



The Comparison of Translation Strategies in the Old and New Translations of *The 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential People in History* by Michael Hart

Ananda Nayla & Haru Deliana Dewi

ananda.nayla@ui.ac.id

English Studies Program, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia, INDONESIA

Abstract

*Translations of the same text might be different from one version to another based on the translation strategies that are used by the translator. By examining the translation strategies in the old and the new translations of a book titled *The 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential People in the World*, this research aims to analyze the different translation procedures, methods, and ideologies used in the two versions. To conduct this research, the researcher uses the descriptive qualitative method with a purposive sampling technique. This research focuses on analyzing the first chapter about the biography of Prophet Muhammad and the fifth chapter about the biography of Confucius. The findings show that nine translation procedures are used in both the old and the new translations. However, there is a difference in the dominant translation procedure and the frequency of the overall translation procedures. The dominant procedure in the old translation is expansion, while in the new translation is naturalization. The total frequency of the procedures in the new translation is also not as many as in the old translation. Based on the procedures found, the old translation uses the communicative translation method and free translation method, while the new translation uses the faithful translation method and semantic translation method. This result shows that there is a shift of ideology between the old and the new translations, from domestication to foreignization.*

Keywords: translation procedures; methods; domestication; foreignization

Article information

Received:
8 May
2023

Revised:
12 September
2023

Accepted:
14 October
2023

Introduction

The 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential People in History is a well-known book written by Michael Hart that was first published in 1978. In this book, Hart lists the 100 people

whom he perceives to have a significant impact on the world. The list of people in this book includes religious figures, political leaders, scientists, artists, and many more. This book has successfully captured people's attention, and it has been translated into different

languages, including Indonesian. The Indonesian translation of this book has more than one version. The first version was translated by H. Mahbub Djunaidi in 1985, while the newer version was translated by Ken Ndaru and M. Nurul in 2012.

These two versions of the translation use different translation strategies from one another, which affects the translation procedures, methods, and ideology. This difference is understandable since there is a huge gap in time between the two translations. Aside from that, the text that is produced can be different from one translator to another based on how they perceive the source text and the effect they want to give to the target readers. Each of the translators developed different strategies as he used different translation procedures and methods in translating the book. Furthermore, the use of the translation procedures and methods will then reflect the translation ideology that is adopted by the translator, whether it is closer to the target language or to the source language. Comparing translation products will be able to provide a deeper understanding of how the shift of emphasis expresses the different perspectives of cultural values (Jahan, 2023).

A comparison of translation strategies has been conducted before in some research. However, all of them only analyze the translation of fictional works, such as novels, comics, and poems. Because of that, the analysis mainly only focuses on the translation of specific terms or figurative language. Widowati's (2013) research compares the translation of figurative language, simile, in the two translations of *Wuthering Heights*. Moreover, the study by Mahardika (2016) compares the translation of the fishery and nautical terms in the two translations of *The Old Man and The Sea*. The research by Widowati (2013) and the one by Mahardika (2016) share some similarities as they both further analyzed the translation quality of the two versions of the translation. Similar to the study by Mahardika (2016), the study by Karavin (2016) also analyzes the two translations of *The Old Man and The Sea* in the Turkish version. However, this study focuses

more on how the textual and extra-textual features influence the shift of expressions.

The study by Kargozari et al. (2017) compares the strategies for translating culture-specific items that are used by native translators and foreign translators. In order to do that, this study analyzes culture-specific items in English translations of two Iranian novels, *Fortune Told in Blood*, which is translated by a native translator and *Journey to Heading 270 Degrees*, which is translated by a foreign translator. Similar to the study by Kargozari et al. (2017), the study by Wijaya & Salim (2019) also analyzes the translation of cultural items in the translation of the *Doraemon* manga series. This research compares the translation of cultural items in the old and the new versions of the translation. Then, Wijaya & Salim (2019) identify the translation ideology and how the sociocultural and sociohistorical relations between Indonesia and Japan influence the translation ideology.

Another study by Turkmen (2020) focuses on comparing the translation of figurative language and word choices in the translations of Persuasion. Moreover, Zhong's (2021) research compares three translations of *The Old Man and The Sea*. This research is similar to Wijaya & Salim's (2019) research as it also analyzes the translation of cultural items and relates them to the translation ideology. Furthermore, the comparison of poem translations is also found in the study by Tóth-Izsó & Lombard (2022). This research compares the two translations of an Italian poem titled *C'è un canto dentro di me* by considering the translator's personal background and experiences.

This research also compares the translation strategies in the two versions of a book translation, specifically the translation procedures and methods in the old and the new translations of the book. Moreover, this research analyzes the translation ideology of both versions, and it is similar to the research by Wijaya & Salim (2019) and Zhong (2020). However, unlike the other previous studies, this research analyzes the translation of a non-fiction book. Thus, the analysis of the

translation strategy is more general and not restricted to the translation of specific terms.

For this research, the non-fiction book used is *The 100: Most Influential People in the World* by Michael Hart. In the old and new translations of *The 100: Most Influential People in the World* by Michael Hart, the different translation strategies that the translators use indicate the difference in translation procedures, methods and ideology of these two versions. Based on this notion, the researcher formulates three questions to conduct this research: (1) What are the translation procedures found in the old translation? (2) What are the translation methods found in the new translation? (3) How do the translation procedures and methods show the differences in translation methods and ideology between the two versions? By examining the translation procedures, methods, and ideology in the two versions, this research aims to unveil the factors that may influence the different use of translation strategies between the old and the new translation. In doing so, the research can contribute to the study of the development of translation strategies in non-fictional works, particularly in the translation of biography texts

Methodology

This research analyzed the English version, and two Indonesian translations of Michael Hart's *The 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential People in History*. The English version used is the second edition, which was published by Citadel Press in 1992. The first version of the translation was translated by H. Mahbub Djunaidi in 1985, and it was published by PT Dunia Pustaka Jaya. Meanwhile, the second version was translated by Ken Ndary & M. Nurul in 2012 and was published by PT Mizan Publika. The old version is actually the translation of the first edition of the book, while the new version is the translation of the second edition. However, the author has noted that the changes in the revised edition only occur for the chapters about contemporary figures. Thus, for this research, the researcher only chooses to analyze the chapters about ancient figures, which are the first chapter about the biography of Prophet Muhammad

and the fifth chapter about the biography of Confucius.

The other consideration for choosing these specific chapters is that they provide ample examples that can highlight the difference in translation strategies used in the two versions. Therefore, the sampling technique used in this research is the purposive sampling technique, as the researchers intentionally select the data that can be used effectively to fulfil the research objectives (Palinkas et al., 2013). The researchers selected data that represented the types of translation procedures and methods based on the theory by Newmark (1988). The data chosen from each version are the translations of the same part of the text, which are to be compared with one another. The total of data used in this research is 100 data from each version. To conduct this research, the researcher used the descriptive qualitative method. By using the descriptive qualitative method, the data were organized categorically with a descriptive summary of the informational contents of the data (Lambert, 2012). The area of research in this study includes the analysis of the translation of words, phrases, and sentences in the old and the new translations.

In collecting the data, first, the researcher analyzed the translation of words, phrases, and sentences in both the old and the new versions, then classified them based on the classification of translation procedure by Newmark (1988). Then, the researcher compared the use of procedures in the two versions. The comparison includes the analysis of whether the two versions use the same procedure in translating the same sentence or not. The reason why Newmark's (1988) theory is chosen to analyze the data is because it provides a comprehensive classification regarding the translation procedures that are still relevant and widely used now. Based on the theory of Newmark (1988), there are twelve kinds of translation procedures, which include literal translation, transference, naturalization, cultural equivalent, functional equivalent, descriptive equivalent, synonymy, through-translation, shifts or transpositions, modulation, recognized translation,

compensation, componential analysis, reduction, expansion, and paraphrase.

Furthermore, based on the procedures found, the researcher analyzed and compared the translation methods in the old and the new translations also by using Newmark's (1988) theory. According to Newmark (1988), the translation methods are divided into two different approaches, which are the source language (SL) emphasis and the target language (TL) emphasis. The methods that are included in the SL emphasis are word-for-word translation, literal translation, faithful translation, and semantic translation. Meanwhile, the TL emphasis methods include adaptation, free translation, idiomatic translation, and communicative translation. The analysis of the translation method uses Newmark's theory (1988) because its classification is more detailed compared to the other theories. Moreover, Newmark's (1988) classification of the translation methods into the source language (SL) emphasis and target language (TL) emphasis can assist the further analysis of translation ideology.

After the translation procedures and methods in both versions were found and compared, the researcher determined whether there was a shift in ideology between the two versions. To analyze the translation ideology, the researcher used Venuti's (2001) theory. Venuti (2001) divides the translation ideology into domestication and foreignization. The domestication ideology brings the text closer to the target reader by

conforming to the values of the target language culture. Because of that, the text seems more natural to the target readers as it does not feel like a translation. On the other hand, the foreignization ideology maintains the cultural and linguistic differences of the source text, so the translation might seem foreign to the target readers.

For data analysis, the Cambridge Dictionary online is used to get an accurate translation. Cambridge Dictionary Online was chosen as it provides a bilingual dictionary and translation feature that offers English-to-Indonesian and Indonesian-to-English translations. Therefore, the dictionary is used to determine the meaning of the data, both from English to Indonesian and from Indonesian to English.

Results and Discussion

Translation Procedures in the Old and the New Translations

Translation procedures are the techniques used by translators for translating sentences and other smaller units of language, such as phrases, clauses, and words (Newmark, 1988). Based on the theory by Newmark (1988), this section provides a comparison of the translation procedures used in the old and the new translations. The summary of the overall translation procedures found in the two versions, along with the frequency of each procedure, is provided in the table below.

Table 1. Summary of the Translation Procedures in the Old and the New Translations

Translation Procedure	Old Translation	New Translation
Modulation	19	11
Expansion	39	10
Reduction	12	9
Descriptive Equivalent	6	5
Transference	5	4
Naturalization	7	16
Cultural Equivalent	4	2
Through Translation	2	2
Synonymy	6	6
Total	100	65

As can be seen from the table, both the old and the new translations use nine translation procedures. However, there is a difference between the total number of procedures that occur, as the total procedures in the old translation are higher than in the new translation. It is affected by the difference in the translation method, which will be further explained in the following section. Moreover, the frequency of each procedure is different from one version to another. One of the factors that affect this difference is that the old and the new translations tend to use different procedures in translating the same sentences from the source text. To illustrate this, the researcher has provided several examples of how a sentence is translated using different procedures in the old and the new versions.

Example 1

ST: As he **slowly** gained converts, the Meccan authorities came to consider him a **dangerous nuisance** (Hart, 1992, p.4)

OT: *Begitu dia **dikit demi dikit** punya pengikut, penguasa memandangnya sebagai **orang berbahaya, pembikin onar*** (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 28)

NT: ***Seiring dengan bertambahnya pengikut-pengikut baru, pihak penguasa Mekkah mulai menganggapnya sebagai gangguan berbahaya*** (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 2)

In the first example, the procedure that occurs in the old translation is expansion, while the procedure in the new translation is the modulation of point of view. In the old translation, the expansion occurs in the translation of the phrase “*dangerous nuisance.*” This phrase is translated into “*orang berbahaya, pembikin onar,*” which means *a dangerous person, a troublemaker* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). There is an additional description, which is “*pembikin onar*” or *a troublemaker*. Therefore, the expansion gives more emphasis on how dangerous Muhammad was perceived by the Meccan authorities. This expansion does not occur in the new translation since the phrase “*dangerous nuisance*” is translated literally into “*gangguan berbahaya.*” As for the new translation, the

procedure that occurs is modulation, as can be seen in the phrase “*As he slowly gained converts*” which is translated into “*Seiring dengan bertambahnya pengikut-pengikut baru.*” There is a modulation of point of view from active to passive. The source text focuses on the subject “*he,*” which refers to Muhammad, who was slowly gaining converts. On the other hand, the target text only focuses on the result of the action, which is “*bertambahnya pengikut-pengikut baru*” which can be translated literally into *the increase in new followers* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). There is no direct mention of the subject of the action in the target text. Meanwhile, in the old translation, this phrase is still translated in the active form as “*Begitu dia dikit demi dikit punya pengikut,*” which means “*Once he has a little follower at a time*” (Cambridge University Press, n.d).

Example 2

ST: Of many **important** historical events, one might say that they were **inevitable and would have occurred** even without the **particular political leader who guided them.** (Hart, 1992, p.9)

OT: *Dari pelbagai peristiwa sejarah, orang bisa saja berkata hal itu **bisa terjadi** tanpa kepemimpinan khusus dari seseorang yang mengepalai mereka.* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 33)

NT: *Dari begitu banyak peristiwa penting dalam sejarah, bisa saja orang berkata bahwa semua itu tidak dapat dihindarkan dan tetap akan terjadi **tanpa panduan pemimpin politik tertentu.*** (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 8)

For the second example, the old translation uses the reduction procedure, while the new translation once again uses the modulation of point of view. In the old translation, the word “*important*” at the beginning of the sentence is omitted, as the phrase “*of many important historical events*” is only translated as “*dari pelbagai peristiwa sejarah.*” Moreover, the phrase “*inevitable and would have occurred*” is only translated as “*bisa terjadi.*” The reduction occurs with the removal of the word “*inevitable*”, as the translator only translated the phrase “*would*

have occurred.” Meanwhile, these phrases are not reduced in the new translation. However, there is a modulation of point of view in the translation of the phrase “*political leader who guided them*” that is translated into “*tanpa panduan pemimpin politik tertentu*” or *without the guidance of particular political leader* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). This phrase in the source text focuses on the “*political leader*” as the subject. Conversely, the target text focuses on the guidance rather than the political leader himself.

Example 3

ST: However, in 732, at the famous **Battle of Tours**, a Moslem army, which had advanced into the center of France, was at last defeated by the Franks (Hart, 1992, p. 5)

OT: *Tapi pada tahun 732, dalam pertempuran yang mahsyur dan dahsyat di Tours, satu pasukan Muslimin yang telah maju ke pusat negeri Perancis pada akhirnya dipukul oleh orang-orang Frank. (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 29)*

NT: *Tapi, pada 732, pada pertempuran Tours yang terkenal itu, satu pasukan Muslim yang bergerak maju sampai ke pusat Prancis, akhirnya dikalahkan oleh pasukan Franks. (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 6)*

Furthermore, the different use of the procedure in the third example can be seen in the translation of “*Battle of Tours*.” In the old translation, the translator decided to describe the phrase “*Battle of Tours*.” The phrase itself is a proper noun as it is the name of the battle between the Franks kingdom and the Muslim army that happened in 732. Instead of translating it literally into “*Pertempuran Tours*,” the translator decided to describe it as “*pertempuran yang mahsyur dan dahsyat di Tours*” or *fierce and mighty battle in Tours* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). Thus, the procedure that occurs in the old translation is descriptive equivalent. On the other hand, the new translation translated “*The Battle of Tours*” literally into “*pertempuran Tours*.” Therefore, there is a different use of procedure as the new translation uses through translation.

Example 4

ST: By 642, Egypt had been wrested from the **Byzantine** Empire. (Hart, 1992, p. 5)

OT: *Pada tahun 642, Mesir direbut dari genggaman Kekaisaran Byzantine. (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 29)*

NT: *Sampai tahun 642, Mesir dirampas dari tangan Kekaisaran Byzantium. (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 3)*

In the fourth example, the difference occurs in the translation of the name of a country, which is “*Byzantine*.” The old translation uses transference as it directly transfers the word without any changes. Meanwhile, the new translation adjusts the word to the spelling in the target language. In the new translation, the spelling of the word is changed to “*Byzantium*.” Thus, the procedure that occurs in the new translation is naturalization.

Example 5

ST: The only comparable conquest in human history is those of the Mongols in the thirteenth century, which were primarily due to the influence of **Genghis Khan**. (Hart, 1992, p. 10)

OT: *Satu-satunya kemiripan dalam hal penaklukan dalam sejarah manusia di abad ke-13 yang sebagian terpokok berkat pengaruh Jenghis Khan. . (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 33)*

NT: *Satu-satunya penaklukan yang dapat disetarakan dengan ini dalam sejarah manusia adalah para Mongol di abad ke-13, yang terutama disebabkan oleh pengaruh Genghis Khan. (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 8)*

In contrast, in the fifth example, the old translation uses naturalization in translating the name “*Genghis Khan*”, while the new translation uses transference. As can be seen, the translator of the new translation directly borrows the name “*Genghis Khan*” without translating it into the target text. Therefore, the translation procedure that occurs for the name is transference. It is different from the

old translation as it uses naturalization, which changes the spelling of the name into “*Jenghis Khan*.”

Example 6

ST: It is probable that the relative influence of Muhammad on Islam has been larger than the combined influence of **Jesus Christ** and **St. Paul** on **Christians** (Hart, 1992, p. 9)

OT: *Kemungkinan pengaruh Muhammad dalam Islam lebih besar dari pengaruh Isa dan St. Paul dalam dunia Kristen digabung jadi satu.* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 33)

NT: *Sangat mungkin pengaruh relatif Muhammad pada Islam lebih besar daripada gabungan pengaruh Yesus Kristus dan Santo Paulus pada agama Nasrani.* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 8)

For the sixth example, the difference occurs in the translation of “*Jesus Christ*,” “*St. Paul*,” and “*Christian*.” In the old translation, “*Jesus Christ*” is translated with its cultural equivalent, which is “*Isa*.” Meanwhile, the translation adjusts the name to the target language’s spelling by using naturalization as it becomes “*Yesus Kristus*.” However, for the translation of “*St. Paul*,” the old translation uses transference by maintaining the spelling without changing anything, while the new translation still uses naturalization by translating it into “*Santo Paulus*.” As for the translation of “*Christianity*,” in this sentence, the old translation adjusts the name of the religion to the spelling in the target language, as it is translated into “*Kristen*.” On the other hand, the new translation uses the cultural equivalent of “*Christianity*,” which is “*Nasrani*.”

Example 7

ST: To the northeast of Arabia lay the large **Neo-Persian Empire** of the Sassanids. (Hart, 1992, p. 5)

OT: *Di sebelah timurlaut Arab berdiri Kekaisaran Persia Baru Sassanids yang luas.* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 29)

NT: *Di Timur Laut Arabia, berdiri Imperium Neo-Persia yang diperintah oleh Dinasti Sassanid.* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 3)

Moreover, in the seventh example, the proper noun “*Neo-Persian Empire*” is translated differently in the two versions. In the old translation, “*Neo-Persian Empire*” is translated literally into “*Kekaisaran Persia Baru*.” Conversely, the new translation uses naturalization with an adjustment to the target language structure as it is translated into “*Imperium Neo-Persia*.” Therefore, there is a different use of procedure as the old translation uses through translation, while the new translation uses naturalization.

Example 8

ST: **Islamic tradition** tells us that he was **illiterate**. (Hart, 1992, p. 4)

OT: *Sumber-sumber Islam menyebutkan bahwa Muhammad seorang buta huruf.* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 28)

NT: *Tradisi Islam berkisah bahwa beliau tidak dapat membaca atau menulis.* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 2)

For the eighth example, the modulation of the scope of meaning occurs in the old translation, while the descriptive equivalent occurs in the new translation. In the old translation, the modulation of the scope of meaning occurs in the translation of “*Islamic tradition*.” Unlike the new translation that translates it literally into “*tradisi Islam*,” the old translation uses “*sumber-sumber*” or *sources* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). The words “*sumber-sumber*” or *sources* have a broader meaning, and they can also include tradition, history, culture, etc. Meanwhile, the procedure that occurs in the new translation is descriptive equivalent, which can be seen in the translation of the word “*illiterate*.” In the new translation, the word “*illiterate*” is translated as “*tidak dapat membaca atau menulis*.” Therefore, it can be seen that the translator gives a description of the word “*illiterate*” as someone who cannot read or write. Meanwhile, in the old translation “*illiterate*” is translated literally as *buta huruf* (Cambridge University Press, n.d).

Indeed, in most cases, the two versions use different types of procedures to translate the same source text. However, it is also possible that both versions use the same procedure. Despite using the same procedure, the result of the translations cannot be exactly the same. There are still some differences between one version and the other. The following examples show how the same procedures are used both in the old and the new translations.

Example 9

ST: However, **unified by Muhammad for the first time in history**, and inspired by their fervent belief in the one true God, these Arab armies now embarked upon one of the most astonishing series of conquests in human history. (Hart, 1992, p. 4-5)

OT: *Tapi Muhammadlah orang pertama dalam sejarah, berkat dorongan kuat kepada keesaan Tuhan, pasukan Arab yang kecil itu sanggup melakukan serentetan penaklukan yang mencengangkan dalam sejarah manusia.* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 29)

NT: *Tapi, setelah Muhammad mempersatukan mereka untuk pertama kalinya dalam sejarah, dan terinspirasi oleh kepercayaan mutlak mereka terhadap keesaan Tuhan, pasukan Arab kecil ini melakukan serangan-serangan paling mengagumkan dalam sejarah manusia.* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 3)

In the ninth example, the modulation of point of view occurs in the translation of the phrase “unified by Muhammad for the first time in history.” In the old translation, the phrase “unified by Muhammad for the first time in history” is translated into “Muhammadlah orang pertama dalam sejarah.” There is a change of point of view from passive to active. In the source text, the sentence has a passive form as it focuses on the action that is done by the subject, which is unifying. Meanwhile, in the target text, the phrase only focuses on Muhammad as the subject without an explicit mention of the action. Similar to the old translation, the sentence in the new translation is also translated using the modulation of point of view with a change from

a passive to an active form. Just like in the old translation, the new translation also focuses on Muhammad as the subject. However, there is a difference in how the phrase is written. While there is no explicit mention of the action in the old translation, as it is only translated as “Muhammadlah orang pertama dalam sejarah,” the new translation explicitly mentions the action and the recipient of the action. In the new translation, the phrase is translated into “setelah Muhammad mempersatukan mereka untuk pertama kalinya dalam sejarah” that means *after Muhammad united them for the first time in history* (Cambridge University Press, n.d).

Example 10

ST: Ancestor worship, **the basic Chinese religion** even before Confucius was reinforced by the strong emphasis that he places on **family loyalty** and respect for one’s parents. (Hart, 1992, p. 28)

OT: *Pemujaan terhadap leluhur, dasar bin dasarnya kepercayaan orang Cina bahkan sebelum lahirnya Kong Hu-Cu, lebih diteguhkan lagi dengan titik berat kesetiaan kepada sanak keluarga dan penghormatan kepada orang tua.* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 54)

NT: *Pemujaan terhadap nenek moyang—agama dasar masyarakat Cina jauh sebelum Konfusius—diperkuat oleh penekanan yang dia letakkan kepada kesetiaan antar anggota keluarga dan rasa hormat kepada orang tua.* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 30).

For the tenth example, the expansion occurs in both translations. The expansion in the old translation can be seen in two phrases. The first phrase is “the basic Chinese religion.” If it is translated faithfully, the phrase should have become “agama dasar Cina (Cambridge University Press, n.d). However, in the target text, it is expanded into “dasar bin dasarnya kepercayaan orang Cina,” which means *the basic of the most basic Chinese religion* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). Thus, the expansion gives a more emphasis on how fundamental the religion that is referred to is. The second phrase is “family loyalty” which is translated into “kesetiaan kepada sanak

keluarga.” There is an addition of the phrase “*kepada sanak keluarga,*” which means *to the relatives* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). Therefore, the expansion emphasizes that loyalty should be given to the relatives in one’s family. In the new translation, the sentence is also translated using expansion. However, unlike in the old translation, the expansion only occurs in the translation of the phrase “*family loyalty.*” This phrase is translated into “*kesetiaan antar anggota keluarga*” with the addition of “*antar anggota keluarga*”, which means *between the family members* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). In the old translation, this phrase is translated into “*kesetiaan kepada sanak keluarga*” or *loyalty to the relatives* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). Indeed, there is a different wording between the old and the new translations, but the message of both phrases is quite similar.

Example 11

ST: Most Arabs at that time were **pagans** and believed in many gods. (Hart, 1992, p. 4)

OT: *Umumnya, bangsa Arab pada saat itu tak memeluk agama tertentu kecuali menyembah berhala.* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 28)

NT: *Kebanyakan orang Arab pada masa itu menyembah berhala dan percaya pada banyak dewa.* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 2)

Furthermore, in the eleventh example, the descriptive equivalent is used in the two versions for the translation of the word “*pagans.*” The word *pagans* in the old translation is translated with the description as “*tak memeluk agama tertentu kecuali menyembah berhala.*” If it is translated into English, this phrase becomes *no religion except idolaters* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). Therefore, “*pagans*” are described based on their belief and their activity as people who do not have any religion and worship idols. Similar to the old translation, the translator of the new version also gives a description of the word “*pagans.*” However, while the old translation gives a description based on the belief and the activity that they do, the description of “*pagans*” in the new translation

is only based on the activity, which is “*menyembah berhala*” or *worshipping idols* (Cambridge University Press, n.d).

Example 12

ST: Another of his tenets was a slight variant of the **Golden Rule** (Hart, 1992, p. 28).

OT: *Dan salah satu hukum ajarannya sangat mirip dengan dengan Golden Rule-nya Nasrani* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 54).

NT: *Salah satu doktrinnya adalah variasi kecil dari Golden Rule* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 30).

For the proper noun “*Golden Rule*” in the twelfth example, both the old and the new translations directly transfer the phrase without translating it. Therefore, both the old and the new translations use the same procedure, which is transference. However, there is a bit of addition in the old translation that gives context to the Christian Golden Rule.

Example 13

ST: He believed that **the Golden Age** was in the past and he urged both rulers and people to return to the good old moral standards. (Hart, 1992, p. 28)

OT: *Menurut hematnya, jaman keemasan sudah lampau, dan dia menghimbau baik penguasa maupun rakyat supaya kembali asal, berpegang pada ukuran moral yang genah, tidak ngelantur.* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 54)

NT: *Dia percaya bahwa Zaman Keemasan sudah berlalu dan dia mendesak penguasa dan rakyat untuk kembali pada standar moral lama* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 30).

Similarly, the phrase “*Golden Age*” in the thirteenth example is translated by using through translation in both versions. The new translation translates it into “*jaman keemasan,*” while the new translation still translates it into “*Zaman Keemasan.*” Although there is a bit of difference in the spelling between the old and the new translations, the meaning is still the same.

Example 14

ST: First, Muhammad played a far more important role in the development of Islam than Jesus did in the development of **Christianity** (Hart, 1992, p. 9).

OT: *Pertama, Muhammad memainkan peran yang jauh lebih penting dalam pengembangan Islam ketimbang peranan Nabi Isa terhadap agama Nasrani* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 32).

NT: *Pertama, Muhammad memainkan peran yang jauh lebih penting dalam perkembangan Islam ketimbang Yesus dalam perkembangan agama Nasrani* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 7)

It also goes the same way for the translation of "Christianity" in the last example. In this example, the translation of the name of the religion, "Christianity," is translated using the cultural equivalent in both the old and the new translations, as it is translated into "Nasrani." However, there is an inconsistency in the translation of this word in the old version. In some other sentences in the old version, the word "Christianity" is sometimes also translated using naturalization as "Kristen."

Based on the examples above, it can be seen that despite using the same procedures, there are still some differences in the translation of the sentences. The difference might have happened due to several factors. For instance, in the tenth example, although both texts use the same procedure, the frequency of the procedure is different as the expansion occurs in two phrases in the old translation, while in the new translation, it only occurs in one phrase. The other factors might be the difference in the spelling, like the thirteenth example, or how the phrases are written, like the ninth and twelfth examples. Therefore, it can be seen that using the same procedure does not make the texts produce the exact same translations.

Overall, the difference in translation procedures in the two versions does not only lie in the total number of procedures but also in the dominant procedures. The old

translation dominantly uses expansion with a total frequency of 39, while the new translation mainly uses naturalization with a total frequency of 16. For some procedures, such as descriptive equivalent, transference, cultural equivalent, through translation, and synonymy, there is no huge gap between the total frequency, some of which even have the same frequency. However, there are differences in how those procedures are used. Even when the same part of the text is translated using the same procedures, there are still some differences in the results. These differences might be affected by the translators' perceptions towards the text and the methods that are used.

Translation Methods in the Old and the New Translations

Unlike translation procedures, translation methods refer to the overall translation of the whole text (Newmark, 1988). Therefore, translation methods are influenced by the use of translation procedures. Based on the procedures that are found in the previous section, this section further analyzes the translation methods in the old and the new translations by using Newmark's (1988) theory. This section provides examples from the text to show the comparison of the translation methods in the old and the new translations.

Example 1

ST: Contemporary rulers did not accept his program, **but after his death his ideas spread widely throughout the country** (Hart, 1992, p. 28).

OT: *Penguasa masa itu tidak menggubris sama sekali petuah-petuahnyanya. Baru sesudah dia wafatlah ajaran-ajarannya menyebarkan luas ke seluruh pojok Cina* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 55).

NT: *Penguasa masa itu tidak menerima programnya. Tapi setelah wafatnya, ide-idenya meluas ke seantero negeri* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 31).

In the first example, the old translation uses the communicative method, while the

new translation uses the semantic method. In the new translation, the semantic method occurs when there is a change in the structure of the sentence. The target text divided the sentence into two separate sentences. The dependent clause, “*but after his death his ideas spread widely throughout the country,*” becomes an independent sentence in the target text. Yet, other than this change, the new translation maintains the overall meaning and message of the source text. Similarly, this sentence is divided into two separate sentences from the old translation. However, unlike the new translation, there are several other changes in the old translation that do not occur in the new translation. For example, the phrase “*did not accept his program*” is literally translated into “*tidak menerima programnya*” in the new translation. However, in the old translation, it becomes “*tidak menggubris sama sekali petuah-petuahnya*” which means *ignored his admonitions at all* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). Another example is the phrase “*his ideas spread widely throughout the country*” which is translated into “*ajaran-ajarannya menyebar luas ke seluruh pojok Cina*” in the old translation. The old translation changes the word “*country*” in this phrase into “*Cina*” or *China* by specifying the country it refers to, while the new translation still translates it literally into “*negeri*.” Moreover, instead of translating the phrase “*his idea*” into “*ide-idenya*” like in the new translation, the old translation uses “*ajaran-ajarannya*” or *his teachings*, which is synonymous in this context. Nevertheless, these changes do not alter the overall message of the text, but they only make the sentences appear more communicative.

Example 2

ST: Rather, **he was restating, in a clear and impressive form, their basic traditional ideals** (Hart, 1992, p. 30).

OT: *Malah kebalikannya, Kong Hu-Cu ikut menunjang dengan bahasa yang jelas bersih agar mereka tidak perlu beringsut.* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 56).

NT: *Dia hanya menegaskan kembali –dalam bentuk yang jelas dan mengagumkan—ide -ide tradisional mereka* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 32).

As for the second example, the method used in the old translation is the free translation method, while the new translation uses the faithful translation method. By using the faithful translation method, the sentence in the new translation is translated literally with some adjustments to the grammatical structure of the target language. However, there is a bit of difference in the use of punctuation. While the source language uses a comma between the phrase “*in a clear and impressive form,*” the target language uses a dash between the phrase “*dalam bentuk yang jelas dan mengagumkan.*” Other than this difference, the meaning and the structure of the sentence are still the same. In contrast, the translation of this sentence in the old version has a different meaning as it uses the free translation method. In the old translation, the phrase “*restating, in a clear and impressive form, their basic traditional ideals*” is translated into “*menunjang dengan bahasa yang jelas bersih agar mereka tidak perlu beringsut*” or *supported with a clear language so they do not need to be edged* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). This translation has a different meaning from the source text. Meanwhile, the new translation still maintains the meaning of the phrase as it is translated into “*menegaskan kembali –dalam bentuk yang jelas dan mengagumkan—ide -ide tradisional mereka.*”

Example 3

ST: The Koran, therefore, closely represents Muhammad’s ideas and teaching, and, to a considerable extent, **his exact words** (Hart, 1992, p. 9).

OT: *Al-Quran dengan demikian berkaitan erat dengan pandangan-pandangan Muhammad serta ajaran-ajarannya karena dia bersandar pada wahyu Tuhan* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 32).

NT: *Karena itu, Al-Qur’an sangat dekat mewakili pemikiran dan ajaran Muhammad, serta—sampai tahap tertentu—setiap kata-katanya* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 7).

Just like the second example, in the third example, the old translation also uses the free translation method, and the new translation uses the faithful translation method. The new

translation barely changes the meaning and the structure of the source text. There is, however, a bit of an adjustment in the structure as the subordinating conjunction “*karena itu*,” which is the translation of “*therefore*,” is written at the beginning of the sentence. The use of commas between the phrase “*and, to a considerable extent*” is also changed into a dash, as can be seen between the phrase “*sampai tahap tertentu*.” The translation of this phrase in this version does not change the meaning of the sentence, and it is mostly faithful to the source text. Unlike the new version, the old translation significantly altered the meaning of the source text. The change of the meaning in the old version occurs as it uses the free translation method, specifically in the phrase “*his exact words*,” which is translated into “*karena dia bersandar pada wahyu Tuhan*” or *for he relied upon the revelation of the Lord* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). The old translation implies that Muhammad’s teachings are based on God’s words instead of his own. Meanwhile, the new translation still implies that Muhammad’s teachings are based on his own words, as the phrase “*his exact words*” is translated into “*setiap kata-katanya*.”

Example 4

ST: Confucius was not asking the Chinese to change their basic beliefs (Hart, 1992, p. 30).

OT: *Kong Hu-Cu tidaklah meminta keliwat banyak. Misalnya, dia tidak minta orang Cina menukar dasar-dasar kepercayaan lamanya* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 56).

NT: *Konfusius tidak meminta mereka untuk mengubah dasar hidup mereka* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 32).

Furthermore, in the fourth example, the method used in the old translation is the communicative translation method, and the method in the new translation is the faithful translation method. In the old translation, the sentence “*Confucius was not asking the Chinese to change their basic beliefs*” is separated into two sentences. There is an additional sentence in the target text, which is “*Kong Hu-Cu*

tidaklah meminta keliwat banyak,” which can be translated as *Confucius does not ask much* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). With this addition, the structure changes from one sentence into two sentences since the original sentence serves as an example for the additional sentence. On the other hand, the new translation stays faithful to the source text without adding any sentences. There is a bit of a change as the word “*Chinese*” is translated into “*mereka*” or *they*, which refers to the Chinese people. However, this change is not significant, and the target text mostly still maintains the structure of the source text.

Example 5

ST: My choice of Muhammad to lead the list of the world’s most influential persons may surprise some readers and may be questioned by others, **but he was the only man in history who was supremely successful on both the religious and secular levels** (Hart, 1992, p. 3).

OT: *Jatuhnya pilihan saya kepada Nabi Muhammad dalam urutan pertama daftar Seratus Tokoh yang berpengaruh di dunia mungkin mengejutkan sementara pembaca dan mungkin jadi tanda tanya sebagian yang lain. Tapi saya berpegang teguh pada keyakinan saya, dialah Nabi Muhammad satu-satunya manusia dalam sejarah yang mampu meraih sukses-sukses luar biasa baik ditilik dari ukuran agama maupun ruang lingkup duniawi* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 27).

NT: *Saya memilih Muhammad saw sebagai tokoh teratas dalam daftar paling berpengaruh di dunia mungkin mengejutkan sejumlah pembaca dan dipertanyakan oleh yang lain. Namun, dialah satu-satunya orang dalam sejarah yang sangat berhasil, baik dalam hal keagamaan maupun sekuler* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 1).

For the fifth example, the old translation once again uses the communicative translation method, while the new translation uses the semantic translation method. In the old translation, the communicative method can be seen in the beginning of the sentence as the phrase, “*but he was the only man in history*” is translated into “*tapi saya berpegang teguh*

pada keyakinan saya, dialah Nabi Muhammad satu-satunya manusia dalam sejarah.” In English the sentence in the target text means *but I cling to my belief he, Muhammad, was the only human being in history* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). There is an addition of the phrase *“tapi saya berpegang teguh pada keyakinan saya,”* which can be translated as *but I cling to my belief.* Meanwhile, in the new translation, there is no such kind of addition. However, there is a change in the structure since the sentence is divided into two separate sentences in the target text. The dependent clause, *“but he was the only man in history who was supremely successful on both the religious and secular levels,”* becomes an independent sentence in the target text.

Example 6

ST: The great Chinese philosopher Confucius was the first man to develop a system of beliefs synthesizing the basic ideas of the Chinese people (Hart, 1992, p. 27).

OT: *Tak salah lagi, Kong Hu-Cu seorang filosof besar Cina. Dan tak salah lagi, dialah orang pertama pengembang sistem memadukan alam pikiran dan kepercayaan orang Cina yang paling mendasar duniawi* (Hart, 1978/1985, p. 53).

NT: *Filsuf besar Cina, Konfusius, merupakan orang pertama yang mengembangkan sistem kepercayaan yang menjadi sintesis ide-ide dasar rakyat Cina* (Hart, 1992/2012, p. 29).

In the last example, the old translation uses the communicative translation method, while the new translation uses the semantic translation method. In the old translation, a change of structure occurs as the sentence is divided into two separate sentences. Other than that, the translator also paraphrases the sentences, which makes them seem a bit different from the source text, even though it still conveys the same message. There is an addition of the phrase *“Tak salah lagi”* that means *unmistakably* (Cambridge University Press, n.d). If the sentence in the old translation is translated into English, it becomes *Unmistakably, Confucius is a great*

Chinese philosopher. And unmistakably that he is the first person who developed a system that combines the basic thoughts and beliefs of the Chinese people (Cambridge University Press, n.d). In contrast, the new translation maintains the structure of the sentence as it is only translated into one sentence. However, there is a bit of a change of structure in the phrase *“a system of beliefs synthesizing the basic ideas”* that is translated into *“mengembangkan sistem kepercayaan yang menjadi sintesis ide-ide dasar.”* If it is translated into English, the phrase means *develop a belief system that becomes a synthesis of basic ideas* (Cambridge University Press, n.d), which is a bit different from the source text. Yet, this difference does not affect the overall meaning of the sentence, and except for this change, the sentence is mostly similar to the source text.

Based on the examples above, it can be seen that the dominant methods in the old translation are the communicative and free translation methods, while the dominant methods in the new translation are the faithful and semantic translation methods. Since the old translation uses the communicative and free translation methods, it does not maintain the structure of the source text. Paraphrasing is often used in the old translation. Sometimes, the translation in the old translation even has a different meaning from the source text. Aside from that, the old translation also tends to add details that are not mentioned in the source text. On the other hand, the new translation mostly maintains the structure of the source text by using the faithful translation method. However, in some cases, the translator changes the structure of the sentences to make them sound more natural by using the semantic translation method.

The different uses of the translation method affect the number of translation procedures that occur in both translations. Since the old translation tends to use communicative and free translation methods, more changes occur. Hence, the frequency of the procedures in the old translation is significantly higher, reaching a total of 100. Meanwhile, the new translation method does not significantly alter the source text as it tends to use the faithful translation method and semantic translation method. Therefore, the

translation procedure that occurs in the new translation is not as extensive as the old translation, with the total number of procedures only reaching 65.

Ideology in the Old and New Translations

The ideology in the old and the new translations is influenced by the translation methods and procedures that are used in each version. The comparison of the translation methods and procedures in the two versions is summarized in the table below.

Table 2. Comparison of Translation Methods and Procedures

	Old translation	New Translation
Translation Methods	Communicative translation method and Free translation method	Faithful translation method and semantic translation method
Translation Procedures	1. Modulation 2. Expansion 3. Reduction 4. Descriptive equivalent 5. Transference 6. Naturalization 7. Cultural equivalent 8. Through translation 9. Synonymy	1. Modulation 2. Expansion 3. Reduction 4. Descriptive equivalent 5. Transference 6. Naturalization 7. Synonymy

As can be seen in the table, there is a difference in translation methods in the old and the new translations. The old translation uses the communicative translation method and the free translation method dominantly. Meanwhile, the new translation uses a combination of faithful and semantic translation methods. Although the translation procedures in the old and the new translations are the same, there are some differences in the dominant procedures and the total frequency of all the procedures. The dominant procedure in the old translation is expansion, while the dominant procedure in the new translation is naturalization. Expansion is a translation procedure that is part of the domestication ideology, while naturalization is a procedure that is part of the foreignization ideology. Moreover, there is a significant difference in the frequency of the overall translation procedures found in the old and the new translations. In the old translation, the total frequency of all the translation procedures was 100, while the total frequency in the new translation was only 65. There are not as many procedures in the new translation as in the old translation because the translation in the newer version tends to stay faithful to the

source text. However, sometimes, the new translation still uses modulation and expansion to make the target text more natural or to give more context to the target readers. Yet, it can also be seen that the frequency of modulation and expansion in the new translation is not as many as in the old translation. In the new translation, the frequency of modulation is only 11, and expansion is 10, while in the old translation, the frequency of modulation is 19 and expansion is 35.

Based on Newmark's (1988) classification, the communicative translation method and free translation method put more emphasis on the target language, while both faithful and semantic translation methods put more emphasis on the source language. From the dominant and the frequency of the procedures, it is shown that there are more changes in the old translation compared to the new one. Therefore, these findings show that there is indeed a shift of ideology between the old translation and the new translation. The translation ideology in the old translation is domestication, as it attempts to bring the translation closer to the target culture, and the

translation ideology in the new translation is foreignization.

However, despite the difference in the dominant ideology, inconsistencies are found in the translation of the proper nouns, both in the old translation and in the new translation. In the old translation, some of the proper names are translated by using cultural equivalents, through translation, and

expansion, while some of them use descriptive equivalents, transference, and naturalization. On the other hand, although the new translation mostly uses naturalization, there are also other procedures found, such as transference, through translation, cultural equivalent, and expansion. A summary of the procedures used in translating the proper nouns is provided in the table below.

Table 3. The Translation Procedures Used for Proper Nouns

Translation Procedure	Old Translation	New Translation
Cultural Equivalent	Jesus → <i>Isa/Nabi Isa</i> Confucius → <i>Kong Hu-Cu</i> Christian → <i>Nasrani</i>	Christian → <i>Nasrani</i>
Expansion	Muhammad → <i>Nabi Muhammad</i>	Muhammad → <i>Muhammad Saw.</i>
Through Translation	Golden Age → <i>jaman keemasan</i> Neo-Persian Empire → <i>Kekaisaran Persia Baru</i>	Golden Age → <i>Zaman Keemasan</i> Battle of Tours → <i>pertempuran Tours</i>
Transference	St. Paul Byzantine Golden Rule	Genghis Khan Golden Rule
Naturalization	Genghis Khan → <i>Jengis Khan</i> Christian → <i>Kristen</i>	Jesus → <i>Yesus</i> Confucius → <i>Konfusius</i> St. Paul → <i>Santo Paulus</i> Byzantine → <i>Byzantium</i> Neo-Persian Empire → <i>Imperium Neo-Persia</i>
Descriptive Equivalent	Battle of Tours → <i>pertempuran yang mahsyur dan dahsyat di Tours</i>	-

As can be seen in the table above, both the old and the new translations use the procedures from both the domestication and foreignization ideologies. For instance, the old translation uses a cultural equivalent, which is part of the domestication ideology, as it translates “Jesus: into “Nabi Isa.” However, in translating “St. Paul”, the translator decides to use the foreignization ideology as it directly borrows the foreign spelling without translating it by using the transference procedure. In contrast, the new translation uses foreignization ideology, which is naturalization, as it translates the word “Jesus” into “Yesus.” Yet, in translating the term “Christian”, it uses the domestication ideology by translating it with a cultural equivalent into *Nasrani*.

Based on the table, the procedures that are included in the domestication ideology are only cultural equivalent and expansion, while

the rest of the procedures belong to the foreignization ideology. Indeed, in terms of translating proper nouns, there is an inconsistency in both the old and the new translations. However, both the old and the new translations tend to use the foreignization ideology in translating the proper nouns.

Furthermore. the differences use of the overall translation strategies used in these two versions might also be influenced by the intratextual and extratextual factors that are proposed by Nord (2006). The intratextual factors are related to the texts themselves, such as the topic, the information, the lexical characteristics, and the syntactic structures. The extratextual factors are related to the sender of the text or the original author, the intention of the author, the target audience, the time and place of the text production and reception, and the purpose of the communication. According to Nord (2006),

translators should consider these two factors in maintaining the communicative function of the translation.

For these two translations, it can be assumed that the intratextual factor, specifically the purpose of the translator, might be the one that influences the difference. From the communicative and free translation methods that are used in the older version, it seems that the translator does not only aim to deliver the message but also to make the target text more communicative to the target reader. It also intends to bring the text closer to the target readers' culture by using the domestication ideology. Meanwhile, it appears that the purpose of the translators of the new version is to deliver the message of the source text as concisely as possible without altering the source text too much, as they use faithful and semantic translation methods along with foreignization ideology. Moreover, the extratextual factor that might influence the ideological differences is the time of publication. There is indeed a huge gap of time between the two versions, as the old translation was published in 1986, and the new translation was published in 2012. Yet, further research on the time gap between these two versions is still needed.

Conclusion

The translation methods and ideology in the old and the new translations of the book are influenced by the translation procedures that are used in the respective versions. Both the old translation uses nine translation procedures, which include modulation, expansion, reduction, descriptive equivalent, transference, naturalization, cultural equivalent, through translation, and synonymy. However, there is a difference in the dominant translation procedure and the total frequency of the overall translation procedures. The dominant procedure in the old translation is expansion, while in the new translation, the dominant procedure is naturalization. Moreover, the total frequency of the overall translation in the old translation is significantly higher than in the new translation. The new translation tends to stay faithful to the source text, which explains why the total frequency of the procedures in the

new version is not as much as in the old version. These findings imply that there might be different perspectives towards the text, which then affect the translation methods that are used in the two versions. Based on the procedures found, the old translation tends to use the communicative translation method and free translation method, while the new translation tends to use the faithful translation method and semantic translation method. These differences further influence the shift of ideology as the old translation uses the domestication ideology, while the new translation uses the foreignization ideology.

The different use of translation strategies in these two texts might be influenced by the intratextual factor, which is the different purpose of the translators. It seems that the translator of the old version aims to make the text more communicative and closer to the target readers' culture, while the translators of the new version only aim to concisely deliver the information without changing the source text if it is not necessary. Furthermore, the extratextual factor of the publication time of the two translations might also influence the ideology shift. However, to be more certain, further research about the influence of this time gap is still required.

The shift of ideology in this research is similar to the previous studies that compare the ideology between the old and new versions of translation. Although this research analyzes a non-fiction work, it has a similar result to the studies by Wijaya & Salim (2019) and Zhong (2021) that analyze fictional works. The studies by Wijaya & Salim (2019) and Zhong (2021) also show that the older version of translation tends to use the domestication ideology, while the newer version tends to use the foreignization ideology. It can be assumed that globalization and the advancement of technology may influence the tendency of the use of foreignization ideology in newer translations. With constant exposure to cross-cultural information from the internet or other popular culture products, people nowadays are already versed in foreign cultures. That may explain why the translators of the newer versions decide to maintain the foreign elements of the text without domesticating

them, as they might believe that the target readers are already familiar with it.

This research contributes to the study of the development of translation strategies in non-fictional works, specifically in the translation of biography texts. However, this research is only limited to the analysis and comparison of the translation strategies between the old and the new translations of the book. This research does not further analyze how the time gap between the two versions might influence the different strategies that are used by the translators. Therefore, for future research suggestions, an in-depth analysis of the time of publication and other factors that can influence the different use of translation strategies can be conducted.

References

- Apriyanti, T., Safitri, M., & Dewi, N. (2016, February). Translating Theory of English into Indonesian and Vice-Versa. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies*, 2(1), 38–48. https://repository.usd.ac.id/23327/1/4257_Translating+Theory-IJELS.pdf
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. New York: Routledge.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dewi, H. D., & Wijaya, A. (2021). *Dasar-Dasar Penerjemahan Umum (2nd.ed)*. Bandung: Manggu Makmur Tanjung Lestari.
- Jahan, F. (2023). Comparative Literature and translation Studies: Approaching an understanding between the two. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 06(03), 1582–1588. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v6-i3-32>
- Karavin, H. (2016). A Systemic Analysis of Two Turkish Translations of Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*. *DergiPark (Istanbul University)*, 2(3), 41–70.
- Kargozari, R. K., Azarnoosh, M., & Valipour, V. (2017). Comparing the strategies applied in the translation of culture-specific items. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 7(3), 216.
- Koller, W. (1989) *Equivalence in translation theory* (A. Chesterman, Ed. & Trans.). (Original work published 1979).
- Lambert, M. (2012). *A Beginner's Guide to Doing Your Education Research Project*. SAGE.
- Mahardika, A. (2016). *A Comparative Analysis of The Impact of Translation Techniques to The Translation Quality in The Translation of Nautical and Fishery Terms from The Novel "The Old Man and The Sea*. [Bachelor's thesis, Sebelas Maret University].
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice HaH International vUIO Ltd.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. E.J. Brill.
- Nord, C. (2006). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis, Second Edition (Amsterdamer [R1] Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur 94)* (2nd ed.). Rodopi.
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2013). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Reiss, K. (1989). *Text types, translation types and translation assessment* (A. Chesterman, Ed. & Trans.). (Original work published 1977).
- Saroukhil, M. A., Ghalkhani, O., & Hashemi, A. (2018). A Critical Review of Translation: A Look Forward. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 6(2), 101–110. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v6n.2p.101>
- Tilla, M., & Ardi, H. (2020). Structure Shift in the Indonesian Translation of Pragmatics Textbook Written by George Yule. *English*

Language and Literature.
<https://doi.org/10.24036/ell.v9i4.11042>
8

- Tóth-Izsó, Z., & Lombard, C. A. (2022). Comparing Two Translations of Giovanni Papini's Poem *C'è un canto dentro di me* Depending on the Translators' Experiences before and during the Translation. *Journal of Critical Studies in Language and Literature*, 3(3), 6–14. <https://doi.org/10.46809/jcsll.v3i3.148>
- Turkmen, B. (2020). Decisions on Literary Translation: Comparative Analysis of Translations of "Persuasion. In M. Dalkilic (Eds.) *International Congress on Social and Education Sciences (INCSES-2020)* (pp. 270-275). Insac.
- Venuti, L. (2001). Strategies of Translation. M. Baker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp.240-244). Routledge.
- Widowati, C. (2013). *A Comparative Analysis of Strategies on Translating Simile In The Novel Entitled Wuthering Heights Into Two Bahasa Indonesia Versions And Quality Of Simile Translation Of Both Translation Versions*. [Bachelor's thesis, Sebelas Maret University].
- Wijaya, A., & Salim, D. R. (2019). Behind the Ideology Shift: Comparison Between Old and New Indonesian Translations of Doraemon Manga Series. *International Review of Humanities Studies*, 4(1), 337–359.
- Zhong, X. (2021). *A Comparative Analysis of Three Translation Versions of The Old Man and the Sea from the Perspective of Domestication and Foreignization*. Atlantis Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210609.109>