

Translation Method and Equivalence of Interrogative Sentences in Subtitles “*Emily in Paris Season 2*”

Annisa Prasetyawati Paundrianagari, I Nyoman Sedeng, Ni Luh Ketut Mas Indrawati
Udayana University, Indonesia

Article Received: 15/09/2023

Article Revised: 15/10/2023

Article Accepted: 17/10/2023

Published Online: 18/10/2023

DOI: 10.47311/IJOES.2023.5.10.52

Abstract

Translation is key in helping us understand different languages and cultures, and it's more than just swapping words between languages. This study explores the deep and detailed world of translation, focusing on keeping the meaning, setting, and cultural touches from the original language (SL) when changing it into the target language (TL). Using ideas from famous experts like Larson, Molina and Albir, Newmark, and Nida, the study highlights the importance of using the right translation methods, ensuring equal meaning, and keeping hidden meanings. The research looks at a real-world example by studying the subtitles in the TV series "Emily in Paris Season 2." It explores how translators keep the meaning, clarity, and natural flow while dealing with the challenges of different cultures and languages. The study aims to shine a light on the translator's job in not only tackling language and cultural differences but also making sure the deep and hidden messages of the SL are clearly and accurately brought across in the TL. By closely looking at how subtitles are translated, the research hopes to uncover the tactics used by translators to manage challenges, like finding equal meanings and keeping the hidden meanings from the SL, adding to the wider discussion on effective translation practices in media like TV and film.

Keywords: TV and film, Translation Method, Equivalence, Interrogative Sentences, target language.

Introduction

Translation is key to helping people understand languages and cultures that are not their own. It's not just about changing words from one language to another but also keeping the original meanings and cultural hints. While some people can speak different languages, many need help from translations to understand texts, books, movies, or songs from different

languages. Translating involves taking the meaning from the original language (source language or SL) and making sure the translation (target language or TL) keeps the same meaning. This can be tricky because translators have to think about context, grammar rules, writing styles, and idioms in both languages.

Translation is not just about changing words but also about keeping the accuracy, clarity, and natural flow of the original text. Translators often face challenges, like finding words that have the same meaning and keeping the hidden meanings from the SL, especially when there are cultural differences to consider. They need to use specific methods and ensure both formal and dynamic Equivalence, as explained by experts like Nida.

This study aims to explore the detailed world of translation, focusing on methods, equivalences, and keeping the hidden meaning, especially in multimedia translation. By looking at the subtitles in the TV series "Emily in Paris Season 2," the research hopes to understand and explain the strategies used by translators to manage the challenges of different languages and cultures, making sure the translated words keep the same meaning and feel as the original language. This study hopes to add to the wider discussion on effective translation practices, especially in media like TV and film, providing insights and guidelines for translators facing similar challenges.

Research Method

This research employs a qualitative approach, specifically utilizing a descriptive qualitative method, to delve into the topic of translation, focusing on the movie series "Emily in Paris Season 2" and its English and Indonesian subtitles. The descriptive qualitative method, as outlined by Gay et al. (2012), seeks to elucidate the current status of the research object and problem through non-numerical data, providing a detailed understanding of the topic based on applied theory.

Data will be sourced directly from the aforementioned movie series, selected due to its popularity, award-winning status, and the diverse, rich data it provides related to the theory utilized in this research. The series, which has not been used in similar studies, is anticipated to offer novel insights and varied analysis results pertinent to the applied theory.

Data collection will be executed using a transcription method, involving intensive viewing of the series, documenting data, and identifying translation methods based on Newmark's theory, followed by classification to find equivalences using Nida and Taber's theory. This method preserves original meanings and facilitates systematic, comparative analysis across studies.

Data analysis will employ a descriptive-qualitative method and technique anchored in theories of translation method by Newmark (1988), translation equivalence by Nida and Taber (1969), and the theory of Implicature by Grice (1975). The analysis process encompasses identification, classification, and note-taking.

Data will be presented using an informal method, describing data narratively and descriptively to address the research issues, thereby facilitating a comprehensive understanding of the material and enabling the development of detailed perspectives through linguistic expression.

Theoretical Frameworks

In the exploration of translation nuances within the movie series "Emily in Paris Season 2", three foundational theories serve as the analytical backbone, guiding the research through various facets of translation.

The first theory, introduced by Newmark in 1988, delves into the translation method, providing a structured approach to understanding how translations can be executed. This theory outlines various methods, such as Word for Word and Literal translation, both of which prioritize a direct conversion of language, maintaining a close adherence to the original text. On the other hand, methods like Faithful and Semantic translation emphasize preserving the original context and aesthetic value of the text, respectively, even while navigating through different linguistic structures. Adaptation and Free translation offer the translator a degree of freedom, allowing for cultural and linguistic adjustments to ensure the translated text resonates with the target audience. Idiomatic and Communicative translations, meanwhile, focus on ensuring that the conveyed message is both relatable and clear to the audience, utilizing common expressions and clear, understandable communication.

The second theory, proposed by Nida and Taber in 1969, explores translation equivalence, which is pivotal in ensuring that the translated text elicits a response from the audience that is akin to the original. Formal Equivalence leans towards a literal, faithful translation, maintaining a strict adherence to the original text. In contrast, Dynamic Equivalence is more fluid, aiming to ensure that the target audience experiences a similar impact to that of the original audience, even if it means altering the form of the text to be more culturally and linguistically palatable.

Result and Discussion

In this chapter, our focus is on the examination of data derived from "Emily in Paris" Season 2. To present a comprehensive understanding, we have divided this chapter into two distinct sections: the results and the discussion. The results section delves into the sentences identified through various translation methods and provides an in-depth analysis of their Equivalence. This section seeks to categorize and interpret the data in order to shed light on the translation techniques employed within the series. We also examine how these methods define and shape our analysis. On the other hand, the discussion section serves as a platform for presenting the data and our detailed analysis. Here, we explore the implications and significance of the findings.

A. Word by Word

| Source Language | Target language |
|---|--|
| Madeline: Everything okay? | Madeline: Semua baik? |
| Emily: Sorry, Mads, um, I've got to run. | Emily: Maaf, Mads,aku harus pergi. |
| Madeline: Of course! Pas de problème. My hotel's near here, anyway. | Madeline: Tentu! Pas de problème. Hotelku dekat dari sini. |

Word-for-word translation, as seen in the given data, involves directly translating each word from the source text into the target language, maintaining the original word order and structure. For instance, "Everything okay?" is translated as "Semua baik?" in a word-for-word manner, preserving the original wording and structure. Formal Equivalence, on the other hand, seeks to closely mirror the form and structure of the source text in the target language. It aims for a literal translation, where the translation of "Everything okay?" as "Semua baik?" maintains a similar structure, word order, and grammatical form as the source text. This approach ensures a high level of formal correspondence between the source and target languages.

B. Faithful Translation

| Source Language | Target language |
|---|---|
| <p>Mindy: What do you think?</p> <p>Emily: I love it</p> | <p>Mindy: Bagaimana menurutmu?</p> <p>Emily: Aku suka sekali</p> |

The faithful translation delivers the meaning by the precise contextual meaning and does not depend on the grammatical structure of the target language. The faithful translation can be classified as formal Equivalence if the translation is equal to the target language. From the data, what do you think shows that the target language and source language are Equivalent and there is no significant difference in meanings between the two languages?

C.Literal Translation

| Source Language | Target language |
|--|--|
| <p>Alfie: What were you doing last week when you were too busy to have a drink with me?</p> <p>Emily: Uh.. we were busy promoting the opening of a restaurant near my apartment.</p> <p>Alfie: Which one?</p> <p>Emily: Chex lava</p> | <p>Alfie: Pekerjaanmu pekan lalu saat terlalu sibuk untuk minum denganku?</p> <p>Emily: Kami sibuk mempromosikan pembukaan restoran dekat apartemenku.</p> <p>Alfie: yang mana?</p> <p>Email: Chex Lavaux</p> |

The first example, *which one?* in the target language, means asking about two options or positions that are mainly discussed at the moment. Through the context and the grammatical structure, *which one?* Share the same meaning in the target language. This aligns with the formal Equivalence, in which the target language is equal in delivering the meaning as mentioned in the equivalence method.

Moving the context, in the previous conversation, Emily said, "We were busy promoting the opening of a restaurant near my apartment." Then, Alfie replied, "Which one?" In this case, the word "which one" is the literal meaning because the context refers to one of the restaurant's names. It lines with Emily's answer that the restaurant was named Chex Lavaux. So, the literal meaning proposed by Alfie means he wants to confirm the restaurant name.

Semantic Translation

| Source Language | Target language |
|---|--|
| <p>Camille: you know, it is been a while. When do we get to see Mindy?</p> <p>Emily: I don't know, but I wanna go to the bathroom. I don't wanna miss her.</p> | <p>Camille: Sudah lama. Kapan kita akan melihat Mindy?</p> <p>Emily: Entahlah tapi aku mau ke toilet, tak mau melewatkan dia.</p> |

The semantic translation differs from faithful, which places greater importance on the aesthetic quality of the source language. The semantics depend on the terminology chosen. For instance, *you know, it's been a while. When do we get to see Mindy?* The translation depends on the choice of word, particularly "it is a while." On the other hand, in Dynamic Equivalence, the message in the original text has been transported into the target language, and the message is similar to the source language. It is one of the dynamic equivalences in which the messages are transported into the target language.

D. Adaptation Translation

| Source Language | Target language |
|---|--|
| <p>Alfie: Actually, I was thinking we could maybe eat here tonight. I mean, the food looks amazing.</p> <p>Emily: Oh. I'm sure they're fully booked.</p> <p>Alfie: Chef, do you think you could spare us a table?</p> <p>Gabriel: It would be my pleasure.</p> | <p>Alfie: Aku berpikir, mungkin bisa makan disini malam ini? Makanannya tampak luar biasa.</p> <p>Emily: Pasti mereka penuh.</p> <p>Alfie: koki, bisa beri kami meja?</p> <p>Gabriel: Dengan senang hati.</p> |

The data above shows that the dialog is a part of Adaptation Translation. Chef, do you think you could spare us a table? It is a freedom translation because it refers to a place. The contextual implicature presents that the restaurant is fully booked. It is obviously seen through Emily's response. The freedom translation is related to the dynamic equivalence translation in which the message in the target language is transported, and the result of that message is similar to the source language.

E. Idiomatic Translation

| Source Language | Target language |
|---|--|
| <p>Gabriel: Emily. Good Morning. Or is it still night for you?</p> <p>Emily: Uh, where are you off to, early bird?</p> <p>Gabriel: Marchè Bastille, you have to be there at 7:00 for the best produce.</p> | <p>Gabriel: Emily. Selamat pagi. Atau masih malam untukmu?</p> <p>Emily: Uh, kau mau kemana, pagi sekali?</p> <p>Gabriel: Marchè Bastille, harus tiba pukul 7:00 untuk bahan pangan terbaik</p> |

This data shows that the dialogue is considered as an Idiomatic Translation. *Uh, where are you off to, early bird?* It means that the person is going out too early than usual. Idiom translation considers figurative language to share the same meaning in the target language and the source language as well as. So, idiom translation focuses on the collocation that is close to the source language. This statement aligns with the dynamic equivalence translation. This translation delivers the meaning through the message that is transported into the target language and presents equal meaning in the source language.

G. Communicative Translation

| Source Language | Target language |
|--|--|
| Madeline: We're about to take off. You caught me just in time. | Emily: Sepedanya kemana? Jalan sendiri? Luc: Sylvie suruh kami membuangnya. |
| Emily: Are you coming to Paris? | Julien: Luc! Emily: Ada apa? |
| Madeline: Yes, my friend. | |
| Emily: Oh my god! Why didn't you tell me? | |

The process of a communicative translation entails precisely and understandably translating the content from its source language into its target language, known as the communicative translation. The words, phrases, and sentences have been translated to their conventional meanings, which society and its people utilize. As the dialogue above, *Uh, where is the bike gone? Did it just wheel itself out here?* The context helps the reader to understand that she lost her bike. This sentence is communicative because of the existence of where the bike is gone. This sentence also delivers the direct meaning that is supported by *Did it just wheel itself out here?*

Conclusion

Translation serves as a means to convey meaning from one language to another. Translating a word involves the application of various methods to describe its meaning effectively. These translation methods encompass literal, faithful, semantic, adaptation, word-by-word, free, idiomatic, and communicative translation. All of these approaches find representation in the data extracted from "*Emily in Paris Season 2.*" The process of translating a word aims to establish Equivalence between the two languages, either in terms of grammatical structure or context. This capability ensures that the target language closely

reflects the meaning of the source language. In this study, which analyzes subtitle translations, it is evident that translators employ a range of translation methods when translating from English to Indonesian. This is done with the intention of discovering a suitable and comprehensible meaning for the viewers.

Références :

- Albir, A.H and Molina, L. 2002. *Translation Technique Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach*. Meta, Vol. XLVII, No. 4.
- Catford, J. 1995. *Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Catford, J. C. (1978). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chen, L. 2009. On Literal Translation of English Idioms. *English teaching language:2(2)*.164.
- Fadly, A. 2013. *The Analysis of Translation Procedures in Subtitle Hachiko Movie* (thesis). Jakarta. English Letters Department of Letters and Humanities Faculty State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Heiner, S. Ubbo Viser. 2000. Semantic Translation Based on Approximate Re-classification: *American Association for Artificial Intelligence*.2-3.
- Juniata, T. 2016. *A Subtitling Analysis Of Imperative Sentence Found In Need For Speed By Pein Akatsuki* (thesis). Surakarta. English Education Department Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.
- Larson, M. L. 1998. *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence*. New York: University Press of America.
- Maryati, F.S. 2016. Translation Method and Meaning Equivalence in the Song Lyric Let It Go Sung By Demi Lovato and Lepaskan Sung by the Artists (thesis). Jakarta. English Department Faculty of Letters UIN Syarif Hidayatullah
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. & C. R. Taber. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation, With Special Reference to Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, E. A. & Taber. 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill
- O'Grady, et al. 1996. *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction*. Essex: Longman.
- Isadore, P. 1977. *Scientific and Technical Translation*. London: Andre Deutsch Limited.
- Panou, D. 2013. Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*.3(1).1-2.
- Shank, G. 2002. *Qualitative Research. A Personal Skills Approach*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Tirana, A. P. 2020. *The Use of Newmark Translation Methods in English to Indonesian Rendering of Austen's Emma*. Surabaya

Venuti, L. 1995 *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. Routledge, London.

Vinay J. P. & Darbelnet, J. 2000. *A Methodology of Translation* (In L. Venuti *The Translation Studies Reader*). London and New York: Routledge.

Yowell, A. & Muftan, S. L 1999. *Principles of Translation*. Dar Annahda Alarabiya.

Grice, H. P. 1975. *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58). Academic Press.

Levinson, S. C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.