LITERAL EQUIVALENCE
IN MEANING-BASED TRANSLATION

A. Djawad Mubasyir

English Department
Faculty of Language and Art, Indraprasta PGRI University
Jalan Nangka 58 Tanjung Barat, Jakarta Selatan
djawad.unindra@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

This paper reports on a study that investigated the literal equivalence in meaning-based translation through a library exploration. The result of the study shows that as far as meaning is concerned, the context of situation is hypothesised to play an important role not only in finding the intended meaning in the source language (SL) text, but also in conveying the meaning equivalence through the lexico-grammatical system in the target language (TL) text. Based on this assumption, some evidence has been proposed to support that literal translation is problematic in meaning-based translation. If it has been found that there are problems with literal translation at word level and above word level up to the sentence level, it seems quite true that problems are even more prevalent at discourse levels and above.

Keywords: Translation, Grammatical Equivalence, Textual Equivalence.

PADANAN LITERAL
DALAM PENTERJEMAHAN BERBASIS MAKNA

Abstrak

Makalah ini membahas padanan literal dalam penterjemahan berbasis makna yang dilakukan berdasarkan eksplorasi kepustakaan. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa dalam membahas makna dalam penterjemahan, konteks situasi memegang peranan sangat penting tidak hanya dalam menangkap makna yang diinginkan (*intended meaning*) dalam bahasa sumber (BS) tetapi juga dalam mengutarakan padanan makna melalui sistem leksiko-gramatikal dalam bahasa target (BT). Berdasarkan asumsi tersebut, bukti menunjukkan bahwa penterjemahan secara literal merupakan masalah dalam penterjemahan berbasis makna. Jika ditemukan bahwa banyak permasalahan terjadi dalam penterjemahan secara literal pada tingkat kata, tingkat frasa, sampai tingkat kalimat, maka bisa diasumsikan bahwa jumlah permasalahan akan lebih tinggi pada penterjemahan tingkat wacana.

Kata kunci: Terjemahan, gramatikal Kesetaraan, Tekstual Equivalen

INTRODUCTION

Equivalence is defined in the *Collins Dictionary of the English Language* (1991: 526) as the state of being "equal or interchangeable in value, quantity, significance, etc." or "having the same or a similar effect or meaning". Similarly, *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* (1991: 421) defines the concept as the state of being "equal in force, amount or value" or "like in signification or import". Leonardi (2000) states that equivalence is assumed to be the central issue in translation and "…many different theories of the concept of equivalence have been elaborated within this field in the past fifty years." The following is Xiabin's (2005: 19) justifications:

1. Equivalence does not mean the source text is the only significant factor. However, equivalence does distinguish translation from writing.
2. Equivalence to a text in another language entails more obstacles, linguistic, temporal and cultural, and therefore more challenges than monolingual interpretation.
3. Sameness to the source texts is neither possible nor even desired.
4. Text type is an important factor in deciding how much a translation should be equivalent as well as other factors such as translation purposes, demands of the clients and expectations of the target readers.
5. Equivalence is never a static term, but is similar to that of value in economics.
6. Equivalence and the techniques to achieve it cannot be dismissed all together because they represent a translation reality.

Panou (2013: 1) concludes "that the usefulness or not of the concept of equivalence to the translation process varies according to the stance of the translators concerned on what they regard are the virtues of equivalence itself".

A translation product may be defined as a text in the target language which according to the translator expresses the same meaning as intended by the original text in the source language (SL). Many products of translation to Indonesian may, to many target language (TL) native speakers, sound unnatural. One of the reasons seems to be the fact that the TL texts, which are in Indonesian, contain expressions which are not normally used in the language. A closer look into the expressions shows that many words seem to be the literal translations (indicating the same points of reference) of the English words, and the longer units of expressions seem to follow the word order according to the English grammatical structure. This is quite common in the subtitles on foreign TV serials, textbooks, and many sources.

Unnatural translation can be problematic. It may annoy the readers because it is hard to understand. They may need to think hard to grope for the most appropriate meaning in relation to the whole text. In serious cases, unnatural translation can even result in complete misunderstanding or a total failure in understanding. Malinowski experienced a problem with literal translation when he attempted to translate a text in Kiriwinian to English and it was unintelligible to an English reader (see Halliday 1985: 5-6).

This review of literature is concerned with the tendency of unnatural translation which results from the translator's applying the structure of the SL text in expressing the intended meaning in the TL text. This is often referred to as the word-by-word or literal approach to translation. There may be two reasons for the translator to do this. First he does this way because he may not

understand the whole idea of the intended meaning contained in the SL text and assume that one-for-one equivalents exist for all lexical items in the SL and the TL. Secondly, he may understand the intended meaning but purposely wants to keep the original structure of the SL to preserve the meaning, assuming that word-by-word translation is the best way to keep the original meaning.

The writer limits his study not to discuss the word-by-word translation which results from the translator's failure to understand the meaning of the SL text as a whole, so that he takes a short cut to use word-by-word translation. Instead, the focus of the study will be on the word-by-word translation as an approach of translation that maintains that keeping the original structure of the SL text will preserve the original meaning intended by the writer, on the basis of the assumption that giving up the original structure may risk distorting the meaning. Newmark, for example, argues that "if a word for word, primary for primary meaning translation has functional equivalence, any other translation is wrong" (Newmark 1981: 137).

Seven years later he still maintains that closeness to the original lexico-grammatical system is primary, but this time he uses the term literal instead of word-by-word. He said that "literal translation is correct and must not be avoided, if it secures referential and pragmatic equivalence to the original" (Newmark 1988: 68-69).

It should not be taken to suggest that Newmark holds that word-by-word or literal translation always works to achieve meaning equivalence, as implied in the second part of his last sentence, "if it secures referential and pragmatic equivalence to the original." These

conditions, referential equivalence and pragmatic equivalence, may be in line with the assumption of a meaning-oriented translator, who believes that meaning is primary.

> … equivalence is related to the ability of the translator to maintain at least some of the same features of substance indicated in the original text. The translator's task, then, is to ensure that all the relevant features of the source language (SL) message are reflected in the target language (TL) text (Kashgary, 2011).

The difference seems to lie on which is the priority of the translator. It seems that, for Newmark, form needs to be prioritised, suggesting that only in cases where it is impossible to maintain the original form to express the intended meaning, the translator is allowed to do otherwise. On the other hand, the meaning-oriented translator believes that meaning equivalence is the priority, suggesting that not preserving the original form is justifiable. The question is how far can the priority on form be consistently met?

The purpose of this review of literature is to analyse relevant theories on translation to prove that prioritising on form will pose a lot more problems to the translator, if the aim of the translator is meaning equivalence, that is, the original meaning is to be perceived by the TL audience.

DISCUSSION

MEANING AND FORM IN TRANSLATION

Perhaps, one of the most important questions in translation is what is the purpose of translating a piece of work into another language? The answers may vary

from person to person, and it generally depends on their needs to use the translation work. An English book is translated into Indonesian, for example, for different possible reasons. If it is the writer who wants it translated, he may want the message that he writes in the book to be accessible to a wider scope of audience, in particular those who speak Indonesian. This may be because he purely wants his message to be understood by the Indonesian audience, or he may have a certain commercial interest. The impetus to translate the book may come from the audience. They want to get access to the message in the book, because it has a particular function for them. Or, it may also be for commercial purposes. The impetus may come from the translator himself, because he sees that the product will sell well in Indonesia. Whatever the reason, there is one thing in common in these reasons, that is, that the message is to be accessible to the Indonesian audience. The same thing may also be true with other works, such as films, documents, novels, and so on.

The above illustration may suggest that translation work is generally useful for the content, in particular the original message of the author. However, the audience seems to play a very important role in determining the kind of language that will be used in the TL translation. In other words, the translator needs to be aware of the fact that he can get the original message across if it is in the language of the target language audience. The success in getting the meaning across may not only be achieved on the principle of intelligibility, but audience design seems to be an important factor, too. According to Hatim and Mason (1997: 213), audience design is "the adaptation of output by text producers to the perceived receiver group." In the case of

translation, the text producer is certainly the translator and the receiver group is the TL audience. Furthermore, Hatim and Mason state that "Central to this notion is the extent to which speakers accommodate to their addressees and how speech style is affected" (*ibid.,* pp. 213-214). It will have a big impact on the attempt to get the original meaning across if the language may pose negative feelings on the part of the audience. One reason may be that the text contains 'odd' or 'strange' constructions, because they are not normally used by the TL speakers. This may be used as an evidence that from the point of view of the audience, form is as important as meaning. While meaning is the ultimate aim of using the translation work, the audience is apparently concerned with the language. This may be because "the grammar is the central processing unit of a language, where meanings are accepted from different metafunctional inputs and spliced together to form integrated outputs, or wordings" (Halliday 1994: xxxiv).

It means that failure to use the right wordings will give the audience more work to decipher for the possible meaning. It is important to note that, in Halliday's term, grammar is not synonymous with syntax because it is also concerned with lexis (see Halliday 1994: F40). So, for the translator, finding the right meaning is as important as finding the right words to express it. The following statement of Halliday's shows the relationship between meaning and form, suggesting that both are equally important.

> The potential of language is a meaning potential. This meaning potential is the linguistic realisation of the behavioral potential; 'can mean' is 'can do' when translated into language. The meaning potential is in turn realised in the language system as lexico-grammar potential, which is

what the speaker 'can say'. (Halliday 1973: 51).

The emphasis on the importance of form seems to imply two different orientations in translation. If the translator is more oriented towards the author of the text, he may choose to preserve the original form, on the assumption that it has been carefully chosen by the author that 'destroying' it may fail to convey the original meaning. In contrast, if he is more oriented towards the audience in the target language, he may choose any form which conveys the meaning as well as sounds 'good' to the audience. The question is, which one is more successful in conveying the original meaning of the author?

TEXT AND CONTEXT OF SITUATION

The final product of translation is obviously in the form of a text in the target language. On the surface, text consists of words that are arranged in the way according to the grammatical rules of the given language. In short, it consists of grammar and vocabulary. This is also the meaning of 'text' in Schiffrin's term, which she distinguishes from the term 'utterance'.

> Text is the linguistic content of utterances: the stable semantic meanings of words, expressions, and sentences, but not the inferences available to hearers depending upon the contexts in which words, expressions, and sentences are used. Text provides for the "what is said" part of utterances; context combines with "what is said" to create an utterance. (Schiffrin 1994: 378-379).

However, this is *not* the meaning of the term 'text' that is used in this review of literature. The term 'text' is used here to refer to Halliday's 'text', which is more or less similar to Schiffrin's 'utterance'.

Halliday (1985: 10) describes text as "language that is functional", in the sense that it has some function in some context of situation. Unlike Schiffrin's text, which consists only of the product of language, Halliday's text consists of both the product and the process. That is to say, it is also a reflection of a continuous process of negotiation and decision-making process by the producer of the text with the social environment. He states that

> The text is a product in the sense that it is an output, something that can be recorded and studied, having a certain construction that can be represented in systematic terms. It is a process in the sense of a continuous process of semantic choice, a movement through the network of meaning potential, with each set of choices constituting the environment for a further set.

In short, according to Halliday, a text is "an instance of the process and product of social meaning in a particular context of situation". Using Leech's term (1983: 46), the term text will consistently be used here according to the functional view of language, that is, it is a reflection of its social function. This is in contrast with the formalist principle which is based on the assumption of language as an autonomous system. From a different point of view, Hatim and Mason (1990: 193) view that as a social event, a text is *motivated*.

> When texts are seen as social events, the links between text producer, text expression and meaning have to be considered not as random but motivated. … actual textual occurrences, though subject to particular grammatical system of the language, are seen as being motivated by contextual factors. … text producers make their choices in such away as best to serve their own communicative ends and within an

institutional settings which exerts its own influence on linguistic expression.

This all implies that in the process of translation, as in other events of language-based activities, the translator is in a continuous process of negotiation between the lexico-grammatical structures to be used in the text and what Halliday refers to as the *context of situation* that is created by the social event in which the text is used. It may be useful to refer to a preliminary understanding of the context of situation.

> … the context of situation, the context in which the text unfolds, is encapsulated in the text, not in a kind of piecemeal fashion, nor at the other extreme in any mechanical way, but through a systematic relationship between the social environment on the one hand, and the functional organisation of language on the other. (Halliday 1985: 11)

By knowing the context of situation, one can make good judgements about, for example, what expressions will 'please' or 'annoy' the other person in the conversation, when he or she is to stop or start another turn, what structures are appropriate to refuse an offer at that time, and so on.

There are different versions of the context of situation. Hymes (1972) proposes eight concepts of the context of situation, which is well known as the SPEAKING grid, as shown in Fig. 1.

S	Setting Scene	Physical circumstances Subjective definition of an occasion
P	Participants	Speaker/sender/addressor Hearer/receiver/audience/addressee
E	Ends	Purposes and goals Outcomes
A	Act sequence	Message form and content
K	Key	Tone, manner
I	Instrumentalities	Channel (verbal, non-verbal, physical) Forms of speech drawn from community repertoire
N	Norms of interaction and interpretation	Specific properties attached to speaking Interpretation of norms within cultural belief system
G	Genre	Textual categories

Fig. 1

Halliday (1985:12) proposes a much simpler model, which consists of only three elements.

1. The Field of Discourse refers to what is happening, to the nature of the social action that is taking place: what is it that the participants are engaged in, in which the language figures as some essential component?
2. The Tenor of Discourse refers to who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statuses and roles: what kinds of role relationship obtain among the participants, including permanent and temporary relationships of one kind or another, both the types of speech role that they are taking on in the dialogue and the whole cluster of socially significant relationships in which they are involved?

3. The Mode of Discourse refers to what part the language is playing, what it is that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in that situation: the symbolic organisation of the text, the status that it has, and its function in the context, including the channel (is it spoken or written or some combination of the two?) and also the rhetorical mode, what is being achieved by the text, in terms of such categories as persuasive, expository, didactic, and the like.

The difference between Halliday's model and Hymes's model seems to lie in the degree of specificity. It seems that the elements of Setting/Scene, Ends, and Act Sequence can all be covered in the element of Field of Discourse in Halliday's mode. The Tenor of Discourse seems to refer to Hymes' element of Participants. The Mode of Discourse seems to cover all the elements of Key, Instrumentalities, Norms of Interaction and Interpretation, and Genre.

Halliday's and Hymes' models of context of situation were designed for language use in general. Hatim and Mason, as translation specialists, also propose a model, which presumably more readily applicable for translation purposes. This model is much more comprehensive than the other two models, in the sense that it consists of more elements. There are three groups of meaning: Communicative, Pragmatic, and Semiotic. The Communicative context consists of two sub-elements: the Use (including the whole scheme of Halliday's) and User, which refers to the sociolinguistic feature of the user, including his or her dialect, idiolect, and so on. The Pragmatic element, which is associated with intentionality or purposes of language use, of which the underlying elements include speech acts, implicatures, presuppositions, and other elements that indicate intention.

The Semiotic dimension, which may also refer to Halliday's Mode of Discourse (which is also included in the communicative dimension in this model), consists of the language unit that is employed to convey the message.

This model places the translator in the center of the communication activity, suggesting that "the translator takes on the role of mediator between different cultures, each of which has its own visions of reality, ideologies, myths, and so on" (Hatim and Mason 1990: 236). Elsewhere he uses the word 'intervene' instead of the more neutral word 'in the centre'.

> If we accept that meaning is something that is negotiated between producers and receivers of texts, it follows that the translator, as a special kind of text user, intervenes in this process of negotiation, to relay it across linguistic and cultural boundaries. In doing so, the translator is necessarily handling such matters as intended meaning, all on the basis of the evidence which the text supplies. The various domains of sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse linguistics are all areas of study which are germane to this process. (Hatim and Mason 1990: 33)

Another important skill that a translator must have is that, in addition to the competence to find out the intentions of the participants in the SL text, he "must be in position to make judgements about the likely effect of the translation on TL readers/hearers" (Hatim and Mason 1990: 65).

It can be concluded, then, that the meaning of a text can not be sought only through the semantic meanings of the words and the grammatical structures. As it has been hypothesised by the three models, the production of a text requires a careful

process in making the right choice for the words and structures that will convey the intended meaning. Assuming that so many factors are involved in the decision-making process, it can be tentatively concluded that within a complex communicative event, a literal equivalence of SL words may be hard to find in the TL.

Problems in Preserving Meaning Through Literal Translation

As a mediator between the SL text producer and the TL text audience, preserving meaning is undoubtedly the most important requirement that has to be met by a translator. To preserve meaning means to make such an effort so that the reader of the TL can get exactly the same meaning as intended by the writer of the SL. It has been suggested that, only by carefully analysing the context of situation, the translator will obtain the intended meaning of the SL text producer. Conversely, on the basis of the analysis, he will have to make the right decision about the right expressions in the TL that match the original.

> … the fact that the role of the translator should not be neglected and acknowledge some limitations of the linguistic approach, thus allowing the translator to also rely on other procedures that will ensure a more effective and comprehensive rendering of the ST message in the target text (Ponou, 2013: 2)

At Word Level

Based the functional view of translation, Baker (1992: 21-26) identifies eleven problems in finding word-to-word equivalence at word level between different languages. All these problems will be dealt with in detail and examples will be given in each case, to show that even at word level, literal translation can be very problematic. It can be assumed that at higher levels (e.g.

collocations, idioms, sentences, and so forth), literal translation may even be more difficult.

1. Culture-specific concepts. Baker suggests that the existence of certain words in a particular language is specifically affected by its culture. For example, the word *gotong-royong*, which refers to a certain kind of activity in which many people work together to achieve a better result, may not have an exact equivalent in English. Another example is *nuju-bulan*, which is a seventh-month celebration of the first pregnancy.

2. The source-language concept is not lexicalised in the TL. This problem refers to the fact that one meaning is lexicalised in the source language but not in the target language. Indonesian has the word *gurih*, which refers to a special taste of such food as nuts, fried food, which does not have a ready equivalent in English. The Indonesian-English translator will need to describe the taste in more than one word.

3. The source-language word is semantically complex. One word in the source language is semantically complex in the sense that it can not be readily translated into the TL in one word because it implies more than one meaning. An example of such a semantically complex word is *kenduri*. The closest equivalence in English may be 'party', but it does not really accommodate the complex meaning of *kenduri*, which means a certain religious party with special kinds of food in association to birth day, wedding day and death commemoration.

4. The source and target languages make different distinctions in meaning. For example, Indonesian makes a distinction between getting up late unpurposely (*bangun kesiangan*) and getting up purposely (*bagun siang*). English does not make this distinction, with the result that if an English text referred to getting up, the Indonesian translator

may find it difficult to choose the right equivalent, unless the context makes it clear whether or not the person in question knew that it was a deliberate or an accident action.

5. The target language lacks a superordinate. It refers to the problem that a superordinate word in the source language does not have an equivalent superordinate word in the TL. For example, Indonesian has no word equivalence for the English word 'spouse', which means either 'husband' or 'wife'. In Indonesian it is only possible to say either *suami* (husband) or *isteri* (wife). Another example is the word 'manchester', which does not have a word equivalence in Indonesian. On the other hand, English has no word equivalence for the word *saudara* which means either brother or sister.

6. The target language lacks a specific term (hyponym). Indonesian has at least four hyponyms under the word 'rice' for which it is difficult to find the precise equivalences in English, that is, *padi, gabah, beras, nasi*.

7. Differences in physical or interpersonal perspective. In Indonesian, differences in the physical environments and interpersonal relationship in which the communication takes place may require different forms for the second person reference 'you'. That is to say, for 'you', the equivalent can be *kamu, kau, anda, saudara, kalian, bapak, ibu*.

8. Differences in expressive meaning. This refers to the problem when both the SL and the TL have a word that has equivalent general meaning but in fact there is a subtle, but important, difference between them. So, it may be possible, for instance, in some contexts to render the English verb *batter* (as in wife/child battering) by the more neutral Indonesian verb 'memukul' meaning 'to beat' plus an equivalent modifier such as 'savagely' or 'ruthlessly'. In line with this problem, Hatim and Mason (1990: 57) writes that "… in certain cases expression of intended meaning is subject to subtle variation between SL and TL text norms and equivalence may therefore be more difficult to achieve".

9. Differences in form. A meaning that is in the SL expressed in the form of affixed construction can not be expressed through the same mechanism in the TL. For example, the English word as '-able' has to be stated in Indonesian in a phrase *"dapat di-"* (can be -): 'drinkable' = *dapat diminum*, 'understandable' = *dapat dipahami*. On the other hand, the meaning that can be conveyed in one word in Indonesian by adding the affix ke-an, for example *kekecilan, kemahalan*, can not be conveyed in English by the same mechanism but by phrases 'too small' and 'too expensive'.

10. Differences in frequency and purpose of using specific forms. The word 'always' is equivalent to the Indonesian word *selalu*. In English 'always' does not normally go together with 'every'. In Indonesian, it is quite normal for the word *selalu* to go together with the word *setiap* which is equivalent to 'every'.

11. The use of loan words in the SL text. The Indonesian word *kensel* is a loan word from English 'cancel', but the meaning is equivalent to the English word 'postpone'. So, the sentence *Rapat dikensel sampai besok*, in English it should be 'The meeting is postponed untll tomorow'.The words *kritik* and *sukses* are also problematic loan words for the Indonesian-English translator. The word *kritik* which sounds like the English 'critic', is a verb, hence being equivalent to 'criticise'. *Kritik* is also used as a noun, but it refers to the 'criticism', not the person. The word *sukses*, which is a loan word from the English word 'success', shifts its function in Indonesian to become an adjective, hence being equivalent to 'successful', or a verb, being equivalent to 'succeed'.

Another problem of word-to-word equivalent at word level may be added to the eleven problems that have been identified by Baker. That is, in the TL the meaning is expressed in a lexical form but in the SL the equivalent meaning is expressed in a grammatical form. For example,

> *Dia **sedang** tidur*
> He is sleeping
> *Saya **sudah** membaca artikel itu.*
> I have read the article.
> *Hari **semakin** gelap.*
> It is getting dark.
> *Dia **dulu** kecil.*
> He was small.

Problems with Idioms and Other Fixed Expressions

Baker (1992: 65) states that there are two main problems in translating idioms and other fixed expressions like collocations. The difficulty is concerned not only with recognizing and interpreting fixed expressions correctly, but, perhaps more difficult than this, is in finding the correct expressions that are equivalent in meaning in the target language. As an illustration, the English idiom 'It's raining *cats and dogs*' does not have a literal equivalent in Indonesian. The fixed expression 'broken heart' is in Indonesian equivalent to 'broken lever', 'broad shoulder' to 'broad chest', and so on.

The problem with collocation may also be related with the fact that "Unlike grammatical statements, statements about collocation are made in terms of what is typical or untypical, rather than what is admissible or inadmissible" (*ibid.,* p. 50). Therefore, failure to use the right collocate in the TL may make the TL sound unnatural. For example, the word *selamat* in Indonesian collocates with any time of the day (morning, afternoon, evening,

night) as a greeting given in the corresponding time, giving *selamat pagi* for 'good morning', *selamat siang* for 'good afternoon', and *selamat sore* for the greeting in early evening, which may be possibly 'good evening'. In the Indonesian concept, after around twenty o'clock, the word *sore* no longer applies and the word *malam* ('night') is used, instead. Therefore the English collocation 'good night' (meaning 'sleep well'), may be considered equivalent and translated to *selamat malam* (word-to-word equivalent), a greeting expression which may be equivalent in meaning with 'good evening'.

Problems with Grammatical Equivalence

This may be one of the most difficult areas in which literal translation may often not be possible. Baker (1992: 85-110) identifies five grammatical areas that are often problematic in translation, that is, Number, Gender, Person, Tense and Aspect, and Voice. These seem to be also the main areas of difficulties in translating Indonesian texts to English, and vice-versa. The notion of Number, which has a significant role in English, may be hardly recognised in Indonesian. Perhaps the only structure which indicates number is 'reduplication', which indicates plurality. For example, for the singular noun 'house', the Indonesian word is *rumah*, and the plural 'houses' is *rumah-rumah*. The reduplication construction in Indonesian may also be a problem for the English-Indonesian translator because it does not only affect nouns, but also adjectives. 'The houses are big (*besar*)' is in Indonesian *Rumahnya besar-besar*. In the case of Person, the pronoun 'they' is problematic to the Indonesian translation. In English 'they' refers to both human beings and non human beings, while in Indonesian *mereka* (the equivalent of 'they') refers only to human beings. The problems with the English

Tense and Aspect to the Indonesian translator may lie in the fact that, since they do not exist in Indonesian, other mechanism may be used to express the various meanings implied in the Tense and Aspect. In the case of Voice, informal Indonesian and English seem to be markedly different; informal English can be said to more highly characterised with active constructions, while Indonesian with passive constructions.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, as far as meaning is concerned, the context of situation is hypothesised to play an important role not only in finding the intended meaning in the SL text, but also in conveying the meaning equivalence through the lexico-grammatical system in the TL text. Based on this assumption, some evidence has been proposed to support that literal translation is problematic in meaning-based translation. If it has been found that there are problems with literal translation at word level and above word level up to the sentence level, it seems quite true that problems are even more prevalent at discourse levels and above.

REFERENCES

Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words: a Course in Translation*. London: Routledge.

Collins English Dictionary. 1991. Glasgow: HarperCollins.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, third edition. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An introduction to Functional Grammar*, second edition. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1985. *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective.* Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Halliday M. A. K. 1973. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. New York: Longman.

Hymes, D. and J. Gumperz. 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Kashgary. A. D. 2011. The paradox of translating the untranslatable: Equivalence vs. non-equivalence in translating from Arabic into English. *Journal of King Saud University – Languages and Translation*, (23), 47–57.

Leech, G. 1983. *Principles and Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Leonardi, Vanessa. 2000. Equivalence in Translation: Between Myth and Reality. *Translation Journal*, (4), 1.

Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Newmark, P. 1981. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Panou. D. 2013. Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, (3), 1-6.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to discourse*, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. 1991. Springfield MA: Merriam-Webster Inc.

Xiabin. H. 2005. Can we throw 'equivalence' out of the window?*Translating Today Magazine*, (4), 18–19.