



Semantic Adjustments in The Translation of English Memorandum



I Gede Putu Sudana¹, Ida Bagus Putra Yadnya²

Article history: Received April, 26, 2021; Accepted: June, 28, 2021; Displayed Online: June, 30, 2021; Published: June, 30, 2021

Keywords

Semantics;
Translation;
Adjustments;
Linguistic gap;

Abstract

This current study is intended to reveal the semantic adjustments taking place in the translation of an English Memorandum of Understanding into Indonesian used as the data source. The data were collected through observation using the close reading and note-taking techniques. The descriptive approach and the theory proposed by Nida (1991) are applied in the study. The result shows that the semantic adjustments can overcome the linguistic gap between the SL and TL and allow the translator to transfer the message in the SL to the TL appropriately enough shown by the acceptability, naturalness and readability of the TL.

1. Introduction

In the translation process, what is transferred from the Source Language (SL) to the Target Language (TL) is meaning instead of form (Larson, 1988; Zanches, 2021). However, in the attempt made by the translator to obtain dynamic equivalence from formal equivalence or the form-based equivalence, it is necessary to make semantic adjustments as well as structural adjustments, resulting from the linguistic and cultural gaps between the SL and TL (Damayanti et al., 2020). Liswahyuningsih et al. (2020) state that the semantic adjustments can be in the forms of gain of information, loss of information, skewing of information, making implicit information explicit, making explicit information implicit, amplification, reduction, generalization, particularization and compensation. As the data available in the text are limited, the current study only discusses the semantic adjustments resulting from the attempts made by the translator to make implicit information explicit as a consequence of ellipsis, gain of information, loss of information and skewing of information (Nida, 1991).

¹ Linguistics Doctor Candidate-Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia. Email: igedeputusudana@yahoo.com

² Translation Professor-Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia. Email: putrayadnya890@gmail.com

According to Beekman and Callow (1974:48) in Hasan (2007: 55-56), the implicit information can be revealed in two ways. They are (1) from the same text through the direct context (immediate context), and one form of information included in this group is ellipsis, and through the remote context; and (2) from a different text or cultural context. However, as the data available in the text used as the data source are limited, the only implicit information resulting from ellipsis that is discussed in the current study (Sudana & Yadnya, 2021).

2. Materials and Methods

Applying the descriptive approach, the study is more oriented towards the descriptions of meaning revealed by interpreting data in the form of translation units such as words, phrases, clauses and sentences, excluding morphemes. The data were searched out, collected, analyzed and generalized based on the phenomena observed (Sutopo, 2002 in Handayani, 2009: 53). The data were taken from a Memorandum of Understanding in the form of translation corpora (Johansson, in Olohan, 2004: 24-25) as it is unidirectional in nature and consists of one text in two language versions, namely in English language and Indonesian language. The English version is the Source Language (TL) and the Indonesian version is the Target Language (TL). The SL was juxtaposed with the TL in such a way that the translation problems and incongruities leading to the semantic adjustments, which were then grouped into the translation units leading to the semantic adjustments, were underlined before they were transferred to the data book.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1 Making Implicit Information Explicit

In the current study what is meant by explicitness is the attempt made by the translator to make the implicit information explicit as consequence of ellipsis, which according to Waridah (2014:21) in Yulianti (2016:66) is language style in which the easily readable sentence elements are deleted. According to Halliday and Hassan (1976) in Hasan (2007:56), ellipsis, which can be grouped into three such as noun ellipsis, verb ellipsis and clause ellipsis, refers to the deletion of one language element or one language element that is not mentioned but can be understood. Furthermore, it is stated that noun ellipsis is the one taking place in the noun group. There are two elements forming the noun group; they are the noun as the nuclear element and the element preceding or following it modifying the noun. The ellipsis taking place in the verb group is referred to as the verb ellipsis in which the verb, as the nuclear element, is deleted as a consequence of its repetition. When the deleted element is a clause, it is referred to as the clause ellipsis.

What requires the translator to make the invisible information in the SL explicit in the TL is the TL's discursive structure and style. However, on the one hand, too many attempts of making implicit information explicit causing the TL to be similar to comments; on the other hand, too limited attempts of explicitness can also cause the TL reader not to understand the TL as the translation product (Hasan, 2007:57). Many semantic adjustments are obligatorily made; in other words, any word, phrase, clause or structure which do not appear in the SL need to be made to appear to make the TL acceptable. However, many others are not, meaning that any word, phrase, clause or structure deleted in the SL are made to appear in the TL for non-linguistic reasons, for example, to clarify the meaning and to make the TL acceptable to its readers.

3.1.1 Noun Ellipsis

Data 1

- SL : **Mr. Khalpey** will be entitled to 3.33% of the Project final profits and 3.33% of any management revenue share allocation received by the Joint Venture but will not be entitled to any of the interest to be paid to NS. (Stead dkk., 2016:3)
- TL : **Bapak Khalpey** berhak menerima 3,33% dari keuntungan akhir dari Proyek tersebut dan 3,33% alokasi pembagian pemasukan manajemen yang diterima oleh Perusahaan tetapi **yang bersangkutan** tidak berhak dengan bunga yang dibayarkan kepada NS. (Kurnia, 2017:3)

Data 1 shows that the structure of the second clause is predicate + object and that its subject is deleted or not explicitly mentioned; however, the first clause informs the target reader that the complete clause is '...Mr. Khalpey will not be entitled to any of the interest to be paid to NS'. The deletion takes place as a consequence of the fact that the subject of the second clause is Mr. Khalpey, which, in the TL, is translated into *yang bersangkutan*. In this case, the translator is required to make the implicit information in the TL explicit by the TL's structure to make the TL clearer and more acceptable to the target reader.

Data 2

- SL : **MC2**, as the Project Manager, is solely responsible for ensuring the successful implementation of the Master Plan and will provide detailed monthly status reports and budgets to the Board. (Stead dkk., 2006: 4)
- TL : MC2, sebagai Manajer Proyek, bertanggungjawab sepenuhnya untuk memastikan keberhasilan pelaksanaan Rencana Induk dan **mereka** wajib menyediakan laporan perkembangan dan anggaran yang rinci setiap bulan kepada Dewan (Kurnia, 2017: 4)

Similar to data 1, the SL in data 2 also consists of two clauses with the same subject, namely MC2, which in this Agreement refers to Mr Grant McArthur and Mr Richard Candless; however, in the second clause it is deleted. Therefore, the TL's structure requires the subject in the TL, which is translated into *mereka*, to appear to make the TL clearer to the target reader.

3.1.2 Verb Ellipsis

Data 3

- SL : Each GM, RM, DF and mc2 heereby RELEASES, ACQUITS AND FOREVER DISCHARGES each of the Investors from many and all past, present, and future payment obligations, adjustments, executions, offsets, actions, causes of actions, suits, debts, sums of money, accounts (including, but not limited to court costs and attorney's fees), judgements, claims, demands, liabilities and/or losses whatsoever, claimed or suspected, fixed or contingent, which each of the Investors, now have, or hereinafter may have arising out of or in connection with the misconduct and wrongdoings of GM, RM, DF and mc2, including but not limited to **all claims that were or could have been alleged** in connection therewith (Stead dkk., 2006: 17)
- TL : Masing-masing GM, RM, DF dan mc2 dengan ini menyatakan MELEPAS, MEMBEBAHKAN DAN MENGHENTIKAN masing-masing Penanam Modal dari kewajiban-kewajiban yang harus dibayar dan disesuaikan, tindakan-tindakan untuk memberikan ganti rugi, tindakan-tindakan lain yang harus dilakukan, hal-

hal yang menyebabkan dilakukannya tindakan-tindakan tersebut, tuntutan-tuntutan, hutang-hutang, jumlah-jumlah uang, rekening-rekening, perjanjian-perjanjian, kontrak-kontrak, kontroversi-kontroversi, kesepakatan-kesepakatan, janji-janji, kerusakan-kerusakan, biaya-biaya (termasuk, tetapi tidak terbatas pada biaya-biaya pengadilan dan honor-honor pengacara), pertimbangan-pertimbangan, klaim-klaim, tuntutan-tuntutan, pertanggungjawaban-pertanggungjawaban dan/atau kerugian-kerugian apapun bentuknya, yang dituntut atau dicuriga, baik yang bersifat pasti atau bergantung yang sekarang menjadi beban Penanam Modal atau yang mungkin muncul sebagai akibat dari atau sehubungan dengan tindakan-tindakan melanggar hukum atau kesalahan-kesalahan yang dilakukan oleh GM, RM, DF dan mc2, termasuk tetapi tidak terbatas pada **klaim-klaim yang sebenarnya sudah dapat diajukan sebelumnya selain klaim-klaim yang sudah diajukan** (Kurnia, 2017: 19).

Data 3 shows that ellipsis takes place in the clause level with a passive construction 'all claims that were ...' and illustrates the verb ellipsis. From the direct context '... or could have been alleged ...' it can be identified that the deleted verb is 'alleged'. In the TL it is made to appear and translated into 'diajukan'.

3.2 Grammatical Meaning → Lexical Meaning

Data 4

SL : WHEREAS NS and/or its appointed nominee **has** signed an Akta Jual Beli, Purchase Agreement, and various Access Road purchase/right of use Agreements which govern the overall land purchase transaction ... (Stead dkk., 2006:1)

TL

: Bahwa NS dan/atau wakil yang ditunjuknya **telah** menandatangani Akta Jual Beli dan Perjanjian pembelian/hak pakai berbagai Akses Jalan yang mengatur keseluruhan transaksi pembelian tanah ... (Kurnia, 2017:1)

Data 5

SL : NOW THEREFORE, the parties **have** agreed to join in the Project through a joint venture company with the terms and conditions as follows: (Stead dkk. : 2006: 1)

TL

: Maka oleh karena itu, semua pihak **telah** setuju untuk bergabung di dalam Proyek tersebut melalui sebuah perusahaan patungan dengan syarat-syarat dan ketentuan-ketentuan sebagai berikut: (Kurnia, 2017:2)

Data 6

SL : All parties **shall** resolve any dispute arising out of or in relation to this Agreement amicably. (Stead dkk., 2006: 6)

TL

: Semua pihak **harus** menyelesaikan perselisihan yang timbul atau berhubungan dengan perjanjian ini secara damai. (Kurnia, 2017: 6)

Data 7

SL	: The initial shareholdings and subsequent profits shall be divided in the following manner between the parties ... (Stead dkk., 2006: 3)
TL	: Kepemilikan saham awal dan keuntungan selanjutnya harus dibagi di antara mereka sebagai berikut di antara para pihak ... (Kurnia, 2017:4)

The word 'has' in data 4 and the word 'have' in data 5 are used to indicate 'aspect' in the SL, namely the verb grammatical category showing how long an activity has taken place (Kridalaksana, 1993:19), which is translated into *telah* in the TL as it does not have any verb grammatical category of the same type as in the SL.

The word 'shall' in data 6 and 7 is not used to indicate a future activity as it is commonly used in which its translation equivalent is *akan*. In fact, it is used to indicate obligation. Its existence in the performative phrase is used to indicate that the parties involved in the Agreement show their promise by signing it. Therefore, in this case the word 'shall' is translated into *harus* in the TL and also shows that the document is legal.

Data 8

SL	: Each GM, RM, DF and mc2 hereby RELEASES, ACQUITS AND FOREVER DISCHARGES each of the Investors from many and all past, present, and future payment obligations, adjustments, executions, offsets, actions, causes of actions, suits, debts, sums of money, accounts (including, but not limited to court costs and attorney's fees), judgements, claims, demands, liabilities and/or losses whatsoever, claimed or suspected, fixed or contingent, which each of the Investors, now have, or hereinafter may have arising out of or in connection with the misconduct and wrongdoings of GM, RM, DF and mc2, including but not limited to all claims that were or could have been alleged in connection therewith (Stead dkk., 2006: 17)
TL	: Masing-masing GM, RM, DF dan mc2 dengan ini menyatakan MELEPAS, MEMBEBAHKAN DAN MENGHENTIKAN masing-masing Penanam Modal dari kewajiban-kewajiban yang harus dibayar dan disesuaikan, tindakan-tindakan untuk memberikan ganti rugi, tindakan-tindakan lain yang harus dilakukan, hal-hal yang menyebabkan dilakukannya tindakan-tindakan tersebut, tuntutan-tuntutan, hutang-hutang, jumlah-jumlah uang, rekening-rekening, perjanjian-perjanjian, kontrak-kontrak, kontroversi-kontroversi, kesepakatan-kesepakatan, janji-janji, kerusakan-kerusakan, biaya-biaya (termasuk, tetapi tidak terbatas pada biaya-biaya pengadilan dan honor-honor pengacara), pertimbangan-pertimbangan, klaim-klaim, tuntutan-tuntutan, pertanggungjawaban-pertanggungjawaban dan/atau kerugian-kerugian apapun bentuknya, yang dituntut atau dicurigai, baik yang bersifat pasti atau bergantung yang sekarang menjadi beban Penanam Modal atau yang mungkin muncul sebagai akibat dari atau sehubungan dengan tindakan-tindakan melanggar hukum atau kesalahan-kesalahan yang dilakukan oleh GM, RM, DF dan mc2, termasuk tetapi tidak terbatas pada klaim-klaim yang sebenarnya sudah dapat diajukan sebelumnya selain klaim-klaim yang sudah diajukan (Kurnia, 2017: 19).

Data 8 is similar to data 3; the difference is that in data 3 the analysis focuses on how the implicit element in the form of ellipsis in the SL is made to be explicit or appear in the TL, whereas in data 8 the analysis focuses on the grammatical instrument '... could + have + past participle..', which is in the SL, is used to express 'something which could be done in the past but it was not done'; therefore, in the TL it is translated into *klaim-klaim yang sebenarnya sudah dapat diajukan sebelumnya* as the

TL does have the grammatical instrument of the same type as in the SL. Therefore, what takes place in this data is the meaning shift from the grammatical meaning to the lexical meaning, allowing the message in the SL to be transferred to the TL. Apart from the meaning adjustment described above, it can also take place in the forms of gain of information, loss of information and skewing of information (Nida, 1991).

3.3 Gain of Information

Data 9

- SL : PDL/mc2 are also responsible for determining and implementing an on going resort management strategy whereby PDL retains a shareholding and/or profit interest in the resultant resort management entity (Stead, dkk. 2006: 2)
- TL : PDL/MC2 bertanggung jawab menentukan dan **kemudian** menerapkan strategi pengelolaan resor yang berkelanjutan di mana PDL mempertahankan kepemilikan saham dan/atau keuntungan di kesatuan manajemen resor yang dihasilkan (Kurnia, 2017: 2)

Grammatically, the SL in data 9 is made up of two clauses with parataxis relation as they are in the same level, that is, *PDL/MC2 are responsible for determining ...* and *(PDL/MC2 are responsible for) implementing an ongoing resort management strategy ...*; however, the subject of the second clause is deleted as it is the same as that of the first clause. Apart from showing parataxis relation, the two clauses also show the temporal semantic relation or sequential temporal relation (Muslich, 2010: 164) with *then*, which is not mentioned, as the cohesive marker as the context shows that the responsibility or the second thing which PDL/mc2 is supposed to do, as the subject of the second clause, after the first job is finished. Therefore, it is considered necessary to add the word *kemudian* as the translation equivalent of 'then' in the TL.

Data 10

- SL : In addition to the specific purposes set forth above, the purpose of the joint venture is also to conduct **any business** in which the parties, from time to time, may agree to become engaged in the surrounding area around the Project land. The Project Overview and agreed initial Financial Model are attached herewith as Appendix H and I (Stead dkk., 2006: 2)
- TL : Selain tujuan khusus yang ditetapkan di atas, tujuan dari usaha patungan ini juga untuk menjalankan **bisnis yang legal** di mana para pihak, dari waktu ke waktu, sepakat untuk berpartisipasi dalam pengembangan areal sekitar lahan Proyek. Ikhtisar Proyek dan Model Keuangan awal yang disepakati di lampirkan di sini sebagai Lampiran H dan I (Kurnia, 2017: 2)

The expression 'any business' in the SL in data 10 is translated into *bisnis yang legal* used by the translator to emphasize that the business that can be developed is the one which does not contradict the laws prevailing in the territory of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia in general and in Bali in particular. Such an addition of information also shows that the translator is careful enough when translating the SL to make the TL have the same function as that of the SL in the area or the country where the project will be developed.

3.4 Loss of Information

Loss of information refers to the attempt made by the translator in the process of translating the SL into the TL not to translate or not to make the translation equivalent appear in the TL (Nida, 1991), as illustrated in the following data:

Data 11

- SL : The joint venture shall become effective as of the date of this agreement, and shall continue until it is **mutually** agreed to be dissolved by all of the parties (Stead dkk., 2006: 2).
- TL : Perusahaan Patungan ini mulai berlaku secara efektif sejak tanggal dibuatnya perjanjian ini dan akan berlaku sampai ada kesepakatan untuk dibubarkan dari semua pihak (Kurnia, 2017: 2).

It can be clearly seen that the word 'mutually' in the SL in data 11 above is intentionally deleted or is intentionally left untranslated in the TL. The reason is that the expression *kesepakatan ... dari semua pihak* is more acceptable and natural in the TL and can be better understood by the target reader than if it the word *mutually*, whose literal translation is *satu sama lain, saling* (Echols & Shadily, 2014: 485), were translated, causing the SL to have been *Perusahaan Patungan ini mulai berlaku secara efektif sejak tanggal dibuatnya perjanjian ini dan akan berlaku sampai ada 'saling kesepakatan' untuk dibubarkan dari semua pihak*.

Data 12

- SL : Each of GM, RM, DF and mc2 hereby fully **admits, acknowledges** and **confesses** that each has predetitatedly and deliberately attempted to deceive the Investors and enrich each of themselves from the outset of the of the relationship by way of misrepresenting the documentation of the land transaction (Stead dkk., 2006:13)
- TL : Masing-masing GM, RM, DF dan mc2 dengan ini menyatakan **sepenuhnya mengakui** bahwa mereka telah merencanakan dan dengan sengaja mencoba menipu para Penanam Modal dan memperkaya diri mereka dari permulaan hubungan mereka lewat pendokumentasian yang dibuat-buat (Kurnia, 2017:14)

Data 13

- SL : GM, RM and mc2 hereby fully **admit, acknowledge** and **confess** that they have concluded the main land transaction without securing the access road which is in contradiction with the initial understanding between GM, RM, mc2 and the Investors (Stead dkk., 2006:13)
- TL : GM, RM dan mc2 dengan ini menyatakan **sepenuhnya mengakui** bahwa mereka menutup transaksi tanah utama tanpa mengikursertakan tanah untuk akses jalan, yang mana hal ini bertentangan dengan kesepakatan awal antara GM, RM, mc2 dan para Penanam Modal (Kurnia, 2017: 14)

Wordiness and redundancy is one of many differences between the legal language, as the language for special purpose, and the common language, meaning that one idea in the legal text is expressed using much more words than in the common text, leading to redundancy. Such a difference can be illustrated through the following example: 'I give, devise and bequeath the **rest, residue** and **remainder** of my estate ...', in which it can be seen that the concept *sisanya* is expressed using three words 'the rest, residue and remainder' which are synonymous to one another.

Data 12 and 13 show the same thing, that is, the words ‘admit’, ‘acknowledge’ and ‘confess’ are translated into one word in the TL, that is *mengakui* without reducing the meaning. It is also supported by the existence of the adverb *sepenuhnya* as the translation equivalent of the word ‘fully’ in the SL to emphasize that what is already done by GM, RM and MC2 has been frankly stated with nothing to hide. Similarly, data 12 and 13 also show that two synonymous words are left not translated in order to avoid redundancy and to make the TL natural and acceptable to the target reader. In the Agreement used as the data source in the current study many phenomena of wordiness and redundancy are found.

3.5 Skewing of Information

Nida (1991) states that skewing of information takes place when the unit translation (UT) in the SL does not formally correspond to its translation equivalent in the TL; therefore, the translator endeavors to find another translation equivalent which formally does not correspond but contextually it does, as illustrated in the following data:

Data 14

- SL : The above documents provide **misrepresentation** statements that the total purchase price of the land located in Desa Kutuh, Bali with total area of 28.650 m² as described in the Certificate of Right of Ownership No. 157 which involves I Ketut Suwiga Arya Dauh, SH as the buyer and I Made Rendah as the seller is Rp. 21.487.500.000 and the first installment of such payment has been made to the seller in a total amount of Rp. 8.000.000, while the actual purchase agreed was Rp. 18.622.500.000 and the first installment was Rp. 6.000.000.000. (Stead dkk., 2006: 13)
- TL : Dokumen-dokumen tersebut di atas berisikan banyak pernyataan yang **dibuat-buat** di mana jumlah harga pembelian tanah yang terletak di Desa Kutuh, Bali dengan luas seluruhnya 28,650 m² seperti yang tertera pada Sertifikat Hak Milik No. 157 yang melibatkan I Ketut Suwiga Arya Dauh, SH sebagai pembeli dan I Made Rendah sebagai penjual adalah Rp. 21.487.500 dan cicilan pertama dari pembayaran tersebut telah dilakukan kepada penjual dengan jumlah keseluruhannya Rp. 8.000.000.000, padahal jumlah harga pembelian yang sesungguhnya yang disepakati adalah Rp. 18.622.500.00 dengan cicilan pertama adalah Rp. 6.000.000.000 (Kurnia, 2017: 15).

The denotative meaning of the word ‘misrepresentation’ in the TL in data 14 is *penggambaran/penyajian yang keliru* (Echols and Shadily, 2002:477); however, in the TL it is translated into *dibuat-buat*. The possible reason is that the document contains the settlement agreement as well as the cooperation termination as several parties such as GM, RM, DF and MC are fraudulent; in other words, they do not carry out what they are supposed to do. What they do is not just a common mistake but a deception as what they report through the statements they make in the document is not based on facts. Therefore, the expression ‘misrepresentation’ is not translated into *pernyataan-pernyataan yang keliru*; instead, it is translated into *pernyataan-pernyataan yang dibuat-buat*. As a consequence, skewing of information in the process of translating the SL into the TL cannot be avoided.

Data 15

- SL : The above documents provide misrepresentation statements that the total purchase price of the land located in Desa Kutuh, Bali with total area of 28.650 m² as described in the Certificate of Right of Ownership No. 157 which involves I Ketut Suwiga Arya Dauh, SH as the buyer and I Made Rendah as the seller is Rp. 21.487.500.000 and **the first installment of such payment has been made** to the seller in a total amount of Rp. 8.000.000, while the actual purchase agreed was Rp. 18.622.500.000 and the first installment was Rp. 6.000.000.000. (Stead dkk., 2006: 13)
- TL : Dokumen-dokumen tersebut di atas berisikan banyak pernyataan yang dibuat-buat di mana jumlah harga pembelian tanah yang terletak di Desa Kutuh, Bali dengan luas seluruhnya 28,650 m² seperti yang tertera pada Sertifikat Hak Milik No. 157 yang melibatkan I Ketut Suwiga Arya Dauh, SH sebagai pembeli dan I Made Rendah sebagai penjual adalah Rp. 21.487.500 dan **cicilan pertama dari pembayaran tersebut telah dilakukan** kepada penjual dengan jumlah keseluruhannya Rp. 8.000.000.000, padahal jumlah harga pembelian yang sesungguhnya yang disepakati adalah Rp. 18.622.500.00 dengan cicilan pertama adalah Rp. 6.000.000.000 (Kurnia, 2017: 15)

Data 14 is similar to data 15; however, in data 14 the analysis focuses on the expression 'misrepresentation statements' which does not correspond to *pernyataan yang keliru*. In fact, they formally correspond to each other but the expression is translated into *pernyataan yang dibuat-buat* to which it contextually correspond. In data 15 the analysis focuses on why in the process of translating the expression 'the first installment of such payment has been made to ..' what is referred to as skewing of information takes place. If the passive construction '... the first installment of such payment has been made to ...' were translated based on formal correspondence, then the translation equivalent would have been *...cicilan pertama dari pembayaran tersebut telah dibuat kepada ...*, which is not certainly acceptable in the TL and not understood by the target reader. Therefore, such a passive construction is translated into '*... cicilan pertama dari pembayaran tersebut telah dilakukan kepada ...*', which turns out to be equivalent, acceptable and natural in the TL and better understood by the target reader.

Data 16

- SL : This agreement supersedes **any other agreement, letter, correspondence (oral or written) entered into** prior to this Agreement in respect of the matters dealt with in this Agreement (Stead dkk., 2006: 18)
- TL : Perjanjian ini menggantikan **perjanjian, surat, korespondensi (baik lisan maupun tertulis) yang telah diadakan** sebelum Perjanjian ini terkait dengan hal-hal yang ditetapkan dalam Perjanjian ini (Kurnia, 2017: 20)

The UT in data 16 above is '...any other agreement, letter, correspondence (oral or written) entered into prior to ...', which is a passive construction as data 14 and 15, and formally correspond to '*... perjanjian, surat, korespondensi lainnya (baik lisan maupun tertulis)*', which is not acceptable at all, awkward and confusing to the target reader; therefore, skewing of information is needed. The result is that such a UT is translated into '*... perjanjian, surat, korespondensi (baik lisan maupun tertulis) yang sudah diadakan sebelumnya ...*', whose equivalence is high enough, natural and highly acceptable in the TL.

4. Conclusion

From what was discussed above, it can be concluded that the semantic adjustments cannot be avoided in the process of translating the Memorandum of Understanding used as the data source in the current study. The semantic adjustments can overcome the linguistic gap between the SL and TL, and allows the translator to be able to transfer the message from the SL to the TL appropriately enough. As well, the semantic adjustments also contribute to the acceptability, naturalness and readability of the TL.

References

- Damayanti, L., Pastika, I. W., & Malini, N. L. N. S. (2020). Translation of Compound Words in The Wings of Joy Book. *The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC)*, 2(01), 98-112.
- Echols, J. M., & Shadily, H. (2002). Kamus Inggris-Indonesia Edisi Ketiga.
- Handayani, A. (2009). Analisis ideologi penerjemahan dan penilaian kualitas terjemahan istilah kedokteran dalam buku "Lecture Notes on Clinical Medicine.". *Unpublished master's thesis, Surakarta: Universitas Negeri Sebelas Maret*. <http://www.slideshare.net/sugengh/reseach-in-translation-studies>
- Hasan, D. C. Penerjemahan Informasi Implisit Dari Bahasa Inggris Ke Bahasa Indonesia Dalam Karya Fiksi. *Linguistik Indonesia, Agustus 2007, Tahun ke 25, Nomor 2*, 55.
- Kridalaksana, H. (1993). *Kamus Linguistik* (Edisi Ketiga). Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Larson, Mildred L. (1998). *Maning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. (Second Edition). USA: University Press of America, Inc.
- Liswahyuningsih, N. L. G., Artawa, K., Udayana, I. N., & Satyawati, M. S. (2020). Indonesian-English Translation of Idiomatic Noun Phrases: Its Techniques Review. *The International Journal of Social Sciences World (TIJOSSW)*, 2(01), 65-74.
- Muslich, M. (2010). *Garis-garis besar tatabahasa baku bahasa Indonesia*. Refika Aditama.
- Nida, E. A. (1991). Theories of translation. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 4(1), 19-32.
- Olohan, M. (2004). *Introducing corpora in translation studies*. Routledge.
- Sudana, I. G. P., & Yadnya, I. B. P. (2021). Contribution of Transposition Procedure to The Structural Adjustments in The Translation of English Memorandum. *The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC)*, 3(01), 91-102. Retrieved from <https://www.growingscholar.org/journal/index.php/TIJOLAC/article/view/117>
- Yulianti Dewi, N.K. (2016). *Aspek Stilistika dalam Teks Srimad Bhagavatam: Kajian Terjemahan dari Bahasa Inggris ke Bahasa Indonesia* (Disertasi).
- Zanches, M. (2021). Translation Errors: Their Advantages for Linguistic Competence. *The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC)*, 3(01), 36-45.

Semantic Adjustments in The Translation of English Memorandum
(I Gede Putu Sudana, Ida Bagus Putra Yadnya)