

10-31-2020

Translation ideology in literary translation; A case study of Bram Stoker's *Dracula* translation into Indonesian

Doni Jaya

*International Language Institute, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia (LBI FIB UI),
stefanus_doni@yahoo.com*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/wacana>



Part of the [Other Arts and Humanities Commons](#), and the [Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jaya, Doni (2020) "Translation ideology in literary translation; A case study of Bram Stoker's *Dracula* translation into Indonesian," *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*: Vol. 21: No. 3, Article 5. DOI: 10.17510/wacana.v21i3.987 Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/wacana/vol21/iss3/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Humanities at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Translation ideology in literary translation

A case study of Bram Stoker's *Dracula* translation into Indonesian

DONI JAYA

ABSTRACT

A literary text typically contains many cultural elements often presented in a very concise manner to enhance its readability and aesthetic quality. Its translation can be challenging when there is a gap between source culture and target culture. Thus, a translator has to make an ideological choice: either to foreignize or to domesticize. This paper aims to identify and examine the ideology applied by a literary translator when translating culturally-divergent translation units. Bram Stoker's *Dracula* and its Indonesian translation by Suwarni were selected as data source due to the novel's significant number of cultural references unfamiliar to modern Indonesians. Forty units were selected for this paper and classified into several groups. Results show that the translator used various strategies, both foreignizing and domesticizing ones, to translate even similar units, indicating her considerable freedom. Furthermore, the results also show that translation ideology is a flexible concept which can shift throughout a translation project and be represented as a multipoint continuum. Moreover, both foreignization and domestication may take place at different levels, depending on various factors such as presence of information, extent of modification, and relevance of information.

KEYWORDS

Literary translation; metaphor translation; translation ideology; foreignization; domestication.

DONI JAYA is a translator, interpreter, translation educator, TOEFL teacher, and coordinator of translation courses at International Language Institute, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia (LBI FIB UI). He took his PhD from Linguistics Department, Faculty of Humanities Universitas Indonesia, in 2018. His research interests are literary translation and academic translation. His publications include PhD thesis summary "Penerjemahan novel *Dracula* karya Bram Stoker dari bahasa Inggris ke dalam bahasa Indonesia; Kasus pengalihan skema budaya divergen", *Paradigma* Vol. 10 No. 1 (2020: 96-111) and "Penerjemahan kutipan di dalam karya sastra; Menjembatani kesenjangan pengetahuan skematis", *Jurnal Penerjemahan* Vol. IV No. 1 (Juli 2017: 72-90). Doni Jaya can be contacted at: stefanus_doni@yahoo.com.

© 2020 Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia

DONI JAYA | DOI: 10.17510/wacana.v21i3.987.

1. INTRODUCTION¹

Literary translation is an area of translation which requires a great degree of cultural sensitivity and creativity on the translator's part.² As one type of creative work, a literary text has two functions: informational and aesthetic, meaning that it should serve as both a source of knowledge and a source of entertainment (M. Budianta et al. 2006). Therefore, a literary translator has to be able to not only transfer the information contained in the source text (ST) but also preserve the ST's aesthetic quality in the target text (TT) (C.E. Landers 2001). The informational aspect of a literary text is reflected in narrative details such as people's names, places (buildings and areas), cultural objects, cultural practices, and general worldview. The literary work's aesthetic quality, on the other hand, is reflected in various literary devices such as figures of speech, idiomatic expressions, emotional expressions, allusions, quotations, imagery, and characterization (T.R. Arp and G. Johnson 2002).

A literary work, just like language, is never created in a vacuum; instead, it is strongly related to culture (M. Snell-Hornby 1988/1995). Indeed, it is inevitably influenced by the author's cultural background and is always written against the backdrop of a particular culture, be it the author's own culture, another culture, an entirely fictional culture, or a mixture or adaptation of any of those. Culture becomes a challenge in the translation of a text when the culture of the source text (source culture or SC) and the culture of the target readers (target culture or TC) are so different that certain cultural references in the source text are not readily understandable or identifiable by the target readers (TR). We have to bear in mind that presumably such problems do not occur among the source readers (SR) because they already have (or are assumed to already have) enough background knowledge to understand and identify those cultural references without lengthy explanation.

In addition to cultural gap, translators often have to deal with a related issue of untranslatability, that is, a condition that arises when a word or expression does not have a precise target language (TL) equivalent (M. Baker 2011). In such cases translators often have to choose a near equivalent which is not totally accurate but seems to fit the context. In other words, a cultural gap may cause a ST to undergo generalization, deletion, or distortion of meaning components during the process of translation (D. Katan 1999). This phenomenon is often inevitable, especially when SC and TC are significantly different from each other and when source language (SL) and TL categorize things in markedly different ways.

Such cultural gaps are more challenging in literary translation because literary writers, more often than not, tend to squeeze a huge amount of cultural

¹ The data I present in this article come from a broader study for my PhD thesis "Penerjemahan novel *Dracula* karya Bram Stoker dari bahasa Inggris ke dalam bahasa Indonesia; Kasus pengalihan skema budaya divergen", defended at the Faculty of the Humanities Universitas Indonesia in 2018 (Doni Jaya 2018b). The summary of this PhD thesis is published in *Paradigma* Vol. 10 No. 1 (Jaya 2020: 96-111).

² See Jaya 2017.

information into short stretches of text in order to achieve a maximum level of naturalness and aesthetics, especially in direct speech and rapid turn-taking between characters. Details of cultural references are not only kept to the minimum, but are also subtly implied in various points throughout the text, thus often leaving readers who are not fully informed of the cultural context wondering what they actually refer to and what is hidden between the lines.

This gives rise to the question how such translation units are to be translated. One possibility is that the translator may help the readers to understand those units by interfering with the text. If s/he is allowed some freedom to do so, this leads to further questions of how far s/he can interfere and in what ways s/he should interfere. In fact, more often than not, a translator's interference "is expected" in order to preserve the "global meaning" or the implied messages of the ST, which is the hallmark of literary or creative texts (F. Israël 1996). The other possibility is that the translator may simply translate literally and leave the results to the imagination of the TRs. Both approaches have consequences for the resulting TT and affect both of its informational and aesthetic qualities in varying degrees, and debates on the merits of each approach are a frequent subject of academic criticism and argument.

Bearing these issues in mind, this paper seeks to examine a translation of an English novel into Indonesian. Bram Stoker's 1897 horror novel *Dracula* (B. Stoker 2006) was chosen as the ST data source because its cultural setting (Late Victorian England and Romania) is significantly different from the culture of its putative TL readership, namely modern Indonesians. The novel's Indonesian translation by Suwarni (Stoker 1993) was selected as the TT data source because it is *Dracula's* first and most widely distributed Indonesian translation published by PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, one of the most reputable Indonesian publishers. Special focus was given to the translation of "culturally-divergent translation units", that is translation units which contain specific cultural references which might not be readily understood or identified by putative TRs. Theoretical concepts drawn from the discussion of translation ideology mentioned above aided the analysis.

This research was designed to answer these questions: (1) what ideology dominates the translation of *Dracula* into Indonesian? (2) What are the relationships between ideology and strategies? (3) Is ideology an absolute concept with two very contrasting poles without anything in between? And if not, how can we best conceptualize translation ideology and its role in translation, based on the research results?

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

"Translation ideology" refers to the general approach which a translator selects to translate a culture-bound ST, namely whether s/he translates it by preserving the SC as far as possible or by adapting them to the TC as far as possible (F. Schleiermacher 1992). It is assumed that translation ideology consists of two opposing poles: foreignization and domestication, which

has to be chosen by a translator as his/her general approach for the whole translation project. The former pole is said to be SL/SC-oriented, while the latter pole is said to be TL/TC-oriented (L. Venuti 1995).

A translator is said to apply “foreignization” if s/he plans to preserve as many SC contents as possible. This ideology is chosen in order to make TT sound like it was originally written in SL (or “not” in TL, at least) and to preserve the author’s original voice. Some translation strategies that are associated with foreignization are:

- transference: using the exact SL words/expressions as equivalents,
- naturalization: using the SL words/expressions with spelling adjustment, and
- literal equivalent: literal rendering of ST, both figurative and nonfigurative.³

It must be noted that, in my opinion, “literal equivalent” can be considered as a foreignizing strategy when the translator “deliberately” chooses to translate literally in order to produce certain effects when the ST could actually be translated using another strategy which would have made it more natural or understandable in TL.

A translator is said to apply “domestication” if s/he plans to adapt as many SC contents into TC elements. This ideology is chosen in order to make TT sound more natural (as if it had been written in TL), to facilitate reading, and to increase comprehensibility. Some translation strategies that are associated with domestication are:

- paraphrase: saying the same thing in a different way, usually involving massive lexical and syntactical modification,
- functional equivalent: using equivalents which have the same general function although not always accurate,
- descriptive equivalent: using a brief description or definition of the word or expression,
- notes: inserting additional information (including appositives, modifying noun clauses, footnotes, and endnotes),
- expansion: adding new elements into TT to increase clarity, and
- omission: deleting ST elements which are deemed irrelevant or very difficult to translate.⁴

³ Transference and naturalization are taken from Newmark’s list of translation procedures (1988), but literal equivalent as a translation strategy is an addition of my own, which I have put forward to explain some of the data that I have collected. It must be noted, however, that the concept of literal translation already exists and is listed as one of eight Newmarkian translation methods applicable at a general level (the whole text), but not as a strategy applicable at a specific level (words, phrases, clauses, and sentences).

⁴ Functional equivalent, descriptive equivalent, notes, and expansion are taken from Newmark’s

Both foreignization and domestication have their own strengths and weaknesses. Proponents of foreignization say that literary texts must be foreignized because it is the only way a translator can be faithful to the ST author and preserve his/her voice. Foreignization rose as a critical reaction against domestication which had dominated literary translation since time immemorial (Venuti 1995). On the other hand, this view has received criticism from the proponents of domestication because they think that there is simply no point in deliberately making a text sound odd and difficult to understand. They argue that, after all, one of the principal reasons why people read literary texts is to entertain themselves, not to rack their brains trying to make sense of what they are reading (Landers 2001).

The concepts of divergence and conformity refer to the extent of the gap between the amount of implied knowledge required to understand a text or utterance and the amount of knowledge that a reader or listener actually has. In psychological terms, such knowledge is called schema or schematic knowledge (Cook 1989). In terms of translation, divergence and conformity refer to how far the gap between source readers' (SR's) schema and target readers' (TR's) schema is, namely the difference between the amount of schema required to understand a particular translation unit and the amount of schema that TRs actually have or do not have. If there is a gap between SR's and TR's schema, the translation unit is said to be divergent, but if there is no such gap, the translation unit is said to be conformable. The concept of schema is useful for analyzing potential translation challenges due to cultural gaps, for identifying potential misunderstandings due to uncritical literal translation, and for proposing suitable equivalents for culturally-sensitive translation units (D. Jaya 2012).

This research focuses on translation units which contain potentially divergent cultural elements or contents, hereinafter referred to as divergent units. The qualifier "potentially" is used here to acknowledge the fact that TRs might possess different amounts of schema, which affects their ability to understand a text. For instance, a TR who has been exposed to English culture may find it much easier to understand a translated English novel than another TR who has not. For the purpose of this paper, I assumed that TRs were urban modern Indonesian speakers with adequate exposure to modern English and to translated literary works, and my judgment on their amount of schema was based on this assumption.

Metaphors and idiomatic expressions are literary features which involve a comparison between two different objects or concepts based on a certain degree of assumed similarity. A metaphor or idiomatic expression consists of a topic (the real object being compared), an image (another object used as a comparison), point of similarity (the similarity assumed to exist between the topic and the object), and nonfigurative meaning (the implied meaning of the expression) (M.L. Larson 1984). With regard to translation, these literary

list of translation procedures (1988). Paraphrase and omission are taken from Baker's list of translation strategies (2011).

devices may pose a great challenge to translators when an image which can be used to represent a topic in SL may not be able to serve the same function in TL, due to schematic gap between the SRs and the TRs (Jaya 2013). The translator generally has a number of choices: using the same image, using a different image, adding the point of similarity, using the nonfigurative meaning, or omitting the metaphor or expression altogether.

Concepts arising from translation ideology, such as foreignization and domestication, were used as theoretical tools for the analysis of the data. Common translation strategies such as transference, naturalization, functional equivalent, notes, expansion, and omission (see above) were used to describe the data, especially the translation process which they underwent. The schema theory was used to describe the influence of SR-TR cultural gap on the translator's choice of equivalents. Concepts in metaphor analysis were specifically used to discuss the translator's treatment of metaphors.

3. METHODS

This research consisted of two main stages: data preparation and data analysis. Data preparation consisted of several steps. First, the data source for this research is the novel *Dracula* and its Indonesian translation which was also the source for my PhD research (Jaya 2018b). Second, I collected all translation units, consisting of ST-TT pairs, which contained SC elements which are potentially divergent from TC. Third, I put them in a two-column table in pairs: the STs were on the left and the TTs were on the right, to facilitate analysis. This pairing is highly recommended for research which falls into the category of "comparison of translations and their source texts" (J. Williams and A. Chesterman 2002). Data reduction was also carried out by excluding obvious mistranslations. Fourth, I divided those pairs into groups based on certain similarities in order that analysis could be performed in a more orderly manner.

For the purpose of this paper, I limited the number of groups into eight: people, places, cultural objects, cultural practices, cultural concepts, quotations, foreign languages, and metaphors. It must be noted, however, that there are many ways to divide those translation units (such as based on topic, unit length, or position within the text), but these eight are the ones which best represent my focus on cultural contents and how they were preserved, modified, or changed during translation.

Data analysis consisted of several steps. First, I determined the translation strategy or strategies which had been applied by the translator to each unit. Second, I determined the translation ideology of each case and tried to further qualify them into different "ideological positions" within an ideological continuum, a new concept which I will explain in greater detail in the Section 5. In order to simplify analysis, I only present five prominent ideological positions in this paper: foreignization plus (FR+), normal foreignization (FR), medial ideology (MD), normal domestication (DM), and domestication plus (DM+). Third, I described the translation process of each translation unit in

terms of translation strategy and ideology. This was done with occasional reference to other units within the same group for comparison purposes. Fourth, I discussed my findings with the goal of proposing several theses on translation ideology and supported them using my data and arguments. These theses serve as the conclusion of this research.

4. RESULTS

In total, my PhD research (Jaya 2018b) has identified 894 translation units which contain potentially-divergent cultural elements.⁵ For this paper I have selected 40 translation units, five units per group, to serve as the representative sample of my main findings and as the basis for my conception of translation ideology. Two additional, essentially non-divergent units were added to unit [7.3] for comparison purposes, namely, to show how a translator may translate the same word or expression using different ideological approaches: one being ideologically neutral (medial ideology) and the other being ideologically motivated (either foreignization or domestication). Those units are presented in Table 1.⁶

CATEGORY	NO.	TRANSLATION UNIT
People	1.1	<i>St. Joseph and Ste. Mary</i> :: <i>St. Joseph dan St. Mary</i> [St. Joseph and St. Mary]
	1.2	<i>Nordau and Lombroso</i> :: <i>Nordau dan Lombroso</i> [Nordau and Lombroso]
	1.3	<i>a figure of Thor</i> :: <i>tokoh Thor</i> [Thor figure]
	1.4	<i>Ellen Terry</i> :: <i>bintang film Ellen Terry</i> [the film star Ellen Terry]
	1.5	<i>the coils of Medusa's snakes</i> :: <i>gelungan ular Ø</i> [snakes' coils]
Places	2.1	<i>Ring</i> :: <i>Ring; Hillingham</i> :: <i>Hillingham</i>
	2.2	<i>Cape Farewell</i> :: <i>Cape Farewell</i>
	2.3	<i>Whitby Abbey</i> :: <i>Biara Whitby</i> [Whitby Abbey]
	2.4	<i>the City</i> :: <i>City (catatan kaki: bagian kota London yang paling tua)</i> [City (footnote: the oldest part of the city of London)]
	2.5	<i>the Stars and Stripes</i> :: <i>negara Amerika Serikat</i> [the country of the United States]

⁵ More detailed description of all translation units and more thorough analysis of the findings can be found in my dissertation (Jaya 2018b).

⁶ In this table, each main ideological position is assigned a different color: (1) blue for FR+, (2) light blue for FR, (3) yellow for MD, (4) light red for DM, and (5) red for DM+. Approximate back-translations from Indonesian TTs into English are presented in square brackets. When a unit or a part thereof was translated using the omission strategy, the TT is indicated by the symbol "Ø".

Cultural objects	3.1	<i>The Law List :: The Law List</i>
	3.2	<i>the "Red" and "Blue" books :: buku "Merah" dan buku "Biru" [the "Red" book and the "Blue" book]</i>
	3.3	<i>port wine :: anggur port [port wine]</i>
	3.4	<i>fez :: fez, yaitu topi yang sering dipakai orang Turki [fez, namely the hat that is often worn by the Turks]</i>
	3.5	<i>lawn frock :: baju putih [white shirt]</i>
Cultural practices	4.1	<i>band :: band</i>
	4.2	<i>My watch was still unwound :: Arlojiku tidak diputar [My watch was unwound]</i>
	4.3	<i>spitting on it for luck :: meludahi uang itu, agaknya supaya membawa keberuntungan [spitting on the money, apparently to bring luck]</i>
	4.4	<i>Derby night :: pesta-pesta malam setelah pacuan kuda Derby [night parties after the Derby horseraces]</i>
	4.5	<i>Tally Ho! As friend Arthur would say when he put on his red frock! :: "Hayo!" sebagaimana biasanya diserukan oleh pemburu seperti Arthur pada anjingnya, bila binatang yang diburu sudah kelihatan! ["Come on!" as usually shouted by a hunter like Arthur at his dog, when the hunted animal is already on sight!]</i>
Cultural concepts	5.1	<i>Treaty :: Treaty</i>
	5.2	<i>the Monroe doctrine :: Doktrin Monroe [the Monroe Doctrine]</i>
	5.3	<i>chaplain of the English mission church :: pendeta dari Gereja Misi Inggris [a pastor of the English Mission Church]</i>
	5.4	<i>physiognomy :: susunan tubuh dan wajah [body and facial arrangement]</i>
	5.5	<i>angels :: bidadari-bidadari [female fairies/goddesses]</i>
Quotations	6.1	<i>omnia Romæ venalia sunt :: omnia Romæ venalia sunt</i>
	6.2	<i>"Denn die Todten reiten schnell" (footnote: "For the dead travel fast") :: "Denn die Todten reiten schnell" (catatan kaki: Karena yang sudah mati cepat larinya) ["Denn die Todten reiten schnell" (footnote: Because those who have died run quickly)]</i>
	6.3	<i>"The unexpected always happens." How well Disraeli knew life :: Yang tak terdugalah yang selalu terjadi. Tepat sekali kata-kata Disraeli itu mengenai kehidupan. [It is the unexpected that always happens. How true Disraeli's words about life.]</i>
	6.4	<i>lying like Ophelia in the play, with "virgin crants and maiden strewments" :: berbaring seperti Ophelia dalam Hamlet, yang berkalung bunga lambang keperawanan [lying like Ophelia in Hamlet, who wore a flower necklace symbolizing virginity]</i>
	6.5	<i>"As idle as a painted ship upon a painted ocean" :: Ø</i>

Foreign languages	7.1	<i>Mein Gott! :: Mein Gott!</i>
	7.2	<i>festina lente :: festina lente (catatan kaki: bersabarlah dalam bergegas) [festina lente (footnote: be patient to be quick)]</i>
	7.3	<i>shock :: kejutan [shock/surprise] vs. shock :: shock good-bye :: selamat jalan [goodbye] vs. good-bye :: good bye</i>
	7.4	<i>parti :: pasangan [pair]</i>
	7.5	<i>in camera :: dengan istilah-istilah [using jargons]</i>
Metaphors	8.1	<i>you may scratch my ears :: Anda boleh menggaruk telinga saya [you may scratch my ears]</i>
	8.2	<i>jumping from tussock to tussock in a misty bog :: melompat dari rumpun ke rumpun dalam rawa-rawa berkabut [jumping from tussock to tussock in misty marshes]</i>
	8.3	<i>a bitter pill for me to swallow :: pil pahit yang harus kutelan [a bitter pill which I must swallow]</i>
	8.4	<i>build our castles in the air :: berangan-angan [daydreaming]</i>
	8.5	<i>'the milk that is spilt cries not out afterwards' :: nasi sudah menjadi bubur [rice has turned into porridge]</i>

Table 1. Examples of ST-TT pairs of culturally-divergent translation units from *Dracula*.

4.1 TRANSLATION OF "PEOPLE"

Translation units in the "people" category were translated using various strategies due to various reasons and considerations. ST [1.1] was transferred even though it can actually be translated into *Santo Yusuf dan Santa Maria*. In this particular case, anyway, the two names appear not as proper names for individuals in their own right (such as *St. Joseph and Ste. Mary Hospital, Buda-Pesth*, which in fact also appears in the novel), but as part of a nun's expression of gratefulness for somebody's recovery. The translator apparently wished to make them sound more foreign by preserving the English version. Both historical names in ST [1.2] are presented as they are in the TT without any additional information about their contribution to criminology in the late nineteenth century, other than a statement that they would classify Count Dracula, the main villain of the novel, as a criminal. This strategy was chosen probably because those names appear in a character's direct speech, in which lengthy notes would sound awkward, especially considering the fact that his listeners are experts who must have known those eminent Victorian scholars. The first and second cases are examples of foreignization, but the first case is arguably more foreignizing because it was applied deliberately when a perfect TL equivalent is available.

ST [1.3] is already composed of a hypernym figure and a proper name Thor, so the translator simply needed to translate the hypernym literally. In my view, this strategy neither foreignized nor domesticized the ST because the real nature of Thor (that is as a "figure") and its function as a metaphor had

been made clear in the ST. Furthermore, most modern Indonesians already know Thor as a European god associated with strength and power, especially now, due to a number of Hollywood movies released over the past decade. Unlike the previous case, ST [1.4] did not come with any hypernym and was thus expanded by adding a relevant hypernym. This was an effort to increase TRs' understanding and therefore can be classified as domestication. On the other hand, ST [1.5] was translated by omitting the reference to Medusa at all, leaving only elements of imagery (*coils of snakes*) which the translator felt should be immediately understood by the TRs. In my opinion, this is an excessive domestication because most TRs must already have some idea about Medusa and her association with snakes, while the strategy has certainly and unnecessarily reduced the terrifying effect of the whole expression.

4.2 TRANSLATION OF PLACES

Similar phenomena can also be found in the places category. The two place names in [2.1] were translated as they are without any explanation that they are actually the residences of the characters Arthur Holmwood and Lucy Westenra. These are potentially divergent because the practice of naming a private house and referring to it as such is not commonly known in Indonesian cultures. *Ring* is particularly problematic because nowhere in the text is *Ring* explicitly mentioned as Mr. Holmwood's residence, except in a sentence which informs that he "has been suddenly called to Ring to see his father, who has been taken seriously ill". This can be mistaken as an area or a hospital. Meanwhile, the hypernym *Cape* in ST [2.2] was not translated into its accurate Indonesian equivalent *Tanjung*. This is in stark contrast with ST [2.3] whose hypernym *Abbey* was translated accurately into *Biara*. In terms of ideology, [2.1] is more foreignizing than [2.2] because the TRs are left with no clue at all about the nature of those two places (probably they are areas or streets?), whereas there is at least the hypernym *Cape* which may be understood by TRs who have decent knowledge of English.

ST [2.4] was transferred and equipped with a translator's footnote which explains that *the City* is not just any city but actually refers to a particular part of London. The reason is clear: the literal equivalent *Kota* will certainly be mistaken as a random city because the TRs are not familiar with the practice of calling London *the City*, as British people do. ST [2.5] is actually the design of the U.S. flag and is used as a metonym to refer to the country. In the TT, the whole reference to the flag design was omitted and replaced with its plain, denotative referent, namely the country's name in TL. The usage of literal equivalent *Bintang-Bintang dan Garis-Garis* would not make any sense in TL because it is not the usual metonym used by the TRs to refer to the U.S.⁷ [2.5] is more domesticizing than [2.4] because [2.5] was translated using completely different words and has much less poetic effect. Besides that, despite the

⁷ Compare this with a much more familiar TL metonym *Negeri Paman Sam* ('the Land of Uncle Sam').

additional footnote, [2.4] still preserves some air of foreignness because it still contains the original English term.

4.3 TRANSLATION OF CULTURAL OBJECTS

Most divergent units belong to the category of cultural objects, and they were also treated in various ways. ST [3.1] and [3.2] are two of a series of printed materials mentioned in quick succession without any explanation about their contents, except that they are reference books which belong to Count Dracula.⁸ ST [3.1] was simply transferred in italics, probably because the short literal equivalent *Daftar Hukum* would not make much sense to the TRs.⁹ ST [3.2] was translated literally, but the resulting TT does not help much because it only tells the TRs about the associated colors of those books. Both are clearly foreignization cases in the sense that the TRs might still not be able to get any idea about what they contain, but the latter one is less foreignizing by virtue of its at least being translated literally.

In [3.3], the hypernym *wine* is already provided by the author and was simply translated literally as *anggur*. Therefore, as what happened with other STs with similar construction, this treatment is ideologically neutral. ST [3.4] was translated by preserving the original Turkish term in italics and by adding a relatively long piece of information in the body text. This extensive note may be possible because it is part of a short, non-direct speech description of a man and placed at the end of a sentence. Meanwhile, in [3.5], the ST term was not preserved at all and underwent a modulation: the ST focuses on the fabric (*lawn*), whereas the TT focuses on the color (*putih* or 'white'). Furthermore, *frock* underwent significant generalization into *baju* ('shirt'), even though it may as well be more specifically translated as *gaun* ('gown'). Having lost its cultural specificity due to modulation and generalization, [3.5] has a higher domestication degree than [3.4] in which the translator still preserved the original term *fez*.

⁸ This series consists of five books of reference which were translated using various strategies: (1) the *London Directory* :: *buku petunjuk kota London* [London city's reference book] (descriptive equivalent), (2) the "Red" and "Blue" books :: *buku "Merah" dan buku "Biru"* [the "Red" book and the "Blue" book] (literal equivalent of both the hypernyms and the proper names), (3) *Whitaker's Almanac* :: *almanak Whitaker* [Whitaker almanac] (literal equivalent of the hypernym only), (4) *the Army and Navy Lists* :: *petunjuk-petunjuk mengenai Angkatan Darat dan Angkatan Laut* [references on the Army and the Navy] (descriptive equivalent), and (5) *the Law List* :: *The Law List* (transference in italics).

The translation of these items clearly demonstrates the translator's high flexibility and freedom in choosing strategies. Nevertheless, more domesticizing strategies in the form of additional information do not seem to be favoured here because of space limitation and aesthetic consideration. Furthermore, the translator might have considered that more complete information was irrelevant because their main function is just to bolster Count Dracula's image as an avid anglophile in the eyes of Jonathan Harker, the narrator.

⁹ It is interesting to note that there are other cultural objects that were also transferred without additional information, such as "*mamaliga*" :: *mamaliga* and "*impletata*" :: *impletata*. However, they were already accompanied by complete explanations provided by the author himself, so their foreignizing degrees significantly dropped. These explanations explicitly present them as two Romanian delicacies, along with their basic ingredients.

4.4 TRANSLATION OF CULTURAL PRACTICES

Varying degrees of translation ideology are also found in the translation of STs related to cultural practices. ST [4.1] can actually be accurately translated into a more Indonesian-sounding *grup musik* ('musical group'), but the translator deliberately preserved the English word, which significantly increased its foreignization degree. ST [4.2] was translated using its literal equivalent, but this practice may actually be rather divergent for the TRs because, in the modern era, the activity of *memutar arloji* ('turning (the knob) of a watch') is usually intended to set the time rather than reactivating the mechanism. This potential confusion is amplified in the TT with the subsequent statement that the narrator *sudah terbiasa memutarnya sebelum tidur* ('is accustomed to turning its knob before sleeping'). There is simply no longer any reason why a wearer of an electric watch must "turn his watch's knob" every day before sleeping. ST [4.3] was also translated using its literal equivalent, but this time it does not cause any potential misunderstanding because both the custom (spitting on money) and its significance (for bringing luck) are explicitly provided in the ST. Therefore, [4.3] cannot be considered as an example of foreignization on the translator's part.

ST [4.4] was expanded to include the words *pesta* ('party'), *setelah* ('after'), and *pacuan kuda* ('horserace') to provide the TRs with encyclopedic knowledge. The literal equivalent *malam Derby* simply would not be understood by the TRs who might mistake it as a period of time rather than as an organized event. A more extreme form of translator's interference can be seen in [4.5] where she totally paraphrased the whole utterance in order to make it justifiably more understandable in TL. Reference to red frocks was omitted and replaced with that to hunting, a prestigious British cultural event associated with the wearing of red frock-coats, horse-riding, and hunting dogs. It is clear that the translator thought that the TRs would more easily associate a European hunting event with the presence of horses and dogs than red frocks. Even the culturally specific exclamation *tally ho* was replaced with *ayo*, a much more general Indonesian exclamation. Because of this extensive modification, it can be argued that [4.5] has a higher degree of domestication than [4.4].

4.5 TRANSLATION OF CULTURAL CONCEPTS

Cultural concepts were also translated at different ideological levels. ST [5.1] was simply transferred even though there is almost no way that the TRs can immediately identify what it is without any additional information. The translator did not even translate it into *Traktat* ('Treaty') or *Perjanjian* ('Agreement') to make it slightly clearer.¹⁰ Curiously, she translated the hypernym of ST [5.2] into TL, although one can argue that this is still far from explaining anything, particularly because there is no useful contextual clue anywhere else in the text.¹¹ Such foreignizing strategies might have been

¹⁰ *Treaty* refers to the 1898 Treaty of Paris which marked the transfer of almost all Spanish territories in North America to the U.S.

¹¹ The Monroe Doctrine was U.S. policy which challenged European dominance in and

used by the translator because the two terms are parts of a long, quick-paced direct speech uttered by Renfield, an extremely well-read and somewhat melodramatic character. In fact, those two political references are mentioned by Renfield in order to impress his listeners with his extensive knowledge about the U.S. Adding any basic information which everyone there is supposed to know already would surely make the character sound unnecessarily verbose and arrogant. Both cases can be considered as examples of foreignization, albeit at slightly different degrees. [5.1] is more foreignizing than [5.2] because the translator retained its TL equivalent.

ST [5.3] must be familiar to readers who know much about the Anglican Church. However, this may serve as a potential divergent unit for the TRs because Anglicanism is not a dominant Christian denomination in Indonesia, compared to Catholicism and other branches of Protestantism. Fortunately, the literal equivalents of all parts of the concept do not seem to hinder understanding since the TRs are supposedly already familiar with general Christian terms such as *pendeta* ('pastor'), *gereja* ('church'), and *misi* ('mission'). Because of these happy matches, this case has a neutral ideological position.

ST [5.4] is a technical term coined in the Victorian era, but it was translated using much less scientific words which make the TT sound like an everyday definition. One may argue that this treatment weakens the narrator's (Dr. John Seward) image as a brilliant and somewhat pedantic medical doctor. However, even more domesticizing is [5.5] where the translator felt the need to use *bidadari* despite the fact that angels already has an accurate and contextually relevant literal equivalent *malaikat*. This is not really necessary since *angels* is used in the narrative to refer to beautiful divine creatures which a girl's soul would meet in heaven after she died. In fact, the word *malaikat* is more appropriate since that particular scene is strongly set within the context of Christian belief.

4.6 TRANSLATION OF QUOTATIONS

Another interesting group is "quotations" which may be inserted by the author into the ST as a literary device, with or without reference to their original sources or authors. The most foreignizing case in [6.1], where the translator simply transferred the whole Latin quotation without adding anything, neither the literal meaning, nor the contextual meaning. The proverb actually came from the Roman historian Sallust (he lived from 86 BC to around 35 BC), but even this information was not provided in the novel, let alone translated. It is interesting to note, however, that this proverb was immediately followed by the sentence *Hell has its price!*, which was translated rather freely as *Selalu ada sebabnya orang masuk neraka!* ('There are always reasons why people enter hell!'). It is therefore probable that the translator did not choose more domesticizing strategies because she thought that the second sentence was the literal translation or at least the nonfigurative meaning of the proverb,

colonization of the entire American continent. It was proposed by the U.S. President James Monroe in 1823.

while actually it is not. The proverb's literal SL equivalent is "everything in Rome is for sale", while its nonfigurative meaning is that everyone is prone to corruption and sin. The second sentence is just a further elaboration of the narrator's thought.

Slightly less foreignizing is [6.2] where the author provided both the literal meaning in the form of a footnote and the literary work from where it was quoted, namely *Lenore*, a ballad by Gottfried August Bürger. The translator simply translated the footnote semantically. However, the fact that she preserved the original German phrase shows that she wanted to maintain some exotic nuances in the TT. However, a different approach is shown in [6.3] where the translator translated the entire quotation into TL and did not preserve its original English sentence. Like in [6.2], the author also provided sufficient information about the source of the quotation, which was also translated semantically with minimal modification. Because the potentially divergent unit has been made reasonably clear from the start, the whole treatment of the quotation can be considered as neither foreignization nor domestication.

In ST [6.4], the quotation was paraphrased with several important modifications. First, it was changed from a quotation to a description, formally marked by the omission of double quotation marks. Second, the Shakespearean words *crants* and *strewments* were translated using an associated phrase, namely *kalung bunga* ('flower necklace'). Third, *the play* is changed into its real title, namely *Hamlet*, because the TR's might be more familiar with the play's title than the quotation taken therefrom. This change from direct quotation into description probably happened because the translator realized that any TL translation would no longer be a faithful quotation, especially because the words themselves exude a distinctively Shakespearean aura which is almost impossible to emulate in another language.

[6.5] is an extreme case where the entire quotation from Samuel Taylor Coleridge's *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* was omitted without any effort to present it at all. However, this is probably because the translator thought that it was not really necessary. In fact, the quotation was inserted as an additional dramatic device in a scene of a ship trapped in the middle of a stormy sea. As domesticizing as [6.4] is, [6.5] has a higher degree of domestication due to omission. Furthermore, in my opinion, the translator could have translated it semantically and added authorship information such as, *seperti kata Coleridge di dalam puisinya* ('as Coleridge said in his poem'), like the author himself exemplified in [6.2], [6.3], and [6.4].

4.7 TRANSLATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE

The novel also contains words and expressions in foreign languages (that is, languages other than the SL) which were treated in various different ways by the translator (Jaya 2018a). Foreign words and expressions already sound exotic in SL, so any effort to preserve it in TL arguably increases its foreignization degree. ST [7.1] is a German common interjection which means 'Oh my God!', while ST [7.2] is a Latin oxymoron which means 'make haste slowly', as well

as a very famous quotation from Marlowe's play *Doctor Faustus*. These two are clear cases of foreignization, but [7.2] is much less foreignizing because the translator provided a footnote about its contextualized nonfigurative meaning.¹² One might argue that [7.1] is doubly foreignizing because it can actually be literally translated as *Ya Tuhan!* ('Oh my God!').

Those two cases are different from [7.4] and [7.5] where the foreign words and phrases were translated using their TL equivalents, thus eliminating their exotic nuances. This is especially true for [7.4] since French terms are commonly used in English texts to create an air of sophistication. However, it can be argued that [7.5] is more domesticizing because the translator paraphrased it so that it matched the narrative context, while *pasangan* is already the literal TL equivalent of the French word *parti*. Indeed, it also matches the narrative context because it is used to refer to a man (Dr. Seward) as a potentially perfect match for a woman (Mina Murray). *In camera*, a Latin phrase which literally means 'in a chamber', is used in the scene to describe two people who are speaking in scientific jargons, as if doing it in a secluded chamber, effectively excluding the laypeople who are actually standing around them.

[7.3] shows an interesting phenomenon where two perfectly translatable English words were translated using two very different approaches: literal equivalent was applied in several places, while transference was applied in several other places. The former are neither foreignization nor domestication because there was no deliberate attempt to make them sound more foreign or domestic than they were supposed to be. However, the latter can be considered as excessive foreignization because it was done deliberately to make the TT sound more English.

4.8 TRANSLATION OF METAPHORS

The last group which can aptly demonstrate how a translation unit can be translated at various ideological degrees is metaphors. In the novel, ST [8.1] is a figure of speech said by a character to indicate that he is ready to do anything that the other speaker wants after receiving some monetary compensation. In this case, he compares himself to a dog which becomes obedient (that is, willing to be scratched) after being fed by its master. This expression may work well in SL and create a rather funny situation, but its literal TL equivalent might be taken literally and thus does not make a proper sense. The same approach was also shown in [8.2] where an original analogy is translated literally, even though this is not a usual image used to describe the topic. The topic is "madman's logic", as shown in the complete sentence: *The logic is simple, no madman's logic this time, jumping from tussock to tussock in a misty bog*. Both cases can be considered as foreignization because the translator maintained the original metaphors, however awkward or unfamiliar among the TRs. Nevertheless, the former is arguably more foreignizing since the TRs may

¹² It is interesting to note that there is actually a suitable TL proverb for [7.2], namely *biar lambat asal selamat* which literally means 'let (us) be slow, as long as (we) are safe'. However, this was not applied.

fail to interpret its nonfigurative meaning. The literal equivalent of [8.2] is more understandable because the TL provides the topic, along with its image.

[8.3] is a much easier ST to translate because the metaphor and its nonfigurative meaning are known both in SL and TL. In other words, the SRs and TRs may use the same image (a bitter pill) to describe the same topic (unpleasant truth). ST [8.4] was translated using its nonfigurative meaning, while ST [8.5] was translated using another metaphor more common in TL. Both are cases of domestication, but the latter is more domesticizing because it demonstrates the translator's creativity to search for the suitable metaphor and determination to preserve the dramatic effect of the ST.

5. DISCUSSION

As can be seen from the results above, potentially divergent translation units in a literary text can be and have actually been translated in various different ways. This remains true even if those units belong to the same group. First, they can be transferred without any additional information, such as *Ring* :: *Ring* and *The Law List* :: *The Law List*. Second, they can be transferred with additional information in the form of footnotes or descriptive noun phrase, such as *festina lente* :: *festina lente* (footnote: *bersabarlah dalam bergegas*) and *fez* :: *fez, yaitu topi yang sering dipakai orang Turki*. Third, sometimes they already come with some information in the form of hypernym or other relevant contextual clues, and the translator simply translates those hypernyms or clues semantically, such as *Whitby Abbey* :: *Biara Whitby* and *spitting on it for luck* :: *meludahi uang itu, agaknya supaya membawa keberuntungan*. Fourth, they can be expanded by adding hypernyms or extra qualifiers, such as *Ellen Terry* :: *bintang film Ellen Terry* and *Derby night* :: *pesta-pesta malam setelah pacuan kuda Derby*. It is interesting to note that *Ellen Terry* was a stage actress, not really a *bintang film* ('movie star') as we understand it now, and it can be argued such distortion increases its degree of domestication. Fifth, they can be translated using their descriptive or functional equivalents, such as *physiognomy* :: *susunan tubuh dan wajah* and *lawn frock* :: *baju putih*, respectively. Sixth, they can even be omitted altogether, such as "*As idle as a painted ship upon a painted ocean*" :: \emptyset .

Translation of metaphors must be discussed separately from other nonfigurative units because they are treated differently when translated: the approach is more semantic than structural. Thus, based on the above data, metaphors can be translated in a number of ways. First, they can be translated using the same metaphor, whether the TRs may be able to interpret their nonfigurative meaning (as in [8.2] and [8.3]) or not (as in [8.1]). Second, they can be translated using their nonfigurative meaning (as in [8.4]). Third, they can be translated using a different metaphor which has the same or similar nonfigurative meaning (as in [8.5]).

Critical examination of these strategies revealed that each strategy is associated with a translation ideology, traditionally consisting of two opposite poles: foreignization and domestication. For instance, transference is strongly associated with foreignization, whereas paraphrase and omission

are strongly associated with domestication. However, the results suggest that these strategies can be said to not only belong to an ideology, but also belong to various points along an ideological scale. Thus, a combination of transference and notes can be considered as domestication, paraphrase can be considered as domestication of a higher degree, and omission can be considered as domestication of an even higher degree. Meanwhile, full transference can be considered as foreignization of the highest degree and unnatural or hard-to-understand literal equivalent can also be considered as foreignization of a lesser degree.

Based on this observation, I would maintain that translation ideology is not simply an absolute bipolar closed-ended line with nothing in between, but rather “a continuum” with innumerable points or “positions” in between and without finite ends. This conception is represented in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Translation Ideology as a multipoint continuum.¹¹

Figure 1 implies that each strategy which a translator chooses is assumed to occupy a particular position along the cline. Thus, we can speak of a strategy which is more/less foreignizing or more/less domesticizing in nature, or a strategy which has a higher/lower foreignization degree, or the one which has a higher/lower domestication degree. Moreover, we can also say that a translator can foreignize or domesticize more or less, depending on various factors.

At this point, I need to propose a new concept of “medial ideology” which is assumed to occupy the position right in the middle of the above cline. This is a hypothetical ideological position which rose out of theoretical necessity, namely to call the ideological position of STs which can be translated in a relatively “straightforward” manner without any demonstrable semantic distortion or structural adjustment, although the STs contain potentially divergent cultural elements. Typical examples of this are terms whose hyponym (usually a proper name) and hypernym appear in the ST, and whose hypernym is literally translated into TL, such as *Whitby Abbey* :: *Biara Whitby* and *port wine* :: *anggur port*. One might argue that this treatment still

¹³ FR+, FR, and FR- stand for high, medium, and low foreignization degrees, respectively. MD stands for MD medial ideology. DM-, DM, and DM+ stand for low, medium, and high domestication degree, respectively. All of these are relative theoretical concepts for facilitating analysis with no absolute boundary between positions. Thus, a researcher can add or omit any position along the cline as s/he deems necessary for the purpose of his study, as long as the left side corresponds with the right side and s/he provides sufficient explanation as to why a particular strategy or approach is put in a particular position. In this way, the continuum, along with its positions, can serve as an adjustable analytical tool in research on translation ideology.

leaves much to explain about the term in question, but more explanation is not always necessary if the context provides sufficient clues. Other examples include metaphors which exist or happen to have the same nonfigurative meaning in both in SL and TL, such as *a bitter pill for me to swallow :: pil pahit yang harus kutelan*.

Furthermore, the concept of medial ideology is required to greatly limit the number of translation cases which may previously be considered as domestication. From a certain point of view, it can be argued that the very act of translating itself "is" domestication to begin with. If this is accepted, the translation of any text can be considered as being overwhelmingly dominated by domestication simply because there are a huge number of units which are translated using TL words, unless the TT ends up containing more SL words than TL ones. Therefore, domestication needs to be limited to translation cases which demonstrate the translator's deliberate effort to make the TT sound more oriented towards TL and TC, despite the fact that it can be adequately translated in a more faithful way. The translator's goal now is not only understandability but also familiarity.

It also follows from the above perspective that a translator, especially a literary translator, has some freedom to select strategies at different ideological degrees. Indeed, such freedom is proven by the fact that there are words and expressions in the same text which are translated differently by the same translator. Examples include *good-bye :: good bye* versus *good-bye :: selamat jalan* dan *shock :: shock* versus *shock :: kejutan*, the former of each pair being obvious cases of foreignization and the latter of each pair being cases of medial ideology. In these extreme cases, there does not seem to be any strong reason to translate differently other than the translator's exercising her poetic license.

Another important thing to note is that the same strategy might not always occupy the very same position along the ideological continuum. It seems that the ideological position of a strategy might shift, depending on various factors. The first factor is the presence or absence of relevant information about the ST. The use of transference to translate a very divergent ST can have a much lower foreignization degree if it is accompanied by sufficient information in the ST. For instance, "*mamaliga*" is explained in the ST by the author as "a sort of porridge of maize flour", so the term was transferred, while the explanation was simply translated semantically.

The second factor is the extent of modification. In general, the more extensive the modification, the higher the domestication degree. For instance, ST [4.5] was translated to such a degree that the unique exclamation *tally ho* and the unique cultural object *red frock* were changed with different things altogether. One could argue that it could be translated more faithfully, such as *Tally ho! sebagaimana biasanya diserukan oleh Arthur ketika mengenakan jas berburunya yang merah itu!* ("Tally ho! as usually exclaimed by Arthur when he's wearing his red hunting coat!") in order to preserve the original flavor and supply the TRs with a unique cultural information.

The third factor is the relevance of schematic knowledge. A divergent

cultural translation unit might contain innumerable pieces of implied information, but not all of them are relevant to the narrative in general or required to fully understand that particular stretch of text. For instance, the TRs do not really need to know exactly how *port wine* looks like or tastes, apart from the fact that it is an alcoholic drink which can be used as a remedy for a fainted woman, as shown in the narrative. Therefore, in this case, *port wine* :: *anggur port* can be considered as having medial ideology. On the other hand, *the Monroe doctrine* :: *Doktrin Monroe* still leaves much to be desired: the modern TRs do not know what or who Monroe is, let alone the content of his doctrine. The ST only explains that it *takes its true place as a political fable*, and the translator translated it semantically as *sudah menempatkan diri sebagai suatu dongeng politik* ('has taken its place as a political legend'), which is not really meaningful. Therefore, in this case, assuming that the original SRs knew more about this doctrine than the TRs do, this example can be considered as a foreignization case.

The fourth factor is the availability (or unavailability) of accurate and literal TL equivalent. This factor may work for both foreignization and domestication. In terms of foreignization, a translator's choice to apply transference may have a significantly higher degree of foreignization if there is actually an accurate TL equivalent for the ST. Such transference shows the translator's deliberate attempt to make the TT sound more foreign or exotic than is actually needed semantically. In terms of domestication, a translator's choice to apply extensive modification (usually modulation, paraphrase, or omission) may have a significantly higher degree of domestication if the ST can actually be translated in a more literal or faithful way, but the TT is still meaningful and appropriate. Such modification shows the translator's deliberate attempt to exercise his/her poetic license or to increase naturalness, sometimes at the expense of accuracy. Hence, these treatments can be said to occupy extreme positions on either side of the ideological continuum due to lack of semantic justification for doing so.

6. CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS

I began this paper by asking about the most dominant ideological approaches in the translation of *Dracula* into Indonesian by Suwarni. Based on the results of my observation on the translation of divergent units within the novel, I conclude that, in general, the translator applied a domestication approach. This is apparent from the fact that domesticizing strategies were applied to 652 translations units out of 894, and from the general impression that the translator almost always tried her best to make SL expressions sound more natural and understandable in the TT, sometimes at the expense of accuracy, albeit at differing degrees (Jaya 2018b).

However, offering a definite answer to such questions is never an easy task. One must always consider the fact that there are units which were foreignized, even deliberately, to create certain effects. For instance, most common forms of address such as *Mr.*, *Mrs.*, *Miss*, and even *Mein Herr* and *Madam* are used

in the TT, and this has indeed become a common practice in the translation of English literary works into Indonesian. Furthermore, one can argue that domestication only happened at minor levels (such as words, phrases, and sentences), but not at major levels (such as characterization, setting, and imagery). After all, despite the translator's effort to domesticize, we are still aware that the story does indeed take place in Victorian Europe, along with all cultural references pertaining to that place and era.

The second question, the relationship between ideology and strategy, has been answered by assigning a number of identified strategies into either foreignization or domestication. Transference is foreignization *par excellence*, whereas domestication is mostly represented by expansion, notes, and paraphrase. Of course, we can think of other Newmarkian strategies such as transposition, modulation, or calque, but since they are not applicable to the limited data which are presented in this paper, their assignment into one of the two ideological poles is still open to further investigation. However, what is new is the fact that these strategies may occupy different positions within the same pole, depending on the nature of the strategy itself and external considerations such as the presence of information, the extent of the modification, the relevance of the schematic knowledge, and the availability of accurate literal TL equivalent.

The third question on the nature of translation ideology is answered in my discussion about ideological continuum. As we can see from the discussion above, it is clear that we need to adopt a more flexible and dynamic understanding of translation ideology, namely viewing it as an open-ended continuum with innumerable possible positions in between which are occupied by different strategies by taking account of various considerations, both intratextual and extratextual. From this perspective, translation ideology is not seen as an absolute bipolar concept which must strictly be determined before the translation itself begins. Rather, it is a collection of ever-changing, ever-shifting choices which a translator has to make each time s/he is translating a particular unit, especially when the unit is culturally divergent. In truth, it is practically impossible to translate anything in a totally foreignizing or domesticizing way: one cannot totally foreignize a ST without creating just another "foreign text" in the same way as one cannot totally domesticize a ST without turning it into a gross adaptation or even recreation. It is more reasonable to think of all translation activities as a mixture between those two at varying degrees.

One final note is that the findings of this research are based on a limited number of data, namely only one translated version of one novel. It would be interesting to examine more than one version of the same work, or even of different works, from an ideological approach standpoint. This might shed a new light on this topic since different translators might have different translating styles and be governed by different translating briefs, which may affect the proportion of foreignization and domestication in the whole project. Furthermore, future researchers might also want to investigate the dynamic

nature of ideology in the translation of other text genres, such as academic, promotional, or journalistic texts. It may be interesting to find out the extent to which a translator can exercise his/her freedom and use his/her creativity when translating those texts with respect to translation ideology.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DM	: medium domestication degree
DM+	: high domestication degree
DM-	: low domestication degree
FR	: medium foreignization degree
FR+	: high foreignization degree
FR-	: low foreignization degree
MD	: medial ideology
SC	: source culture
SL	: source language
SR	: source readers
ST	: source text
TC	: target culture
TL	: target language
TR	: target readers
TT	: target text

REFERENCES

- Arp, T.R. and G. Johnson. 2002. *Perrine's sound and sense; An introduction to poetry*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
- Baker, M. 2011. *In other words; A coursebook on translation*. Second edition. London/New York, NY: Routledge.
- Budianta, M., I.S. Husen, M. Budiman, and I. Wahyudi. 2006. *Membaca sastra; Pengantar memahami sastra untuk perguruan tinggi*. Third edition. Magelang: Indonesia Tera.
- Cook, G. 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Israël, F. 1996. "Makna, bentuk, efek; Ancangan komunikatif dalam penerjemahan susastra". [Paper. Translated by R.S. Hidayat.]
- Jaya, D. 2012. "Application of schema theory; A text analysis on an excerpt from a Christian religious book", in: Faizah Sari (ed.), *The proceedings of TransCon 2012; Linguistics and translation*, pp. 123-134. Jakarta: UNIKA Atma Jaya.
- Jaya, D. 2013. "Breaking fashion gap between two cultures: Translating the idiomatic expression in his shirtsleeves", in: Faizah Sari (ed.), *The proceedings of TransCon 2013; The multifaceted world of translation*, pp. 203-212. Jakarta: UNIKA Atma Jaya.

- Jaya, D. 2017. "Penerjemahan kutipan di dalam karya sastra; Menjembatani kesenjangan pengetahuan skematis", *Jurnal Penerjemahan* Vol. IV No. 1: 72-90
- Jaya, D. 2018a. "Translating foreign language in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*; A case study". [Paper, International Conference on Transdisciplinary Linguistics, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 10-12 October 2018.]
- Jaya, D. 2018b. *Penerjemahan novel Dracula karya Bram Stoker dari bahasa Inggris ke dalam bahasa Indonesia; Kasus pengalihan skema budaya divergen*. [Translation of Bram Stoker's *Dracula* into Indonesian; A case study of divergent cultural schemata transfer.] PhD thesis, Universitas Indonesia.
- Jaya, D. 2020. "Penerjemahan novel *Dracula* karya Bram Stoker dari bahasa Inggris ke dalam bahasa Indonesia; Kasus pengalihan skema budaya divergen", PhD thesis summary, in: *Paradigma* Vol. 10(1): 96-111.
- Katan, D. 1999. *Translating cultures; An introduction for translators, interpreters, and mediators*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Landers, C.E. 2001. *Literary translation; A practical guide*. Clevedon/Buffalo, NY/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Larson, M.L. 1984. *Meaning-based translation; A guide to cross-language equivalence*. Translated by K. Taniran. Lanham, MD/New York, NY/London: University Press of America and Summer School of Linguistics.
- Newmark, P. 1988. *A textbook of translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Schleiermacher, F. 1992. "On the different methods of translating", in: A. Lefevere (ed.), *Translation/history/culture; A sourcebook*, pp. 141-166. London/New York, NY: Routledge.
- Snell-Hornby, M. 1988/1995. *Translation studies; An integrated approach, revised edition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Stoker, B. 1993. *Dracula*. Translated by Suwarni A.S. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama. [Retrieved from: baca-online.pun.bz/files/bram-stoker-dracula1.pdf [first part]; accessed on 1 March 2015.]
- Stoker, B. 1993. *Dracula*. Translated by Suwarni A.S. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama. [Retrieved from: baca-online.pun.bz/files/bram-stoker-dracula2.pdf [second part]; accessed on 1 March 2015.]
- Stoker, B. 2006. *Dracula*. Clayton, DE: Prestwick House Literary Touchtone Classics.
- Venuti, L. 1995. *The translator's invisibility; A history of translation*. London/New York, NY: Routledge.
- Williams, J. and A. Chesterman. 2002. *The map; A beginner's guide to doing research in translation studies*. Manchester/Northampton: St. Jerome Publishing.