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Abstract. This paper attempts to unfold the phenomena of two different translation versions of culinary terms in film ‘Chef’, namely the subtitle version of ‘Siberian’ and of ‘Agent Nas’. The objectives of the study are to describe the translation techniques used in translating the culinary specific terms in each subtitle version and to explain the influence of the translation techniques used towards the accuracy, acceptability, and the readability of the culinary specific term translation. The study is a product, context, and participant-oriented translation research based on qualitative paradigm that employs a case study model. The data collection techniques are document analysis and focus group discussion and the data technique analysis adopt the principles of ethnography manifested in the use of domain, taxonomy, and componential analysis as well as finding cultural values. The result of the study shows that the two subtitlers have different frequency level in using the techniques and that the techniques used affect the quality of the culinary term translation. The most obvious distinction is that Siberian resorts to many pure borrowings compared to Agent Nas. This translates to a good score of accuracy, but potentially reduce the level of acceptability of the translation. In addition, Agent Nas resorts to annotation technique that is meant to improve the understanding of the viewers while Siberian does not. All in all, the overall translation quality of culinary terms produced by the two subtitlers is almost equal with Agent Nas version slightly better than Siberian.
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Abstrak. Penelitian ini berusaha untuk mengungkap fenomena dua versi terjemahan istilah khusus kuliner yang berbeda dalam film ‘Chef’, yakni versi subtitle ‘Siberian’ dan versi ‘Agent Nas’. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengungkap teknik penerjemahan yang digunakan dalam menerjemahkan istilah khusus kuliner pada masing-masing versi subtitle dan menjelaskan dampak penggunaan teknik penerjemahan tersebut terhadap tingkat keakuratan, keberterimaan, dan keterbacaan terjemahan istilah khusus kuliner. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian penerjemahan yang berorientasi pada produk, konteks, dan partisipan yang berdasarkan pada paradigma kualitatif yang berbentuk studi kasus. Teknik pengumpulan data yang digunakan adalah analisis dokumen dan diskusi kelompok fokus dan teknik analisis data yang digunakan menerapkan prinsip etnografi dalam bentuk analisis dokumen, taksonomi, komponensial, serta menemukan tema budaya. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa dua penerjemah tersebut memiliki tingkat frekuensi penggunaan teknik penerjemahan yang berbeda dan teknik yang digunakan berdampak pada kualitas terjemahan yang dihasilkan. Perbedaan yang paling mencolok adalah penggunaan teknik peninjaman murni oleh Siberian jauh lebih sering dilakukan dibandingkan dengan Agen Nas. Namun demikian, Agent Nas juga ditemukan menggunakan teknik anotasi yang dimaksudkan untuk memudahkan penonton untuk memahami terjemahan sedangkan Siberian sama sekali tidak menggunakankannya. Secara garis besar, kualitas keseluruhan terjemahan istilah khusus kuliner yang dihasilkan oleh kedua versi subtitle hampir sama dengan nilai Agent Nas sedikit lebih tinggi dari Siberian.
Kata kunci: terjemahan istilah khusus kuliner; teknik penerjemahan; kualitas terjemahan; subtitle

INTRODUCTION

In the past, subtitle was always subsun but nowadays, it becomes available in softsub (Kusumastuti, 2011; Sirait, 2018). In other words, subtitle has become one of free-accessed translation products today unlike years ago when it was still attached in the film or video. People can access subtitles through internet and use them independently. Although not being labelled official, in fact, these free-accessed subtitles found in the internet are commonly used by people as the films they watch are downloaded from the internet and those downloaded films usually do not have subtitles in them.

One of the biggest subtitle providers in the internet is subscene.com (https://www.makeuseof.com/tag/3-subtitle-sources-movies-tv-series/ accessed on Friday, July, 2nd 2021; https://duniagames.co.id/discover/article/14-situs-tempat-download-subtitle accessed on Friday, July, 2nd 2021). It is an open website, meaning that everyone can submit a subtitle of their own works to be uploaded on the website. However, not all subtitles submitted will be uploaded as there are internal selection processes going to ensure visitors getting good quality subtitles only. In addition to that, there are many subtitle versions available to download on subscene.com. Even, there are several versions of the same language subtitle as well. This is intended to help people choose subtitles that fit their needs. The uploaded subtitles are mostly the works of prominent subtitlers such as Samehadaku, Pein Akatsuki, Lebah Ganteng, Siberian, Agent Nas, etc. Those subtitles do not only differ in terms of their compatibility with the subtitled films, but also in terms of their content translation. A foreign term could be translated by borrowing the term itself in a certain subtitle version, while it is translated by adapting the term into a more familiar term and acceptable to the target text viewers.

A compelling case was gripped in the case of several Indonesian subtitles of family film ‘Chef’. This film tells about a career path, romance, and family of a cook who becomes the main lead character of the film. Many culinary-specific terms that are quite Western are found in the film. Those terms might sound foreign and strange to the audiences. The intriguing part is that those terms are translated differently in some versions of the Indonesian subtitle. For instance, there is a culinary-specific term in the film mentioned by Percy, the son of the cook, which is ‘kettle corn’. This term is translated differently in the two most downloaded Indonesian subtitles of the film in subscene.com, namely Agent Nas and Siberian version. Other than considering the correctness of equivalence, subtitlers also consider the limitation of space and time of the subtitle in the film. This shows that quality of translation is not the sole thing of consideration. There is also another crucial aspect to attend to in subtitling, that is the limitation of space and time in the film.

First, the term ‘kettle corn’ is translated by maintaining the original term in the target text plus adding informative annotation of the term ‘sejenis popcorn’ (a kind of popcorn). on the bottom of the screen by Agent Nas. In this case, the subtitler uses pure borrowing and annotation technique altogether (Molina & Albir, 2002:509-510). There is a positive side to this decision. First, pure borrowing can serve as a tool for cultural transfer used for cultural learning so that viewers know about the existence of certain type of food. Next, the annotation helps the viewers to understand the borrowed term. Generally, annotation, description, and addition are translation techniques to avoid in subtitling as they go against the limited space on the screen. However, annotation can be done in this case due to
the appearance of the culinary term within a so short sentence that enables the addition of more information on the screen.

In contrast, Siberian translated ‘kettle corn’ into ‘berondong jagung’ (popcorn). This translation is a form of generalization technique of the original term. This technique is opted to achieve a more natural as well as easy-to-understand equivalence. Nevertheless, generalization risks in the loss of the specificness of the original term which leads to the reduction of the semantic feature of the original (Molinda & Albir, 2002). It means that the level of accuracy of the translation by generalization is decreased.

The different choices of translation techniques used by the two subtitlers, as depicted previously, affect not only the level of the accuracy of the translation but also the naturalness of the translation, or the so-called acceptability, and the level of difficulty of a translation to be understood by the readers, or referred to as readability. Hence, a study on the impact caused by the choice of translation techniques by the two subtitlers in translating culinary-specific terms in the film ‘Chef’ from English into Indonesian is pivotal to conduct. Apart from the fact that they are the most downloaded subtitles of the film in subscene.com, the urgency is also that the study case can be of use as an input model for other subtitlers in translating films, most especially in dealing with culturally culinary specific terms.

Some previous studies on the translation of culturally specific terms have been conducted by some scholars such as a study on cultural specific term translation in the novel (Hapsari & Setyaningsih, 2013; Prabawati, 2014; Fedora, 2015; Kuncara, 2015; Farahani & Mokhtari, 2016; Wayhu, et al., 2017), study on specific term translation in scientific texts (Nurnani, 2018), study on religious specific term translation (Yulianita, et al., 2017), study on the translation of machine and technology-specific terms in a manual text (Fachruddin, et al., 2017); and study on legal term translation in legal texts (Siregar, 2009). However, those studies are focusing on specific term translation on monomodal texts. In monomodal texts, a translator has more flexibility than a subtitler who translates a multimodal text film. Besides that, a translator has not limited to space and time as tight as a translator of films deals with. This reflects in the differences of choices translators make due to the different situations faced. In addition to that, study in specific term translation in multimodal texts has been undertaken by some researchers where they focus on film as the source of data (Khasanah, 2009; Wulandari, 2016; Sari, et al., 2016) and also study on game term translation (Putra, et al., 2017).

Either study on specific term translation conducted in monomodal texts or in multimodal texts above attempts to unfold the choice of the translator in translating specific terms from one viewpoint or one case translator only. Another viewpoint from another case translator is not yet present. On top of that, there is none that specifically analyzes culinary term translation in the study. Moreover, audiovisual translation studies conducted previously have not yet touched the discussion on the impact of subtitling convention related to limitation of time and space on the choice of translation techniques taken by translators (Goettlieb, 1992).

Based on the explanation and description above, the study on culinary specific term translation in two subtitle versions of film ‘Chef’, Siberian and Agent Nas version, from English into Indonesian is deemed decisively crucial. So, It can be the research gap of this study since it has not been conducted before. In so doing, the objectives of the study are to reveal the translation techniques used in translating the culinary terms in each subtitle version and to explain the influence of the translation techniques used towards the accuracy, acceptability, and readability of the culinary-specific term translation.
In addition, finally, it is expected that this study will be significant for subtitlers or translators in shedding a light on how to translate culinary-specific terms that have a high level of accuracy, acceptability, and readability. Also, this is expected to become a pilot translation study on the culinary-specific term translation from the point of view of more than one translator or subtitler. Next, future researchers can benefit from this study in terms of furthering this study with more aspects to unfold such as with more translation versions to capture even wider choices of translating culinary terms that are possible to do. In the long run, they can form a theoretical and practical model for translating culinary-specific terms in films and in other types of texts.

In response to such a need, the underlying theories adopted in this study are the theory of translation and subtitling (Goettlieb, 1992; 1998; Karamitoglou, 1998); theory of translation techniques (Molina & Albir, 2002); and theory of translation quality (Nababan, et al., 2012). First, the theory of subtitling is used to provide basic perspectives of the concepts and limitations present in subtitling that affect the choice of translation techniques made by translators in translating culinary-specific terms in the film. The limitation in subtitling covers the limitation of the length of line and segments of subtitles, of line numbers, of the number of characters per line, of the duration of the appearance of subtitle lines on the screen, and so on. Second, the theory of translation technique is adopted to give light to the various choices of the way translators translate culinary-specific terms in film. The utilized translation techniques in this study are established equivalence, adaptation, pure borrowing, naturalized borrowing, explicitation, implicitation, generalization, particularization, modulation, compensation, reduction, deletion, description, addition, annotation, paraphrase, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, calque, literal translation, and variation. This theory is applied because it is by far the most complete set categories of translation techniques. Therefore, it is expected to be able to provide wider choices of translation techniques to capture from the translators.

In the case of assessing the quality of translation, the quality consists of three aspects namely accuracy, acceptability, and readability. Accuracy deals with the sameness of message of the origin and the target text and has three categories: accurate, less accurate, and inaccurate. Acceptability deals with the naturalness of the translation and the conformity of the translation to the culture of the target text. It also has three categories of assessment: acceptable, less acceptable, and unacceptable. The last aspect of quality is readability. It deals with the easiness of the translation to be understood by target readers and is also categorized into three-level: high readability, medium readability, and low readability. This concept of quality measurement was chosen because it is yet the most holistic assessment instrument that does not only evaluate the sameness of the message of source text and target text that becomes the core concept of translation, but it also reviews the naturalness of the translation produced and also how the translation is understood by target readers. In short, this model assesses the translation product from several points of view that makes a holistic relation concept: the relation of text producer, translator, and target readers of the translation.

The problems to answer this study are first, what translation techniques are used in translating the culinary terms Agent Nas and Siberian subtitle version?, and second, how do they affect the accuracy, acceptability and readability of the culinary translation?

METHOD

This study employs a combination of three types of translation research altogether, namely product-oriented translation research, context-oriented translation research, and participant-oriented translation research (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2014). As product-oriented translation research, the object
of the study is a translation of the culinary term in film ‘Chef’ in the form of the subtitle from English into Indonesian. Next, as context-oriented translation research, this study is based on a qualitative paradigm with an embedded case study model. The phenomenon of the study focused on the case of culinary term translation produced by two subtitlers, Siberian and Agent Nas, in the film ‘Chef’ from English into Indonesian. Finally, as participant-oriented translation research, other than the researcher is the main instrument of the study, this study also involved other participants that served as informants who assessed the translation quality of the culinary term translation in terms of accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

The data are in the form of linguistic data and translation data that are purposively sampled. The linguistic data are the original culinary terms in the source text that were collected by using document analysis technique from the script of film ‘Chef’ as the data source and also the translated culinary terms in the two subtitle versions: Siberian and Agent Nas. The film ‘Chef’ was chosen because it fits several criteria to be the data source of this study such as having a theme of culinary topic and therefore providing enough data for the research. The two subtitle versions were chosen because they are the most downloaded subtitles for ‘Chef’ in subscene.com. The translation data are in the form of translation techniques used in translating the culinary terms applied in the two subtitles that were collected by contrastive analysis and comparative analysis of the source text culinary terms and the target text culinary terms. The other translation data are the assessment score of the accuracy level, acceptability level, and the readability level of the translation that we collected by focus group discussion from two informants. The informants were chosen based on some criteria such as having descriptive knowledge and command of translation studies, having experience in using the instrument of quality assessment proposed by Nababan, et al (2012); having a formal degree on translation studies (at least having a master degree on translation studies).

This study employs the principles of ethnography for the data analysis techniques. The techniques of analysis are domain analysis, taxonomy analysis, componential analysis, and finding cultural values (Spradley, 1980). In domain analysis, the origin of the data was determined. In taxonomy analysis, the data were classified into several categories such categories of translation techniques and categories of translation quality in terms of accuracy (accurate, less accurate, inaccurate), acceptability (acceptable, less acceptable, unacceptable), and readability (high, medium, and low). After that, all of those categories are correlated in componential analysis. In this stage, researcher attempted to interrelate one aspect or one category to another and the underlying explanation for the interrelation is discussed in details in the stage of finding cultural values.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There were found 110 culinary specific terms in ‘Chef’ film. They cover various categories of culinary terms such as food names, drinks, kitchen utensils, cooking activities, etc. However, the categorization of such was not conducted as it is not a crucial aspect of the study as this study focuses on the distinction of the use of translation techniques by each subtitler in translating the culinary terms found in the film and their effects on the translation quality viewed in terms of level of accuracy, acceptability, and readability. Aside from that fact, the categorization of culinary terms does not correlate with the chosen translation technique of a particular culinary term by translator.

**Translation Techniques Used in Translating Culinary Terms of Film ‘Chef’ in Siberian and Agent Nas Subtitle Version**
As the culinary terms found in the film are in the form of word or phrases, translation techniques used in translating them are single techniques. Nevertheless, there are some cases in which translators resort to a combination of two types of translation techniques altogether for a phrasal culinary term with certain considerations. The techniques used by the two subtitlers are listed in details in table 1 below.

Table 1 Translation Techniques Used by Siberian and Agent Nas in Translating Culinary Terms in Film ‘Chef’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Version</th>
<th>Translation Technique</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siberian</td>
<td>Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established Equivalence</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Borrowing + Established Equivalence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discursive Creation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modulation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implicitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Borrowing + Discursive Creation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Borrowing + Reduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Borrowing + Literal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Nas</td>
<td>Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established Equivalence</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Borrowing + Established Equivalence</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discursive Creation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Borrowing + Annotation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Borrowing + Addition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implicitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established Equivalence + Explicitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established Equivalence + Discursive Creation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variant Borrowing + Addition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description + Annotation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Borrowing + Established Equivalence + Annotation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that in general, the two subtitlers resort to almost the same types and combinations of translation techniques in dealing with culinary terms in film ‘Chef’. This is signified in the same most used technique in both versions, namely pure borrowing. Other than pure borrowing, established equivalence is also applied in both versions in almost equal frequency. Furthermore, generalization, discursive creation, modulation, and implication are found in both versions in almost the same manner of use.
The most obvious differences are in the choice of adaptation, literal, deletion, description, reduction, particularization, annotation, and variant borrowing. Adaptation, deletion, and description are used by Agent Nas but not applied by Siberian. In contrast, literal translation is present in the choice made by Siberian but it is absent in the version of Agent Nas. Likewise, reduction only occurs in the subtitle of Siberian while annotation and addition only occur in the subtitle of Agent Nas.

1. Pure Borrowing

Pure borrowing is a translation technique that maintains the original form of the culinary term from the source text into target text without any slightest change or modification at all.

**Excerpt 1**

ST: “Beignets.”

TT: “Beignets.”

The term ‘beignets’ refer to a French food in the form of a specially fried bread and it is served with powdered sugar. The specific culinary term ‘beignets’ in excerpt 1 is retained in the Indonesian translation in the same form of the original culinary term ‘beignets’. The use of this technique is motivated by some different considerations. First, pure borrowing may be chosen when there is no equivalence for the term with the same concept in the target language. Hence, translator attempts to introduce the culture of the source text manifested in the culinary term into the target language audience.

**Excerpt 2**

ST: “Yes, Chef.”

TT: “Ya, Chef.” (Yes, Chef)

In another case as in excerpt 2, the translator borrows the original culinary term in the target language because the term is already popularly used in the target language. The term ‘chef’ refers to a profession, the highest rank of a cook.

2. Established Equivalence

This technique translates a culinary term into an equally natural term in terms of meaning in the target language. In this study, there are found some universal culinary terms so that the concept is also found in other cultures. In this case, established equivalence is possibly used. A term is established if it is found in the target language dictionary or if it is used naturally in the daily conversation.

**Excerpt 3**

ST: “Starting with caviar egg.”

TT: “Dimulai dengan telur kaviar.” (started with caviar egg)

The underlined term refers to the eggs of certain fish that are preserved in a certain way and is used as a high quality condiment for special food. It is translated into target language term ‘telur kaviar’.
This term is found in Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia V (KBBI V) and is used popularly in the context of culinary settings in Indonesia.

3. Generalization

This technique makes a general term equivalence of a specific culinary term of the original in the target text. This is normally chosen because target culture does not have a similar concept term with the original term. It only has the general concept of the origin so that the translation picks up this general term.

Excerpt 4

ST: “Bistro”

TT: “Bistro”

The culinary term ‘bistro’ refers to a restaurant which sells French food as well as wine. Such a specific concept is not found in the target culture. Therefore, the translator decided to generalize the translation. This choice is also plausible to do because the context of situation on screen gives a nod to translator to do such a translation. By the time the term is spoken, the moving image of the term appears on the screen. It means that even though a generalization of the term is used, the information details still get across to the viewers through the moving image.

4. Discursive Creation

This technique makes the translation different from the original in terms of meaning but oftentimes natural in target language. This technique is often used to only achieve the naturalness of the translation.

Excerpt 5

ST: “Intended to impress the country club brunch crowd.”

TT: “Yang ditambahkan untuk membuat senang kerumunan klub makanan ringan.” (added to impress snack club crowd)

The underlined term refers to a gala dining conducted by collective elites in the form of sport clubs of which members have high social class status. This concept is not available in the target text culture and therefore translator seems to be unable to produce a correct translation. The translation produced means differently from the original. This mistaken equivalence is a form of discursive creation.

5. Literal Translation

This technique translates a culinary specific term of the original out of context.

Excerpt 6

ST: “Are you talking about my sweetbreads?”

TT: “Kau membicarakan tentang roti manisku?” (Are you talking about my sweet tasting bread?”
The underlined culinary term in the source text does not have anything to do with bread at all even though the name suggests so. The term refers to a type of meal made from cow intestines. Translator translates this term literally because the produced translation is out of context. The translation is natural and easy to understand but the message is totally different from the source text. In addition to that, the mistranslation leads to a confusing storyline as the term points to an event in the film in which the main character messes up.

6. Modulation

This technique changes the point of view of the source text in the target text. It is also referred to as a semantic shift technique.

Excerpt 7

ST: “I got you curry paste.”

TT: “Aku bawa kari siap pakai.” (I’m bringing with me instant curry)

The underlined original term refers to curry in the form of paste. The established translation should be ‘kari pasta’ (curry paste). However, translator chose another point of view ‘kari siap pakai’ (instant curry) to ease the viewers to understand the concept. Both the original and the translation share the same meaning but just different in point of view with the original term referring to the form and the translation referring to the function.

7. Deletion

This technique deletes the culinary terms in the target text. In other words, the term is untranslated. There are many factors that drive translators to do this. One of them is that translator cannot find the right equivalence for the original culinary term. Another possibility is that translator regards the term as unessential so that it can be erased in the translation. Whatever the reason may be, deletion affects the quality of translation negatively.

Excerpt 8

ST: “You’re a cook. You’re a chef.”

TT: “Kau seorang chef.” (You’re a chef).

The underlined term ‘cook’ is a term that refers to a professional cook in general. Translator fails to translate the term. Translator deletes the term in the target text. There seems to be a possibility that translator assumes that ‘cook’ and ‘chef’ are terms of the same meaning so that translator decided to delete one of them to avoid repetition. In fact, the two terms have their individual specific meaning. ‘Chef’ refers to a highest rank of a cook and ‘cook’ is a general term for the profession.

8. Adaptation

This technique culturally adapts the original culinary term with a culinary term that is natural in the target text but not of the same exact meaning. The objective of the use of this technique is to ease the translation to be understood by viewers.

Excerpt 9
ST: “Listen, I gotta go to the farmer’s market, pick up some ingredients.”

TT: “Dengar, aku harus pergi ke pasar tradisional, membeli beberapa bahan makanan.”
(Listen, I have to go the traditional market, buying some ingredients.)

The underlined original term means a market in which farmers sell their farm products or their harvest products. However, there is no dirty ambience in this concept as opposed to the translated term. Harvest is always conducted using modern tools. This concept is not present in the target text and to help viewers to grasp the idea of such a concept, translator decided to culturally adapt the term into target language’s natural term ‘pasar tradisional’ (traditional market). The two terms share the same meaning in terms of both of them are market. However, the translated term does not share the same concept in terms of modern tools used in the harvest as farmers in the translated concept still make use of traditional tools, hence the name.

9. Addition

This technique is adopted to clarify the translation so that it is more easily understood. Addition is done by adding information to a translated culinary term. Therefore, this technique is often found alongside another technique such as pure borrowing.

Excerpt 10

ST: “We should get some sliders.”

TT: “Harusnya kita buat sliders (burgers)” (We should make sliders (burgers))

The term ‘slider’ refers to a type of grilled or cooked burger in mini size. This food does not have an equivalence in the target culture, so translator borrows the term purely in the translation. Furthermore, translator also adds supporting information ‘burger’ after the borrowed term so that viewers understand that the borrowed term is a type of burger. The addition of information here attempts to improve the readability of the translation.

10. Annotation

The objective of this technique is the same with addition, which is to clarify the translation of a culturally specific term. These two differ in the location of placement. This technique places clarifying information on the bottom of the screen like a footnote. This technique also appears side by side with other technique such as pure borrowing.

Excerpt 11

ST: “Are you talking about my sweetbreads?”

TT: “Maksudmu soal sweetbreads-ku? (You mean about my sweetbreads?)
*(makanan dari pankreas sapi)(food made of cow pancreas)

Different from the case in excerpt 6, in this case the culinary term of original is translated by using two techniques at the same time, namely pure borrowing and annotation. The annotation in the form of additional information of the borrowed term is place on the bottom of the screen and is intended to make viewers easier to understand the concept of the original culinary term.
11. Description

The objective of this technique is similar with addition and annotation. However, while addition and annotation adds informative explanation to a translated culinary term, this technique translates the culinary term in the form of a longer description as the equivalence of the term is not discoverable in the target text.

Excerpt 12

ST: “Arroz con polo, yuca frita.”

TT: “Nasi dengan ayam, yuca goreng.” (Rice with chicken, fried yuca)

The original underlined term is a Spanish and Latin America traditional culinary term which is in the form of a combination of rice and boiled chicken. The concept is foreign in target culture. Therefore, translator chose to describe the term in details in the translation to make it more understandable by the viewers.

12. Particularization

It is the opposite concept of generalization. This technique finds a particular form of the original culinary term in the translation. This technique is doable if target culture does not have the exact equivalence of the term but instead have the more specific or particular form of the culinary term.

Excerpt 13

ST: “... filet.”

TT: “Irisan Lobster.”

The term filet means a slice of beef or boneless fish. This is a generic term. Translator translates this term in accordance with the moving image mode appearing on the screen, which is the slices of lobster. The translation is a particular form of the filet.

13. Implicitation

This technique makes a grammatically implicit form of translation of the original culinary term. The purpose is for the sake of efficiency. Implicitation does not affect negatively on the quality of the translation as it does not reduce any message or omit the form at all.

Excerpt 14

ST: “We should do sliders, man.”

TT: “Kita harus menambahkannya, kawan.” (We should add it, man)

The underlined original specific term is implied in the translation in the form of grammatical pronoun ‘nya’ (it) by translator.
Based on the assessment of the informants, the overall quality (combination of accuracy, acceptability, and readability level) score of the culinary term translation of the two versions is good enough. Siberian version achieved 2.46 and Agent Nas achieved 2.49. It means that the two subtitle versions are not far apart in term of the translation quality produced. This score means that in general the translation of culinary terms in both versions maintain the message of the original, although in some cases there are found translations with different message with the original. It also means that the translation of the culinary terms in two subtitles are generally natural. Again, there are also cases in which the translations are unnatural and strange nonetheless. And finally, it also signifies that the translation produced can be understood relatively easily by the viewers, even though in some occurrences there are also some translations that are so strange and foreign that audiences find it hard to understand. The details of the assessment is depicted in table 2 below.

**Table 2 Translation Quality of the Culinary Term Translation in the Two Version Subtitles of film ‘Chef’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtitle Version</th>
<th>Quality Aspect</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siberian</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Accurate data</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92,40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less accurate data</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inaccurate data</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10,90</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keberterimaan</td>
<td>Acceptable data</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52,73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less acceptable data</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13,64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unacceptable data</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33,64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keterbacaan</td>
<td>High readability data</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49,09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium readability data</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47,27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low readability data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Nas</td>
<td>Keakuratan</td>
<td>Accurate data</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70,91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less accurate data</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15,45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inaccurate data</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13,64</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keberterimaan</td>
<td>Acceptable data</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56,36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less acceptable data</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22,73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unacceptable data</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20,91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keterbacaan</td>
<td>High readability data</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63,64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium readability data</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30,91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low readability data</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 2 above, it can be seen that the aspect of accuracy is the aspect that receives the most positive assessment in both subtitle versions followed by readability and then acceptability. This is due to the fact that both translators focus on the maintenance of the original message first and foremost. This is understandable as the case happens in the context of multimodal translation. It means that many non-verbal aspects help audience grasp the concept of the given translation. This is also the reason of the fact that readability level is higher than acceptability in this study. Although...
some translations are rated as unacceptable or less acceptable, audiences still can get the meaning with the help of the multimodal clue such as moving image on screen, etc.

1. **Accurate Data**

A translation of a culinary term is accurate when it retains the original uniqueness message in the translation.

**Excerpt 15**

ST: “And get the mise on the steak.”

TT: “Dan tambahkan mise di steak-nya.” (And add the mise on the steak)

The underlined term of original refers to European and American grilled meat of high quality with various types of cooking state: rare, medium, well-done. The term is retained as it is in the translation or purely borrowed. Therefore, the translation has a high accuracy level as there is no distortion at all to the term.

2. **Less Accurate Data**

A translation of a culinary specific term is said to be less accurate if only a part of the message is transferred in the translation while the other part is distorted.

**Excerpt 16**

ST: “How can you even ask for the kettle corn?”

TT: “Bagaimana mungkin kau bisa meminta berondong jagung? (How can you even ask for a popcorn?)

The underlined original term is a specific type of popcorn which is sweet and flavored with crystal sugar and is cooked in a kettle. The translation produced is a general form of the original culinary term. The translation therefore diminishes the aspect of sweet kinds of popcorn and is served with crystal sugar on top of it. For the reduction of partial message, this is categorized as a less accurate translation.

3. **Inaccurate Data**

A culinary term translation is deemed inaccurate if the message of the original is totally distorted.

**Excerpt 17**

ST: “French cooking suite”

TT: “Masakan Francis yang mewah” (A fancy French food)

The original term refers to a cooking set of utensils in the form of a table set made of stainless steel comprising of stove, dish washer, cooking utensil shelf, etc. The translation has a totally different meaning from the original culinary term. Therefore, this is an inaccurate translation.
4. Acceptable Data

The culinary term translation is acceptable when it is following the system of language and culture of the target text.

Excerpt 18

ST: “It’s spicy.”

TT: “Itu pedas.” (That is spicy)

The term ‘spicy’ refers to a type of taste in culinary context. This concept is universal as it can be found in many cultures. Therefore, this term is translated by using its established equivalence in the target language ‘pedas’ (spicy). The translation is natural as it is found in daily life conversation.

5. Less Acceptable Data

A culinary term translation is said to be less acceptable when a part of the translation is not natural in the target language.

Excerpt 19

ST: “Like this andouille sausage.”

TT: “Seperti sosis andouille ini.” (Like this andouille sausage).

The original culinary term refers to a type of sausage made from pork and is smoked. A part of the translation is natural, which is ‘sosis’ because it is already popular and known by people of target culture. However, the other part of the translation, which is ‘andouille’, is retained as it is as translator cannot find the equivalence of the term in target language. The use of the foreign term makes the translation less natural.

6. Unacceptable Data

A translation of culinary term is unacceptable if it reads foreign and unnatural in the target language culture.

Excerpt 20

ST: “Beignets.”

TT: “Beignets.”

The original term is retained in the translation so that the translation reads unnatural and foreign. In this situation, the translation is unknown and is unacceptable.

7. High Readability Data

A translation of culinary term has a high level of readability when it is easy to understand by the target audiences.

Excerpt 21
ST: “Eat some crackers or something.”

TT: “Makanlah biskuit atau apa saja.” (Eat some biscuit or anything)

The translation of the underlined original term is a term that is easily understood by audiences in target culture because it is naturally used in daily life conversation.

8. Medium Readability Data

A culinary term translation has a medium score of readability when the translation is rather difficult to understand. For instance, if it takes more than one time reading to get the message, then the translation has a medium score of readability.

Excerpt 22

ST: “That’s broccoli rabe l’anchois.”

TT: “Itu brokoli rabe l’anchois.” (That’s broccoli rabe l’anchois).

Similar with the case in excerpt 19 in which a part of the translation is translated into a natural form of target culture while the other part is not, the case here is also the same. This hinders viewers from understanding the translation completely. Audiences may understand that the translation is a food made of broccoli but they might not know the specific details of the type of the broccoli as it is still in the foreign term. Therefore, this translation has a medium score of readability.

9. Low Readability Data

A translation of culinary term is said to have a low readability when it is difficult to understand. In this study, other than due to the verbal aspects, other aspect that leads to the low readability is the absence of the moving image accompanying the terms on screen.

Excerpt 23

ST: “This is what you make tostones with.”

TT: “Ini bahan untuk membuat tostones.” (This is the ingredient to make tostones)

The original term is retained in the translation by borrowing it without any change at all. The foreign form of the term is certainly unknown to the audience of the target culture and therefore it is difficult to understand. The translator might be motivated by the attempt to introduce the culture of the source text to the audience of target text. However, in doing so, the translator sacrifices the easiness of the translation to be understood. The borrowing should be equipped with additional information to make it easier to understand but translator also fails to do so.

The Interrelation of Translation Techniques Used toward the Level of Accuracy, Acceptability, and Readability of the Culinary Term Translation in Two Different Subtitles of Film ‘Chef’ (Agent Nas and Siberian Version)

After all, all aspects studied are interrelated in a componential analysis manifested in table 3 and table 4 below.
Table 3 The interrelation of translation techniques toward the level of accuracy, acceptability, and readability of the culinary term translation in Siberian Subtitle Version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation Technique</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Translation Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Established</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discursive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Generalization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Modulation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adaptation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Implication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Discursive Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Literal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 The interrelation of translation techniques toward the level of accuracy, acceptability, and readability of the culinary term translation in Agent Nas Subtitle Version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation Techniques</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Borrowing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Established</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Generalization</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discursive Creation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deletion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Annotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pure Borrowing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table 3 and table 4 above, they depict holistically the interrelation of translation techniques used by each subtitler and the level of accuracy, acceptability, and readability of the culinary term translation in the two subtitle versions of film ‘Chef’. In general, the translation techniques adopted by the two subtitlers in this study, as mentioned earlier, are pure borrowing, established equivalence, generalization, discursive creation, literal translation, deletion, modulation, adaptation, annotation, addition, description, particularization, explicitation, variant borrowing, and reduction.

This finding is different from the finding of translation techniques used in translating cultural terms in Fedora (2015). First, the distinction lies in the underlying theory used to unfold the phenomena. In that study, theory of translation procedure coined by Vinay and Daber (in Fedora, 2015) is used. In essence, the concept of procedure as a tool to analyze translation product has been argued by Molina & Albir (2002), which explains that the term procedure is oriented to translation process, instead of translation product. Also, it is argued that the correct term that shows the decision of translator in finding the equivalence in translation product is referred to as translation technique. Even, Molina & Albir (2002) completes and details the types of translation techniques. Therefore, the finding of this study is more detailed.

In addition to that, the finding of the translation techniques adopted in this study is in line in general with the finding of Sari (2016), Wahyu, et al., (2017), Fachruddin (2018), and Nurnani (2018). This similarity is based on the application of the same underlying theory. Secondly, the focus being studied is also on cultural term translation. The differences somehow lie in the fact that amplification concept is used generically, while in this study it is viewed as an umbrella term for other more specific concepts that attempt to boost the score of readability, such as addition, explicitation, and annotation. The specific mapping of the amplification is proven to be able to capture the phenomena of culinary term translation in more detailed manner.

Next, it can be seen from table 3 and table 4 that translation techniques used by the two subtitlers affect the translation quality, in terms of accuracy, acceptability and readability level. Translation techniques that affect positively toward the accuracy level of the culinary term translation are pure borrowing, variant borrowing, established equivalence, modulation and implicitation. These techniques retain the message of the original in the translation holistically without any change at all.
In contrast, translation techniques that affect the accuracy level negatively are discursive creation, literal, adaptation, generalization, deletion and reduction. These techniques distort the message of the original in the translation. This finding is somehow different from one found by Rahmawati (2016). In her study, she explains that adaptation and generalization affect positively toward the accuracy of culinary term translation. On the other hand, in this study, the two techniques are proven to reduce accuracy level. Adaptation reduces accuracy because it adapts an original cultural term with a natural term of the target text that has the same function and value but has a rather different meaning. Generalization finds a more generic term of the specific cultural term of the original in the translation. In short, both techniques result in a translation of which message undergoes a distortion from the original to the translation.

More, translation techniques that affect positively toward acceptability level of culinary term translation are established equivalence, discursive creation, generalization, particularization, adaptation and modulation. These techniques produce natural equivalences of original culinary terms in target language. On the hand, in general, translation techniques that affect negatively toward the acceptability level are pure borrowing, variant borrowing and literal. These techniques maintain the foreign form of the original so that they read foreign and unknown to the culture of the target text. However, it is crucial to note that there are some cases in which pure borrowings produce acceptable translations because the borrowed terms are already familiar and popular in daily use of the target culture. It is in conjunction with the finding of Nurnani (2018) that states the same thing.

In terms of readability, it is of importance to remember that this culinary term translation study was conducted upon a film, so that the meaning signifiers are various and not only limited to verbal aspect alone. It means that what influences the aspect of readability of the audiences is not only the translation itself, but also the presence of the moving image and other meaning making devices that accompany the occurrences of the term.

Commonly, translation techniques that affect positively toward the level of readability are established equivalence, generalization, modulation, particularization, adaptation, and most especially, description, addition, and annotation that are indeed designed to improve the readability of the translation. However, the translation techniques that affect negatively toward the readability level are pure borrowing, variant borrowing, and literal. This notion is essentially in the same vein with the case of acceptability. In short, translation techniques that affect positively toward acceptability also affect positively toward the readability level and vice versa.

CONCLUSION

In can be concluded that translation techniques used in translating culinary terms in two subtitle versions of film ‘Chef’ affect the level of accuracy, acceptability and the readability of the translation. Meanwhile, the translation techniques used in subtitle version of Siberian are pure borrowing, established equivalence, discursive creation, generalization, literal, modulation, adaptation, implicitation and reduction. Next, the translation techniques used in subtitle version of Agent Nas are pure borrowing, established equivalence, generalization, discursive creation, deletion, annotation, addition, modulation, adaptation, implicitation, explicitation, and description. Furthermore, overall, translation techniques that affect positively toward accuracy are pure borrowing, variant borrowing, established equivalence, modulation and implicitation. While those that affect negatively toward accuracy of the translation are discursive creation, literal, generalization, adaptation, deletion, and reduction. In addition to that, translation techniques that affect positively acceptability are established
equivalence, discursive creation, generalization, particularization, adaptation, and modulation and in contrast, those that may reduce the acceptability of translation are pure borrowing, variant borrowing, and literal. Translation techniques that produce culinary translation terms that are easy to understand or have high score of readability are established equivalence, modulation, generalization, particularization, adaptation, annotation, addition and description and those who reduce the score of readability are pure borrowing, variant borrowing and literal. Finally, the overall translation quality of culinary terms in the two subtitle versions are good enough, with Agent Nas being slightly better than Siberian. The implication of the finding is that translating specific terms on screen (audiovisual texts) and in paper (novel, booklet, etc.) have different strategies as the readability aspect in the two modes may differ as both have different resources of signifiers. Moreover, audiovisual texts have more signifiers such as verbal and non-verbal while monomodal texts only have verbal signifier, which affects the consideration of readability of the specific term translation.

The analysis of translation quality of the culinary terms in this study has involved the consideration of the non-verbal moving image in the film depicting the culinary terms. However, the in-depth analysis of the translation techniques in relation with the non-verbal aspect has yet to be taken. Such a delicate and deeper analysis will help the subtitler determine how to translate culinary terms in conjunction with the existence or the non-existence of their non-verbal representation on the screen.
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