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Abstrak

Pergeseran merupakan salah satu strategi penerjemah yang sering tidak dapat dihindari. Pergeseran kohesi suatu ungkapan yang disebabkan oleh faktor linguistik meliputi (1) pergeseran level eksplisitasi: level keseluruhan target teks dalam eksplisitasi tekstualnya lebih tinggi atau lebih rendah dari teks sumbernya, (2) pergeseran makna teks: makna potensial eksplisit teks sumber berubah menjadi implisit atau sebaliknya.

Pergeseran koherensi dari suatu ungkapan yang disebabkan oleh faktor budaya meliputi (1) dari BENTUK BENDA ke dalam BENTUK BENDA yang lain, (2) dari BENTUK BENDA ke dalam BENTUK KEJADIAN, (3) dari BENTUK KEJADIAN ke dalam BENTUK KEJADIAN yang lain, dan (4) pergeseran koherensi pengganti kebudayaan.

Kata-kata kunci: pergeseran kohesi, pergeseran koherensi, kesenjangan budaya

BACKGROUND AND PROBLEMS OF THE STUDY

It is understood that translation is not a simple process as of studying the lexicon, the grammatical structure, the communication situation of the source language text, analyzing it in order to determine the meaning, and then reconstructing the same meaning using the natural forms of the receptor language. However, the translator is constantly searching for, especially covert potential, lexical equivalent meaning concepts between two different linguistics systems and cultures. Consider examples a, b, c how meaning concept of expression shoes in combination with other words transferred in different ways in sequence paragraphs in a text quoted form an English novel entitled Mirror Image (Steel, 1998) and its Indonesian Translation into Belahan Jiwa (Sigarlaki, 2001);

a. SL: It wasn’t that she was jealous of her, it was just that she felt she was in the wrong shoes, ... (p.316)
   TL: Victoria kesal dan capek karena selalu merasa berada di tempat yang salah. (p.308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pro (Noun)</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Adverb of place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL:</td>
<td>She</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>in the wrong shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL:</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>berada</td>
<td>ditempat yang salah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. SL: ‘Perhaps if you go back to Father he’ll be willing to exchange us for each other. Like shoes that don’t fit. (p.322)
TL: ‘Barangkali kalau kau pergi ke Papa, dia akan mau menukar kami. Seperti sepatu yang tak cocok.’ (p.314)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Relative Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shoes</td>
<td>that do not fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TL: ‘… dan melakukan segala yang diperlukan sebelum Olivia menggantikan tempat Victoria.’ (p.325)

TL: menggantikan Tempat Victoria

As we can see in the above diagrams, in (a), we presumably have no difficulty to accept *ditempat yang salah* as the equivalence of *in the wrong shoes*, though there is no overt relationship to the both SL and TL lexicons. However, shared knowledge of the world, or the SL and TL structural level will suffice to interpret *ditempat yang salah* as the meaning *in the wrong shoes*. In (b), equivalent *shoes* into *sepatu* is overtly linked to both lexicons, at least by their category or level. In (c), there is no such linking, however the equivalence is perfectly acceptable. The interpretation may need some specific shared knowledge between the writer and its reader a textual meaning to continue (*melanjutkan, meneruskan*) a job or the work that somebody else (Victoria) has started, or with a stretch of imagination coherently adjusted to a discoursal meaning to trade place with (*menggantikan*) Victoria.

As a matter of fact, the expression such as; idioms, proverb and saying, metaphor, simile, derogatory, words or phrase which function as a unit semantically can not be understood literally. They are expression of a culture which is often different from the TL culture which will be hard to find the same lexical meaning components. The two meaning components of the two languages will not match. From this end, in translating, the translator will make necessary meaning adjustments to express the desired meaning of the SL. Blum-Kulka in Venuti (2000:299) stated that the process of translation involves shifts that can not be avoided either in textual or discoursal relationships.

The difference of linguistic systems and cultures in two languages and attempts made by the translator to appropriate the text to its reader have raised the problems into: what cohesion and coherence shift of expression found in the novel of Mirror Image and its translation into Belahan Jiwa?

1. CONCEPTS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1 Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence

Approached from reader’s point of view, Blum-Kulka (in Venuti 2000:304) equates coherence with the text’s interpretability. In considering shift in coherence through translation she points out the possibility that the text may change their potential meaning through translation. The above quotation answers the question ‘what’ is coherence and what is shift of coherence. Not less important is how the process of translation carried out for the analysis of this study.
Bell (1991:165) identifies that coherence consists of the configuration and sequencing of concepts and relations of the textual world which underlie and are realized by the surface text. Hu (1991:42) states that coherence covers cohesion and they are intertwined. Further she describes that coherence in the SLT is closely tied to cohesion, and translation equivalence can sometimes be attained by manipulating those markers that are overt. As search for coherence is a general principle in discourse interpretation, Blum Kulka (in Venuti 2000:298) states that coherence can be viewed as a covert potential meaning relationship among parts of a text, made overt by the reader through process of interpretation. For this process to be realized, the reader or listener must be able to relate the text to relevant or familiar worlds, either real or fictional. From the above description, in relation to this study we can say that coherence shift is an adjustment of SL unknown concept into known TL concept by making overt the covert discoursal potential meaning relationship among parts of the text through process of interpretation. On the other hand, as semantic translation, it can be stated that cohesion shift is meaning adjustments of meaning components in textual relationships of a known concept in a different linguistic system of two languages.

1.2 Theoretical Framework
The Theoretical Framework of this study based on the theory proposed by Blum-Kulka (in Venuti 2000) about ‘Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation’, for the classification of cohesion shift of expression. This theory is supported by Larson (1998) for the analysis of meaning components of a concept of expression, for the translation equivalent.

Blum-Kulka quotes Haliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion ties do much more than provide continuity and thus create the semantic unity of the text. The choice involved in the types of cohesive markers used in a particular text can effect the texture as being “loose” or “dense” as well as the style and meaning of that text. On level of cohesion, he divides shifts in cohesion into two:

a. Shifts in levels of explicitness, namely the general levels of the target text’s textual explicitness is higher or lower, than that of the source text.

b. Shifts in text meaning(s); namely the explicit and implicit meaning potential of the source text changes through translations.

Cohesion in this study means cohesive relationship of meaning component in a semantic domain of a concept. Larson (1998:429) states that semantic domain does not refer to using the same form or referring to the same specific item over and over (this would be concordance), but rather to the fact that the things being referred to are from the same domain, i.e., center around the same topic or have certain semantic components in common. For example: from specific to generic meaning component or vice versa, from explicit to implicit meaning or vice versa.

On coherence, for objects and events which are unknown in the receptor culture, this study quotes Larson (1998:181) that understanding correspondence of the form and its function is crucial to finding good lexical equivalents (we are not talking about linguistic form, but physical form). She divides the correspondence of the FORM and its FUNCTION into four possibilities:
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a. A THING or EVENT in one language ands culture may have the same FORM and the same FUNCTION in another language. For example, *eyes* with the function of seeing is the same in all cultures and languages.
b. The FORM may be the same but the FUNCTION may be different. For example, fried rice for western people may only be served for breakfast, but for eastern people may be served for lunch and dinner as well.
c. The same FORM does not occur, but another THING or EVENT with the same FUNCTION does occur. For example, heart in SL expression broken heart, does not have the same FORM in TL. *Hati* (literally means *liver*) in *patah hati* (literally means *broken liver*) occurs.
d. There may be no correspondence of FORM and FUNCTION at all. For example, *sheep* has the function of being a *sacrifice for sin* for a certain culture. However, for a SL culture animal *sheep* does not occur because of no comparable animal for a sacrifice for *sin*. There is no correspondence of either form or function. In that case, the translation will need to use a descriptive phrase for both the FORM and function.

2. COHESION AND COHERENCE SHIFT OF EXPRESSION IN THE TRANSLATION OF MIRROR IMAGE INTO BELAHAN JIWA

2.1 Cohesion Shift of Expression
In translating concept of meaning, it is often found that there is no exact equivalent between the SL and target language expression due to linguistic differences of two languages. There will be expressions which have some of the meaning components combined in them matching an expression which has the components with some additional ones. There will be overlap, but there is seldom a complete match between languages. Further, Blum-Kulka defined that on the level of cohesion, shifts in types of cohesive markers used in translation seem to affect translations in one or both of the following directions:

2.1.1 Shifts in Levels of Explicitness
In translating, the process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text might lead to a TL text which is more redundant than the SL text. This redundancy can be expressed by the higher level of cohesive explicitness in the TL text.

(1) The General Level of the Target Text’s Textual Explicitness is Higher than that of the Source Text

Larson (1998:495) stated that in the most general terms, the rule is that implicit information should be made explicit, if the receptor language necessitates it in order to avoid wrong meaning or in order to present the material in natural forms and pleasing style. Further, Blum-Kulka determined that to make implicit information explicit may result that the general level of the target text’s textual explicitness is higher than that of the source text, as can be seen in the following examples:
a) SL: ‘... it’s like a wall between us ... ‘ (p.263).

TL: ‘... sepertinya ada tembok pemisah diantara kita ... ’ (p.255)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL: a wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL: tembok pemisah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literal translation TL:

Tembok pemisah is a compound word in the target language, which means 'a separating wall'. The translator necessarily uses the expectancy chain (Larson, 1998: 486) of tembok... as in tembok pemisah in TL for correct and clear expression of the source text meaning. It makes the translation natural and results to the level of explicitness is higher than that of the source text, as seen in the above diagram. Otherwise it will leave some questions for the reader what wall?, since in target language we have tembok beton (concrete wall), tembok penahan or tembok penyangga (retaining wall) which may be as in jurang pemisah and a gap in the gap between rich and poor.

b) SL: ‘In Europe? At war? Over my dead body...’ (p.273)


c) SL: ’ You broke the ice for me, ... ’ (p.104)

TL: ‘ Kau telah mencairkan es di hatiku. ... ’ (p.95).

Combinations of words (collocation) will differ from one language to language (Larson, 1998:155) as in to break the ice and mencairkan es. Similar to example (f), the literal translation sounds confusing. Larsson (1998:494) stated that the receptor language may require that certain information be made explicit because of special grammatical requirements of certain words. Besides object es is needed by a certain verb mencairkan, Larson added that other words require the location, direction, result etc., be given as required by the grammar of the receptor language. It means that the expression telah mencairkan es requires location di hati as an immediate context that makes the information more explicit. The idiomatic expression break the ice (figurative) means to get people on friendly term in order to overcome formality (Hornby 1980) is related to the context situation describing the formality when they first met.

(2) The General Level of the Target Text’s Textual Explicitness is Lower than that of the Source Text

The guidelines for the discussion are very similar to those given above but are the converse, since the level of target text’s textual explicitness is not always higher than that of source text. They also have to do with the requirements of the target language grammatically, semantically, and stylistically as, always, general principle in translation.

Examples:
d) SL: … and she looked like the queen of midnight. (p.226)  
   TL: … dan tampak seperti ratu malam. (p.215)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Prepositional Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the queen</td>
<td>of midnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ratu</td>
<td>tengah Malam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certain grammatical items are present in the source text because they are obligatory categories in such expression as *mid- in the queen of midnight*. Such SL expression is not known in TL. Prefix *mid-* indicating time is absent in the TL *ratu malam*. Such expression is more common in TL. No information is lost. How Victoria dressed was compared with the dress color of *midnight blue*. It is a very dark blue color (Hornby, 2003), as presupposed to the context that Victoria looked like the queen who was wearing a dark blue satin dress. Such meaning concept is not known in the TL that makes literal translation *ratu tengah malam* is not natural in the target language. The omission of prefix *mid-* in SL midnight is to avoid redundancy in TL. As stated by Larson (1998:479) the redundancy of the source text must not be translated literally that only makes the TL information load too ‘heavy’.

e) SL: ‘… and the boys were cut down like toy soldiers, … ’ (p.459)  
   TL: ‘… dan para pemuda itu di bantai seperti mainan, … ‘ (p.449)  
f) SL: ‘But it’s like two sides of the same coin. (p.461)  
   TL: ‘Tapi kami seperti dua sisi sebuah mata uang. (p.451)

From the above discussion (1) we can see that on a higher TL textual level, such shifts in level of explicitness are linked to different style of cohesive marker in two languages involved in translation: a wall *tembok pemisah*, over my dead body *langkahi dulu mayatku*, broke the ice for me *mencairkan es di hatiku*. Those specific forms are obligatory categories required by the TL. On the other hand (2), on a lower TL textual level of explicitness are absent due to grammar, semantic, and style of two different forms of languages: the queen of *midnight ratu malam*, toy *soldiers mainan*, two sides of the same *coin dua sisi mata uang* (tengah, serdadu-serdaduan, yang sama are absent).

2.1.2 Shifts in Text Meaning(s)

As pointed out by Bell (1991:165) cohesion ties much more than mutual connection of components of surface text within a sequence of clauses or sentences and accordingly create the semantic unity of the text. Since there is no same word in two languages, the translator choice on meaning components of meaning concept involved in the type of cohesive markers used in a particular text can affect the SL explicit and implicit meaning potential of the SL.

Larson (1998:44) stated that explicit information is the information which is overtly stated by lexical items and grammatical forms. It is part of the surface structure form. The implicit information is that for which there is no form but the information is part of the total communication intended or assumed by the writer.

(1) The Explicit Meaning Potential of the SL Changes to Implicit through Translation
Based on the amount of shared information between SL and TL, further he added that the implicit information may consist of referential, organizational, and/or situational meaning. English has specific grammatical markers which are cohesively obligatory. In English, *a* is an indefinite obligatory article to make explicit whether a noun is singular or plural as in the example (g), and (h) below:

**g)** SL: It had been a bitter lesson in the cruelty of men, … (p.224)  
TL: Victoria telah mendapat pelajaran pahit tentang kejamnya kaum lelaki, (p.213)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indef. article</th>
<th>noun phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>a</em></td>
<td><em>bitter lesson</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**h)** SL: He was like a doll they had shared, … . (p.520)  
TL: … seolah pria itu boneka milik bersama, (p.512)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indef. article</th>
<th>noun phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>a</em></td>
<td><em>doll they had shared</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In SL context, it is clear that ‘*a*’ in (g) *a* *bitter lesson*, or (h) *a* *doll*, used before countable or singular nouns referring to people or things that have not already been mentioned. The indefinite article ‘*a*’ in *a* *bitter lesson* means one of the lessons, and ‘*a*’ in *a* *doll* means one of the toys. The absence of indefinite grammatical feature ‘*a*’ in TL translation means that the referential meaning to *pelajaran* (g), or *boneka* (h) is left implicit. Examples (i1), (i2), and (i3) bellow are organizational meaning;

**i1)** SL: …, she was like a wild mare, and he …. (p.201)  
TL: …, gadis itu masih seperti kuda liar, dan ia …. (p.189)

**i2)** SL: …, and looked like a madwoman as she clutched him. (p.388)  
TL: …, dan mencengkeram seperti orang gila. (p.378)

**i3)** SL: … like a piece of antique glass, and she …. (p.457)  
TL: seperti sepotong barang antik, dan Olivia …. (p.447)

Examples (j1), (j2), and (j3) bellow are situational meaning in a text;

**j1)** SL: ‘… we’ll look like harlots. And I won’t hear it.’ (p.100)  
TL: ‘… Kita akan tampak seperti pelacur, aku tak mau memakainya.’ (p.92)

**j2)** SL: ‘… I feel like a harlot, …. ’ (p.105)  
TL: ‘… saya merasa seperti wanita jalang. …. ’ (p.96)

**j3)** SL: ‘…, she did indeed feel like a harlot. (p.112)  
TL: ‘… Adiknya benar-benar telah merendahkan martabat mereka. (p.103)

Examples (k), (l) and (m) below are situational meaning;

**k)** SL: ‘You can’t stay an old maid, … .’ (p. 97)  
TL: ‘Kalian tak boleh jadi perawan tua; … .’ (p.90)

**l)** SL: … to let her remain an old maid, and …. (p.167)  
TL: … membayangkan putrinya jadi perawan tua, namun …. (p.156)

**m)** SL: And overnight, she had become a spinster. (p.183)  
TL: Dalam semalam saja ia sudah menjadi perawan tua. (p.172)
To discover the similar related meaning concept of a lexical item, Larson (1998:87) stated that it can be done by grouping and contrast as in part-whole relations and contrastive pairs.

n) SL: Well, I’m not a toy for either of you. (p.526)
TL: Aku bukan boneka kalian. (p.518)
SL: toy
TL: boneka

Literal translation TL: mainan (anak-anak)

Semantically, the meaning concept of SL *toy* and TL *boneka* (doll) are closely related. *Car toy, person toy* and *bear toy* are part of the meaning components of the head *toy*. Apparently the semantic translation *toy* into *boneka* is not an exact equivalence. Some meaning components will be missing in TL or another.

From the point of view of their function, *toys* and *boneka* are both objects for children to play with. As Part-whole relations: a doll is a toy (a child’s toy in the shape of a person) but not on the contrary (Whole-part relations) a *toy* is not always *a doll* because it can be in a shape of a car as in *toy car*, or in a shape of a bear as in *toy bear*. It depends upon the shape. When a translator is transferring the central meaning concept *toys* (mainan anak-anak) into a more specific meaning component target language *boneka* (doll) as Part-whole relations, it is attended to make the information explicit for a clear meaning by adding explicit information what is the toy made of.

Besides Part-whole relations, a contrastive pairs is also a great help in determining the meaning of particular TL words that have related pairs like the following example.

o) SL: ‘We’ll look like a couple of a country bumpkins, ….’ (p.99)
   TL: ‘Kita akan kelihatan seperti sepasang gadis kampung, ….’ (p.92)
2.1.3 Coherence Shift of Expression

From the above discussion, in cohesion shift, as a semantic translation, there is an adjustment of target texts’ textual explicitness that can be overtly seen at textual relationship namely objectively detectable of lexically dependable in the phrase (as a language pair-specific phenomenon) of TL translation. On the other hand, as a communicative translation, coherence shift is an adjustment of meaning concept of a covert discoursal potential meaning relationship among parts of the text made overt by the translator through process of interpretation.

Larson, (1998:181) stated that when the concept of expression for objects and events to be translated is not known in target language, the translator will be looking for a way to express a concept which is part of the translator world knowledge related to the experience of target language reader by transferring them into SL objects /events. Such transferring may result shift of SL text meaning.

Further, he states that things and events can be looked at from the perspective of the FORM (FORM here means physical form not linguistic form) of the THING or EVENT, or from the perspective of its FUNCTION.

a. From the FORM of the THINGS to the Different FORM of the THINGS

p) SL: It made her heart beat faster just thinking of it. (p.99)
   TL: Hatinya berdebar kencang. (p.19)
   SL: her heart beat faster
   TL: hatinya berdebar kencang

The SL her heart beat faster used to say that you have a sudden feeling of happiness or excitement (Hornby, 2003) is coherently shifted to TL hatinya berdebar kencang as we can see in the following SL and TL form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective of the FORM</th>
<th>of the THING</th>
<th>of the EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL:</td>
<td>her heart</td>
<td>beat faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL:</td>
<td>hati-nya</td>
<td>berdebar kencang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of its FUNCTION</td>
<td>does change</td>
<td>does not change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different FUNCTION</td>
<td>different FUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The literal translation of her heart in her heart beat faster is jantungnya in jantungnya berdebar kencang. It is known also that heart in SL medical term heart attack has its TL equivalence jantung (heart) in serangan jantung. However, as we can see in the diagram above, the FORM of THING heart is translated into a different TL FORM of the THING hati (liver), and the SL form of the EVENT beat faster is translated into the TL same form of the EVENT berdebar kencang. Jantung (heart in SL) and hati (liver in TL) are different forms of the THING and they have the different FUNCTION. Heart is the organ in the left side of the chest that pumps blood around the body. Liver is a large organ in the body that cleans the blood (Hornby, 2003). However, the perspective focus on the form of the THING heart is coherently shifted into hati (liver) is culturally unique and can be seen due to different placement of heart in SL and hati in TL that can be seen in the following componential analysis below:
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SL: heart  TL: hati
Where feelings and emotions are thought to be especially those connected with love. +  +
Outside part of the chest (as a part-whole relationship). _  +
Faster beating can be felt when feeling or emotions arises. +  +

When the Indonesian people said *hatinya* in *hatinya berdebar kencang*, it is meant that the outside part of the chest where the liver or the heart is associated with the feelings and emotions are thought to be, (SL: broken heart TL: *patah hati*), especially those connected with love as in the context how happy Olivia will be if Charles ever asked her to marry.

Other examples:

q) SL: … if he was planning to make Victoria his next victim. (p. 201)  
   TL: … kalau dia bermaksud menjadikan Victoria mangsa berikutnya. (p.100)

r) SL: He’s disgusting worm, and it’s time someone told him.’ (p.467)  
   TL: ‘Dia pria yang sangat menjijikkan, dan sudah waktunya seseorang mengatakannya padanya. (p.458)

s) SL: ‘… how good you are at it, with words like daggers.’ (p.468)  
   TL: ‘… dengan kata-kata yang menusuk bagaikan pedang.’ (p.457)

t) SL: …, he is the light of my life. … . (p.80)  
   TL: Dia permata hatiku. (p.74)

b. From the FORM of the THING to the FORM of the EVENTS

Examples:

u) SL: She felt like a witch as she snatch it … . (p.388)  
   TL: Dengan bernafsu Olivia merebut kertas itu … . (p.378)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>of the THING</th>
<th>of the EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>a witch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>bernafsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the FORM</td>
<td>does not occur</td>
<td>different FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of its FUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A *witch* (disapproving) is an ugly unpleasant old woman (Hornby 2003), and has negative connotation for the majority of English speaker (Larson 1998:143). The SL perspective form of thing does not occur in TL because the expression *like a witch* is unknown in TL. However, the function of EVENT *bernaful* does occur.

SL: felt like a witch  TL: dengan bernafsu
Having a negative connotation  +  +
An ugly unpleasant woman  +  -
Showing strong feeling of enthusiasm for something  -  +
In SL a witch (tukang sihir wanita) is an ugly old woman who is believed to have magic powers, especially to do evil things like practicing black magic. However lexical concept of expression is not known in TL. Shift of meaning component concept from an ugly unpleasant old woman into showing strong feeling of enthusiasm done by the translator is related to the context how Olivia was curious to read the letter. Other examples:

v) SL: She was a sweet girl, and an absolute angel to put up with Toby (p. 67)
TL: … sebab ia bisa bersabar menghadapi tingkah Toby. (p.64)
w) SL: ‘That’s not what I recall,’ he said, looking like a handsome snake, … (p.466)
TL: ‘Seingatku dulu tidak begitu,’ tukas Toby licik ketika … . (p.456)

c. From the FORM of the EVENT to the Different EVENT

x) SL: She felt as though she’d been awake all night, battered by demons, but she knew she hadn’t. (p.214)
TL: Ia merasa seakan-akan semalaman tak tidur tapi dikejar-kejar hantu. (p.215)
SL: battered by demons
TL: dikejar-kejar hantu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>of the EVENT</th>
<th>of the THING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL:</td>
<td>battered by...</td>
<td>demons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL:</td>
<td>dikejar-kejar ...</td>
<td>hantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the FORM</td>
<td>changes</td>
<td>changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of its FUNCTION</td>
<td>same FUNCTION</td>
<td>same FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demon means an evil spirit (Hornby 2003). The expression battered by demons means been attacked or hit by evil spirit. Such expression is not known in TL. From the above diagram we can see that the form of the EVENT battered (dipukul) occurs, but changes into dikejar-kejar (run after). Also, the form of the THING demons (setan) occurs, but changes into hantu (ghost). Demon and hantu (ghost) are different form of object of the THING. Larson (1998:116) distinguishes concept of demons and ghost from nonhuman vs. human as follow:
English ‘spirit’ (Nida 1974:107)
(having personality vs. not having personality)

(nonhuman vs. human) (character vs. substance)

(theological vs. nontheological) (unseen vs. seen)

(human vs. nonhuman)

(inferior vs. superior) (technological vs. folk)

(evil vs. good) (individual vs. group)

(angel vs. demons) gremlins part of personality

God, gods liveliness, intent, meaning, animation as of a document

The different form of the EVENT and the THING can be seen in the following:
SL: battered by demons
TL: dikejar-kejar hantu
Attacked or hit by nonhuman evil spirit. + _
Run after by the spirit of a dead person. _ +
Meaning shift from attacked or hit by nonhuman evil spirit into run after by the spirit of a dead person is related to the context how worry and unhappy Olivia was.
Other example:
y) SL: It would have been agony for her to live under his roof with him and never have what she’d dreamed of. (p.189)
TL: Pasti ia akan tersiksa, kalau tinggal satu atap dengan pria itu dan tak dapat memperoleh apa yang didambakannya. (p.178)

d. Coherence Shift by Cultural Gap
Example;
z) SL: ..., and vomited what felt like gallons of water. (p.382)
TL: ..., dan memuntahkan berliter-liter air. (p.372)
SL: gallons of water
TL: berliter-liter air
Finding equivalent translation for a specific measurement of the different system is often difficult (Larson, 1998:171). Form of THING gallons changes into TL form of THING liter (litre) which is more natural in TL. Both are units for measuring liquid, but the amount of one gallon of water is not the same as one litre of water. In the UK a gallon is equal to about 4.5 litres; in the US it is equal to about 3.8 litres (Hornby, 2003). Shift in text meaning from gallons of water into berliter-liter air is related to the context that one’s had vomited a lot of water.

Other example:

SL: But she wasn’t. She was a twenty-one-year-old girl, and he imagined that despite her broken heart, she was still a virgin. (p.259)
TL: Bagaimanapun, ia baru berumur 21 tahun dan mungkin masih gadis. (p.250)

From the above discussion in (3.2.1), we can see that SL expression of perspective FORM of THINGS are not always translated to the same FORM of THING as in the examples: heart to hati, victim to mangsa, worm to pria, daggers to pedang. Sometimes SL perspective form of THING does not occur in TL, but perspective form of EVENT does as in the examples (3.2.2): a witch to bernafsu, angel to bersabar, and a snake to licik. Similarly, as in (3.2.3) perspective form of EVENT occurs but does change as in the examples: battered by demons to dikejar-kejar hantu, to live under his roof to tinggal satu atap. In 3.2.4, a cultural substitute may need to be used for measure equivalents such as in gallons to litre, or taboo word expression such as in virgin to gadis. In general, it can be concluded that coherence shift is effort that is done by the translator by changing the SL OBJECTS or EVENT that are not available in TL.

3. CONCLUSIONS

After analyzing shifts of expressions found in the novel Mirror Image and their translation into Belahan Jiwa, some conclusions can be drawn out:

In transferring the source language expression, the translator applies cohesion shift and coherence shift. In brief, it can be stated that cohesion shift is meaning adjustments, of meaning components in textual relationships of a shared or known concept in a different linguistic system of two languages. On the other hand, coherence shift is an adjustment of an unknown meaning concept of a covert discoursal potential meaning relationship among parts of the text made overt by the translator through process of interpretation to appropriate the meaning for the intended reader. The principles of classification of cohesion and coherence shifts of expression are as follows:
Cohesion shift of expression: (1) Shifts in Levels of Explicitness namely the general level of the target texts’ textual explicitness is higher or lower than that of the source text, (2) Shifts in Text Meaning(s) namely the explicit and implicit meaning potential of the known and unknown concept of SL text changes through translation due to different TL linguistic system.

Coherence shift of expression: Changes on most general level of SL unknown concept with the text’s interpretability. As a covert SL potential meaning relationships among parts of a text, it is made overt by the translator through process of interpretation namely: (1) From the FORM of the THINGS to the different FORM of the THINGS, (2) From the FORM of the THING to the FORM of the EVENTS, (3) From FORM of the EVENT to the different EVENT, and (4) Coherence shift by cultural gap.
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