

JEPAL

Journal of English Pedagogy and Applied Linguistics

<https://ejournal.masoemiversity.ac.id/jepal/index.php/englishpedagogy>

TRANSFER OF LEXICAL COHESION IN AN INDONESIAN TRANSLATED NOVEL

Eka Herdiana Susanto

Universitas Halim Sanusi

eka.herdiana.susanto@gmail.com

Abstract: This study investigates the realization of transfer of lexical cohesion implemented in the original novel into the translated one. It uses qualitative method whose data was the best-selling novel of Andrea Hirata written in Bahasa Indonesia and its English version translated by Angie Kilbane. The analysis focuses on the realization of taxonomy in lexical cohesion in the source text based on Eggins' (2004) cohesive devices categorization and its transfer into the translated version based on Newmark's (1988) translation methods. The result reveals a lot of lexical cohesive devices used by the writer in his original novel, and the most frequent appeared is similarity. Additionally, it shows some translation methods implemented in this translated version, and the most frequent is literal translation. Thus, these results support the students in preparing for translating a text and practicing within the particular criterion environment, namely academic setting.

Keywords: lexical cohesion, novel, transfer, translation

INTRODUCTION

Translation, nowadays, plays an essential role. At this time, it is exceptionally common that nation's cooperation emerges among countries in many fields, and translation supports this cooperation go well. According to some experts, translation means to render the meaning of a text from one language into another language based on the intention and aim of the writer (Newmark, 1988; Venuti, 2008).

Since translation is essential, even though some technology applications emerge to help translating activity, it is not astounding that in some universities, translation becomes one of the offered courses. It can be said that translation is relatively a young course compared to other academic disciplines. However, translation is practically initiated by writing (Ajunwa, 2015; Mogadam & Shabaipoor 2013). Writing, as the result of some research is not a simple and easy skill to master, neither is translation. It focuses on a lot of aspects, including cohesion and coherence in both the source and the target texts (Mohamed, 2016).

Cohesion and coherence are able to decide the eminence of a text. They concern how a particular text connects to its milieu and how its parts are connected to each other (Bloor & Bloor, 2004; Eggins, 2004). They would stay consistent in translation and offer assistance to achieve well-constructed, justifiable, and understandable contents (Hatim, 2004).

Cohesion and coherence are two vital factors of texture that will decide the eminence of a particular text, including its translated version. They function to tie each part in the text, for example clauses, sentences, or paragraphs relating to each other (Eggins, 2004; Gerot & Wignell, 1994). Additionally, they are able to assist to assemble a great production of writing (Shreiber, 1993 cited in Krein-Kuhle, 2002). The connection of cohesion, coherence, and translation exists in the content analysis process. This analysis is not the purpose of its process, but it can be exchanged by clear, logical, and comprehensible meaning (Mohamed, 2016; Ninsiana, 2014). The position of cohesion, coherence, and translation connects to linguistic studies and education that have been studied and investigated by many people.

Transferring cohesion from source to target text has been the topic investigated by some researchers because it is a fundamental dimension for creating a great text and a great translation. By implementing cohesive devices, a text can be developed (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Even though, Eggins (2004) stated that cohesion has three primary kinds in written language including reference, lexical cohesion, and conjunction. Similar to translation, cohesive devices, especially lexical cohesion, are also essential for transferring meaning from source to target text. It is because the word choice is extremely vital in transferring cohesion to target text so that its implementation can help readers understand the meaning in source text.

Considering the significance of transferring and applying lexical cohesion from source to target text, the realization of transfer of lexical cohesion becomes the issue of this study. Some studies have been conducted related to cohesive devices in translation using some analysis approaches. On the other hand, in Indonesia, only few researchers focus on transferring lexical cohesion analysis towards translation. Thus, this study was conducted to recognize the implementation of lexical cohesion in the source text and its transfer in the target text.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cohesion is one of the elements that must exist in a text. Cohesion is usually present in a text together with coherence. Cohesion and coherence have a function to connect parts of the text, for example clauses, sentences, or paragraphs so that they can relate to each other. As a result, the meaning of the text can be delivered properly by the writer to the readers (Eggins, 2004).

In general, cohesion and coherence have the same function, but they have different roles. Cohesion, in Systemic Functional perspective, has a tendency to connect parts of the text lexically and grammatically, while coherence tends to link each part in the text conceptually. In conclusion, cohesion refers to the establishment of relations, while coherence refers to the relationship of meaning (Baker, 2010; Gerot & Wignell, 1994).

It is further said that cohesion helps distinguish a text from non-text. The reader or listener inquires about the significance among what has been said, what is being said,

and what will be said through the suitable use of indispensable lexical and grammatical cohesive devices (Eggins, 2004; Newmark, 1988). In this context, cohesion binds some parts of the text so that they connect with each other, and this will help readers identify relationships between parts of a text. In other words, cohesion has a function to differ a text from a detached sequence of sentences.

Another concern about cohesion is that it focuses on its meaning. In cohesion, the meaning is designed as the semantic relationship found between the lexical and grammatical terms in the text. Cohesion happens when the semantic interpretation of linguistic fundamentals of discourse depends on other linguistic elements (Baker, 2010, p. 180).

It has been mentioned above that cohesion is a façade connection bonding together the actual words or terms which can be seen and heard. In other words, cohesion does not only refer to written sentences but also spoken expressions or utterances that join together to make a text. Cohesion refers to available devices that can be mentioned as interrelated inter-elements (Carter & McCarthy, 2006; Knapp & Watkins, 2005). The devices can be grammatical or lexical. Cohesion occurs to connect information in the text and help the text flow.

A text is categorized as cohesive if the written or spoken expressions are semantically linked and consistent. They make use of resources in the language which connect clauses so that they become understandable. As a result, cohesion referring to the relationship of meaning in the text could characterize whether a series of sentences is categorized as a text (Carter & McCarthy, 2006). In other words, the relationship of meaning in the text can help and facilitate the readers or the listeners to understand the text.

In building a text, someone must pay attention to the lexicogrammar consisting of grammar and vocabulary. The contribution of grammar and vocabulary is certainly to make meaning of the text. Grammar functions to express general meaning, while vocabulary serves to express specific meaning (Halliday & Hasan, 1985). As the result, the collaboration of grammar and vocabulary will build a good text.

A text will be categorized as a good text if it has good cohesive relations. Some forms of cohesion are realized through the grammar and others are realized through the vocabulary. It can be said that grammar and vocabulary express cohesive relations by grammatical and lexical cohesion. The former comprises reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, while the latter comprises lexical cohesion and partly conjunction (Eggins, 2004). It can therefore be concluded that if a text is considered a good text, it has a good cohesive relationship which usually meets five main cohesive devices, that are reference, conjunction, lexical relations, ellipsis and substitution (Gerot & Wignell, 1994).

Lexical cohesion is another one of the five main cohesive devices which is a lexical relation among the parts of the text. This relationship is created by particular lexical items in semantic ties. In semantic, sentences, paragraphs, and a unit of discourse depend on and connect to each other. This relationship can be seen from the relationship between text and texture whose meaning can be reached when the comprehension of the

linguistic elements in the text depends on the comprehension of the other elements in the same text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Halliday & Hasan (1976) say that the lexical cohesion is the lexical relations among elements in the text to get the harmony structure cohesively. This relation occurs by following the pattern of lexical cohesive in which this pattern is a network generated from multiple relations of lexical items. In any kind of lexical cohesive relations, this pattern can happen on the previous element which forms a relation with the second element.

Lexical relations used in a text can be revealed by their lexical cohesion. The lexical relations can be taxonomically and non-taxonomically (expectancy relation, based on Eggins, 2004). Taxonomic is an identification of relation that arises from the lexical meaning, whereas non-taxonomic or expectancy relation is the relation that develops out of context. Lexical cohesion is a cohesive impact reached by selecting vocabulary in which vocabulary selection is divided into two primary groups: reiteration and collocation. Both of them rely on the interpretation of the elements of the vocabulary through the presence of people.

Halliday & Hasan (1976) classify four types of reiterated items that generally arise in the text:

- a) repetition of the same word,
There is a girl sitting on the desk. The girl is going to read a best-selling novel.
- b) synonym or near-synonym,
There is a girl sitting on the desk. The young woman is going to read a best-selling novel.
- c) super-ordinate word, and
There is a girl sitting on the desk. The child is going to read a best-selling novel.
- d) general and specific word.
There is a girl sitting on the desk. The pretty is going to read a best-selling novel.

These types of reiteration of Halliday & Hasan (1976) are similar with the key devices of Eggins (2004) in lexical relations e.g. repetition and synonym (which include in similarity), contrast, class/sub-classes, co-hyponym, meronymy, and co-meronymy that is included into taxonomic lexical relations. Besides that, there is expectancy relation. It is happened when an unsurprising relation occurs between a process (verb) and the doer (subject) of the process or the one affected by it.

Similarity occurs when two or more lexical items express similar meanings (Eggins, 2004). There are two sub-types of similarity, i.e. repetition and synonymy. Repetition concerns the appearance of the same form that refers to the same meaning in the text. Similarly, repetition occurs when a lexical item is repeated and gives a sense of unity. Repetition has a variety of roles such as a confirmation, the creation of language, and expression style of emotions. It is because repetition is not just a repetition of forms but pragmatic role whose meaning depends on the context (Eggins, 2004; Gerot & Wignell, 1994).

Besides repetition, synonymy becomes other sub-type of similarity. Synonymy is created by the selections of a lexical item that has same meaning but different forms. It

can involve the repetition of the pattern represented by a given lexical item, rather than its form. It also concerns cultural richness and intensity of contact with other synonymy in one language to determining color in a language (Eggins, 2004).

Contrast concerns contradictory lexical items in meaning that are able to cause cohesive impact in a particular text. It occurs when two or more lexical items instruct a contrast relationship. A dynamic text often puts lexical cohesion in a flexible and varied with contrasting meanings opposite to make the text more interesting to read (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Hasan, 1985).

Class/sub-class is one of lexical devices that occur when two or more lexical items used in a text are related through sub-classification. The relationship that is also called as hyponymy by other experts is between the superordinate term or general item and sub-classes or hyponyms. It has a function to avoid the repetition of the same words that appear and form a field of meaning. Therefore, it is able to use to build a text with a variety of lexical forms (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Hasan, 1985).

Co-hyponymy occurs when two or more lexical items used in a text as subordinate members of a superordinate class (Eggins, 2004). If class/sub-classes relation is between the general item and its specific items, co-hyponymy relation is between two or more specific items.

Meronymy occurs when two lexical items are related as whole to part (or vice versa). Similarly to the hyponymy, the directionality of the relation determines under which category the relations is ranked. To differentiate them, in hyponym, an item is a kind of another item, in meronymy, an item is a part of another item (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Hasan, 1985).

Co-meronymy is one of the lexical cohesion devices when two lexical items are related by both being parts of a common whole. It is like the relation between hyponymy and co-hyponymy that link two specific items which share a common general item. In other words, the relation between meronymy and co-meronymy connect two items which are parts or members of the same item (Eggins, 2004).

METHOD

The study used qualitative method, especially content analysis, to answer the aforementioned issue. In this study, the instrument is the document in form of a novel written by Andrea Hirata entitled *Laskar Pelangi* published by Benteng Pustaka in December 2008 in Bahasa Indonesia. The novel consisting of 382 pages was renowned as Indonesia's best-selling literary work in which it is the first novel of Tetralogi *Laskar Pelangi*. The following novels are *Sang Pemimpi*, *Edensor*, and *Maryamah Karpov*.

Laskar Pelangi was elected to be analyzed due to several reasons. First, this is a best-selling novel based on several categories, one of which is because of the language used. Second, this novel has been read by many readers ranging from children to adults. Though not all the readers like the language used, they like its story, character, plot, etc. Third, it was written by Indonesian novelist and translated into several languages. Related to language, this study was conducted to discover the acceptability of its

translation so that the message from the author can still be delivered to the readers with different languages.

Rainbow Troops is the English version of *Laskar Pelangi* translated by Angie Kilbane. The English version has 478 pages. Other version of *Laskar Pelangi* has been published by Farrar, Straus and Giroux in USA, Random House in New Zealand and Australia, Penguin in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal, Sunmark Publisher in Japan, Hanser-Berlin in German, Atlas-Contact in Netherland, Temas de hoy in Spain, Rizzoli in Italy, Butik Yayinlari in Turkey, Editora Sextante in Brazil, Theory and Praxis Publishing Co in Korea, PTS Malaysia in Malaysia, Yilin Press in China, Solo Press in Taiwan, and Nha Nam Publishing in Vietnam.

In this study, the analysis is only to compare Bahasa Indonesia and English version of *Laskar Pelangi* to perceive the realization of lexical cohesion in source text and the transfer of lexical cohesion in target text.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The novel *Laskar Pelangi* as the source text is explored to see how lexical cohesion is realized in the novel. The analysis focuses on three chapters of the novel, i.e. the beginning, the middle, and the end chapters of the novel. The analysis is conducted through close reading on the basis of the concepts of lexical cohesion. It is supported by the previous research's conclusion that revealed the investigation on interpreting the meaning of the text, in this case translating text, can fulfill the content incorporating a great cohesive and coherence (Alderson in Ajunwa, 2015)

Andrea Hirata's translated novel entitled *Rainbow Troops* is different in some respects from its original version in the Bahasa Indonesia, i.e *Laskar Pelangi*. While *Laskar Pelangi* consists of 34 chapters with 382 pages, *Rainbow Troops* has 48 chapters with 478 pages. The transfer of lexical cohesion from *Laskar Pelangi* to *Rainbow Troops* is summarized in the following table.

Table 1. The occurrences of lexical cohesion in the source and target text

Source Text	Frequency	Target Text	Frequency
similarity: repetition	15	similarity: repetition	16
similarity: synonymy	19	similarity: synonymy	19
contrast	7	Contrast	6
class/sub-classes	5	class/sub-classes	5
co-hyponymy	7	co-hyponymy	7
meronymy	13	Meronymy	10
co-meronymy	3	co-meronymy	3
SUB TOTAL	69		66

Repetition is realized in two translating methods, i.e. word-for-word and literal translation. The former is exemplified in [1], while the latter is exemplified in [2] (the numbers in the brackets are the number of sentence in the novel).

- [1] (2) *Pagi itu, waktu aku masih kecil, aku duduk di bangku panjang di depan sebuah kelas.*
That morning, when I was just a boy, I sat on a long bench outside of a school.

The example above shows the repetition of the first-person pronoun *aku* in the source text. The pronoun is mentioned twice in one sentence. This repetition is fully transferred into the target text, in which the translator also mentioned the first-person pronoun 'I' twice as the equivalent for *aku*. This repetition indicates word-for-word translation based on Newmark's method of translation (1988) because the noun phrase (pronoun) *aku* is directly translated into the noun phrase (pronoun) 'I', which is the English equivalent for *aku*. In addition, the syntactic position the two pronouns are also equivalent in the two languages.

- [2] (4) *Ayahku duduk di sampingku, memeluk pundakku dengan kedua lengannya dan tersenyum mengangguk-angguk pada setiap orangtua dan anak-anaknya yang duduk berderet-deret di bangku panjang lain di depan kami.*

My father sat beside me, hugging my shoulders with both of his arms as he nodded and smiled to each parent and child sitting side by side on the bench in front of us.

- (11) *Seperti ayahku, mereka berdua juga tersenyum.*
Like my father, they also were smiling.

The example above shows the repetition of the noun phrase *ayahku* in the source text. The noun *ayahku* is mentioned twice in different sentences. This repetition is transferred into the target text, in which the translator also mentioned the noun phrase 'my father' twice in different sentences as the equivalent for *ayahku*. This repetition indicates literal translation based on Newmark's method of translation (1988) because the grammatical construction of noun phrase *ayahku* is converted to the nearest TL equivalent i.e 'my father'. In addition, in literal translation, the most important thing is that the meaning is transferred from the source to target text although the syntactic construction is not the same. In this context, the syntactic difference concerns the word order. In Indonesian, the possessive adjective is mentioned after the noun, while in English the possessive is mentioned before the noun.

Synonymy is realized in two translating methods, i.e. adaptation and literal translation, as exemplified in [3].

- [3] (10) Mereka adalah seorang bapak tua berwajah sabar, Bapak K.A. Harfan Efendy Noor, sang kepala sekolah dan seorang wanita muda berjilbab, Ibu N.A. Muslimah Hafsari atau Bu Mus.

There was an old man with a patient face, Bapak K.A. Harfan Efendy Noor, or Pak Harfan – the school principal – and a young woman wearing a jilbab, or headscarf, Ibu N.A. Muslimah Hafsari, or Bu Mus for short.

The example above shows how synonymy is used as a cohesive device in the source and the target text. The entity 'Harfan', which is a name, is mentioned three times through synonymy in the source text, and four times in the target text, as underlined in the example.

Furthermore, synonymy is transferred into the target texts through the three translation methods mentioned above. Transfer through adaptation method is evidenced in the transfer of the noun phrase *Bapak K.A. Harfan Efendy Noor* in the source text to exactly the same expression in the target text. Literal translation method is evidenced in the transfer of *kepala sekolah* in the source text into 'school principle' in the target text. This method is regarded as literal because the transfer of meaning requires different syntactic constructions. Another evidence of literal translation method is identified in the transfer of *seorang bapak tua berwajah sabar* in the source text to 'an old man with a patient face' in the target text. This method is regarded as literal because the syntactic construction *seorang bapak tua* and its equivalent 'an old man' are different, especially in terms of word order. In addition, the construction *berwajah sabar*, which is a relative clause, is transferred to 'with a patient face', which is a prepositional phrase.

In addition, it is worth noting that there is an addition of element in the transfer of the chain of synonymy above. While the chain of synonymy in the source text consists of three synonyms, in the target text the chain consists of four synonyms, with *Pak Harfan* as the additional synonym. This expression seems to be used to introduce a more common way of mentioning the entity, which was previously mentioned as *Bapak K.A. Harfan Efendy Noor*.

As previously discussed, contrast is one type of the taxonomic lexical cohesion. It concerns lexical items which are opposite in meaning and have cohesive impact in a text. Contrast is realized in two translating methods, i.e word for word (exemplified in [4]) and literal translation (exemplified in example [5]).

- [4] (18) *Pulau Belitong yang dulu biru berkilauan laksana jutaan ubur-ubur Ctenopore redup laksana kapal hantu yang terapung-apung tak tentu arah, gelap, dan sendirian.*

Belitong Island, once sparkling blue like millions of comb jellies, was suddenly as dull as a drifting ghost ship – dark,

abandoned, and alone.

The example above shows the contrast of the adjective *berkilauan* and *redup* in the source text. These adjectives are fully transferred into target text, in which the translator wrote the adjectives 'sparkling' and 'dull' as the equivalent for *berkilauan* and *redup*. This contrast indicates word-for-word translation based on Newmark's method of translation (1988) because the adjectives *berkilauan* and *redup* are directly translated into the adjectives 'sparkling' and 'dull', which are equivalent to *berkilauan* and *redup*. Additionally, the syntactic position of the two adjectives is also equivalent in the two languages. The adjective *berkilauan* is modifying the adjective *biru*, and in the translation the adjective 'sparkling' also modifies the adjective 'blue'. Meanwhile, the adjective *redup* is in predicative position, and so is the adjective 'dull'.

- [6] (178) *Apakah jari-jari tangan kirinya seindah jari-jari tangan kanannya?*
Were the nails on her left hand as gorgeous as those on her right?

The example [4.12] shows the contrast of noun phrase *tangan kirinya* and *tangan kanannya* in the source text. The noun phrase *tangan kirinya* and *tangan kanannya* are transferred into the target text, in which the translator wrote the noun phrase 'her left hand' as the equivalent for *tangan kirinya* and 'her right' in as the equivalent for *tangan kanannya*.

This contrast indicates literal translation based on Newmark's method of translation (1988) because the grammatical construction of noun phrase *tangan kirinya* and *tangan kanannya* is converted to the nearest TL equivalent i.e. 'her left hand' and 'her right'. In addition, in literal translation, the most important thing is that the meaning is transferred from the source to target text although the syntactic construction is different. In this context, the syntactic difference concerns the word order and ellipsis. In Indonesian, the possessive adjective is mentioned after the noun, while in English the possessive it is mentioned before the noun.

In the literal translation of *tangan kanannya* 'her right', there is an ellipsis in which it refers to a word or phrase that is omitted without changing the meaning of the sentence (Egins, 2004; Gerot & Wignell, 1994). Ellipsis allows the writers to reach optimum sentence's use. It means the writers avoid having to repeat lexical and structural elements that can be reclaim or understood by the readers by what has preceded or what has followed by ellipsed elements.

Besides that, class/sub-classes is one type of the taxonomic lexical cohesion. It concerns two (or more) lexical items related through sub-classification. The relationship is between the superordinate term or general item and sub-classes or hyponyms.

Class/sub-classes is realized in two translation methods, i.e word-for-word and communicative translation, as exemplified in the example [7].

- [7] (15) *Beragam familia pakis mulai dari kembang tanduk rusa sampai puluhan pot suplir kesayangan Bu Mus serta rupa-rupa kaktus topi uskup, Parodia, dan Mammillaria harus diperlakukan dengan sopan seperti porselen mahal dari Tiongkok*
The various ferns, from the Platyserium coronarium to the dozens of pots of Bu Mus' beloved Adiantum, had to be treated delicately, as if they were expensive Chinese porcelain.

The example above shows how the class/sub-classes is used as cohesive device both in source and target text. In the sentence 15, *pakis* acts as a superordinate or general term of *kembang tanduk rusa* and *suplir* that act as the sub-classes or hyponyms in the class/sub-classes, as underlined in the example.

Moreover, class/sub-classes is transferred into the target text through the two translation methods mentioned above. The transfer through word-for-word translation method is evidenced in the transfer of noun *pakis* in the source text into the noun 'ferns' in the target text. Additionally, the syntactic position of the two nouns are also equivalent in the two languages, but the transfer of both items has a little changing, from singular to plural. According to the applicable rules in Bahasa Indonesia, there is a different way in mentioning grammatical rules in two languages. In Bahasa Indonesia, if there is a sign of plurality, the noun is not reduplicated. As the example above, there is *beragam* as a sign of plurality before *pakis*, so *pakis* is not necessary to reduplicate. In contrast, in English, if there is a sign of plurality, the noun is added by 's' to show plurality. Though there is 'a various' as a sign of plurality, the word 'fern' must follow the existence of plural word, so 'fern' is added by 's' becomes 'ferns'.

Communicative translation method is evidenced in the transfer of *kembang tanduk rusa* and *suplir* in the source text into *Platyserium coronarium* and *Adiantum* in the target text. Additionally, co-hyponymy is one type of the taxonomic lexical cohesion. It concerns two (or more) lexical items used in a text as subordinate members of a superordinate class and co-hyponymy relation is between two (or more) specific items. Co-hyponymy is realized in two translation methods, i.e. literal translation and adaptation, as exemplified in the example [8].

- [8] (16) *Belum lagi deretan panjang pot amarilis, kalimatis, azalea, nanas sabrang, Calathea, Stromanthe, Abutilon, kalmus, dammar kamar, dan anggrek Dendrobium dengan berbagai variannya.*
Additionally, there are the long line of potted amaryllis, kalimatis, azalea, sabrang pineapple, Calathea,

Stromanthe, Abutilon, kalmus, resins, and Dendrobium orchid with its variants.

The example above shows how co-hyponymy is used as a cohesive device both in the source and target text. The underlined terms in the sentence 16 are the co-hyponyms or the member of superordinate 'kinds of flowers' in which the superordinate are not written in this sentence.

Furthermore, co-hyponymy is transferred into the target texts through the two translation methods mentioned above. Transfer through literal translation method is evidenced in the transfer of the noun phrase *nanas sabrang* and *anggrek Dendrobium* in the source text to 'sabrang pineapple and Dendrobium orchid' in the target text. The translation method used is literal translation because the transfer of meaning requires different syntactic constructions.

Transfer through word-for-word translation method is evidenced in the transfer of the word *nanas* and *anggrek* in the source text to 'pineapple' and 'orchid' in the target text. It is regarded as word-for-word translation method because the syntactic position the two pronouns are also equivalent in the two languages. Transfer through adaptation is evidenced in the transfer of the word *sabrang* and *Dendrobium* in the source to target text. It is regarded as adaptation method because the nouns are rewritten to help a conversion of SL culture to the TL culture.

Besides that, transfer through adaptation method is evidenced in the transfer of the nouns *amarilis*, *kalimatis*, *azalea*, *Calathea*, *Stromanthe*, *Abutilon*, and *kalmus* in the source text to 'amaryllis', 'kalimatis', 'azalea', 'Calathea', 'Stromanthe', 'Abutilon', and 'kalmus' in the target text. It is regarded as adaptation method because the nouns are rewritten to help a conversion of SL culture to the TL culture. Additionally, transfer through communicative translation is evidenced in the noun *dammar kamar* in the source to 'resins' in target text.

In addition, meronymy is one type of the taxonomic lexical cohesion. It concerns two lexical items related as whole to part (or vice versa). An item is a part of another item. Meronymy is realized in one translation method, i.e. word-for-word translation, as exemplified in the example [9].

- [9] (352) *Kejadiannya sangat mengejutkan, karena amat cepat, tanpa disangka sama sekali, si nona misterius justru tiba-tiba membuka tirai dan tindakan cerobohnya itu membuat wajah kami sama-sama terperanjat hampir bersentuhan!!!.*

and it happened so quickly. All of a sudden, the mysterious young girl unexpectedly drew back the curtain, nearly causing our startled faces to collide, leaving them less than an inch away from each other.

(354) Mata kami bertatapan dengan perasaan yang tak dapat kulukiskan dengan kata-kata.

We looked into each other's eyes with a feeling I cannot describe with words.

The example above shows how meronymy is used as a cohesive device both in the source and target text. The underlined terms are the meronymy or some parts that are related to each other. Two lexical items related as whole to part

The example above shows the meronymy of *wajah* 'face' and *mata* 'eye' in which both of them are related as whole to part and vice versa: *mata* is a part of *wajah*. This meronymy occurs in different sentences. because the nouns *wajah* and *mata* are directly translated into the nouns 'faces' and 'eyes', which are the English equivalent for *wajah* and *mata*. In addition, the syntactic position the pronouns are also equivalent in the two languages, but the transfer of both items has a little changing, from singular to plural.

According to the applicable rules in Bahasa Indonesia, there is a different way in mentioning grammatical rules in two languages. In Bahasa Indonesia, if there is a sign of plurality, the noun is not reduplicated. For example, a singular *wajah* is translated into a plural 'faces' and the singular *mata* is translated into a plural 'eyes'. It is because in the sentence (352), *wajah* appears with *kami* in which *kami* is a sign of plurality, hence *wajah* in this sentence is plural. Therefore, it is translated into plural 'faces'. This occurrence is implemented to *mata* too. *Mata* appears with *kami* is translated into 'each other's eyes'.

As previously discussed, co-meronymy is one type of the taxonomic lexical cohesion. It concerns two lexical items that are related by both being parts of a common whole. Co-meronymy is realized into one translation method, i.e. word-for-word translation, as exemplified in the example [4.16].

[10] (319) *Atau ... apakah dia cuma punya satu tangan?*

Or did she only have one hand?

(320) *Jangan-jangan dia tidak punya wajah!*

Did she even have a face?

The example above shows how the co-meronymy is used as a cohesive device both in the source and target text. In the source text the nouns *tangan* 'hand' and *wajah* 'face' are parts of the body, so they are co-meronyms. In the target text, the co-meronyms were transferred into 'hand' and 'face' as the equivalents for *tangan* and *wajah* through the word-for-word translation method. In other words, the transfer of this co-meronymy indicates the word-for-word translation because the nouns *tangan* and *wajah* are directly translated into the nouns 'hand' and 'face'. In addition, the syntactic position the two nouns are also equivalent in the two languages.

CONCLUSION

This study basically inquires about the realization of lexical cohesion in the original text of novel *Laskar Pelangi* in Bahasa Indonesia. It has been proposed that lexical cohesion plays vital function in the development of analyzing source and target text that is *Rainbow Troops* as its translation in English version. Therefore, it would be of interest to consider, firstly, the degree to which the understandable teaching could advantage student's preparation for translating a text; secondly, translation practices within the particular criterion environment, namely academic setting.

The first inquiry considers the pedagogical implications of the achieved conclusions in this study. Decades of studies on translation signify that readers can please his or her intention in reading when the text has great cohesive and coherence, it can predictably be said that someone has comprehended the text. In this study, both source and target texts have the same frequency of synonymy as the highest frequency. It means that the translator wanted to keep the culture in the source text. Afterwards, repetition emerged as the second most frequent appeared element in both texts, with a difference of one point. This indicated the existence of confirmation made by the characters in the novel. The confirmation is a repeated designation of a word or phrase that then leads to emphasizing.

The emergence of meronymy as the third most frequent lexical cohesion element in this analysis study shows that Andrea Hirata wanted to mention the relationship between the main and the parts items that exist in the inside, and vice versa. The score of meronymy in source text is three points greater than the target text. This score is then followed by co-hyponymy which certainly has similar meaning to meronymy. The score of co-hyponymy is seven on both texts.

The score seven also appears in contrast as one of lexical cohesion element in the source text and six in the target text. This reveals that the translator wanted to keep the meaning contained within the source text. The same score between source text and target text also appears in class/sub-classes and co-meronymy as much as 5 and 3, respectively. This score indicates that both writer and translator have the same word used to make the readers always remember the character, setting, and plot in the novel.

A second possible inquiry emerging from the achieved conclusions concerns the ability in actual other academic skills such as listening, reading, speaking, and writing. This study, regarding the essential role played by lexical cohesion in translation, should focus on the limitations of the create of other skills.

REFERENCES

- Ajunwa, E. (2015). Advancing the Theory of Fidelity Erosion in Translation. *Translation Journal*, 12-19.
- Baker, M. (2010). *Critical Reading in Translation Studies*. Routledge.
- Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2004). *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*.

Arnold Publishers.

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide: Spoken and Written English Grammar and Usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Egins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (2nd edition). Continuum.

Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Gerd Stabler.

Halliday, M. A., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

Halliday, M. A., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Deakin University Press.

Hatim, B. A. (2004). *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. Routledge.

Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, Text, Grammar: Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing*. UNSW Press.

Krein-Kuhle, M. (2002). *Cohesion and Coherence in Technical Translation: The Case of Demonstrative Reference*. Cambridge University Press.

Mogadam, L., & Shabaipoor, M. (2013). Application of ellipsis and lexical cohesion in subtitling and dubbing: the case of Prison Break TV series. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies*, 2(2), 70–90.

Mohamed, T. A. (2016). Cohesion and coherence interrelation: an approach to literary translation-Mahfouz's trilogy. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2), 220–238.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.

Ninsiana, W. (2014). Grammatical cohesion devices on the Indonesian translation of English bidding document. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(6), 361–367.

Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (2nd edition). Routledge.