
Translating “Interjections, Exclamations dan Phatic Expressions” from Indonesian Literature Bumi Manusia by Pramoedya Ananta Toer into English This Earth of Mankind by Max Lane

ERNA WILES

Universitas Triatma Mulya Stenden Bali

erna.wiles@nhlstenden.com

Abstract

Due to their uniqueness, which among others are having various forms (particles, morphemes, words, phrases, minor and extra-sentences), different form of part of speech, containing connotative, emotive or affective, and social-stylistic meanings, culturally-bound, etcetera, it is quite challenging to translate interjections, exclamations and phatic communions from one language to another, especially when it involves literary work. To discover the most effective strategies, an analysis was conducted by comparing Bumi Manusia by Pramoedya Ananta Toer with its English translation ‘This Earth of Mankind’ by Max Lane. To gain the optimum meaning of transportation, interjections, exclamations, and phatic communions especially those containing socio-cultural meaning, those which has been archaic, universally used and understood, and any interjections, exclamations, and phatic communions written in other languages than that of source text should be retained. The spelling and the orthography can be adjusted to target language system if necessary and when the context allows. Any interjections, exclamations, and phatic communions which have equivalent in a target language have to be translated. Those with no equivalents should be retained as they are. For clarity, extra information can be added on their first appearance. On their second appearance onward, they can be retained. It is sometimes wise to translate them into a different part of speech.

Keywords: *interjection, exclamation, phatic communion, equivalent*

INTRODUCTION

There are seven types of meanings which are 1) conceptual meaning or denotative – the clear and the logical meaning of words seen from its form and structure; 2) connotative meaning – the meaning that is implied, apart from what is described explicitly; 3) social or stylistic meaning – any information conveyed in a linguistic expression including pronunciation, variation about certain social characteristics; 4) affective or expressive meaning – the personal feelings expressed by the speakers; 5) reflected meaning – a phenomenon whereby a single word or phrase is associated with more than one sense of meaning; 6) collocative meaning – the association a word acquires on account of the meaning of words which tend to occur in its environment; and 7) thematic meaning – what

was communicated by the way in which a speaker or writer organizes the message, in terms of the ordering, focus and emphasis (Leech, 1985, pp 9-20).

Other than the conceptual meaning, translating expressions containing the other types of meaning is really challenging. Aside from the knowledge about the source language (SL) and the target language (TL), a translator needs to have extra expertise to read behind the lines to seek the core meaning. According to Larson (1998) the core process of translating is analysing SL lexicon, its grammatical structure, its communication situation, and its social context in order to get the meaning; then finding the equivalent in the TL, to be reconstructed into the TL lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and social context. The process can be depicted in figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Translation Process (Larson, 1998, p 26)

Referring to the Universal Grammar Theory, which was first coined by Chomsky (Cook & Newson, 2010), Larson (1998) states that the basic structure or the semantic structure is actually more universal when compared to the surface structure. Figure 2 below illustrates the correlation.

Figure 2. The Correlation between Semantic Structures and Grammatical Units (Larson, 1998, p 26)

The smallest particle in a semantic structure is the meaning component. Two or more components of meaning merge into concepts, concepts converge into concept clusters and, if joined together, they become propositions. When used in a communication, the combination of these propositions will become clusters of propositions. These clusters become semantic paragraphs. Then the semantic paragraphs can join into episodes, and episodes can be combined into cluster episodes. Next, groups of these cluster episodes become semantic parts, and the combination of semantic parts becomes a discourse. In the surface structure, they are equivalent respectively to morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, sections, divisions, parts, and texts or texts. It can be imagined how difficult it is to translate meanings from one language to the other. To make matter worse, according to Munday (2016), very often a word acquires meaning through its context, hence when a word in the source text (ST) is context-bound it can produce varying results when translated based on the culture of the target language (TT). Further, Munday (2016) reiterates that semantic structure analysis needs to be conducted by means of clarifying the ambiguity, elucidating obscure passages and taking into consideration the cultural differences. This includes the translation of interjections, exclamations and phatic communions.

The earliest analysis on interjections in Indonesia is recorded to happen in 1889, with the publication of D. Gerth van Wijk's book titled *Spraakleer der Maleische Taal*. According to Wijk (1985), interjection or *tussenwerpsels* in Dutch, etimologically is from Latin *interjectionem* (nom. *interjectio*), which means inserted or throwing or placing between. The root word, *intericere*, consists of *inter* or *in between* and a combination of *icere* and *jacere* which means throwing.

As the form does not qualify as a sentence, Bloomfield (1993) labels the interjection as a primitive, instinctive, and minor sentence. An interjection is also referred to as a 'minor sentence' because it is only completive in nature, which means it is merely a supplement to a situation, for instance, when someone suddenly remembers something, while clicking his thumb to say 'Tsch!'; and exclamatory in nature as it arises because of a stimulus such as 'Ouch, damn it!' is a response to a stimulus – stumbling. This is in accordance with the definitions coined by Leech (1985, 1989: 215) in which he says, an interjection is just a grammatical term for an exclamation word such as 'oh', 'ah', and 'wow'.

Wilkins (1992) semantically defines interjection as a lexical form which, although created arbitrarily, is the result of an agreement of a group of language-speaking communities - conventional lexical form. Interjections usually consist of a single morpheme unit and have never joined an inflection morpheme or its derivation, and is conventionally formed as an independent speech; in the sense that an interjection independently can already be categorized as a speech, for example, 'Auch!' – and agreed upon to be commensurate with for example 'Look! I'm in pain'.

From pragmatics point of view, Ameka (1992: 102-106) defines interjections as 'linguistic gestures which express a speaker's mental state, action or attitude, or reaction to a situation'. Ameka's opinion is supported by Wilkins (1992: 132), who claims that interjections contain deictic elements such as 1. 'Gimme!', 'Welcome!', signalling the first and second person personal deictic; 2. 'Fuck off!', 'Buzz off!', 'Piss off!', 'Kiss off!', signalling 'away from the spatial' deictic; and (3) 'Now, now!' and 'Come, come!', signalling a temporal deviation.

Wierzbicka (1992:164) divides interjections into 1. emotive - for interjections which contain a component of meaning 'I feel something' for example 'Auch!' - pain; 2. volitive - for those which contain the component of the meaning 'I want something' but does not contain the component of meaning of 'I feel something' for example 'Sh!' - silence; and 3. cognitive - which contains the components of meaning 'I think about something' and 'I know something' for example 'Aha!' - I know now.

In the aforementioned explanation, the role of an interjection in the syntax has been reviewed. Wilkins (1992: 127), take, for instance, states that an interjection can stand independently as a speech - a lexeme may constitute a whole utterance. Similarly, Cuenca (2000), states that although an interjection does not qualify as a sentence, i.e. does not have a subject and predicate, nor does it have lexical meaning, it acts as a sentence. The reasons are 1. it corresponds to the communicative unit (speech), which is syntactically autonomous – independent, 2. it has a purpose and is semantically intact, and 3. it expresses pragmatic meanings such as shock, pain, joy and so on. In addition, according to Cuenca (2000) an interjection is very context-dependent. Likewise, Ameka (1992) reiterates that an interjection arises because it is a reaction of a linguistic or extralinguistic context, thus, can only be interpreted through the context.

According to Gehweiler (2008: 73) the prototype of an interjection is considered unique as it has a property that is phonologically aberrant - not normal, strange, distorted, not characterized. Interjections are 1. mostly monosyllabic ('Ow!', 'Yuck!'), 2. not syllabic ('Tsktsk!', 'Shh!', 'Psst!', 'Hm!'), 3. contain sounds or a combination of sounds that are not present in the main sound system in a language ('Brrr!' - bilabial vibrant,

urgent) - contain choked sounds, ‘Tut-tut!’, ‘Tsksk!’, ‘Nt!’ - consist of a series of clicking dental alveolar sounds, 4. has a tonal structure (‘oh!’), 5. are repetitions - iterations (German: ‘iiiiieeh!’), 6. reduplications (German: ‘Igittigittigitt!’), 7. graphologically considered significant, for example, because some do not have a fixed spelling (‘Tut-tut!’, ‘Tsksk!’, ‘St!’; ‘Shh!’, ‘Hush!’), 8. follow certain phonological principles (German: ‘bäääh!’ or ‘iiiiieeh!’), and 9. Are lexically unclear or opaque because it has no homonyms in other word class.

Slightly different, Kridalaksana (2007) believes that interjections are extra-sentences and always precede utterances as loose or independent screams. Kridalaksana (2007) classifies interjections into two namely 1. the primary form of exclamation words such as ah, bok, coy, eh, hai, idih, lho, mak, oi, nah, sip, wuih, yoi, etcetera; and 2. interjections of derivative forms (secondary) which are usually from ordinary words such as *astaganaga*, *busyet*, *duile*, or fragments of Arabic sentences such as *Alhamdulillah*, *Astaghfirullah*, *Innalillahi*, etcetera.

In Indonesian and English languages, interjections belong to a specific word class or part of speech. Confirmed by Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 18), interjections belong to ‘one of the ten parts of speech’. They can be classified into two groups i.e. the first group comprises noun, adjective, adverb, verb, and the second group comprises article, demonstrative, pronoun, preposition, conjunction, interjection. In writing, direct sentences containing interjections usually end with an exclamation mark ‘!’.

The question is then whether interjections are the same as exclamations. Cuenca (2000: 28) opines ‘an exclamation or exclamatory sentence is an utterance which shows the speaker’s or writer’s feelings’ and normally begins with a question word ‘what’ and ‘how’. This construction, however, is not a question as there is no reversal between the subject and the auxiliary verb; for example ‘How clever she is!’, ‘What a good dog!’. The equivalent in Indonesian is an exclamation that begins with the words *betapa* and *aduhai*.

This study of interjection and exclamation plays an important role in the process of translation of literary works, especially novels. Summarising Crystal (2010) and Lightfoot (2002), Mrochen (2009) reiterates novels is the only written work in which these points are found i.e. 1. language variants ranging from colloquial to formal; 2. a clear picture of the emotions of each character; 3. realistic dialogue; 4. sentence patterns, variations in wording, and movements of constituents in syntax, morphological, lexical structures related to vocative forms, affirmations, adjectives related to emotions, honorifics and 5. speech styles based on class background, regional and the personal style of the character.

Aside from interjections and exclamations, to keep the conversations in the literary text natural, the writer deliberately uses what is called phatic communion/phatic communication. Phatic communion was first coined by an anthropologist, Malinowski (1923). It refers to a form of communication in which ties of the union between the speakers are created solely by means of exchanging words. Phatic communion is a form of communication with the purpose of not to exchange, give or seek information among speech participants but only to maintain social relations. Crystal (2017) adds that phatic communion exists to meet basic human needs in order to signal a partnership, and to keep the relationship between speakers comfortable, to establish atmosphere and/or maintain social contact. This is in line with Jakobson (1960), who states that basically there are six

functions of language i.e. emotive – self-expression, conative – vocative or imperative addressing of receiver, referential – contextual information, metalingual – checking code working, and aesthetic/poetic – auto-reflection and phatic – checking channel. Further, Crystal (2017) emphasizes that phatic expressions are cliché in nature – they are stereotypes, state a situation which is actually very clear e.g. 'Lovely day!', and do not have contents such as 'Hello!'.

In his research, Jumanto (2014), tried to incorporate various functions of phatic communion from various linguists, which among others are for breaking the silence, starting a conversation, small talk, gossiping, keeping the conversation going, expressing solidarity, creating harmony, creating comfort, expressing empathy, expressing friendship, expressing respect, and expressing politeness (Abercrombie, 1998; G. Cook, 1989; Coupland, 2014; Deborah Tannen; Heidi Hamilton, 2015; Holmes, 2011; Kridalaksana, 2007; Leech, 1983; Jacob L. Mey, 2001; O’Sullivant, Hartley, Saunders, Montgomery, & Fiske, 1994; Renkema, 2009; Renkema & Schubert, 2018; Verschueren, 1999). His research, however, (Jumanto, 2014) discovered more functions i.e. expressing wishes, giving compliment, criticizing, pacifying, encouraging, expressing sympathy, saying bad words, mocking and joking.

According to Kridalaksana (2007) , a phatic expression, which is partly a feature of oral and non-standard variety can be categorized into 1. particles such as ah, deh, dog, ding, kan, kek, kok, -lah, lho, nah, pun, sih, toh, ya, yah; 2. words for example ayo, halo, mari, selamat, and 3. phrases for example selamat, terima kasih, turut berduka cita, assalamu’alaikum, wa’alaikumsalam, insya Allah, dan lain-lain, and others. Although most of phatic communions are oral varieties, written variations are also found, take for instance dengan hormat, hormat saya, salam takzim, wassalam, etcetera. Even though some forms of phatic communion are similar to interjection, Kridalaksana (2007) ensures that they are not – interjections are emotive while the phatic expressions are communicative.

Unfortunately, according to Crystal (2017), the phatic communion is not universal in nature and tends to be dialectical. Particles dong and deh are identical with Malay speakers of Betawi dialect; particles gek or nek are of Javanese villagers. This, very often, creates potential problems in the translation process. Just like interjections, this phatic category is, in some ways, also arbitrary in nature.

To see the challenges when translating interjections, exclamations and phatic communion used in an Indonesian literary work into English, analysis has been conducted by comparing Bumi Manusia (Toer, 2002) and the English translation ‘This Earth of Mankind’ (Toer & Lane, 1996). To facilitate the analysis of the literary work Bumi Manusia, the term interjection is used as the primary interjection, whereas the term exclamation is used for secondary interjection and exclamative sentences.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Interjections

Data collected shows that over 20 (twenty) various types of interjections are found expressing various kinds of feelings and most interjections have been translated according to their respective functions. The pronunciation is sometimes adjusted to the spelling in

English, for example *ahoi* – *ahoy*, *ha* – *ha*, *hai* – *hi*, *heh* and *hei* – *heh*, *hei-hei* – *he-he*, *hoseeee* – *hoséééé*, *husy* – *hush*, *stt* – *sst*. To ensure that the TT readers can pronounce it correctly, the translation is equipped with an orthography, for example, *hoseeee* – *hoséééé*. Interjection *hose* has been decided to be retained as it carries a cultural meaning i.e. uttered by Javanese-speaking community. *Hose* is 1. part of the songs called *senggakan* – *nywara giyak ramé mbarengi (nyambung) unining gamelan (sindhén)* or utterances in a merry manner accompanying the sound of the traditional *gamelan* music instrument and the sound of the *sindhén* or singer; and 2. Utterances, which are spoken merrily in groups during the *tayub* dance (Nardiati, Suwadji, Sukardi, Pardi, & Suwatno, 1992).

[1a]

“*Minum manis! Minun, hoseeee!*” (p. 202)

“Drink it, sweetie! Drink **hoséééééé!**” (p. 98)

[1b]

Para lurah, wedana, mantri, polisi, menyerbu pendopo, dan tayub berlangsung sampai pagi dengan seruan hoseeee setiap teguk minuman keras (p. 202)

The village chiefs, district officers, police constables, charged the pendopo, and the **tayub** continued until morning with the shout of **hoséééééé** after every swallow of liquor. (p. 99)

Interjections which have no equivalent in English is transported to TT as they are. The emotive meaning is expected to be understood through the context, for example *ah* is used to express the shame of being seduced [2a], dreams of happiness [2b], reluctance [2c], frustration [2d], and relief [2e].

[2a]

“**Ah**, *Mama ini!*” *serunya sambil memukul pundak ibunya dan melirik padaku dengan mata besar.* (p. 60)

“**Ah**, *Mama!*” she exclaimed prodding her mother’s shoulder and glancing at me with her big eyes. (p. 25)

[2b]

“**Ah**, *betapa berbahagia dengannya, Ann.*” (p. 135)

“**Ah**, how happy I was with him, Ann!” (p. 63)

[2c]

“**Ah**, *Bunda jangan hukum sahaya.*” (p. 193)

“**Ah**, *Mother, don’t punish me this way.*” (p. 94)

[2d]

“**Ah**, *tuan Dokter. Tuan Dokter!*” (p. 383)

“**Ah**, Doctor, Doctor!” (p. 196)

[2e]

“**Ah**, *Annelies, Anneliesku! Kau sudah baik, Ann!*” *aku peluk dan ciumi dia.*” (p. 526)

“**Ah**, Annelies, my Annelies! You’re well again, Ann!” I embraced her and kissed her. (p. 273)

Unfortunately, there are some interjections that actually have their equivalents in English but are still maintained as they are.

[3a]

“**Ah**, *Bunda jangan hukum sahaya.*” (p. 193)

“**Ah**, Mother, don’t punish me this way.” (p. 94)

Suggestion:

“**Argh**, Mother, don’t punish me this way.”

[3b]

“**Ah**, *tuan Dokter. Tuan Dokter!*” (p. 383)

“**Ah**, Doctor, Doctor!” (p. 196)

Suggestion:

“**Argh**, Doctor, Doctor!”

As an expression to signal victory, surprise and mockery at the same time, *ahoi* has an equivalent to ‘aha’.

[4]

“**Ahoi**, *philogynik, dalam keadaan begini pun kau masih sempat mengagumi dan memuja kecantikan.*” (p. 29)

“**Ahoy!** Oh *philogynik* (sic)! Even in a situation like this you still can admire and praise beauty.” (p. 11)

Suggestion:

“**Aha!** Oh *philogynik* (sic)! Even in a situation like this you still can admire and praise beauty.”

As an expression to depict an astonishment in English ‘hey’ can be used, unfortunately, the translator decided to use ‘he’, which actually does not exist in English.

[5]

“**Hei-hei**, mengapa si Gendut agak sipit itu mengawasi aku saja?” (p. 221)

“**He, he!** Why was Fatso, that fat man, with the rather slanted eyes, watching only me?” (p. 109)

Suggestion:

“**Hey-hey!** Why was Fatso, that fat man, with the rather slanted eyes, watching only me?”

As an expression to indicate inconveniences and objections in English ‘hmp’, ‘hrmph’ or ‘humph’ can be used; whereas to express indications of distrust, confusion, and surprise ‘huh’ can be used. In sentence [6] the meaning to be conveyed is Robert Mellema’s resentment towards his mother, his uneasiness with Minke’s presence in his house, also his frustration with his own situation, so that the most appropriate interjection used should be ‘hmp’, ‘hrmph’, ‘humph’ or ‘feh’ and ‘meh’.

[6]

“Siapa nanti mengurus perusahaan besar ini?” “**Huh,**” ia mendengus. “Aku sudah dewasa, berhak menentukan diri sendiri.” (p. 158)

“Who look after this big business?” “**Huh,**” he hissed. “I’m an adult, with the right to decide for myself.” (p. 75)

Suggestion:

“Who look after this big business?” “**Hmph,**” he hissed. “I’m an adult, with the right to decide for myself.”

The equivalent of *husy* in English, besides ‘hush’ is ‘hist’, ‘shush’, ‘pss’ and ‘shh’. In most part, ‘hush’ has been used except one in which ‘ah’ is used. This does not have much impact on the TT readers emotionally. Suggested to re the same interjections are consistently used.

[7]

“**Husy**, sedikit pun cukup, yang banyak ada pada kau.” (p. 370)

“**Ah!** A little is enough, you’re the one who is really handsome.” (p. 189)

Suggestion:

“**Shh!** A little is enough, you’re the one who is really handsome.”

Without being translated, the emotive and cultural meanings of *iiih* can still be understood as this interjection is somewhat universally used, however for the sake of consistency ‘ew’, an interjection indicating disgust in English, can also be used.

[8]

“**Tiih!**” ia mencubit lagi. (p. 53)

“**Tiih!**” she pinched me again. (p. 22)

Suggestion:

“**Ew!**” she pinched me again.

In Indonesian ‘nah’ is an interjection used to express relief. The equivalent in English is ‘ah’, however even if it is retained, as can be seen in [9b], the meaning will still be easily understood by target language readers.

[9a]

“**Nah**, Ann, jawablah: *te-ri-ma-ka-sih*.” (p. 39)

“**Ah**, Ann, answer: thank you.” (p. 15)

[9b]

Mendadak: “**Nah**, Ann, *Sinyo Minke sudah ada di dekatmu*.” (p. 101)

Suddenly: “**Nah**, Ann, *Sinyo Minke is now close to you*.”

‘Nah’ can also be used to replace the word ‘so’, thus for the sake of clarity, instead of translating it into ‘ah’, the word ‘so’ is much better.

[10a]

“**Nah**, kalau kau masih Jawa, kau akan selalu bisa menulis Jawa.” (p. 460)

“**Ah**, if you were Javanese, you would be able to write in Javanese.” (p. 238)

Suggestion:

“**So**, if you were Javanese, you would be able to write in Javanese.”

The back translation:

“**Jadi**, kalau kau masih Jawa, kau akan selalu bisa menulis Jawa.”

[10b]

“**Nah**, sekarang duduk kau di lantai. Tundukkan kepalamu” pada kesempatan seperti itu tahulah aku apa yang akan menyusul: wejangan sebelum pesta perkawinan. (p. 463)

“**So**, sit down there on the floor. Bow down your head” and I knew what would follow on such an occasion as this: the advice before the marriage ceremony. (p. 240)

The back translation:

“**Jadi**, sekarang duduk kau di lantai. Tundukkan kepalamu” pada kesempatan seperti itu tahulah aku apa yang akan menyusul: wejangan sebelum pesta perkawinan.

To get attention, the most appropriate interjection to be used for *oho* is ‘ahoy’, ‘hi’ or ‘hey’.

[11]

“**Oho**, Rob!” sambut Suurhof. “Aku bawa temanku, Rob. Tak apa toh? Kau tak ada keberatan, kan?” (p. 25)

“**Oho**, Rob!” greeted Suurhof. “I’ve brought my friend. It’s okay, isn’t it? You don’t mind, do you?” (p. 9)

“**Hey**, Rob!” greeted Suurhof. “I’ve brought my friend. It’s okay, isn’t it? You don’t mind, do you?”

Even though the equivalent of *sst* in English is ‘pssst’, ‘shh’ or ‘shus’, when retained TT readers will still understand.

[12a]

“**Stt**. Belas-kasihannya hanya untuk yang tahu.” (p. 113)

“**Sst!** Pity is only for those who are conscious of their condition.” (p. 52)

Suggestion:

“**Psst!** Pity is only for those who are conscious of their condition.”

[12b]

“**Stt.** *Diam, kau. Jadi kau larang istrimu dipangur?*” (p. 459)

“**Ssst.** Silent, you. So, you’ve forbidden your wife to have her teeth filed?” (p. 237)

Suggestion:

“**Shus.** Silent, you. So, you’ve forbidden your wife to have her teeth filed?”

In English, the interjection equivalent to 'ts-ts', to express insults, curses or disagreements is tsk-tsk (clicking).

[13]

“**Ts-ts,** *itu baru dugaanku ayahnya berkulit putih.*” (p. 370)

“**Ts, ts,** this is only a guess. Her father was white-skinned.” (p. 189)

Suggestion:

“**Tsk, tsk,** this is only a guess. Her father was white-skinned.”

Even though *ah* or *aah* are acceptable, *uah* which is used to express mistrust and a little bit of harassment, is more in tune with ‘duh’ or ‘hmp’, ‘hrmph’, ‘humph’, ‘huh’, ‘shees’, which are normally used to laugh at others’ stupidity.

[14a]

“**Uah,** *tahu apa kau tentang batik,*” dan sengaja ia tidak melihat padaku, tahu aku sedang meringis kesakitan. (p. 461)

“**Aah,** what do you know about *batik,*” and deliberately she didn’t look at me knowing that I’d be grimacing from the pain. (p. 238)

Suggestion:

“**Hmph,** what do you know about *batik,*” and deliberately she didn’t look at me knowing that I’d be grimacing from the pain.

[14b]

“**Uah,** *macammu! Aku juga sudah senang, Gus, dapat melihat kau sudah pandai berpura-pura untuk menyenangkan hati perempuan tua ini,*” dan sekali lagi ia tak memandangi aku yang meringis kesakitan. (p. 461)

“**Ah,** you! I’m happy, *Gus,* to see you so clever at pretending, so as to please the heart of this old woman,” and once again she didn’t look at me as I grimaced with the pain. (p. 238-239)

Suggestion:

“**Huh**, you! I’m happy, *Gus*, to see you so clever at pretending, so as to please the heart of this old woman,” and once again she didn’t look at me as I grimaced with the pain.

‘Wah’ and ‘wah-wah’ are interjections used to show admiration and the equivalent are respectively *wow* or *oh-wow*.

[15a]

“**Wah-wah**,” seru Sarah, “*Kalau begitu coba deklamasikan salah sebuah sajak Kloos, biar kami lihat apa benar gurumu memang jagoan.*” (p. 206)

“**Ah!**” cried Sarah. “If that’s the case, try declaiming one of Kloos’ poems, so we can see if your teacher really is so great.” (p. 101)

Suggestion:

“**Oh-wow!**” cried Sarah. “If that’s the case, try declaiming one of Kloos’ poems, so we can see if your teacher really is so great.”

[15b]

“**Wah**, *Nyo*, *sekalang dua. Mana lebih menalik?*” (p. 246)

“**Wah**, *Nyo*, there are two now. Which is the more inteesting (sic)?” (p. 123)

Suggestion:

“**Wow**, *Nyo*, there are two now. Which is the more inteesting (sic)?”

Sometimes an interjection also carries a cultural meaning. For example, interjection *ai* actually has already been archaic, which means it signifies that it used to be popular for a certain period of time, in a certain generation type. Even though there is an equivalent in English, to keep its authenticity, it should be maintained as is.

[16]

“*Meninggali pun ... ai*, *Minke*, *seperti rumah-rumah Jerman di Eropa Tengah.*” (p. 338)

“Or to live in one . . . **oh**, *Minke*, like the German houses of Central Europe.” (p. 171)

Suggestion:

“Or to live in one . . . **ai**, *Minke*, like the German houses of Central Europe.”

In the following sentence, *hei* is translated as ‘heh’, even though this interjection is not used in English. ‘Heh’ is actually used in Javanese. It is understandable if *heh* is retained, as the emotive effect is more pronounced.

[17a]

“**Hei**, *Drasam! Mengapa tak membelok ke kanan?*” protesku. (p. 223)

“**Heh!** Darsam! Why aren’t you turning right?” I protested. (p. 110)

[17b]

“**Hei**, *kau mimpi, jangan ganggu aku!*” (p. 526)

“**Heh**, dream, don’t bother me like this!” (p. 273)

Sometimes, certain an interjection does not carry a certain emotive effect which can change the meaning. This kind of interjection can be completely removed.

[18]

“**Nah**, *mengasohlah. Aku hendak bekerja sekarang.*” (p. 98)

“Rest now. I want to do some work.” (p. 44)

Conversely, in certain situations, to add the weight to the emotive meaning, an interjection is added to the translation version.

[19]

Lihat: mereka membutuhkan aku demi keselamatan keluarga dan perusahaan.

Kan *aku termaksud orang hebat juga?* (p. 91)

See, I thought: they need me in order to save their family and their business. So, I was pretty remarkable too, **heh?** (p. 40)

In general, it can be concluded that interjections can be translated into the target language through various means, which among others are by 1. finding all the meanings, be it emotive, cultural and social meanings contained in the interjections, 2. finding the equivalent in the target language with the same content of meaning, 3. transporting an interjection from ST when it is ascertained that TT readers can get the meaning through the context, 4. if necessary, the orthography can be written and adapted to the TT. Orthographic writing will also greatly enrich TT readers with new knowledge.

Exclamations

Data collected shows that there are seven types of exclamations from the TT *Bumi Manusia*, namely *aduh*, *aduhai*, *betapa*, *eilok*, *Masaallah*, *ya Allah* and *ya Tuhan*; and one type of exclamation from English *God* used in the novel.

Exclamation *aduh* first appeared when Minke got a letter from *Nyai Ontosoroh*, containing a request to come to her house because Annelies was sick. *Aduh* can actually be likened to interjections ‘ah’ or ‘oh’, which is actually merely a complaint. *Aduh* can actually be kept as it is, provided that the context allows.

[1a]

Genggam-mengengam-lah, kalau tak dapat dikatakan sihir-menyihir. Seorang ibu yang bijaksana dan berwibawa seperti Nyai memang dibutuhkan oleh setiap anak, dan dara cantik tiada bandingan dibutuhkan setiap pemuda. Lihat: mereka membutuhkan aku demi keselamatan keluarga dan perusahaan. Kan aku termaksud orang hebat juga? Aduh, sekarang ini betapa banyak alasan dapat aku bariskan untuk membenarkan diri sendiri. (p. 91)

It (the letter) gave me courage, gave me back my character: if I was in their grip, they were also in mine. In each other’s grip, if you couldn’t actually say under each other’s spell. A wise mother, naturally emanating authority like *Nyai*, is needed by every child, and a maiden whose beauty beyond compare, is needed by every youth. See, I thought: they need me in order to save their family and their business. So, I was pretty remarkable too, heh? **Aduh!** How many arguments could I now assemble to justify myself in my actions. (p. 40)

Otherwise, provide an additional explanation before it is retained as it is in the next appearance.

Suggestion:

It (the letter) gave me courage, gave me back my character: if I was in their grip, they were also in mine. In each other’s grip, if you couldn’t actually say under each other’s spell. A wise mother, naturally emanating authority like *Nyai*, is needed by every child, and a maiden whose beauty beyond compare, is needed by every youth. See, I thought: they need me in order to save their family and their business. So, I was pretty remarkable too, heh? **Aduh! Oh, my God!** How many arguments could I now assemble to justify myself in my actions. (p. 40)

Once it is introduced the second appearance onwards, *aduh* can be retained.

[1b]

Aduh sabahat, bagaimana gerangan wajah bangsamu yang mengibakan sekarang ini pada duapuluh tahun medatang? (p. 288)

Aduh! My friend, what will your so-saddening-a-people look like twenty years from now? (p. 145)

Similarly, the word *aduhai*, which is used to show admiration, can be used as it is in TT. That way, TT readers will get to know a new word, because there is no equivalent of *aduhai* in English, except with a phatic sentence that starts with ‘how’ as in ‘How pretty she is’. *Aduhai*, on the other hand, which is used to express a surprise, as a response to a surprising or shocking situation or a sarcastic response can be translated into ‘oh my God’, ‘oh my’, ‘my oh my’ or ‘oh dear’. The word can be retained should the context allow.

[2]

Aduhai, kursi goyang, kau akan jadi saksi bagaimana aku harus menghinakan diri sendiri untuk memuliakan seorang bupati yang tak kukenal. (p. 180)

Aduhai! Rocking chair, you will be a witness of how I must humiliate myself in order to glorify some *bupati* I don’t even know. (p. 87)

Suggestion:

Oh my! Rocking chair, you will be a witness of how I must humiliate myself in order to glorify some *bupati* I don’t even know. (p. 87)

Oh my God! Rocking chair, you will be a witness of how I must humiliate myself in order to glorify some *bupati* I don’t even know. (p. 87)

The word *eilok* is actually only orthographic writing of the sound /ei/, a sign of the emphasis of *elok*, which in English is equivalent to beautiful or wonderful. This sound /ei/ can be translated into English by using a phatic communication expression ‘how...’ or ‘oh, how...’. *Eilok*, however, was replaced with an interjection ‘oho’, which contains less emotive meaning. The results can be compared as in sentence [3] below.

[3]

Dan aku sebagai kelinci yang dapat ditangkapnya dari pinggir jalan. **Eilok!** **Haibat!** (p. 215)

And I was the guinea pig caught by them along the side of the road. **Oho!** **Incredible!** (p. 106)

Suggestions:

And I was the guinea pig caught by them along the side of the road. **How wonderful!** **Incredible!** (p. 106)

And I was the guinea pig caught by them along the side of the road. **Oh, how wonderful!** **Incredible!** (p. 106)

Back translation:

Dan aku sebagai kelinci yang dapat ditangkapnya dari pinggir jalan. **Oho!** Haibat!

Dan aku sebagai kelinci yang dapat ditangkapnya dari pinggir jalan. **Betapa eiloknya!** Haibat!

The exclamation of '*masaallah*' or '*masya Allah*' serves to express feelings of wonder, affection, and surprise can actually be translated into 'Oh my God!' or 'Oh my Lord!', however, it was decided to be eliminated, thereby reducing the weight of cultural and emotive meaning contained in said speech.

[4]

Masaallah, dia tahu Victor Hugo. Dan aku malu bertanya siapa dia. (p. 163)

....., And I was embarrassed to ask who Victor Hugo was. (p. 77)

Suggestion:

Oh my God! she knew Victor Hugo. And I was embarrassed to ask who he was.

Allah has been absorbed in English and has been in language dictionary entries such as the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. *Allah* is defined as 'name of God among Muslims' (1974: 23), thus if exclamation *Ya Allah!* is maintained as it is, it will still be understood by TT readers. On the contrary, the exclamation of *Ya Tuhan!* will not be understood by TT readers if it is not translated as the word *Tuhan* is Indonesian and has not been in dictionaries' entry. The literal translation of *Ya Tuhan!* into 'yes God', also feels rather odd. The best solution is translating it into 'Oh God' or 'Oh my God' or 'for God sake', 'for Christ sake', which is more striking.

[5]

"Ditimbang Nenendamu jadi bupati, ditimbang dihormati semua orang anak terpandai dalam keluarga terpandai di seluruh kota ya Tuhan, bakal apa jadinya anak ini!" (p. 185)

"Prepared by your grandfather to be a *bupati*, to be honoured by all people, the cleverest child in the family . . . the cleverest in the town . . . **yes, God**, what will become of this child!" (p. 89)

Suggestion:

"Prepared by your grandfather to be a *bupati*, to be honoured by all people, the cleverest child in the family . . . the cleverest in the town . . . **oh my God/ for God sake**, what will become of this child!"

As a part of speech that carries an emotive meaning and are able to make a literary work closer to the real-life, extra caution is needed when translating an exclamation. If the context is perceived to be sufficient to help TT readers understand its meaning, it should be transported as it is because this means there will be linguistic enrichment for TT readers.

Phatic Expression

There are almost 20 types of expressions fall under phatic communion category found in *Bumi Manusia*. Some have been translated well, a few can still be adjusted, in order to maintain the equivalent with the SL.

In certain cases, certain phatic communions from SL sometimes contain features which are equivalent in TT. If that is the case, then the respective phatic communions can be transported directly as it is. It is guaranteed that the TT readers will still be able to understand the rest of the text. As the proof, even when a phatic particle in a sentence is removed, the overall meaning of the sentence is still retained, nothing feels unchanged and it still sounds beautiful. What might slightly change is the weight of its naturalness.

[1]

“Bohong! Ah, kau bohong, Mas,” ditariknya lenganku keras-keras, memprotes jalannya kebenaran yang tidak tepat. (p. 357)

“Liar! **Ah**, you’re lying, *Mas*,” and she pulled my arm hard, protesting against untrue course of the story. (p. 182)

When the phatic communion is discarded:

“Bohong! Kau bohong, Mas,” ditariknya lenganku keras-keras, memprotes jalannya kebenaran yang tidak tepat.

“Liar! You’re lying, *Mas*,” and she pulled my arm hard, protesting against untrue course of the story.

[2]

“Kowe coba-coba lawan perintahku, hei?” (p. 520)

“You’re trying to oppose my orders, **hey!**” (p. 270)

When the phatic communion is discarded:

“Kowe coba-coba lawan perintahku?”

“You’re trying to oppose my orders!”

[3]

“**Ai-ai**, Tuanmuda Minke!” *sambut Mevrouw Telinga bawel itu.* (p. 70)

“**Ai-ai**, Master Minke!” Mrs. Telinga, my talkative old landlady called out. (p. 30)

When the phatic communion is discarded:

“*Tuanmuda Minke!*” *sambut Mevrouw Telinga bawel itu.*

“Master Minke!” Mrs. Telinga, my talkative old landlady called out.

Likewise, the particle *koq*, which has an exclusive social meaning - only spoken by speakers of Indonesian/Javanese only, has no equivalent in English; if it is decided to be eliminated there will be no meaningful impact.

[4]

“*Ya, Dik,*” *katanya pada Nyai, calon besan,* “*bocah koq* *begini ayu seperti Nawungwulan.*” (p. 450)

“Ya, Sis,” she said to *Nyai*, the future mother-in-law of her son, “a child so beautiful, like *Nawangwulan.*” (p. 233)

If the phatic particles are retained, the writing can be adapted to the target language orthographic system, this the emotive weight can also be retained.

[5]

“*Kowe coba-coba lawan perintahku, hei?*” (p. 520)

“You’re trying to oppose my orders, **hey!**” (p. 270)

[6]

“*Minum manis! Minum hoseeeee!*” (p. 202)

“Drink it, sweetie! Drink **hosééééé!**” (p. 98)

Emotive, social or cultural phatic expressions have their equivalent. Here is an example.

[7]

“*Tidak, eh, eh*” (p. 34)

“No, **Ny, Ny . . .**” (p. 13)

It has been universally acclaimed (except in a few cultures) that if a person refuses and offer and does not want to use “No, thank you”, he will shake his head while saying ‘eh-eh’ which is pronounced /ə-ə/, accompanied by a shake of the head. In informal

English, the speaker tends to use the word ‘ny’ or ‘nope’ instead of ‘no’. Likewise, with the particle *nah*, one of which functions is to indicate the end of a stage of speech and a gesture of request from the speaker for the hearer’s attention to the next utterance, which can be likened to the phrase *baiklah*, so that it can be translated into ‘all right’ or its equivalent ‘now’.

[8a]

“**Nah**, kalian, salah seorang tampil, memberikan uraian atau tanggapan, barangkali juga penilaian.” (p. 316)

“**All right**, one of you come forward and give us your reactions and comments on this story, perhaps even a critique.” (p. 160)

[8b]

“**Nah**, sahabat, pasukan Mellema, begitu tulis teman dari Nederland itu, memasuki rumah besar Mard Wongs minta penginapan.” (p. 328)

“**Now**, Mellema’s platoon, so writes my friend from the Netherlands, entered Mard Wongs’s house to shelter there for a night. (p. 166)

Aside from carrying emotive meanings - spoken when people are happy, and social meanings - spoken by certain circles, at certain times, and has already been archaic; the *ai-ai* phatic particle also contains cultural meaning - only in literary works; hence, it really should be retained.

[9a]

“**Ai-ai**, Tuanmuda Minke!” sambut Mevrouw Telinga bawel itu. (p. 70)

“**Ai-ai**, Master Minke!” Mrs. Telinga, my talkative old landlady called out. (p. 30)

[9b]

“**Ai-ai**, Sinyo jangan pula-pula tidak belpengalaman begitu.” (p. 244)

“**Ai-ai** don’t pletend (sic) Sinyo has never done this before!” (p. 122)

Of all the phatic expressions, only a few have not been translated correctly. Below are examples.

[10a]

“Tak dengarkan **sih**, Oom ini.” (p. 275)

“You’re not listening, **heh** Uncle, come on!” (p. 138)

One of the functions of phatic particle *sih* is to replace the task of *-ah* or *-kah*. In English, ‘-ah’ and ‘-kah’ are tag-question; thus, it would be best to substitute with ‘heh’, however, the sentence should be converted into a tag-question form.

[10b]

*Kemudian: “Ran, ran, pata plan! Ran, plan, plan,” dari Foly Tambour. “Tak dengarkan **sih**, Oom ini.” (hlm 275)*

Then: “Ran, ran pata plan! Ran, plan, plan,” from Jolie Tambour. “You’re not listening, **aren’t you, Oom**. Come on!”

The same applies for the *yah* particle. This particle is not the same *ya* because *yah* is used to express doubt or uncertainty, so it will not be suitable to be translated into ‘yes’. It should be retained as it is.

[11]

Kecuali, **yah**, kecuali dari B. ke kotaku sendiri, T. (p. 176)

Except, yes, except from B- to my own town T-. (p. 85)

Suggestion:

*Except, **yah**, except from B- to my own town T-.*

Unlike the phatic particles, the phatic words and phrases are mostly fixed and standard, thus finding an equivalent is the best translating process. Some phatic words and phrases like *adieu*, *ayoh* and *daag* can be retained and absorbed into English as long as the context allows.

[12]

*Ya, harus melepaskan Annelies, **Adieu**, ma belle! (p. 282)*

Yes, I must let go of Annelies. **Adieu**, ma belle! (p. 142)

[13]

*“**Ayoh**,” katanya, “kita pergi sekarang.” (p. 19)*

“**Ayoh!**”, he said. “We’ll go now.” (p. 6)

[14]

*“**Daag**, Jean, Minke, tumben pada duduk-duduk berdua sepagi ini,” sapa Tuan Telinga dalam Melayu. (p. 276)*

“**Daag**, Jean, Minke, what’s going on? You two sitting out here together so early in the morning?” he greeted us in Malay. (p. 139)

The data show that there have been inconsistencies in translating phatic communions. For example *'alleluya'* which is globally used and absorbed in English into *'hallelujah'*, is not translated at all; the word *'ayoh'* is only used once but in subsequent appearances it is always surrounded by supporting contexts; the word *'tabik'* which carries cultural and social meaning - only used by Indonesians in the Dutch era, is neither retained nor translated. Likewise, the phrase *'selamat berpisah'* is translated into *'happy separation'* even though there is a standard phrase *'goodbye'*; while the phrase *'damai dan sejahtera'* is translated into *'peace and well-being be with you'*, which is not commonly used.

[15]

Jean Marais: “**Hallelujah**, Minke, *ca va*? He greeted me in French, forcing me too to use his language.”

Minke: “*Ca va bien*, Jean, I have some work for you. One sitting-room suite,’ I gave him a drawing of what the customer wanted.”

[16a]

“**Ayoh**, *nyanyikan veni, vidi, vici – Datang, Lihat, Menang.*” (p. 20)

“**Come on**, sing *veni, vidi, vici – I came, I saw, I conquered*” (p. 6)

Suggestions:

“**Ayoh**, sing *veni, vidi, vici – I came, I saw, I conquered*,” he prompted me to join in between the rattle of the wheels.

[16b]

“*Ayoh, mari ikut, sedikit-tidaknyanya kalau kau da keberatan.*” (p. 43)

“**Come on**, come along.” (p. 17)

Suggestion:

“**Ayoh**, *come along, if you don't mind.*”

[16c]

Teruskan, ayoh, teruskan, darah raja-raja Jawa! (p. 184)

Come on, keep going, continue, blood of kings of Java! (p. 89)

Suggestion:

Ayoh, keep going, continue, blood of kings of Java!

[17a]

“Tabik, Sinyo!” tegurnya bebas, lunak dan memikat. (p. 47)

“Greetings, Sinyo” she addressed me freely, softly and enticingly. (p. 19)

Suggestion:

“Tabik, Sinyo” she addressed me freely, softly and enticingly.

[17b]

“Tabik, Tuanmuda!” seru Darsam dari samping andong. (p. 222)

“Greetings, Young Master!” called Darsam from beside the *andong*. (p. 110)

Suggestion:

“Tabik, Young Master!” called Darsam from beside the *andong*. (p. 110)

[18]

Selamat berpisah, impian, untuk takkan bertemu kembali, kapan dan di mana pun.

(p. 282)

Happy separation, oh dream, which I’ll never meet again, not any time nor in any place. (p. 142)

Suggestion:

Goodbye, oh dream, which I’ll never meet again, not any time nor in any place. (p. 142)

[19]

Damai dan sejahtera untukmu, Miriamku yang tulus. (p. 290)

Peace and well being (sic) be with you, my sincere Miriam. (p. 145)

Suggestion:

All the best, my sincere Miriam.

Wishing you all the best, my sincere Miriam.

It can be said that the main key to the success of the translation of this phatic category once again greatly depends on the consistency of the translator.

CONCLUSION

Interjections, exclamations and phatic communions are themselves quite unique. There have been conflicting opinions regarding their status. They respectively can be just particles, morphemes, words, phrases but they definitely can be a (minor and extra-) sentence. Other than their conceptual meaning, interjections, exclamations and phatic

communions mostly carry other types of meaning, for instance emotive – ‘hmmmp!’ expresses an anger, connotative – ‘*Masyaallah!!!*’ expresses disbelieve, social – ‘ai-ai!’ shows that the speaker is of Chinese background and very often they are culturally bound for instance ‘daag!’ – is of Dutch culture, ‘*sih*’ – is of Betawi culture. As a novel normally depicts a life in a certain period in the past, very often some have been archaic – ‘*Tabik!*’ – mostly used during the Dutch colonization.

Extra caution needs to be done when translating a text from one language to the other. Firstly, all interjections, exclamations and phatic communions containing socio-cultural meaning including those which has been archaic, universally used and understood, and written in other language than that of ST should be retained. The spelling and the orthography can be adjusted to TL system if necessary, especially when the context allows. Secondly, in case the interjections, exclamations and phatic communions do have equivalent in TL, it is highly suggested to be translated as the interjections, exclamations and phatic communions of the TT also contain certain meaning and they will give emotional impacts to the TT readers. Thirdly, those who do not have the equivalent should be retained as they are. On its first appearance, the translator can add extra information or an extra interjection, exclamation and phatic communion from TL, but on their second appearance onward, they can be retained as they are. Last but not least, it is also possible to convert interjections, exclamations and phatic communions into different part of speech, for instance, particle *sih* is turned into tag-question type “....., aren’t you?”

References

- Abercrombie, D. (1998). Phatic Communion. In J. L. Mey (Ed.), *The Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics* (pp. 672–673). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Ameka, F. (1992). Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(2–3), 101–118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(92\)90048-G](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90048-G)
- Bloomfield, L. (1993). *Language*. Retrieved from <https://www.press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/L/bo3636364.html>
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford, The UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, V. J., & Newson, M. (2010). Chomsky’s Universal Grammar. In *Blackwell Publishing*. Retrieved from http://d.wanfangdata.com.cn/periodical_khgsbl201004025.aspx
- Coupland, J. (2014). *Small Talk*. New York, NY, The USA: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge, The UK: Cambridge University Press.

-
- Crystal, D. (2017). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. In *Language* (Vol. 68, p. 422). Cambridge University Press.
- Cuenca, M. J. (2000). Defining the indefinable? Interjections. *Syntaxis* 3, 29–44. Retrieved from <http://rabida.uhu.es/dspace/bitstream/handle/10272/3204/b15127369.pdf?sequence=1>
- Deborah tannen; Heidi Hamilton, D. S. (2015). Discourse analysis. In *Applied Linguistics for Teachers of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-8467-4.ch010>
- Gehweiler, E. (2008). From proper name to primary interjection: The case of gee! *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 9(1), 71–88. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.9.1.05geh>
- Holmes, J. (2011). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York, NY, The USA: Routledge.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Concluding Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language* (pp. 350–377). Cambridge, The UK: MIT Press.
- Jumanto, D. (2014). Phatic Communication: How English Native Speakers Create Ties of Union. *American Journal of Linguistics*, 3(1), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.linguistics.20140301.02>
- Kridalaksana, H. (2007). *Kelas Kata dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Larson, M. L. (1998). *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Lanham, Maryland, the USA: University Press of America.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles in Pragmatics*. New York, NY, The USA: Longman Group Ltd.
- Leech, G. (1985). *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Leech, G. (1989). *An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage*. Edinburgh, The UK: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.
- Lightfoot, D. W. (2002). *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199250691.001.0001>
- Malinowski, B. (1923). The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages. In C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards (Ed.), *The Meaning of Meaning* (pp. 296–336). New York, NY, The USA: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Mey, Jacob L. (2001). Pragmatics: An introduction, 2nd edition. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 86, p. 386.

-
- Mrochen, I. (2009). *A history of emotive interjections in English: what, why and how* (Uniwersytet Śląski, Katowice). Retrieved from https://rebus.us.edu.pl/bitstream/20.500.12128/5214/1/Mrochen_A_history_of_emotive_interjections_in_English.pdf
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. <https://doi.org/10.1556/acr.14.2013.1.8>
- Nardiati, S., Suwadji, Sukardi, Pardi, & Suwatno, E. (1992). *Kamus Bahasa Jawa - Bahasa Indonesia 1*. Retrieved from http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahasa_Jawa
- O'Sullivant, T., Hartley, J., Saunders, D., Montgomery, M., & Fiske, J. (1994). *Key Concepts in Communication and Cultural Studies*. London, The UK: Routledge.
- Quirk, R., & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A University Grammar Of English*. London, The UK: Longman Publishing Group.
- Renkema, J. (2009). *Discourse, of Course: An overview of research in discourse studies*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Renkema, J., & Schubert, C. (2018). Introduction to Discourse Studies. In *Discourse Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1075>
- Toer, P. A. (2002). *Bumi Manusia* (9th ed.). Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Hasta Mitra.
- Toer, P. A., & Lane, M. (1996). This Earth of Mankind. In *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (Vol. 53). New York, NY, The USA: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Verschueren, J. (1999). Understanding Pragmatics. In *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166\(00\)00022-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(00)00022-9)
- Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantic, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. New York, NY, The USA.
- Wijk, G. van. (1985). Tata Bahasa Melayu. In *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (Vol. 53). Retrieved from [http://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id/2641/1/Tata Bahasa Melayu %281985%29.pdf](http://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id/2641/1/Tata_Bahasa_Melayu_%281985%29.pdf)
- Wilkins, D. P. (1992). Interjections as deictics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(2-3), 119-158. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(92\)90049-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90049-H)