



Sarcastic Utterance Translation in Kesatria, Putri, Bintang Jatuh (Pragmatic Approach)

Salsadila Sindya Dewantari

Postgraduate in Linguistic Studies, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i2.5494>

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to explore the translation of sarcastic utterances in a novel titled *Kesatria, Putri, dan Bintang Jatuh*. In this research, the researcher analyzes the linguistic and cultural nuances involved in conveying the intended meaning and structure in the target language. The evaluation of translation quality revealed moderate accuracy, high acceptability, and excellent readability. The results suggest that the data from the source text is effectively conveyed to the target text, aligning with cultural norms and ensuring comprehensibility for the target audience. However, the negative impact of literal translation emphasizes the necessity of careful consideration in selecting appropriate techniques to preserve the nuances and effectiveness of eliciting a high-quality translation.

Keywords: *Sarcastic; Flouting; Kpbj; Translation Technique; Translation Quality*

Introduction

The Cooperative Principle is a fundamental concept in pragmatics. Grice in Yule (1996), discusses Grice's Cooperative Principle as a central aspect of pragmatic analysis. The Cooperative Principle states that in conversation, participants generally follow four maxims: the Maxim of Quantity (provide as much information as is needed, and no more), the Maxim of Quality (do not provide false or misleading information), the Maxim of Relation (be relevant), and the Maxim of Manner (avoid ambiguity and be brief and orderly). Yule explores how adherence to the Cooperative Principle facilitates effective communication and how violations or flouting of these maxims can lead to implicatures—additional implied meanings beyond the literal interpretation. Understanding the Cooperative Principle is crucial for analyzing how speakers navigate communication by relying on shared expectations for cooperative and informative dialogue.

In the context of Grice's (1989) Cooperative Principle and conversational maxims, "flouting" refers to the intentional violation or non-observance of these maxims by a speaker during communication. Grice introduced the concept of flouting to explain instances where speakers deviate from the expected adherence to the maxims to convey meaning indirectly. When a speaker flouts a maxim, they intentionally provide information that seems to violate the maxim, prompting the listener to infer a more nuanced or implicit meaning. This violation often leads to implicatures, which are additional implied meanings

beyond the literal interpretation of the words. Grice argued that listeners, in understanding these implicatures, engage in cooperative interpretation to make sense of the speaker's intention. For example, if someone asks, "How was your presentation?" and the speaker responds, "Well, the audience stayed awake," they are flouting the Maxim of Quality (providing truthful information) to convey a sarcastic or critical implication about the audience's engagement.

Next, sarcasm consistent with Grice's framework in pragmatics can be viewed as a strategy for flouting the maxims. Sarcasm often involves intentional flouting of one or more of these maxims, particularly the Maxim of Quality (providing truthful information) and the Maxim of Relation (being relevant). When a speaker uses sarcasm, they deliberately say something opposite to what they mean, relying on the listener to recognize the incongruity and infer the intended, often ironic, meaning. For instance, if someone says, "Nice job!" in a sarcastic tone when the actual performance was subpar, they flout the Maxim of Quality by not providing straightforward, positive feedback. Instead, they communicate a critical or ironic message through the violation of this maxim.

As we transition from the nuanced exploration of sarcasm within Grice's pragmatic framework to the realm of translation, the interplay of language intricacies continues to unfold. Translation, as a complex process involving the transposition of meaning from one language to another, introduces a different facet to the study of linguistic expression. The application of translation techniques becomes paramount in understanding how linguistic features, such as those identified by Baker (1992) as universals of translation, manifest in the translated context. In essence, just as sarcasm manipulates language for specific communicative effects within the bounds of Grice's maxims, the choices made during translation, guided by various techniques, shape the outcome of the target text, navigating the delicate balance between linguistic equivalence and the preservation of intended meaning.

Translation techniques are defined as instruments of textual analysis that, in combination with other instruments, allow the study of how translation equivalence works in relation to the original text. These techniques are used to analyze and classify how translation equivalence works, affecting the result of the translation, micro-units of text, and being discursive, contextual, and functional in nature. Molina & Albir (2002) identified eighteen translation techniques, which are: Adaption, Amplification, Borrowing, Calque, Compensation, Descriptive, Discursive creation, Established Equivalent, Generalization, Linguistic amplification, Linguistic Compression, Literal Translation, Modulation, Particularization, Reduction, Substitution, Transposition, and Variation.

Translation quality is the degree to which a translated text faithfully and effectively conveys the meaning, style, and cultural nuances of the source text. Assessing translation quality is crucial as it ensures accurate and culturally sensitive renditions, preserving the intended meaning and facilitating effective communication across linguistic boundaries. According to Nababan (2012), translation quality assessment is focused on three main aspects: accuracy, acceptability, and readability. Accuracy refers to the equivalence of the source language and target language, while acceptability refers to the degree to which the translation is acceptable to the target audience. Readability refers to the ease with which the target audience can read and understand the translation. These aspects are influenced by the translator's competence, the impact on the translation results, the classification of translation solutions, the influence on the micro-units of the text, and the discursive and contextual nature of the translation techniques. Translation techniques, such as adaptation, amplification, borrowing, calque, compensation, description, discursive creation, established equivalent, generalization, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, literal translation, modulation, and particularization, are analyzed to assess the quality of the translation.

In this research, the researcher analysed the sarcastic utterance translation in the novel which is titled *Supernova: Kesatria, Putri, dan Bintang Jatuh*. The novel "Supernova: Kesatria, Putri, dan Bintang Jatuh" by Dee Lestari was translated into English. The English translation of the novel is titled "Supernova: The Knight, the Princess, and the Falling Star" and was published in 2016. Supernova:

Kesatria, Putri, dan Bintang Jatuh is a science fiction novel by Dee Lestari, a well-known Indonesian singer and novelist. The novel was first published in 2001 and is the first book in the six-part Supernova series.

Translating sarcastic utterances poses a formidable challenge as it necessitates not only linguistic proficiency but also a deep understanding of cultural nuances and context, given that sarcasm heavily relies on subtleties, tone, and shared knowledge; capturing the intended ironic meaning without compromising cultural relevance demands a delicate balance, making it a complex endeavor in the realm of cross-cultural communication. This research analyzed through pragmatic approach. The pragmatic approach to analyzing sarcastic utterances offers a valuable lens by considering context, speaker intentions, and the cooperative nature of communication; it enables a nuanced exploration of the contextual cues, implicatures, and conversational dynamics inherent in sarcasm, providing a more comprehensive understanding of how speakers strategically deploy this complex linguistic phenomenon.

Methods

Blaxter, Hughes, and Tight (as cited in Santosa, 2021) assert that methodology refers to the ways or methods employed in conducting research. Research methodology is associated with the fundamental approach used to determine the research location, data sources, data collection, sampling, data validity, analysis, and so forth. Consequently, it can be inferred that research methodology is procedural in nature, involving the steps taken by researchers throughout the research process (Santosa, 2021).

In the realm of research, the term "method" encompasses the specific techniques and procedures employed to gather and analyze data. It serves as the practical application of the broader methodological framework. Researchers adopt various methods depending on the nature of their study, such as surveys, interviews, experiments, or content analysis. These methods are instrumental in addressing research questions, testing hypotheses, and ultimately contributing to the advancement of knowledge in a particular field.

In conclusion, research methodology involves a comprehensive set of procedures and approaches that guide researchers in conducting systematic investigations. It encompasses both the practical methods employed in data collection and analysis and the theoretical considerations that shape the research design. A robust methodology is crucial for producing reliable and valid research outcomes, contributing significantly to the advancement of knowledge within a specific field of study (Santosa, 2021).

In this research, the researcher will analyze impoliteness from novel titled *Kesatria, Putri, dan Bintang Jatuh*. Next, the data collection will be analyzed using Miles and Huberman (1984) theory. They are:

1. Data Collection

- Qualitative data collection methods, such as interviews, observations, and document analysis, are employed to gather rich and detailed information.
- Data collection is often iterative and continues throughout the research process.

2. Data Reduction

- This step involves condensing and summarizing the raw data.
- Coding and categorization are used to identify patterns, themes, and key concepts in the data.

3. Data Display

- Miles and Huberman emphasize the use of visual representations, such as matrices or tables, to organize and display data.
- Data displays facilitate the exploration of relationships and patterns within the data.

4. Drawing Conclusions

- Researchers draw conclusions by synthesizing patterns identified in the data displays.
- The goal is to develop a coherent and meaningful interpretation of the data.

5. Verification

- The research procedure includes strategies for ensuring the trustworthiness and validity of findings.
- Triangulation, member checking, and peer review are some of the techniques employed for verification.

6. Writing the Report

- Researchers document and communicate their findings in a comprehensive and coherent manner.
- The report includes a detailed description of the research process, data analysis, and the interpretation of results.

Results and Discussion

1. The Concept of Sarcastic Utterance

Sarcasm is a type of utterance that fits into Grice's overall theoretical picture. According to Grice's (1989) Cooperative Principle, speakers are expected to follow certain conversational maxims, such as the maxim of relevance and the maxim of quality. By flouting these maxims, speakers can produce sarcastic utterances. The standard implicature view is that in speaking sarcastically, a speaker implicates the opposite of what she actually says. Sarcasm is context-dependent and can be recognized by the inflection with which it is spoken or by the extreme disproportion of the comment to the situation. Sarcasm is often used as a tool for politeness, group affiliation, sophistication, evaluation, persuasive aspects, and retractability. Sarcasm is less common among strangers and more common among friends and family. Sarcasm recognition and expression both require the development of understanding forms of language, especially if sarcasm occurs without a cue or signal.

In this research, the researcher has found 25 data regarding sarcastic utterances. All those utterances were conveyed by one of the characters, named Diva to her clients. In this novel, Diva is a model and also sex worker that has a beautiful face and blunt. All those utterances are conveyed when they would like to do a 'transaction.' Here is the detailed information:

Data 1

Saya Cantik? Ya, Sudah Tahu. Ada Untungnya? Saya Rasa Nggak. Saya Capek, Terus Terang Saja. Bahkan Lupa Kalau Kita Ada Janji. Tapi Tenang, Saya Profesional.

Gloss

"Am I Beautiful? Yes, I already Know. Is There any Benefit? I don't Think So. I'm Tired, to Be Honest. I Even Forgot That We Had an Appointment. But Don't Worry, I'm Professional."

The provided text contains elements that contribute to its sarcastic tone. Sarcasm often involves saying something but meaning the opposite, and it is typically conveyed through tone, context, or choice of words. Here are some aspects in the text that contribute to its sarcastic nature:

- Repetition of self-evident facts: The repetition of "*Saya cantik?*" (**Beautiful?**) followed by "*Ya, sudah tahu.*" (**I know that**) adds a sarcastic tone, as the speaker seemingly acknowledges the obvious in a dismissive manner.
- Rhetorical question: The question "*Ada untungnya?*" (**Is there any benefit?**) is rhetorical and implies that the speaker believes there is no benefit to being beautiful, creating a sarcastic commentary.
- Downplaying statements: The statement "*Saya rasa nggak.*" (**I don't think so**) downplays the potential advantages of being beautiful, contributing to the sarcastic tone by suggesting the speaker is being modest or ironic.
- Bluntness and honesty claim: The phrase "*Saya capek, terus terang saja.*" (**To be honest, I'm exhausted**) is delivered in a straightforward manner, claiming honesty, but the overall context suggests a sarcastic twist, as if the speaker is implying they are tired of such obvious statements.
- Casual dismissal: The line "*Tapi tenang, saya profesional.*" (**But don't worry, I'm professional**) is casually dismissive, implying that despite the apparent flaws or issues raised earlier, the speaker asserts their professionalism in a somewhat sarcastic manner.

Data 2

Muntahan Kantor Saja Bangga

Gloss

Office Vomit, Proud.

The phrase "*Muntahan kantor saja bangga*" can be interpreted as sarcastic due to the irony and implied criticism it conveys. Here are some reasons why it might be considered sarcastic:

- Contrast between words: The phrase juxtaposes "*muntahan kantor*" (**office vomit, colloquially referring to mundane or unimportant office matters**) with "*bangga*" (**proud**). This contrast between the seemingly trivial or unpleasant "office vomit" and the notion of pride suggests sarcasm, as it implies that there is little to be proud of in such circumstances.
- Understated criticism: By using the word "*bangga*" (**proud**), the speaker is ironically asserting pride in something that is typically not considered praiseworthy. This understated criticism contributes to the sarcastic tone, suggesting that the speaker is mocking or ridiculing the notion of taking pride in mundane or unimpressive aspects of work.
- Hyperbole: The use of "*saja*" (**just**) may imply an exaggerated or dismissive tone. It suggests that taking pride in "office vomit" is so absurd or inconsequential that it doesn't warrant any additional effort or achievement.

Data 3

Mahal Saja Banyak Yang Kangen. Apalagi Kalau Saya Pasang Murah. Nggak Kebayang Repotnya Kaya Apa, Menghadapi Orang-Orang Seperti Kamu.

Gloss

Expensive, and Many Miss It. What if I Set It Cheap? Can't Imagine How Troublesome It Would Be, dealing with People Like You.

- Irony in the first sentence: The statement "*Mahal saja banyak yang kangen*" (**Expensive, and many miss it**) uses irony by suggesting that only when something is expensive, people appreciate or long for it. The speaker implies that this is an absurd or contradictory idea.
- Exaggeration with "Apalagi": The use of "*Apalagi*" (**What if**) intensifies the sarcasm by introducing an element of exaggeration. It suggests that if the speaker were to set a lower price ("*saya pasang murah*"), the situation would become even more troublesome or chaotic.
- Anticipation of trouble: The phrase "*Nggak kebayang repotnya kaya apa, menghadapi orang-orang seperti kamu*" (**Can't imagine how troublesome it would be, dealing with people like you**) explicitly conveys the sarcastic tone. The speaker anticipates difficulty in dealing with individuals who might be looking for a cheaper option, implying a negative judgment.
- Use of informal language: The informal term "*kamu*" (**you**) at the end adds a touch of directness and informality, enhancing the sarcastic and potentially condescending tone.

Data 4

Banyaklah. Tapi Kalau Saya Sebal Dengan Pejabat, Berarti Saya Juga Sama Sebalnya Dengan Kamu

Gloss

It's Plenty. But If I'm Annoyed with Officials, It Means I'm Equally Annoyed with You

The provided statement "*Banyaklah. Tapi kalau saya sebal dengan pejabat, berarti saya juga sama sebalnya dengan kamu*" includes elements of sarcasm due to its use of irony and a contrasting implication. Here's why it can be considered sarcastic:

- Irony in the first sentence: The phrase "*Banyaklah*" (**It's plenty**) could be interpreted as dismissive or even sarcastic, suggesting that there are numerous instances or reasons for the speaker to be annoyed.
- Contrast in the second sentence: The second sentence introduces a contrast by stating, "*Tapi kalau saya sebal dengan pejabat, berarti saya juga sama sebalnya dengan kamu*" (**But if I'm annoyed with officials, it means I'm equally annoyed with you**). The implication here is that being annoyed with officials is so common or expected that it is equivalent to being annoyed with the person being addressed.
- Implied criticism: The statement subtly criticizes or mocks the situation where being annoyed with authorities is considered normal or even shared by others. The speaker may be highlighting what they perceive as a flaw or absurdity in the mindset or behavior being discussed.
- Use of informal language: The use of "*kamu*" (**you**) adds an informal and direct touch, which can enhance the tone of sarcasm or criticism.

Overall, the sarcasm in this utterance lies in the speaker's ironic acknowledgment of numerous sources of frustration and the contrasting implication that being annoyed with authorities is so common that it extends to the person being addressed.

Data 5

Itu Dia. Baru Saja Kamu Tunjukkan. Kamu Mengira Bisa Membeli Sesuatu Yang Sebenarnya Tidak Dijual. Itu Namanya Delusif.

Gloss

That's It. Just Now You Showed It. You Think You Can Buy Something That Is Not Actually for Sale. That's Called Being Delusional.

The provided statement includes elements of sarcasm due to the use of irony, implicit criticism, and a dismissive tone. Here are some features that contribute to its sarcastic nature:

- **Contrast and Irony:** The phrase "*Baru saja kamu tunjukkan*" (**Just now you showed it**) suggests that the listener has just demonstrated something, but the subsequent statement challenges the validity or desirability of what was shown. This creates a contrast between the apparent demonstration and the speaker's dismissive response, introducing an element of irony.
- **Accusation of Delusion:** The statement "*Kamu mengira bisa membeli sesuatu yang sebenarnya tidak dijual. Itu namanya delusif*" (**You think you can buy something that is not actually for sale. That's called being delusional**) explicitly accuses the listener of holding a false belief or illusion. This direct accusation adds a layer of sarcasm by mocking the listener's perceived unrealistic expectations.
- **Dismissive Tone:** The use of "*Itu namanya delusif*" (**That's called being delusional**) in a straightforward manner contributes to a dismissive tone, implying that the listener's belief is not only incorrect but also somewhat ridiculous.

In summary, the sarcasm in this utterance arises from the contrast between the listener's perceived action and the speaker's dismissive and critical response, which includes a direct accusation of holding delusional beliefs.

2. The Translation Techniques of Sarcastic Utterances

While Molina and Albir (2002) have identified and categorized 18 translation techniques, this study specifically identified and utilized nine distinct techniques in the translation of sarcastic utterances. These include established equivalent, discursive creation, particularization, transposition, literal translation, amplification, description, generalization, and reduction. The following provides an elucidation of each technique employed in the translation process.

Table 2.1. Translation techniques that are used to translate sarcastic utterances

Technique	Frequency
Establish Equivalent	7
Discursive Creation	5
Particularization	4
Transposition	3
Literal	2

Amplification	1
Description	1
Generalization	1
Reduction	1
Total	25

The translation of sarcastic utterances in this study employed various techniques, as indicated by their frequencies. The most frequently used technique was “Establish Equivalent,” implemented seven times, suggesting a focus on finding equivalent expressions in the target language to convey the intended sarcasm. The frequent use of the “Establish Equivalent” technique in translating sarcastic utterances may be attributed to its effectiveness in capturing the intended meaning while maintaining cultural and linguistic appropriateness in the target language. “Discursive Creation” was used five times, indicating instances where the translator generated new discourse to capture the sarcastic tone. “Particularization” (four times) involved specifying details to enhance the sarcastic effect. “Transposition” (three times) denotes changing the syntactic structure or word order to adapt to the target language. Additionally, “Literal” translation occurred twice, maintaining a more direct rendering of the source text. The techniques of “Amplification,” “Description,” “Generalization,” and “Reduction” each appeared once, showcasing diverse approaches to translating sarcastic utterances. The variety in techniques reflects the complexity and creativity involved in rendering sarcasm across linguistic and cultural contexts.

However, during the researchers that has been done by the researcher, there’s a technique that makes the translation is out of context, which is literal translation. The use of the “Literal” translation technique in the context of sarcastic utterances is often discouraged because sarcasm frequently relies on subtle nuances, tone, and context for its effectiveness. Literal translation, which involves rendering the text word-for-word without considering the idiomatic or contextual implications, can lead to a loss of these crucial elements. Sarcasm often involves saying something opposite to the intended meaning, and a literal translation may miss the intended irony, resulting in a failure to convey the sarcastic tone.

On the other hand, the frequent use of the “Establish Equivalent” technique in translating sarcastic utterances may be attributed to its effectiveness in capturing the intended meaning while maintaining cultural and linguistic appropriateness in the target language. This technique involves finding expressions or phrases in the target language that have a similar impact, tone, or nuance as the original sarcastic utterance. Given the intricacies of sarcasm, which often rely on cultural nuances and context, establishing equivalents allows the translator to convey the intended ironic or critical message effectively. By prioritizing equivalence, the translator aims to ensure that the sarcasm is not lost in translation, contributing to the overall accuracy and effectiveness of the translated text.

3. The Translation Quality of Sarcastic Utterances

The use of translation techniques significantly influences translation quality, as the selection and application of appropriate techniques impact the accuracy, acceptability, and readability of the translated text, ultimately determining the effectiveness of conveying the intended meaning across language boundaries. A translator's attempts to condense or expand content in the target text can compromise accuracy, acceptability, and readability, underscoring the importance of maintaining faithfulness to the source text for the creation of a high-quality translation. Striving for fidelity ensures the preservation of meaning and enhances the overall effectiveness of the translated work.

Table 3.1. The Score of Translation quality

Category of Translation Quality	Scores
Accuracy	2,36
Acceptability	2,88
Readability	2,95

To achieve a high-quality translation, it is essential to ensure accuracy, acceptability, and readability. In this study, the translation quality of sarcastic utterances demonstrates moderate accuracy (score of 2.36), high acceptability (score of 2.88), and excellent readability (score of 2.95). The findings suggest that the data from the source text is effectively conveyed to the target text, preserving both the meaning and structure of sarcastic utterances. The translation aligns with the cultural norms of the target text and is easily comprehensible to the target readers. However, a single translation technique, namely literal translation, has a negative impact on accuracy, acceptability, and readability by causing the loss of construction and meaning in sarcastic utterances.

Conclusion

In this research, an exploration of sarcastic utterances and their translation techniques has been undertaken, shedding light on the complexities involved in conveying sarcasm across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Sarcasm, as a type of utterance, aligns with Grice's Cooperative Principle, where speakers intentionally flout conversational maxims to create a sarcastic effect. The implicature view posits that speakers implicate the opposite of what they say, making sarcasm a context-dependent and nuanced form of communication. The study identified 25 instances of sarcastic utterances in the source text, all conveyed by the character Diva. The translation process involved the application of various techniques, with "Establish Equivalent" being the most frequently employed, highlighting the importance of finding equivalent expressions in the target language to maintain cultural and linguistic appropriateness. However, the use of the "Literal" translation technique was found to be less effective, leading to a compromise in accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

The evaluation of translation quality revealed moderate accuracy, high acceptability, and excellent readability. The translation successfully transferred the intended meaning and structure of sarcastic utterances to the target text, aligning with cultural norms and ensuring comprehensibility for the target audience. Nevertheless, the negative impact of literal translation emphasizes the necessity of careful consideration in selecting appropriate techniques to preserve the nuances and effectiveness of sarcasm during the translation process. In conclusion, the study provides valuable insights into the challenges and strategies associated with translating sarcastic utterances, emphasizing the significance of maintaining fidelity to the source text while navigating the intricacies of language and cultural nuances.

Reference

Ackerman, B. P. (1982). Contextual Integration and Utterance Interpretation: The Ability of Children and Adults to Interpret Sarcastic Utterances. *Child Development*, 53(4), 1075–1083. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129149>.

- Al Anssari, R. S., & Hadi, H. A. N. (2021). A Pragmatic Study of Sarcasm in Selected TV Shows. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 1(1), 148. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt>.
- Baker, M. (1992). In *Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Camp, E. (2011). Sarcasm, Pretense, and The Semantics/Pragmatics Distinction. *Nous*, 45(1), 1-7.
- Grice, H.P. (1989). Logic and Conversation. In *Studies in the Way of Words* (pp. 22–40). Harvard University Press .
- Miles, M.B & Huberman. A.M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Beverly Hills: CA Sage.
- Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functional Approach. *Meta: Translator' Journal*, 47(4), 499-512.
- Nababan, M. R., Nuraeni, A., & Sumardiono. (2012). Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 24(1), 39-57.
- Reimer, M. (2013). Grice on Irony and Metaphor: Discredited by the Experimental Evidence?. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 5(1), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18773109-13050101>.
- Santosa, R. (2021). *Dasar-Dasar Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan*. Surakarta. UNS Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).