

# COMPONENT AND FUNCTION OF SPEECH ACT IN THE TRANSLATION OF *MIRROR IMAGE* INTO *BELAHAN JIWA*

I Kadek Restu Sumaranama  
Master Program in Linguistics  
Faculty of Arts, Udayana University  
Jalan Pulau Nias No 13 Denpasar 80114, Phone 0361-224121  
Bali-Indonesia  
Hand phone: 087861997112  
Email: restwo\_haifeng@yahoo.com

## ABSTRACT

This study was intended to examine the components of speech act consisting of locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act and to analyze the classification of communicative illocutionary acts and functions of speech act both in source language and target language. The data were collected from the novel entitled *Mirror Image* (Steel:1999) and its Indonesian translated version entitled *Belahan Jiwa* (Sigarlaki:2001). The results showed that there were some changes of locutionary act type of utterance that occurred in the translation, consisting of change in source language declarative form into target language interrogative form, from source language declarative form into target language imperative form, from source language interrogative form into target language imperative form and from source language imperative form into target language declarative form. The change in utterance types from the level of locutionary act into illocutionary act occurred from source language to target language. In the locutionary act, the force was only focused on the surface of the utterance form, when the utterance was brought into the illocutionary level, the involvement of the speaker's intention was added to the virtue or context of the utterance. The changes involved the ones from source language declarative into acknowledgment type of source language illocutionary with accept function, from source language interrogative into target language directive type of illocutionary with question function. The second one, the changes occurred from source language declarative into source language constantive type of illocutionary with informative function, from target language imperative into source language directive type of illocutionary with requestive function. The third one was the changes from source language interrogative into target language imperative which was classified into directive type of illocutionary with requirement function in both source language and target language. And the last one, the changes from source language imperative into directive type of illocutionary with source language requestive function, from target language declarative into target language constantive type of illocutionary with assertive function. This study expected to contribute significantly to the use of speech act approach in translation activities.

Keywords : *speech act, translation, component of speech act, function of speech act*

## ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji komponen tindak tutur yang terdiri atas; tindak lokusi, ilokusi dan perlokusi dan menganalisa klasifikasi tindak ilokusi komunikatif dan fungsi tindak tutur baik pada bahasa sumber maupun pada bahasa target. Sumber data adalah novel berjudul *Mirror Image* (Steel: 1999) dan versi terjemahan bahasa Indonesia yang berjudul *Belahan Jiwa* (Sigarlaki: 2001). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat beberapa perubahan jenis tindak lokusi yang terjadi pada terjemahan bahasa sumber ke bahasa target, yang terdiri atas perubahan dari bentuk bahasa sumber *deklaratif* menjadi bahasa target berbentuk *interogatif*, dari bentuk bahasa sumber yang *deklaratif* menjadi bentuk bahasa target *imperatif*, dari bentuk bahasa sumber *interogatif* menjadi bahasa target *imperatif*, dan dari bentuk bahasa sumber *imperatif* ke bentuk bahasa target *deklaratif*. Perubahan jenis ucapan dari tingkat tindak lokusi ke tindak ilokusi terjadi dari bahasa sumber ke bahasa target. Dalam tindak lokusi, penekanannya berasal dari bentuk ucapan, ketika ucapan itu dibawa ke tingkat ilokusi, terdapat keterlibatan niat pembicara ditambah dengan fitur atau konteks ucapan. Perubahan tersebut terdiri atas bahasa sumber *deklaratif* menjadi jenis ilokusi yang bersifat *accept* sebagai fungsi bahasa sumber, dari bahasa target *interogatif* menjadi jenis ilokusi dengan fungsi *question*. Kedua yaitu perubahan yang terjadi dari bahasa sumber *deklaratif* menjadi tipe *constantive* pada level ilokusi dengan fungsi *informatives*, dari bahasa target *imperatif* menjadi jenis ilokusi dengan fungsi *requestives*. Ketiga adalah perubahan dari bahasa sumber *interogatif* ke bahasa target *imperatif* yang diklasifikasikan ke dalam jenis *direktif* pada ilokusi dengan fungsi *requirement* pada bahasa sumber dan bahasa target. Terakhir, perubahan dari bahasa sumber *imperative* menjadi jenis *direktif* dari ilokusi dengan fungsi *requestitives*, dari bahasa sumber *deklaratif* menjadi *constantives* pada ilokusi dengan fungsi *assertives*. Penelitian ini diharapkan mampu memberikan kontribusi yang signifikan sebagai pertimbangan dalam penggunaan pendekatan tindak tutur dalam penerjemahan.

Kata kunci: *tindak tutur, penerjemahan, komponen tindak tutur, fungsi tindak tutur*

## INTRODUCTION

Brown & Yule (1983) state that the value or the use of language to transmit information is well embedded in our cultural mythology. We all believe that it is the faculty of language which has enabled the human race to develop diverse cultures, each with its distinctive social customs, religious observances, laws, oral traditions, patterns of trading and so on. Supporting this, Nida (1974) also says that each language possesses certain distinctive characteristics which give a special character, e.g. word-building capacities, unique patterns of phrase orders, technique for linking clauses into sentences,

discourse marker and a special discourse types of poetry, proverbs and expression. In the relation of using language, translation is the current phenomenon discussed. Translation is a process based on the theory that it is possible to abstract the meaning of a text from its forms and reproduce that meaning with the very different forms in a second language. Translation, then, consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of the source language text, analyzing it in order to determine its meaning, and then reconstructing this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context (Larson:1998). In translation, the unit to be translated is not limited to only word or clause. However, utterances are also one of the biggest challenging units to be transferred from Source Language (SL) into Target Language (TL). The context and message should be preserved in the whole, and not simply transferring the word per word that may cause the distortion on a package meaning and message to be lost. In this case, the concern on speech act is alerted. Therefore the task of the translator here is firstly to study the communicative functions of the sentence, to determine the meaning intended in the sentence of source language whether it is grammatical or rhetorical before he can concentrate on the analysis the receptor language ( Larson :1984). In other word, in the process of rendering, a translator should have the knowledge of both SL and TL (Sudiatmika: 2006).

In linguistic pragmatics, speech acts remain, along with presupposition and implicature in particular, one of the central phenomena that any general pragmatics theory must account for (Levinson:1983). Austin (1962) insisted that the total speech act in the total speech situation is only actual phenomenon which in the last resort, we are engaged in elucidating. He isolates three basic senses in which saying something one is doing something, and hence three kinds of acts that are simultaneously performed, such as locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act as also supported by Cook (1989). Austin in Oishi (2006) classifies illocutionary acts into five types, i.e., *verdictives*, *exer-citives*, *commissives*, *behabitives*, and *expositives*. Although it is often argued that Austin's

classification is not complete and those coined categories are not mutually exclusive, Austin's classification is best seen as an attempt to give a general picture of illocutionary acts: what types of illocutionary act one can generally perform in uttering a sentence.

The utterances may differ and change from one level act to another level of act, especially due to translation, the changes do not only occur in the level of those three basic senses, but also in the translation product of SL into its TL. The concept of an utterance with a certain meaning (that is, the concept of a locutionary act) is indeed a different concept from the concept of an utterance with a certain force (that is, the concept of an illocutionary act ) (Searle:1968). Therefore, in translation, it is obligatory for the translator first to study the communicative function of the text in SL in terms of its communicative meaning and how it is best expressed in TL (Wardhana: 2005). Based on the background, there are two research questions in the present study; they are (1) the SL and TL components of speech acts, and (2) the functions of speech acts of SL and TL. In line with these problems, the aims of this study are (1) to analyze the components of speech act of SL and TL, and (2) to discuss the functions of speech acts of SL and TL. The study aims at researching the variety of language use, since it holds such important role. In line with Melia, et.al (2013) state that the proper selection variety of language takes an important role in communication. This study also sets the purpose to contribute to the approach in the relation to translation.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

The data sources used in this study were written sources in the form of bilingual novels. The novel was written in two versions, the original English one entitled "Mirror Image" by Steel (1999) and the Indonesian translated version entitled "Belahan Jiwa" by Sigarlaki (2001). The data sources were chosen due to the availability of enormous number of speech acts in the story. The research method applied in this study was the qualitative one, intended to gather an in-depth understanding of

human behaviour and the reasons that govern such behaviour. The qualitative method investigates the *why* and *how* of decision making that provides the result of investigation of study descriptively by arranging explanation through words and sentences. The method of this research also involves a series of processes from the collection until the analysis of data. In collecting the data, both, SL and TL texts were observed side by side to find the phenomenon of speech act change from SL into TL. The collected data in the form of speech acts or utterances were filtered and highlighted for the discussion. Eventually, the data were utilized to do discuss the three components of speech acts by applying the theory of speech acts proposed by Austin (1962). It was also completed with the discussion of classification of communicative illocutionary acts and functions of speech act both in SL and TL proposed by Bach and Harnish (1976). In analyzing the data, generally, there were processes of inspecting, cleaning, transforming, and modeling data with the goal of highlighting useful information, suggesting conclusions, and supporting decision making of the study.

## DISCUSSION

The analysis was conducted upon the translation of speech acts from SL into TL. The collected data were classified and labeled according to the change of utterance type in SL and in TL. This study involved the discussion on components and functions of speech acts in SL and TL. Austin (1962) classifies three basic senses of speech act consisting of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Afterwards, it was completed with a more in detail discussion of illocutionary act and function of speech act based on the theory of taxonomy of communicative illocutionary acts proposed by Bach and Harnish (1976).

### **Change from SL Declarative form into TL Interrogative form**

No	SL	TL
(3-1)	Olivia : “I think she went to play tennis at the Astors ‘’ Olivia said vaguely, with no	Olivia : “kurasa dia main tenis di kediaman keluarga Astor” jawab Olivia ragu-ragu,

---

<p>clear idea of where she was, but only a vague suspicion. Edward ‘<i>typical of her</i>’ (p.9)</p>	<p>karena ia tak tahu dimana adiknya berada. Edward : ‘<i>yang benar?</i>’ (p.15)</p>
--	---

---

### **Components of Speech Act in SL and TL**

The production of an utterance as communicative product goes through a complex process from concept formed in the human mind, or called as human information processing (Bell:1991). Therefore in the discussion of speech act component, there are three main components are investigated as discussed in following section.

#### **Locutionary Act**

Austin (1962) defines locutionary act as utterance of a sentence with a determinate sense and reference. Locutionary acts include *phonetic* acts, *phatic* acts, and *rhetic* acts. Phonetic acts are acts of pronouncing sounds, phatic acts are acts of uttering words or sentences in accordance with the phonological and syntactic rules of the language to which they belong, and rhetic acts are acts of uttering a sentence with a sense and a more or less definite reference. The change in SL utterance type in TL occurred in the above data. According to its locutionary act, SL utterance ‘‘typical of her’’ is a type of simply *declarative*. While, in TL, the utterance changed into *interrogative* type ‘‘yang benar?’’. The SL utterance ‘‘typical of her’’; when having no illocutionary force, is simply a *statement* or *declarative*, and its TL ‘‘yang benar’’ means simply a *question*.

#### **Illocutionary Act**

Quirk (1985) states that primary illocutionary force of a declarative sentence is to make a statement. As Austin (1962) states that illocutionary act must consider the virtue of the conventional force associated with it or with its explicit performative paraphrase. According to Bach and Harnish (1976), communicative illocutionary acts are derived into constantives, directives, commissives and acknowledgements. SL utterance ‘‘typical of her’’ has illocutionary act not simply as *declarative*. The

utterance was the *acknowledgement* type of communicative illocutionary act. It expressed feelings regarding the hearer or in cases where the utterance is clearly perfunctory or formal, the speaker's intention that his utterance satisfies a social expectation to express certain feelings and his belief that it does (Bach and Harnish :1976). SL illocutionary act showed that the speaker, Edward, acknowledged the answer of his daughter, Olivia was telling about her twin sister; Victoria was going to play tennis at the moment. Edward understood that Victoria was a dynamic girl who loved to wander and leave home; therefore, he acknowledged this fact by saying "typical of her. While, in TL, the utterance "yang benar" changed in illocutionary act. It signified more on type of *directives* communicative illocutionary acts. The utterance showed that the intention of Edward to question his hesitance of Olivia's answer about where Victoria was indeed. The utterance was intended not only to question but to push Olivia to clarify and interrogate the truth of Victoria's disposition.

### **Perlocutionary Act**

Austin (1962) defines perlocutionary act as effect brought on the audience by means of uttering the sentence; such effects being special to the circumstances of utterance. Both SL and TL brought the same effect to hearers. Even though in locutionary and illocutionary acts, the utterances were differently communicated, the effect showed by Olivia as the hearer was consistent. Olivia, hearing his father's utterance made herself doubt and hesitant upon her answer saying that Victoria was playing tennis at Astors. Moreover, when her father noticed that Astors was leaving for Maine at the moment made Olivia embarrassed and apologize due to lie she did on behalf of her sister.

### **Function of Speech Act in SL and TL**

The SL "typical of her" has the function of *accept* subtype of acknowledgment communicative illocutionary act. The acknowledgment showing *accept* means in uttering the expression, the speaker accepts the hearer acknowledgment by expressing appreciation for the hearer's acknowledgment (Bach and Harnish :1976). The utterance was the way of appreciating that Edward showed to Olivia's

confession when she was asked about where her sister was. However, based on TL, besides containing acknowledgment, it also functioned to question. *Question* is one of derived subtypes of directives. It was used to ask, inquire, interrogate, query, question and quiz. Olivia was asked the utterance ‘‘yang benar?’’ since her father was hesitant of Olivia’s answer. It proved that her father was indeed aware of Olivia’s pretense. However, her father resorted to honor his daughter’s acknowledgment

**Change from SL form of Declarative into TL form of Imperative**

No	SL	TL
(3-2)	Victoria : ‘ <i>I’d like to point out to you</i> ’. Victoria said coldly as the cab pulled up in front of their house. (p.47)	Victoria : ‘ <i>harap kalian tahu</i> ’, cetus Victoria dingin ketika taksi berhenti di depan rumah. (p.46)

**Component of Speech Act in SL and TL**

The stages in understanding the component of speech act consist of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act as analyzed as follows.

**Locutionary Act**

The form or type of utterance of SL is *declarative*. It shows that Victoria declared something through positive *statement*. In locutionary act level, it still had no meaning than simply a *declarative utterance* that was pointed out to the two hearers; Olivia and Charles. While, the type of SL’s utterance changed into *imperative* in TL. It signified that Victoria ordered Charles and Olivia to know something by saying ‘‘harap kalian tau’’.

**Illocutionary Act**

SL utterance was classified as *constantives* type of communicative illocutionary act according to Bach and Harnish (1976). In general, it is the expression of a belief, together with the expression of an intention that the hearer form (or continue to hold) a like belief. It was the expression of Victoria’s belief that she was not to be blamed yet she was not in need of help by either Olivia or Charles. By

saying the utterance, Victoria wished to claim her belief and stance that she was not a guilty-girl after being arrested due to joining demonstration. In TL's version, the utterance became illocutionary *directives*. *Directive* expresses Victoria's attitude toward some prospective action by the hearer; Charles and Olivia. Besides, at the illocutionary level, the utterance has potential illocutionary act as expression of belief (*constative*), it was also a directive type which was intended to bring the hearer; Olivia and Charles to listen and concern to what Victoria was about to communicate. She intended to gather Charles and Olivia into one cognition; that she felt and insisted for not needing any help. Therefore, the utterance was objected to both, convey her belief and grab the attention of the hearers to listen to her belief at once.

### **Perlocutionary Act**

The perlocutionary act refers to the impact caused on the hearers. The impact caused by Victoria's utterance was the attention given by either Charles or Olivia. Both utterances; in SL and TL brought the same perlocutionary impact. As explained above, that Victoria's utterance contained at least two illocutionary acts; that was intended to direct the hearer to pay attention and before then to communicate her belief. Victoria believed that she was not in demand of help. She tried hard to build image that she was tough and less need of rescue. This utterance carried perlocutionary impact on Charles, of which, he thought Victoria as only a little young unstable girl. Therefore, casually and less-seriously he replied Victoria's argument by "perhaps we should send you back then". The perlocutionary effect which occurred on Charles was in response to Victoria's hard headed argument. This perlocutionary effect made Charles to respond in joke and has implicitly unserious context, except for making fun of Victoria's madness.

### **Function of Speech Act in SL and TL**

In SL illocutionary communicative speech act, it was functioned as *informatives* utterance. Bach and Harnish (1976) derives the *informative* utterances into advise, announce, apprise, disclose,

inform, insist, notify, point out, report, reveal, tell, testify. The utterance was classified as to-point-out utterance. It functioned to point out and tell information. While in TL, the utterance functioned as *requestives*. It had role to ask, beg, beseech, implore, insist, invite, petition, plead, pray, request, solicit, summon, supplicate, tell and urge). The *requestive* utterance ‘‘harap kalian tahu!’’ showed that the speaker request and beg the hearers’ attention before telling the information.

### **Change from SL form of Interrogative into TL form of Imperative**

No	SL	TL
(3-3)	Olivia : ‘‘ <i>you know Petrie?</i> I thought you ought to let the dust settle for a moment’’ (p.17)	Olivia : ‘‘ <i>dengar Petrie!</i> Kurasa kau perlu mendiamkan dulu persoalan ini’’ (p.21)

### **Component of Speech Act in SL and TL**

As Sugiardi (2006) states that there are also cases in which the speaker may utter a sentence to mean what he says and also mean another illocution with different propositional content. Therefore, in the discussion of the component of speech act, the investigation of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act should be conducted as follows.

#### **Locutionary Act**

The basic form of SL utterance ‘‘you know Petrie’’ was an *interrogative*. It showed that the speaker was asking question and needing answer from the hearer. However, the translator opted to change the form of SL utterance through translation. The change was seen from the TL form of utterance ‘‘dengar Petrie!’’ which is typically *imperative*. The utterance signified that the speaker asked or order the hearer to do something; to listen (dengar).

#### **Illocutionary Act**

The basic form of locutionary act in SL and TL needed to be examined in order to reveal what their illocutionary acts were. SL utterance ‘‘you know Petrie?’’ was not intended to ask particular question or to inquire any information. According its communicative illocutionary act, it was classified

into *question* type of utterance. *Questions* are special cases of requests, in that what is requested is that the hearer provided the speaker with certain information. However, it was not the utterances which were intended. Therefore, the TL utterance “dengar Petrie” clarified that the speaker did not intend to get information from the hearer. However, it suited more as *directive* type of communicative illocutionary act. This type of illocutionary act consisted of the expression to the speaker’s attitude toward some prospective action by the hearer ( Bach and Harnish :1976). The utterance was intended to gather the hearer’s attention to what the speaker’s saying. It was not explicitly in form of order to the hearer to do certain action. However, It was said in purpose of grabbing the hearer’s attention upon what further thing the speaker was about to tell or say.

### **Perlocutionary Act**

Sometimes it appears that the perlocutionary acts do not differ from illocutionary acts very much, yet there is one important feature which tells them apart. There are two levels of success in performing illocutionary and perlocutionary acts which are related to each other. The effects brought by the utterance either in SL and TL are similar, that the hearer; Petrie listened to the speaker; Olivia. Olivia calmed Petrie down after being made to be shocked by the disappearance of the ford. Petrie thought that he would lose his job due to failing to protect his master’s car. Therefore, Olivia; his master’s daughter tried to relieve him. By uttering “you know Petrie” which was translated into “dengar Petrie”, she directed him to listen and to calm down and leave the panicking act. The intention of Olivia was successfully making Petrie listen and calm himself down while listening to her advice and say.

### **Function of Speech Act of SL and TL**

According to Bach and Harnish (1976), even though the basic form of sentence of SL and TL was different, the utterance had the same function as *requirement* type of directive communicative illocutionary act. *Requirement* involves ordering, or dictating, which should not be confused with

request even strong ones. What differs it from requesting was the speaker was expressing his or her intention that the hearer took his expressed desire as a reason to act, requirement in contrast does not necessarily involve the speaker's expressing any desire at all that the hearer acted in certain way. The utterance of Olivia was aimed not to order or urge Petrie to act or do something. However, it was only a sufficient reason for Petrie to take action. Olivia's utterance became a sufficient requirement for Petrie to calm himself down and relieve some moment to rethink and consider where the car probably was, rather than going involved into deeper panic and shock.

### Change from SL Imperative form into TL Declarative form

No	SL	TL
(3-4)	Olivia : "He's wounded," Olivia explained (p.52) Victoria : "'spare me!'" Victoria grinned, easily unkind, and quick to dispense with the impaired or injured. (p.53)	Olivia : "hatinya terluka," kilah Olivia Victoria : "'bukan urusanku.'" Victoria menyeringai kejam. Ia memang bias dengan mudah menjadi kelam dan tega menyingkirkan orang cacat atau yang terluka. (p.51)

### Component of Speech Act in SL and TL

The discussion of speech act involves the stages of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act as discussed as follows.

#### Locutionary Act

The basic form of sentence of SL was *imperative* which aimed to make the hearer do something; that is to "spare". While the translator in its TL translation changed the basic form into type of *declarative*. The *declarative* sentence aimed to simply declare and state a proposition or argument or information.

## **Illocutionary Act**

The utterance of SL was type of *directive* communicative illocutionary act. The utterance of Victoria illocutionarily showed that she intended to make Olivia do something. It was Olivia not to involve her in the matter relating to Charles. By the utterance she wished Olivia to stop to talk about him. When they talked about arrest that happened to Victoria, she wondered of why did her sister; Olivia who called for help to Charles. Olivia was offended by showing his attention to Charles's bad and sad history. However, Victoria responded Olivia by asking her not to involve and put her into his problem. In TL, the utterance "bukan urusanku" was conveyed more explicitly, showing the type of *constantives*. *Constantives* is the expression of belief, together with the expression of an intention that the hearer form a like belief (Bach and Harnish :1976). The utterance in TL was explicit message aimed at delivering belief of Victoria that she did not feel touched or sorry for Charles's tragedy past. Therefore, the utterance in SL and TL showed Victoria's intention not to get involved yet to care about Charles's past.

## **Perlocutionary Act**

The effect caused by the utterance to the hearer was constantly found both in SL and TL. Listening to the ignorant response by Victoria makes Olivia mad. It was since Charles had helped Victoria out from the police's arrest, while Victoria showed no care and mercy on what Charles had undergone. Olivia even argued about how Charles hurried and caught time to only release Victoria from the police's arrest. The ignorance of Victoria was shown through her utterances in SL and TL , that is, to give perlocutionary impact to Olivia's anger.

## **Function of Speech Act in SL and TL**

The utterance of SL "spare me" functioned as *requestitives* which expressed the speaker's desire that the hearer should do something. Moreover, they express the speaker's intention that the hearer take this expressed desire as reason to act. The *requestitives* consist of action to ask, beg,

besech, implore, insist, invite, petition, plead, pray, request, solicit, summon, supplicate, tell and urge. The utterance was used by Victoria to beg and insist her sister not to tell anything regarding Charles since she had no desire to care. It was strengthened by the translation in TL “bukan urusanku” which explicitly referred to the undesirability of Victoria to listen and even get to know Charles’s problem or history. The TL’s utterance functioned to be *assertive* telling the action to affirm, allege, assert, aver, avow, claim, declare, deny, indicate, maintain, propound, say, state and submit.

## CONCLUSION

Some conclusions can be drawn from the discussion as follows:

(a) The components of speech act consist of locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act. There were some changes of locutionary act type of utterance that occurred in the translation from SL into TL, consisting of change from SL *declarative* form into TL interrogative form, from SL *declarative* form into TL imperative form, from SL *interrogative* form into TL *imperative* form and from SL *imperative* form into TL *declarative* form.

(b) The change of utterance types from the level of locutionary act into illocutionary act occurred from SL into TL. In locutionary act, the force was only seeing the surface of the utterance form, when the utterance was brought into the illocutionary level, the involvement of the speaker’s intention was added to the virtue or context of the utterance. The changes involved the ones from SL *declarative* into TL *acknowledgment* type of illocutionary with accept function, from SL *interrogative* into TL *directives* type of illocutionary. The second one, the changes occurred from SL *declarative* into TL *constative* type of illocutionary with *informatives* function, from SL *imperative* into TL *directives* type of illocutionary with *requestives* function. The third one was the change from SL *interrogative* into TL *imperative* which were classified into *directive* type of illocutionary with *requirements* function in both SL and TL. And the last one, the change from SL *imperative* into TL *directive* type of

illocutionary with *requestives* function, from TL *declarative* into TL *constantives* type of illocutionary with *assertives* function.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Clarendon: Oxford.
- Bach, Kent and Harnish, Robert. 1979. *Linguistic Communication and Speech Act*. Massachusetts: the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Bell, T. 1991. *Translation and Translating*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, Gillian & Yule, George. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, Guy. 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larson, Mildred. 1984. *Meaning-Based Translation*. New York: University Press.
- Larson, Mildred. 1998. *Meaning-Based Translation*. Maryland : University Press of America.
- Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Melia, Zares.et.al. 2013. Various Speech Acts in Disclosing Conversational Implicature among UKM KSR PMI Unit UNILA members. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*. Vol.1.Issue.4.
- Nida, E.A and R. Taber. 1974. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J Brill.
- Oishi, Etsuko. 2006. Austin's Speech Act Theory and the Speech Situation. *Esercizi Filosofici* 1. pp. 1-14.
- Quirk, et.al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Searle, John. 1968. Austin on Locutionary and Illocutionary Acts. *Philosophical Review*. Vol. 77, No. 4. pp. 405-424.
- Sudiatmika, Putu. 2006. "The Analysis of Skewing in the Translation 'The Adventures of Tom Sawyer' by Mark Twain into 'Petualangan Tom Sawyer' by Djoko Lelono. (*Thesis*.)Denpasar: Udayana University.
- Sugiardi, Made. 2006. "Skewing Analysis on Illocutionary Force in the Translation of a Play Romeo and Juliet". (*Thesis*). Denpasar: Udayana University.
- Wardhana, I Made. 2005. "The Illocutionary Force of Sentence Types in the Gospels: a Communication Study" (*Thesis*). Denpasar: Udayana University.