

The Equivalence between Form and Function of the Explanatory Modal Particle *Noda* Meaning 'Conclusion' in the novel *Laskar Pelangi*

Hana Nimashita¹, Suhandano², Tatang Hariri³

¹Faculty of Cultural Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

²Faculty of Cultural Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

³Faculty of Cultural Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

hananimashita76@mail.ugm.ac.id^{1*}, suhandano@ugm.ac.id², hariri39@ugm.ac.id³

Article History:

Submission
April 22nd, 2026

Accepted
June 30th, 2026

Published
July 30th, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the occurrence of the Japanese linguistic feature known as noda which conveys the meaning of 'conclusion' in the novel Niji no Shounentachi (the Japanese translation of the novel Laskar Pelangi). The focus of this study is to explain the functional background of Indonesian language forms that can be equated with noda in the sense of 'conclusion'. The data in this study consist of narrative sentences containing noda that express 'conclusion' and narrative sentences in the source text that express 'conclusion' in textual form (possessing linguistic markers). The main theories used in this study are the explanatory modality of noda proposed by Masuoka. Liu on the function of noda in discourse, and the theory of textual equivalence by Baker. This study identified several linguistic forms that can be equated with the use of noda signifying 'conclusion,' namely the conjunctions 'maka' and 'sehingga', the pronoun 'demikian', the phrases dengan 'demikian' and 'oleh karena itu', and the adjective 'baru'. Based on these findings, the function of noda in this study explains the indirect relationship between the explanatory element (Q), which takes the form of the author's subjective attitude regarding the element being explained in the context (P).

Keywords: conjunction; modality of explanation noda; subjectivity; textual equivalence

INTRODUCTION

Translation is the transfer of meaning from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL). In this process of meaning transfer, the form of the SL is transformed into the form of the TL through semantic structures (Larson, 1984). Meanwhile, Nida & Taber (1974:12) define the act of translation as reproducing the SL message in the TL by providing the closest natural equivalent in terms of meaning and style. Both definitions focus on the transfer of meaning because the forms of each language can vary in their expression. Therefore, high-quality translation results from linguistic proficiency, cognitive skills (Deilen et al., 2023; Su, 2025), and critical thinking abilities, enabling effective problem-solving and decision-making (Su, 2025). Decisions in translation can also be influenced by reasoning traditions, the inherent nature of language, and the translator's personal experience (Kang & Zhang, 2025)

or cross-cultural adaptation (Alfarina & Hartono, 2025) (Cruchinho et al., 2024). In translation, differences in modality expression affect equivalence, leading to modality omission, modality retention, or modality addition from Source Language (SL) to Target Language (TL) as strategies employed by translators (Yu & Wang, 2023). This relates to the role of modality as a crucial linguistic tool for expressing attitude (Huang & Li, 2023; Lyons, 1977), judgment, and evaluation (Hunston & Thompson, 2000) and conveying the author's subjective assessment (Hinkel, 1995).

In Japanese, modality markers are highly varied. Narrog (2009) identifies forms of modality in Japanese that consist of modal affixes such as *beki* 'valuative obligation' and *-tai* 'general intention'; one-word phrases such as *nakereba naranai* 'general necessity/obligation'; verbal moods such as *yo* 'hortative'; adverbs such as *kitto* 'certainly' and *tabun* 'likely'; and mental predicates such as *omou* 'feel/think'. Japanese linguists such as Nitta (2003), in their subcategorization of speech-act modality (*hatsuwa-dentatsu no modality*), include sentence-final particles (*shuujoshi/illocutionary particles*) such as *yo* and *ne* in their study of modality. One of the most frequently occurring markers of Japanese modality in both dialogue and narrative texts is the explanatory modality (*setsumei modariti*) *noda* (hereafter written as *noda*). Nitta (2009) categorizes explanatory modality under the epistemic modality *ninshiki*, whereas Miyazaki et al. (2002) place explanatory modality not only in relation to *ninshiki* (epistemic modality) but also to several other subcategories, namely *hyouka* (value judgment), *gimon-utagai* (question-doubt), and *kakunin youkyuu* (request for confirmation). Nitta et al. (2003) define explanatory modality (*setsumei no modariti*) as expressions that indicate the relationship between a sentence and the preceding context (sentence), while Masuoka (1991) uses the terms "inter-propositional" and "situational" to convey the same meaning. Explanatory modality is generally expressed by *noda* and *wakeda*. There are also other forms, namely *monoda* and *kotoda* (Nitta et al., 2003).

The explanatory modal marker *noda* is a distinctive modal marker in Japanese, making it difficult to find an equivalent in other languages. Nevertheless, research on the equivalence of the explanatory modal marker *noda* with other languages has been conducted. Wang (2023) conducted a study on the equivalents of the explanatory modal marker *noda* with linguistic elements in Mandarin. The findings indicate (1) that the construction *shi....de* can be equated with the function of focus or emphasis, (2) that many *noda* carry the meaning of 'reason,' so in Mandarin they are often translated using explicit conjunctions without the *shi....de* construction, (3) some *noda* are translated solely with the copula *shi* 'is' followed by a clause to indicate definition, (4) in dialogues found in novels, *noda* are often rendered with sentence-final particles to indicate emotion, (5) zero correspondence means that although equivalents exist, many *noda* are not translated into Mandarin, particularly in descriptive narratives.

The functions and meanings of *noda* have been extensively studied and described by previous researchers (Isao, 2026; Masuoka, 1991; Maynard, 1992; Nishi, 2023; Oshima, 2024; Takatsu, 1991). Takatsu (1991) notes that the particle serves as a cohesive device linking the proposition attached to the particle with the preceding extra-linguistic context. As a cohesive device, the particle indicates that the entire proposition refers to a previous utterance in the conversation or to the situation in which the utterance is taking place. This aligns with Masuoka's (1991:3) view, who states that to understand meaning and form, it is insufficient to

rely solely on syntactic and semantic concepts, as some grammatical expressions require common sense (*joushiki*), that is, knowledge of the background context in which the expression arises.

The *noda* modality is formed from the auxiliary verb *no*, which functions as a noun, and the copula *da* (an auxiliary verb), together constituting a single linguistic unit of the *noda* modality that possesses meaning and function (Noda, 1997:12). *Noda* is one of the explanatory modalities (*setsume no modariti*) integrated into the relationship between propositions and elements outside the proposition (Masuoka, 1991:139). Masuoka mentions the explanatory modality based on Tanaka's (1980) view, which states that a sentence containing a *noda* element has no meaning when examined as a standalone element (in Masuoka, 1991). For a *noda* sentence to be understood as an explanatory expression, it must be examined in relation to the premises or the sentence's context. Tanaka explains that a *noda*-element sentence has two parts: *setsumeiko*, which contains the premise (the explanatory element), and *hisetsumeiko*, which contains the context (the element being explained) (in Masuoka, 1991). Masuoka introduces the concept of problem-setting (*kadai no settei*) for the structure of *noda* sentences. According to him, a proposition that contains an explanation of the established problem is based on a premise (Masuoka, 1991:140). The concept of problem-setting (*kadai no settei*) can be seen in the following example.

- (1) *Hanako ga naite iru. Daiji ni shite ita kaado ga nakunatta noda.* (Masuoka, 1991)
Hanako was crying. The card she had taken such good care of was gone *noda*.
'Hanako was crying. The card she had taken such good care of was gone.'

Masuoka explains that the proposition *Hanako ga naite iru* 'Hanako is crying' raises the question, "Why is that the case?" In this instance, the proposition *Hanako ga naite iru* alone is insufficient to provide an explanation. Therefore, the proposition *Daiji ni shite ita kaado ga nakunatta noda* 'The card she had been taking good care of has gone missing' is needed as an explanation of the previous proposition to answer the question of why such a thing occurred. Miyazaki et al., (2002:230) define explanatory modality as content expressed in a preceding sentence; to make it easier for the listener or interlocutor to understand, the 'state' or 'consequence' regarding that content is explained in the following sentence.

- (2) *Yokujitsu wa, asa, hayaku me ga sameta. Denwa ga natta no dearu.* (Miyazaki et al., 2002:230)
'The next day, (I) woke up early. The phone rang.' (translated by the author)

In example (2), the situation described by the *asa, hayaku me ga sameta* clause 'waking up early in the morning,' is explained by the *denwa ga natta* clause 'the phone rang.' Miyazaki et al. (2002) add that an explanatory expression is generally defined as a detailed explanation provided to the listener or interlocutor to facilitate understanding of a matter or situation that the listener or interlocutor cannot fully grasp on their own. In other words, the clause *denwa ga natta* 'the phone rang' serves as an explanation for the occurrence of the situation, *hayaku me ga sameta* 'waking up early in the morning'. Miyazaki et al. (2002) explain the structure of a *noda* sentence as consisting of a sentence or propositional clause (Q) and a context (P).

According to Lin (2016), *noda* in discourse are related to the status of information and have two functions: 1) *ninshikikei*, used when the speaker acquires new knowledge while speaking, and 2) *dentatsukei*, used when the speaker conveys information that is already known or established to the listener. The concept of *kiteisei* is explained by Noda (1997) and Lin (2016) as the status of information that is considered already known or established within the discourse context. In relation to the narrative flow of a text, Kaneko (2018) examined the flaws found in a translated novel adapted from the Russian novel *Anna Karenina*. Kaneko employed two theoretical frameworks: aspectuality and modality. Kaneko argues that aspectuality describes the pace or dynamics of an event's development within a narrative. Furthermore, she explains that slow aspect is used to describe events gradually, while rapid aspect describes events quickly or directly. Meanwhile, the theory of modality indicates the speaker's attitude toward the information. In his research, strong modality indicates interpretation or evaluation, and weak modality indicates that the speaker is merely reporting facts without evaluation. Kaneko notes that Japanese tends to use explanatory constructions to connect events, provide the narrator's interpretation, and explain the background of a situation. Meanwhile, Russian tends to use a verbal aspect system.

This study focuses on identifying instances of text that indicate 'conclusions' or 'results' in the novel *Niji no Shounentachi* (Target Text, hereinafter referred to as TT). This novel was translated by Kato Hiroaki and Fukutake Shintaro from the novel *Laskar Pelangi* (Source Text, hereinafter referred to as ST). The Japanese translation of *Laskar Pelangi*, *Niji no Shounentachi*, was published in 2013. In *Niji no Shounentachi*, the use of punctuation marks is very high. Out of the 391 pages of *Niji no Shounentachi*, there are 405 punctuation marks used. This study investigates (1) the reasons for the use of *noda* to express 'conclusions' or 'results' in TT; and (2) the linguistic forms in the ST that can be equivalence with the use of *noda* in TS.

METHODOLOGY

This study aims to analyze the translation of the novel *Laskar Pelangi* and its Japanese translation titled *Niji no Shounentachi*, focusing on the occurrence of *noda* in *Niji no Shounentachi*. *Noda* is a modality of explanation inherent in explanatory sentences (Q) with the function of providing an explanation for the context (P) presented in the preceding sentence. This study employs a qualitative approach to elucidate the phenomenon of the occurrence of the *noda* modality in the Japanese translation (Moleong, 2010). The equivalence analysis approach between ST and TT refers to textual equivalence in the form of cohesion devices (Baker, 2018; Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The identification of cohesion devices in the source text refers to conjunctions (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

The data used in this study are sourced from the novel *Laskar Pelangi* and its Japanese translation *Niji no Shounentachi*. The selection of a novel as the data source was based on the novel's function as a medium of linguistic communication that conveys a story using language (Avatara et al., 2024)(Sajarwa, 2021). This study used a number of methodical steps to acquire data. The initial phase involved identifying and cataloging sentences that contain elements serving as conclusions in the translated text (TT). Subsequently, elements marked in the source text (ST) were categorized according to their

attributes and functionalities. The data acquired from the identification and cataloging method were further categorized based on the function of these elements as conclusion markers. In the concluding phase, the researcher collected and cataloged representative data from the source text (ST) that corresponded with the markers contained in the translated text (TT), facilitating a more in-depth analysis of the link between the parts in both texts..

The data are presented in pairs of ST and TT and illustrate the relationship between P and Q using a problem-setting model, as shown in the following example.

(3) ST: *Dua orang melihat objek yang sama dari dua sudut pandang yang berbeda maka pasti mereka memiliki persepsi yang berbeda. Oleh karena itu, Lintang menyebutnya simultan.* (Hirata, 2005:469).

TT: *Tatoe onaji mono de atte mo, futari no ningen ga futatsu no mono no mikata de sore o mireba, touzen futatsu no kotonari kaishaku ga umareru. **Dakara** Rintan wa, douji to iu hyougen o shitta **noda**.* (Kato & Fukutake, 2013:383-384).

Problem-Solving Model (Masuoka, 1991)		Noda (1997)	Tanaka (1980)
Questions asked	What does it mean, or what can be concluded, that when two people view the same object from two different perspectives, they are bound to have different perceptions?	P (context)	<i>Hisetsumeiko</i> (the element described)
The answer provided	Lintang calls it simultaneous.	Q (the element marked with <i>noda</i>)	<i>Setsumeiko</i> (the explanatory element)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The following are the results of an analysis showing the textual correspondence between the *noda* and the 'conclusion' marker in the novel *Laskar Pelangi*.

Table 1: Equivalences Form, Category, and Function of the Term 'conclusion' in Narrative Texts *Laskar Pelangi*

	FORM	CATEGORY	FUNCTION
TT	<i>noda/nda</i>	auxiliary verbs (modality markers)	A device of internal causal cohesion that indirectly links a clause or sentence to the context preceding and/or following it, or to a context outside the text. It expresses a 'conclusion' or 'result' in the form of the author's argument, opinion, or comment, which is indirect, subjective, and unexpected.
ST	<i>maka</i>	conjunction	An internal causal cohesive device that indirectly links a subordinate clause or sentence following a conjunction to the preceding context, explaining the 'conclusion' or 'result'—such as the author's argument, opinion, or comment—which may be either subjective or objective (general causal).
	<i>sehingga</i>	conjunction	A causal internal cohesion device that links a subordinate clause to the preceding context, explaining the 'conclusion' or 'result'—which may take the form of the author's argument, opinion, or comment—and can be either subjective or objective (general causal).
	<i>demikian</i>	pronoun	A causal internal cohesion device that indirectly links the concluding sentence to the preceding context, expressing the author's 'conclusion' which may be either subjective or objective.
	<i>dengan demikian</i>	phrase	A causal internal cohesion device that indirectly links the concluding sentence to the preceding context, which explains the 'conclusion,' 'consequence' or 'result' in the form of the author's argument, which may be either subjective or objective (general causal).
	<i>oleh karena itu</i>	phrase	A causal internal cohesion device that indirectly links the concluding sentence to the preceding context, which explains the 'conclusion,' 'result,' or 'consequence'

			in the form of the author's argument, which may be either subjective or objective (general causal).
	<i>baru</i>	adjective	A conditional causal cohesive device that indirectly links a subordinate clause to the preceding context, explaining the 'result' that occurs once the condition is met—which takes the form of the speaker's argument and may be either subjective or objective.

(4) ST: [...] *Setiap usaha mempertanyakannya hanya akan berujung dengan kesimpulan yang mempertontonkan kemahatololan sang penanya sendiri. Maka semua jangkauan akal telah berakhir di langit ketujuh tadi* (Hirata, 2005:105).

TT: *Shirou to suru koto jitai, mizukara no orokasa o sarakedasu ketsuron to naru. Shikou no subete ga dainanabanme no sou de tsukite shimau noda* (Kato & Fukutake, 2013:88).

Problem-Solving Model (Masuoka, 1991)		Noda (1997)	Tanaka (1980)
Questions asked	What meaning or conclusion can be drawn from [...] any attempt to question it will only lead to a conclusion that exposes the questioner's own utter foolishness?	P (context)	<i>Hisetsumeiko</i> (the element described)
The answer provided	All the limits of reason have come to an end in that seventh heaven.	Q (the element marked with <i>noda</i>)	<i>Setsumeiko</i> (the explanatory element)

Thus, in Indonesian (SL), 'maka' functions as a conjunction indicating 'conclusion' or 'result' (Moeliono et al., 2017). The use of *noda* in TT can be indicated by the use of 'maka' based on the relationship between P and Q, as shown in the problem-setting model above. The relationship of 'conclusion' or 'result' indicated by 'maka' is a semantic relationship that is not easily understood (unexpected), not a logical consequence that is easily understood—namely, that Q is the result of P (see Kamio, 1997). In Japanese, the expression of logical consequences, causality (cause and effect), or objective conclusions that are indisputable because they are based on common facts or common sense (*joushiki*) or common sense is expressed through the use of *wakeda* (Masuoka, 1991).

In data (4), the proposition Q (the explanatory element) is linked to the proposition P (the element being explained). The use of *noda* as a conjunction (a cohesive device) signifying 'conclusion' is not only derived from the preceding contextual sentences but is also linked to a broader context. In data (4), to interpret the relationship marked by *noda*, proposition Q requires a context that connects the logical reasoning established from the opening paragraphs of the relevant chapter, which describes scientific findings in the field of physics regarding the sky, which are then juxtaposed with the metaphor of the seventh heaven. Liu (2008) refers to this as retrospective context or 'accessible knowledge' (shared knowledge) in Cook's (1990) terms, or *kiteisei* in Noda's (1997) terms. Liu (2008) also explains that *noda* sentences in narrative texts typically introduce new information marked by new lexical items. In data (4), the new lexical item is the 'scope of reason' 'logic' or 'reasoning'. According to Liu (2008), such new lexical items frequently become issues or subtopics for subsequent discussion and initiate new lexical chains. In this case, the new lexical chains in ST are *Arasy* (*Kami no gyokuza*) 'the place where God's majesty reigns', and *Lauhul Mahfuzh* 'the place where God's decrees are recorded'. The emergence of a lexical item associated with the context that follows the lexical item in question is referred to by Liu (2008) as a prospective context.

As seen in Q, the explanation provided is the author's personal interpretation or subjective perspective on P (see Liu, 2008; Masuoka, 1991). Liu (2008) refers to such 'conjectural' conclusions as a more subjective epistemic modality. As a cohesive device, *noda*

can be equated with the use of 'maka'. The equivalence of 'maka' and *noda* as cohesive devices in the discourse of data (4) lies in the presence of an element of subjectivity (the author's argumentation or opinion) and an element of unpredictability in drawing conclusions. Baker (2018) refers to this as internal causality, which connects the author's argumentation to justify their conclusion based on the premises they have established. In ST, the idea or argumentation of the conclusion expressed by 'maka' can also be traced back to lexical cohesion devices such as repetition (reiteration) of the words 'kebodohan' and 'langit ketujuh' which are repeated in more than two paragraphs before the 'maka' clause is presented (see Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The difference in usage between 'maka' and *noda* is that 'maka' can be used to draw direct logical conclusions. Baker (2018) refers to this relationship as 'general causal', whereas *noda* is used only for indirect causal relationships (internal causal).

In (5), a subordinating conjunction also appears, indicating 'result' or 'consequence' (Moeliono et al., 2017). Regarding the omission of *noda* in TT, this is because the cause-and-effect relationship can be understood directly (is easily predictable). In other words, the idea that *dengan melatih akan menghasilkan kemampuan* is a logical consequence that is easily understood without context. This differs from the use of 'maka' in (5), where the conclusion or result is not easily predictable and constitutes entirely new information that must be inferred from a broader context—namely, regarding the character Mahar's *meloncat-loncat liar, kreativitas yang tak terduga, unik, tak biasa, memberontak, segar, dan menerobos* as depicted in the preceding sentences of the same paragraph. In other words, the fact that *kera memiliki kemampuan memerintah tuannya* cannot be predicted directly, or must be inferred from within the text, thus becoming 'unexpected' new information for the reader. The element of unpredictability is one of the key criteria in the use of *noda* (see Yoshida, 1988).

- (5) ST: [...] Misalnya, ia melatih kera peliharaannya sedemikian rupa sehingga mampu berperilaku layaknya seorang instruktur. **Maka** dalam sebuah penampilan, keranya itu memerintahkannya untuk melakukan sesuatu yang dalam pertunjukan biasa hal itu seharusnya dilakukan sang kera (Hirata, 2005:146).
- TT: Tatoeba, kare wa saru o atakamo insutorakutaa no you ni koudou suru you shitsuketa. Sono saru wa honrai naraba insutorakutaa ga saru ni mukatte suru you na shitei o Mahaaru ni taishite okonau **noda** (Kato & Fukutake, 2013:120).

Problem-Solving Model (Masuoka, 1991)		Noda (1997)	Tanaka (1980)
Questions asked	What is the meaning of this, or what can be concluded from [...] ? For example, he trained his pet monkey in such a way that it was able to behave like an instructor.	P (context)	<i>Hisetsumeiko</i> (the element described)
The answer provided	During a performance, the monkey was instructed to do something that, in a typical show, the monkey would normally be the one to do.	Q (the element marked with <i>noda</i>)	<i>Setsumeiko</i> (the explanatory element)

In (6), the *noda* can be linked to the use of the word 'sehingga'. The conjunction 'sehingga' appears in a subordinate clause and expresses the 'consequence' or 'result' of what is stated in the main clause (see Chaer, 2015; and Moeliono et al., 2017). The context of sentence (6) is the social conditions of the Belitung community living outside the walls of the PN Timah company, where the economy is poor, particularly for those working as PN Timah labourers, and where entertainment facilities are scarce, and every married couple has at least six children.

- (6) ST: [...] Mereka menyalahkan pemerintah karena tidak menyediakan hiburan yang memadai **sehingga** jika malam tiba mereka tak punya kegiatan lain selain membuat anak-anak itu. (Hirata, 2005:50).

TT: [...] *Kono koto ni tsuite karera wa seifu no sei ni shita. Taishita goraku mo nai node, yoru ni naru to kodomo o tsukuru kurai shika yaru koto ga nai **noda**.* (Kato & Fukutake, 2013:46).

Problem-Solving Model (Masuoka, 1991)		Noda (1997)	Tanaka (1980)
Questions asked	“What does it mean, or what can be inferred from the fact that they are blaming the government for not providing adequate entertainment?”	P (context)	<i>Hisetsumeiko</i> (the element described)
The answer provided	When night falls, they have nothing else to do but make those children.	Q (the element marked with <i>noda</i>)	<i>Setsumeiko</i> (the explanatory element)

In (6), the clause *jika malam tiba mereka tak punya kegiatan lain selain membuat anak-anak itu* cannot easily be interpreted as a consequence of *mereka menyalahkan pemerintah karena tidak menyediakan hiburan yang memadai*. To establish a cause-and-effect relationship, an implicature must be inferred from the context—namely, that the marital act ('membuat anak-anak') is considered a form of entertainment. The lack of other adequate entertainment makes that activity the only form of entertainment when night falls. In (6), there is no direct correlation or consequence between the main clause (P) and the subordinate clause (Q). The ‘consequence’ presented in P is an explanation based on the author’s personal or subjective perspective. This can be linked to Cook’s (1990) explanation of accessible knowledge. The information in Q can be understood as a joke among adults. Based on this explanation, the conclusion in (6) constitutes the author’s subjective argument or opinion. Just as with ‘maka’ in (4) and (5), ‘sehingga’ can be used in general causal and internal causal contexts, whereas *noda* is used only for internal causal contexts and involves implicature.

In (7), *nda* (a colloquial variant of *noda*) can be equated with the use of the adjective 'baru'. The adjective 'baru' functions as a conjunction to indicate the result after a condition is met. Baker (2018) refers to this as a conditional causal. The new use as a 'result' conjunction is an informal variety (used colloquially).

(7) ST: “Belum waktunya, harus selesai hitung nama dan orang tua, **baru** ada khasiatnya!” (Hirata, 2005:80).

TT: “Mada da. Minna no namae o subete fuuruneemu de iiowaru made tsuzukete, hajimete kouka ga aru **nda**.” (Kato & Fukutake, 2013:69).

Problem-Solving Model (Masuoka, 1991)		Noda (1997)	Tanaka (1980)
Questions asked	What does this mean, or what can be concluded from “It’s not time yet; we still need to finish tallying the names and parents,”	P (context)	<i>Hisetsumeiko</i> (the element described)
The answer provided	“It works!” Count the names and parents?	Q (the element marked with <i>noda</i>)	<i>Setsumeiko</i> (the explanatory element)

Unlike the previous narrative data, data (7) consists of a direct conversation between the characters Samson and Ikal. The usage of 'baru' to connect P and Q in (7) is indirect because it requires drawing on the context within the text—namely, the fact that Malay parents’ names are very long, as they are followed by 'bin', and the character Ikal would not be able to say them in full. The implicature that can be drawn is ‘it takes a long time,’ so Ikal suffers for longer. Based on this, the result described by the character Samson is indirect, subjective, and unexpected.

Just as with the conjunctions 'maka' (4) and (5) and 'sehingga' (6), the use of 'baru' in (7) can function as a conditional causal connector. Thus, in (6), the equivalence between *noda* and 'baru' lies in their ability to express a conditional causal relationship that involves an indirect inference (requiring context), is subjective (reflecting the speaker's opinion), and is unexpected.

The context preceding data (8) begins with a story about Lintang's father, who gave Lintang (an elementary school student) an adult-sized bicycle to use for school. The mismatch between the bicycle's size and Lintang's body made it difficult for Lintang to ride it. The appearance of *noda* in (8) must be viewed within that context because the meaning of the conclusion cannot be understood directly.

In (8), the use of the *noda* can be equated with the demonstrative pronoun 'demikian'. 'Demikian' functions as an anaphoric marker that is usually followed by a conclusion.

(8) ST: [...] *Ia akan beringsut-ingsut dan terlonjak-lonjat hebat di atas batangan besi itu sambil menggigit bibirnya, mengumpulkan tenaga. Demikian perjuangannya mengayuh sepeda pulang dan pergi ke sekolah, delapan puluh kilometer setiap hari.* (Hirata, 2005:97).

TT: *Rintan wa sono tetsu no baa no ue de, moteru chikara o furishibori, tobihaneru you ni jitensha o koida. Kono jitensha de, Rintan wa katamichi yonjuu kiro meetoru no michinori o, mainichi oofuku shite ita noda.* (Kato & Fukutake, 2013:82).

Problem-Solving Model (Masuoka, 1991)		Noda (1997)	Tanaka (1980)
Questions asked	What is the meaning of this, or what can be inferred from [...] He would squirm and jump violently on the iron bar while biting his lip, gathering his strength.	P (context)	<i>Hisetsumeiko</i> (the element described)
The answer provided	his struggle to bike back and forth to school, eighty kilometers every day.	Q (the element marked with <i>noda</i>)	<i>Setsumeiko</i> (the explanatory element)

Based on the problem-setting model above, Q is the conclusion drawn from P. The appearance of the *noda* caused by the fact that information Q is presented to the reader for the first time (Kamio, 1997). This conclusion or implication is based on facts drawn from the author's personal experience. The use of the *noda* in this context also demonstrates the author's effort to draw the reader's attention to the immense difficulty Lintang faces in attending school. Liu (2008) explains this as the author's voice directing attention rather than merely the narrator's objective action. In line with Liu (2008) and Kamio (1997) explains that the matter of Q *delapan puluh kilometer setiap hari selama bersekolah* is psychologically difficult to imagine or accept. The use of ellipses in (8) can also be explained based on Zufferey (2016) view, who states that ellipses are used for unexpected sequences. He refers to this as a complex causal relationship or the presence of a cognitive leap, which can cause the sentence to become discontinuous.

The relevance of 'demikian' to the stain relates to the connection between the described event and the speaker's commentary. This can be linked to the internal causality described by Baker (2018). Relevance is achieved due to an indirect connection to the speaker's argument or opinion; unpredictability and knowledge of Q are also subjective elements that incorporate the writer's experience. The difference from *noda* is that *noda* is used to direct the reader's attention (see Liu, 2008).

The context of the story in (9) concerns the situation of the narrator (Ikal) twelve years later. It is revealed that the narrator works as a mail sorter at a postal company, earning an income that hovers just above the poverty line. His life is depicted as being different from his plans twelve years ago, when he aspired to become a famous author and badminton player.

What he least asked for in his prayers in the past has now become the job that allows him to survive.

In example (9), the inter-sentential conjunction 'oleh karena itu' can be equated with *noda* in TT. Semantically, the phrase 'oleh karena itu' indicates that the sentence following it is a consequence or result of what was previously stated. However, the conjunction *dakara* (*oleh karena itu*) can also be used to convey the same meaning. Functionally, both *dakara* and *noda* serve to establish textual cohesion. As in (9), in Japanese, *dakara* and *noda* often appear in pairs.

(9) ST: *Kuberi tahu kawan, cara bertindak Tuhan sangat aneh. Tuhan tidak tunduk pada postulat dan teorema mana pun. Oleh karena itu, Tuhan sama sekali tak dapat diramalkan. (Hirata, 2005:441).*

TT: *Wareware ga okonau koto wa ookare, shukunakare, yosou dekiru mono dearu. Shikashi, koko de aeteieba, Kami sama no okonai wa ri ni kanatte inai. Ikanaru kijun ya ronri ni mo shitagau koto wa nai. Dakara, Kami no goyou to iu no wa mattaku yosou ga tsukanai noda. (Kato & Fukutake, 2013:361).*

Problem-Solving Model (Masuoka, 1991)		Noda (1997)	Tanaka (1980)
Questions asked	What is the meaning of this, or what can we conclude from it? Tell your friends: God's ways are truly mysterious. God is not bound by any postulates or theorems.	P (context)	<i>Hisetsumeiko</i> (the element described)
The answer provided	God is completely unpredictable.	Q (the element marked with <i>noda</i>)	<i>Setsumeiko</i> (the explanatory element)

Based on the problem statement above, the *noda* marker is used in TSa because the conclusion expressed by Q cannot be directly linked to P or is difficult to predict. The marker in (9) is used to indicate that the conclusion Q is the speaker's personal opinion or argument and is subjective (see Liu, 2008). Baker (2018) describes this relationship as an internal causal relationship or one that indicates a personal opinion drawn from previous explanations (context). The information conveyed in Q is also unexpected. Zufferey (2016) explains this as an unexpected sequence due to complex causal relationships that have the potential for discontinuity. The difference with 'oleh karena itu' is that the author also uses *noda* as an attempt to direct the reader's attention and perspective, not merely as an objective action of the narrator alone (Liu, 2008). Additionally, 'oleh karena itu' can also be used for general causal statements that do not require context.

The context of the data (10) is the story surrounding the festivities of the annual Chiong Si Ku (Rush Prayer) ritual, a celebration where the entire Chinese community gathers.

(10) ST: *[...] Banyak hiburan lain yang ditempelkan pada ritual keagamaan ini, misalnya panjat pinang, komidi putar, dan orkes Melayu, sehingga menarik minat setiap orang untuk berkunjung. Dengan demikian ajang ini dapat disebut sebagai media tempat empat komponen utama kelompok subetnik di kampung kami orang Tionghoa, orang Melayu, orang pulau bersarung, dan orang Sawang berkumpul. (Hirata, 2005:259).*

TT: *[...] Kono shuukyō gyōji niwa samazama na atarakushon ga tsukimonoda. Tatoeba panjatto pinan (abura o nuritakutta hashira o yoji noboru geemu), kanransha, maree gakudan no ensou nado ga hitobito o kono matsuri ni hikitsukeru. Kono matsuri wa, bokutachi no mura no yotsu no esunikku guruupu, sunawachi kajin, mareejin, bugisujin, soshite sawanjin no dare demo sankā dekiru omatsurina noda. (Kato & Fukutake, 2013:212).*

Problem-Solving Model (Masuoka, 1991)		Noda (1997)	Tanaka (1980)
Questions asked	What is the significance of, or what can be concluded from [...] ? Many other forms of entertainment are incorporated into this religious ritual, such as the coconut tree climbing contest, the carousel, and Malay orchestras, which attract visitors of all ages.	P (context)	<i>Hisetsumeiko</i> (the element described)
The answer provided	This event can be described as a gathering place for the four main subethnic groups in our village the Chinese, the Malays, the people from the island of Bersarung, and the Sawang people.	Q (the element marked with <i>noda</i>)	<i>Setsumeiko</i> (the explanatory element)

Based on the problem statement above, Q is the conclusion of P. *Noda* is used because the meaning of the conclusion cannot be understood directly and requires context. The context in (10) must refer far back. Here, although information about *orang pulau bersarung* (translated in TT as *orang Bugis* ‘the Bugis people’) and the Sawang people has appeared in TSu, it is far removed from the data in (10) specifically in different chapters on pages 202 and 212, and in the same chapter on page 252 for *orang bersarung*. Meanwhile, *orang sawang* appear more frequently and even serve as the title of one of the chapters in the novel *Laskar Pelangi*. Therefore, to understand the conclusion, the reader is assumed to already possess this information.

The *noda* on (10) also indicates that the conclusion in Q is the speaker’s personal opinion based on the context, as explained above. As with (8), the information conveyed in Q is also unexpected. Zufferey (2016) describes this as an unexpected sequence due to complex causal relationships that have the potential for discontinuity.

Based on the explanation above, ‘dengan demikian’ and *noda* are associated with drawing conclusions of an *internal causal* nature, characterized by an indirect relationship between P and Q and the author’s subjective arguments. The difference from *noda* lies in the element of unpredictability and its use is limited to internal causation, whereas the use of ‘dengan demikian’ is not restricted to internal causation but also applies to general causation, making it more neutral.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study found that several Indonesian discourse markers expressing conclusion function as textual equivalents of the Japanese modal expression *noda*. The markers *maka*, *sehingga*, *demikian*, *dengan demikian*, *oleh karena itu*, and *baru* were identified as the closest equivalents in the Indonesian translation of *Laskar Pelangi*. These markers serve as cohesive devices that connect clauses and sentences by signaling logical conclusions or inferences. Their equivalence with *noda* is based on their shared discourse function rather than direct lexical similarity.

However, important differences exist between the two languages. Indonesian conclusion markers generally function as neutral discourse connectors that may express either objective or subjective conclusions depending on the context. In contrast, *noda* mainly conveys the speaker’s subjective interpretation, explanation, or realization of a situation. Therefore, while Indonesian conjunctions can represent the textual function of *noda*, they do not always preserve its full pragmatic meaning. This finding also reflects a typological difference: Japanese tends to express explanatory and inferential meanings through grammatical modality, whereas Indonesian relies more on lexical items and discourse markers.

These findings contribute to translation studies and contrastive linguistics by demonstrating that translation equivalence should be understood at the discourse-functional level rather than through direct lexical correspondence. They also highlight the importance of considering pragmatic meaning and speaker stance when translating Japanese modal expressions into Indonesian. This study is limited to the Indonesian translation of *Laskar Pelangi*. Future research should examine larger and more diverse literary and non-literary corpora to identify additional equivalents of *noda* and provide a broader understanding of its semantic and pragmatic functions in Japanese–Indonesian translation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is derived from first author's doctoral dissertation at the postgraduate program of Humanities, Universitas Gadjah Mada. The first author would like to thank Professor Suhandano and Doctor Tatang Hariri for their intensive guidance and insightful comments on the draft of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Alfarina, L., & Hartono, R. (2025). Grammatical Accuracy in Translating Direct Speech: A Comparison between Professionals and EFL Students. *Allure Journal*, 5(2), 201–209.
- Avatara, B., Karima, F. H., Kustantinah, I., & Vatsiniaina, A. H. (2024). Social Inequality in the Movie Fantastic Mr. Fox. *Allure Journal*, 4(2), 117–126.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge.
- Chaer, A. (2015). *Sintaksis Bahasa Indonesia: Pendekatan Proses*. Rineka Cipta.
- Cook, H. M. (1990). An indexical account of the Japanese sentence-final particle no. *Discourse Processes*, 13(4), 401–439.
- Cruchinho, P., López-Franco, M. D., Capelas, M. L., Almeida, S., Bennett, P. M., da Silva, M. M., Teixeira, G., Nunes, E., Lucas, P., & Gaspar, F. (2024). Translation, Cross-Cultural Adaptation, and Validation of Measurement Instruments: A Practical Guideline for Novice Researchers. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 17, 2701–2728. <https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S419714>
- Deilen, S., Lapshinova-Koltunski, E., & Carl, M. (2023). Cognitive aspects of compound translation: Insights into the relation between implicature and cognitive effort from a translation process perspective. *Ampersand*, 11.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman Group.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*.
- Hinkel, E. (1995). The use of model verbs as a reflection of cultural values. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 325–343. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/3587627>
- Hirata, A. (2005). *Laskar pelangi*. Bentang Pustaka.
- Huang, Y., & Li, D. (2023). Translational voice through modal stance: A corpus-based study of modality shifts in Chinese-to-English translation of research article abstracts. *Lingua*, 295. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2023.103610>
- Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford university press.
- Isao, I. (2026). Continuity And Discontinuity Between Demonstratives And Conjunctions In Japanese. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 66, 14–31.
- Kamio, A. (1997). *Territory of information*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Kaneko, Y. (2018). Asupekuto no kankyuu to modariti no noutan: Noda-bun wo meguru nichi-ro taishou kenkyuu [Aspectual rhythm and modal gradation: A comparative Japanese-Russian study on the noda construction]. *Koubeshi Gaikokugo Daigaku Kenkyuukai*, 69(1).
- Kang, H., & Zhang, Y. (2025). Socio-cognitive influences on translating forward causal connectives: A multivariate analysis of English translations of Tao Te Ching. *Lingua*, 314.
- Kato, H., & Fukutake, S. (2013). *Niji no Shounentachi. (Terjemahan Laskar Pelangi)*. Sanmaaku Shuppan.
- Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. University Press of America.
- Lin, X. (2016). Noda no setsumei modariti youhou ni kansuru kousatsu kiteisei no kanten kara (A Study on the Explanation Usage of “Noda”: From the Perspective of Anaphoricity). In *Journal Jinbun kaisha kagaku kenkyuu*. Chiba University.
- Liu, X. (2008). *The discourse functions of the modal auxiliaries wake da and no da in Japanese*. Lincom
- Hana Nimashita, Suhandano, Tatang Hariri
The equivalence between form and function of the explanatory modal particle noda meaning 'conclusion' in the novel laskar pelangi

- Europa.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Two volume). Cambridge University Press.
- Masuoka, T. (1991). *Modariti Bunpoo (Tata Bahasa Modalitas)*. Kuroshio.
- Maynard, S. K. (1992). Cognitive and pragmatic messages of a syntactic choice: The case of the Japanese commentary predicate *n(o) da*. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 12(4), 563–614.
- Miyazaki, K., Adachi, T., Noda, H., & Takanashi, S. (2002). *Modariti (Modalitas)*. Kuroshio.
- Moeliono, A. M., Lapoliwa, H., Alwi, H., & Sasangka, S. S. T. W. (2017). *Tata bahasa baku bahasa Indonesia* (Edisi Keem). Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Moleong, L. J. (2017). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (Edisi Revi). PT remaja rosdakarya.
- Narrog, H. (2009). *Modality in Japanese*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1974). *The theory and practice of translation*. E. J. Brill.
- Nishi, H. (2023). Japanese *no datta* and *no de atta* in written discourse. *Pragmatics*, 33(2), 260–284.
- Nitta, Y. (2003). *Gendai Nihongo Bunpoo 4 Modariti*. Kuroshio.
- Nitta, Y. (2009). *Nihon no Modariti to Sono Shuuhen [Japanese Modality and Their Surroundings]*. Hitsuji Shobou.
- Noda, H. (1997). *No (da) no Kinoo (Function of no (da))*. Kuroshio.
- Oshima, D. Y. (2024). On the mirative use of the *no (da)* construction in Japanese. In I. E. M. & H. N. (Eds.) (Ed.), *Discourse Particles in Asian Languages*. Routledge.
- Sajarwa. (2021). Metode penelitian bahasa. In *Metode penelitian penerjemahan* (pp. 106–108). Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Su, H. (2025). Critical thinking-embedded EFL translation instruction and its impact on EFL translation learners. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 57.
- Takatsu, T. (1991). A unified semantic analysis of the *NO DA* construction in Japanese. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 25(2), 167–176.
- Tanaka, N. (1980). *Nihongo to Nihongo Kyouiku* (Vol. 8). Pusat Internasional Universitas Keio.
- Wang, X. (2023). *Noda koubun ni taiou suru outai suru chuugokugo no hyougen kaki kotoba no chousha o chuushin ni [Chinese expressions corresponding to the “noda” construction: Focusing on written language research]*. Hitotsubashi University.
- Yoshida, S. (1988). *Noda keishiki no kouzou to hyougen kouka [The structure and expressive effects of the noda form]*. *Kobe Daigaku Kokugo Ronso*, 15.
- Yu, H., & Wang, N. (2023). What happened to the modal expressions? Modality in translating Chinese texts into English. *Lingua*, 294. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2023.103606>
- Zufferey, S. (2016). Discourse connectives across languages: Factors influencing their explicit or implicit translation. *International Journal for Contrastive Linguistics*, 16(2), 264–279. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.16.2.05zuf>