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Abstract  
This paper examines the interjection of ômma in Acehnese language using a natural semantic metalanguage approach. The study employed a qualitative method using oral, written, and artificial data sources. Twelve qualified informants from three study locations, i.e., Aceh Besar, West Aceh, and South Aceh provided their consent to participate in this study. Meanwhile, written data were sourced from Acehnese books and previous studies, and the artificial data were used as complementary to oral and written data. The data analysis is presented using a distributional approach. In addition, the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) theory was also applied. The results show that the interjection of ômma in the Acehnese language expressed three semantic aspects, i.e., emotive, volitive, and cognitive. The emotive aspect includes expressions of amazement, surprise, and anger. In addition, the meanings of the interjection of ômma are highly dependent on the text and the context of the sentence. A chuckle of amazement, pleasant facial expression, hand-clap, head-shake, or thumbs-up accompanies the interjection of ômma expressing amazement. The interjection of ômma that expresses anger is accompanied by a sour facial expression, such as frowns and lip-biting, as well as a high intonation voice. In expressing a feeling of surprise, the interjection of ômma is accompanied by a voice that indicates joy and a happy facial expression. Meanwhile, the interjection of ômma expressing

\* Corresponding author, email: rostina.taib@unsyiah.ac.id

Citation in APA style: Taib, R., & Mulyadi. (2022). The interjection of ômma in the Acehnese language: A natural semantic metalanguage approach. Studies in English Language and Education, 9(3), 1315-1328.

Received February 4, 2021; Revised June 1, 2022; Accepted July 26, 2022; Published Online September 15, 2022.

https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i3.24688
volition is accompanied by limb movements, either using hands, mouth, or face. The interjection of ômma that expresses the cognitive aspect is followed by movements or pats on the forehead or legs.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

In Aceh, other regional languages, apart from the Acehnese language, also exist. Within the Aceh region, at least nine regional languages are spoken, i.e., Acehnese, Gayonese, Alas, Tamiang, Jamee, Kluet, Singkil, Sigulai, and Devayan (Yusuf et al., 2021). Moreover, Toha et al. (2008) stated that there are thirteen regional languages in Aceh, namely Acehnese, Gayonese, Aneuk Jamee, Kluet, Tamiang, Julu, Haloban, Pak-Pak, Nias, Lekon, Sigulai, Devayan, and Alas. It is learned that currently, there is no certain consensus regarding the names and number of regional languages in Aceh (Wildan, 2010). However, of the many regional languages in the area, the Acehnese language has the largest number of speakers.

As commonly understood, one of the language functions is to convey feelings through interjection. Similarly in the Acehnese language, interjections include ômma, ômmi, bakbudik, alahmak oi, and alahhuwe (Azharina et al., 2012; Wildan, 2010). Acehnese people deliver these words to express amazement, anger, fear, hate, disgust, and many more. This is in line with the definition of interjection by Alwi et al. (2003) stating that a function of an interjection word is to express the speaker’s feelings such as admiration, sadness, surprise, and disgust. Meanwhile, Wierzbicka (1992) defined interjection as a linguistic sign that can stand alone in its use to express a specific meaning, but it is not included in other signs, either a homophone with other lexical forms that are semantically related, and it is the speaker’s spontaneous mental or action requirement.

In the study of linguistic theory, interjection has mostly fallen out of favor (Ameka, 1992; Goddard, 2014; Jovanovic, 2004). However, interjections are essential to express local values, norms, and communication interactions in social life (Ameka, 2006). Linguists have currently been encouraged to focus and pay great attention to the field of interjection, evidenced by many scientific articles discussing this topic. Parsieva and Gatsalova (2020) have discussed the differences between cognitive, cognitive-evaluative, emotive, emotive-evaluative, and volitional interjections. They examined interjection in spoken language, where factors such as gender and age are considered to distinguish the type of interjections used.

Several other researchers also showed interest in interjections. Simanihuruk and Mulyadi (2020) discovered five meanings of the interjection of bah in the Toba Batak language, i.e., surprise, disappointment, confusion, and amazement. Simanjuntak and Mulyadi (2019), who show interest in the Batak language interjections, stated that interjections in the Toba Batak language are not affected by context; only a small number of interjections are highly context-dependent. Nasrullah et al. (2017) proposed a new interjection that has not been acknowledged as an Indonesian interjection, i.e., ciye, an expression that has been widely used among celebrities and teenagers. In Semarang, a form of Javanese interjection can represent several expressions, such as
anger, amazement, fear, surprise or shock, sadness, disgust, and many more (Jovanovic, 2004).

Among previous studies, discussions of interjections in the Acehnese language remain limited. Although as a natural language, the Acehnese certainly has a tool to express the communicator’s feelings, i.e., through interjections. Interjections are unique in different languages. An interjection in Acehnese, i.e., ômma, not only expresses feelings (emotive) as discovered by Jovanovic (2004) but it can express all three interjection meanings, namely emotive, volitive, and cognitive, at once. Apart from this uniqueness, the interjection of ômma is used throughout Aceh, while other interjections, such as bak budi, are only used in a few areas. Therefore, it is critical to study the interjection of ômma in Acehnese through a natural semantic grammar approach. The formulation of the problem is:
1. What potential meanings can the interjection of ômma reveal?
2. Is the use of the interjection of ômma in Acehnese determined by the text and context?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Interjection

An interjection is a type of closed word that has received less attention in linguistic studies; thus, it became a neglected topic in the study of linguistic theory (Ameka, 1992; Goddard, 2014). According to Chaer (2008) interjections are words that express emotions, e.g., surprise, anger, touched, loss, amazement, sadness, and many more. An interjection is a function word used to express inner feelings such as amazement, sadness, surprise, and disgust. An interjection is a word that expresses the speaker’s feelings and is syntactically unrelated to other words in the utterance (Putrayasa, 2008). It is an extra-sentence and always precedes speech.

Linguists classify interjections into several groups. Wilkins (1992) classified interjection forms into primary, secondary, phrase, and clause interjections. Meanwhile, Kridalaksana (2015) categorized interjections based on their form, meaning, and function. Interjections are classified into basic or simple and derivative based on their form, i.e., affix, reduplications, and word combinations. Examples of basic interjections include cis, bah, and ah, while examples of combined interjections are alah and mak. There are various interjections based on their meaning, i.e., amazement, sadness, surprise, anger, irritation, disgust, disappointment, and many more. Interjections are classified into emotive and referential or cognitive interjections based on their function.

The classification by Wilkins (1992) and Kridalaksana (2015) is considered less representative because of the overlapping classification scope between the fields of morphology, syntax, and semantics. Interjections based on derivatives, affixes, reduplications, and word combinations are included in the topic of morphological studies, while phrase and clause interjections are included in syntactic studies. However, Kridalaksana (2015) also grouped interjections based on meaning.

So far, one of the interjection discussions put more focus on the semantic side, i.e., emotive. Therefore, it is relevant to group interjections based on the proposed semantic view (Goddard, 2008; Wierzbicka, 1992, 2003). In the meantime, it is also
classified into primary interjections, i.e., short or simple monosyllabic words, and secondary interjections, i.e., a more complex form/derivative.

Semantically, interjections are categorized into emotive, i.e., emotion or feeling about something (good or bad), volitive (will, desire, or obtaining reactions), and cognitive, i.e., the process of thinking and knowing something. Wierzbicka (1992) divided basic emotions into interest, joy, surprise, sadness, anger, disgust, humiliation, fear, shame, and guilt. This classification is considered a reference for emotional expressions and universal emotions. Volitional interjection expresses a desire that encourages specific reactions from the other party. It asks other people to do as the speaker’s wishes. Examples of volitive interjections include hai to call someone and sst to ask someone to be quiet. A cognitive interjection is used to convey messages that are more oriented to cognition or thought, i.e., something known as information, and becomes new knowledge. The Indonesian language has many cognitive interjections, namely wow, wah, aha, ah, wah, oh, hmm, oops, hah, aduh, and nah (Shalika & Mulyadi, 2019). The interjections wow and wah deliver amazement and happiness, which are included in the emotive aspect. It can also convey a thought or knowledge, which are parts of the cognitive aspect. There is often an overlap between cognitive and emotive interjections because both are tools for expressing feelings (Goddard, 2014). Although similar, the difference between these two aspects is more clearly in speech. To conclude, interjections are used to express something but not to describe something (emotions or mental states, attitudes, actions, or reactions to a situation). Interjections only convey what a person feels, thinks, wants, believes, or knows at a specific time (Goddard, 2014).

Although there is a clear distinction, an interjection is often considered similar to the exclamation and fatis category (a subclass of the word task that has a special form) (Mulyadi, 2021). Interjection does not recognize derivation, for example, cis. The interjection of cis cannot be converted into cis lah. Interjections are located at the beginning of sentences, while exclamations are freely distributed. Interjections are formed non-elliptically, while exclamation is formed elliptically. Furthermore, an interjection refers to an event, which distinguishes it from the exclamation and fatis category. The semantic structure of an interjection consists of a macro event formed by two micro-events, which have causal relationships with different semantic elements. Cause events are marked by word elements as predicates and effect events are marked by feeling, thinking, knowing, and wanting elements. Interjections are located at the beginning of sentences. In exclamations, the resultant event is formed by the elements of feeling, knowing, and wanting as the predicate. The exclamation is freely located in spoken language. Meanwhile, fatis has similar parameters as interjections, i.e., located at the beginning of a sentence. However, there is a significant difference, i.e., fatis functions to start, maintain, or confirm the conversation between the speakers (Putrayasa, 2008).

### 2.2 Acehnese Interjections

The previously recorded interjections in Acehnese are ôdu, ôku, astagfirullah, insya Allah, ma é, ek, hoi, alah hai Po, woi, ôi, ô, eh, jeh, nyan ban, ôma or ômma, ômi or ômni, paléh, and euh (Azharina et al., 2012; Wildan, 2010). The emotive aspect was the only element discussed in this language, while the volitive and cognitive aspects were not discussed. Meanwhile, Durie (1985) classified ômma as an
exclamation without providing detailed reasons regarding the difference between interjection, exclamation, and fatis. Even though there are clear distinctions between the categories, i.e., an interjection is only located at the beginning of sentences, fatis is freely located, while exclamation can be located at the beginning of the sentence or on other positions.

Ômma is the most produced interjection in the Acehnese language. It has several variations, including ôma, ômi, ômmi, and ômman, which have similar meanings but different sound variations. However, the interjections ôma, ômi, ômmi, and ômman are only used in a few areas, i.e., Aceh Pidie, Aceh Besar, Aceh Selatan, and Aceh Utara.

2.3 The Natural Semantic Metalanguage Theory

Natural semantic metalanguage (NSM) is an approach to analyzing words’ meaning in a language. Mulyadi (2006) wrote that the theory was suggested by Anna Weirzbicha, a semantic expert of Polish descent who became a lecturer at the Australian National University. Together with several colleagues, including Cliff Goddard, Felik Ameka, Hilary Chappell, and Jen Harkins, she developed NSM through cross-language semantic studies over the years. Her theory began with an investigation of semantic primitives.

The theory assumes that a sign cannot be analyzed into a form that is not the sign itself, which means that it is impossible to analyze the meaning of a combination of forms that is not the meaning of the form itself. This assumption refers to semiotic principles, i.e., the theory of signs (Goddard, 1994). The primary assumption is that meaning cannot be fully described without a set of semantic primitives (Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2014). In other words, the meaning of a word is a configuration of the semantic primitives. Thus, meaning analysis will be discrete, complete, and straightforward without other discrete meaning combination residues (Goddard, 2008; Wierzbicka, 1996).

The semantic primitive is the first meaning of a word that does not easily change despite cultural changes. The semantic primitive is a reflection and formation of thoughts that can be explicated from ordinary language, which is the only way to present meaning. Those words are universal lexical items, and their meanings can be translated into all languages. The amount of proposed semantic primitives ranges from a few units, like seven (Jackendoff, 1983), to several dozen (Wierzbicka, 1985), or even hundreds (Apresyan, 1995). Although there have not been any dramatic changes to the collection of fundamental ideas governing human society in recent decades, as time goes on, their relative importance shifts.

One of the main theoretical concepts in determining interjection is to apply a set of semantic primitives. However, all semantic primitives presented in the NSM theory refer to the English exponents. Apart from different morphosyntactic properties, the exponents have variations with combinations. Recently, 61 English semantic primitives have been discovered (Goddard, 2008; Wierzbicka, 1996), including think, know, want, feel, see, and hear.

In this paper, the interjection meanings are traced using the components of semantic primitives to distinguish the emotive, volitive, and cognitive aspects. The emotive aspect has a meaning component of ‘I feel something’, while the volitive aspect has ‘I want something’ and does not have a component meaning of ‘I feel something’. On the other hand, the cognitive aspect has a meaning component of ‘I
think of something’ or ‘I know something’ and has no emotional component of ‘I feel something’ or a volitive component of ‘I want something’. The categorization is adopted from Wierzbicka (1992) and Goddard (2014).

3. METHOD

The study employed a qualitative approach selected due to its linguistic form of data (Bungin, 2007; Moleong, 2007; Neuman, 2014; Sugiyono, 2006). The data comprised oral and written, in the form of sentences that include interjections. Oral data were collected from informants with Acehnese mother tongue by applying an observation method with a conversation technique for one month. Twelve informants consented to participate in this study, and they are from Aceh Besar, West Aceh, and South Aceh. The informants meet the qualifications proposed by Mahsun (2005) and Djajasudarma (2006). The informants should be male or female, be native Acehnese speakers, born in Aceh, have an Acehnese mother tongue, and aged between 30-60 years old. In addition to oral data as the primary data in this study, written data from previous studies and Acehnese books were used as supporting data.

The result of the data analysis is presented using a distributional method in which the determinants were contained in the language (Djajasudarma, 2006; Mahsun, 2005). This method is used because every language element is related to one another. This paper also applied the NSM theory for data analysis (Goddard, 2008; Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2002; Wierzbicka, 1996). Data were analyzed by following the research procedure as follows: determining the semantic primes from the analyzed words and paraphrasing the meaning of the word.

4. RESULTS

The interjection of ômma is one of the Acehnese words used to express feelings. The meaning of interjection of ômma in Acehnese is similar to wah, wow, and walah in Indonesian. The study demonstrates that the interjection of ômma can express emotive, volitive, and cognitive aspects. The context of the sentence differentiates the meaning of the three aspects. The context is the primary determinant in deciding the semantic aspect of an interjection.

4.1 The Emotive Aspect

Ômma is generally used to express feelings or emotions (good or bad), including amazement, anger, and surprise.

4.1.1 Emotive interjections expressing amazement

Emotive interjections specifically express amazement or responses to specific events experienced by speakers and delivered to interlocutors, as exemplified below.

(1) Ômma! Leupah that carong ji-beut aneuk nyan.
Intj. extreme very skillful 3-reciting Quran child that
‘Ômma! The child is very skillful in reciting the Quran’.
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(2) Ômma! Ubè raya rumoh cidara-kah.
   Intj. size big house relative-2.
   ‘Ômma! Your relative’s house is huge’.

Data (1) and (2) can be tested using the following sequence of NSM analysis.

I now know something about something.
I would never have thought that I would notice.
When I think about this
(I did not imagine it could be like it).
I felt something extraordinary happen; I was so amazed.
When I felt it happen, I said ômma.

Now I know something.
I would never have thought that I would notice.
I thought, “That is very good and wonderful”.
(I never imagined it could be that wonderful.
Because such a wonderful and amazing thing is beyond my mind)
I felt something positive.
Therefore, I said ômma.

Therefore, in Acehnese, the emotive ômma is spoken when one finds out something does not concur with their knowledge or previous thoughts. Something happened pleasingly that the speaker said ômma as an expression of his or her amazement for something. In this case, the interjection of ômma is classified into an expression with a positive meaning. The text and context are also significant because a stand-alone ômma without any text and context may not express amazement; instead, it may have expressed anger or surprise. Therefore, facial expressions and gestures also determine the meanings of the interjection of ômma.

4.1.2 Emotive interjections that express anger

Several emotive interjections express negative feelings such as anger. An angry interjection is a negative interjection. Examples are shown in (3), (4), (5), and (6).

(3) Ômma! Pakon meunoe ka-buet dikah. Hana ka-kalôn buet gop.
   Intj. why this 2- work 2- no 2-look work people
   ‘Ômma! Why do you work like this? Don’t you pay attention to other people’s work?’

(4) Ômma! Peu hana mata-kah, ka-jak hana kalôn sahoe. Gop dong ka-pok.
   Intj. what no eye-2 2-walk no look where man standing 2-bump
   ‘Ômma! What is wrong with your eyesight? You bumped into a standing man’.

(5) Ômma! Ku-yu meunoe, ka-pubuet meudéh. Meunyoe han âk lé ka-peugah.
   Intj. 1-ask this 2-do that if no want anymore 2-tell
   ‘Ômma! I told you to do this; instead, you did something else. If you cannot do it, please say so’.

(6) Ômma! Bit-bit kah hana ji-lôp asam garam.
   Intj. seriously you no 2-enter acid salt
   ‘Ômma! Seriously, it is so difficult to talk to you’.
The interjections ômma in (3), (4), (5), and (6) express anger. It can be analyzed using the following NSM.

I now know something.  
I would never have thought that I would notice.  
I thought, “It is something horrible”.  
(I never imagined it could be that bad.  
Because it was so horrible and beyond my imagination)  
I felt something negative.  
Therefore, I said ômma.

4.1.3 *Emotive interjections that express surprise or shock reactions*

The data in (7) and (8) show that the interjection of ômma can express surprise reactions.

(7) Ômma! Ku tuwoe ku-balah WA gopnyan.  
Intj. have forgotten 1-reply  WhatsApp him  
Ômma! I forgot to reply to his WhatsApp message.

(8) Ômma! Pakon trȏk? Pakon hana neu-brithè neu-jak keuwoe.  
Intj. when arrive Why not 2-tell 2-come here  
Ômma! When did you arrive? Why didn’t you say that you were coming?

The interjection of ômma in (7) and (8) that express surprise reactions can be proven using an NSM analysis below.

I now know something.  
I would never have thought that I would notice.  
When I thought about it  
(I never imagined it like that).  
I felt something; I was shocked.  
When I felt it happen, I said ômma.

4.2 *Volitive Aspect*

These interjections express a desire to encourage particular reactions from the other party. A volitive interjection has the meaning of ‘I want’ something. The interjection of ômma is also used to ask someone to do as the speaker wishes. The data below show that the speaker wanted his interlocutor to follow his command.

(9) Ômma! Aneuk miet bèk karu-karu, ka-duék di lua mantong.  
Intj. Child small no noisy 2-sit 2-come outside only  
Ômma! Kids, please be quiet! You should wait outside.

The ômma in (9) actually expresses a feeling that wishes the other party to follow the speaker’s will. The speaker wanted the children to stop talking or be quiet in this case. The children were expected to do what the speaker commanded, i.e., to be silent. Hence, the ômma in (9) is proven using the following NSM analysis.
I want to something now.
I would never have thought that I can fulfill that wish.
(I commanded someone
Because I want something to be stopped)
When I want something to happen
I request someone to fulfill my need.
I said ômma.

Data (10) can be also analyzed by the similar phrases such as in data (9). A gesture usually accompanies interjections to express volition. In addition to saying ômma, forbidding children from being noisy such as in (9), asking them to be quiet, and requesting them to move to another location, can also be accompanied by putting an index finger to the lip as a sign of prohibition. So, the children, in this case, followed the speaker’s command. Likewise, the ômma in (10) is used so that the speaker could get the listener to lend him an umbrella.

10) Ômma! Pah that na  ka-ba payông. Tôh keu lôn siat.
Intj. fit very exist 2-bring umbrella. Let to I awhile
‘Ômma! What a coincidence, you brought an umbrella. Let me borrow it for a while’.

The ômma in (11), at first glance, seems like expressing amazement or praise; however, the sentence is semantically volitive, i.e., the speaker wanted someone to do what he wanted, which was to let him bring the flowers back to his village. His desire is by interjecting ômma in his utterance as a sign of control.

11) Ômma! Lagak-lagak that  bungong nyoe. Yang tôh  jeut ku-puwoe u gampông?
Intj. pretty very flower this that which can 1-bring to hometown
‘Ômma! The flowers are so pretty. Which one can I take back to my hometown?’

4.3 Cognitive Aspect

An interjection of the cognitive aspect is used to deliver a message that is more oriented towards cognition or thought, i.e., in the form of information and becomes new knowledge. Cognitive and emotive interjections sometimes are considered similar because they both can be tools to express feelings; however, the difference is more apparent in speech.

12) Ômma! Nyoe tanyoe na  raseuki, thôn nyoe jeut ta-jak umrah lom.
Intj. this we have money year this can 1-go umrah again
‘Ômma! If only we have money, we can go for Umrah again this year’.

The NSM analysis for (12) is as the following:

I’m thinking about something now
(if we have money)
I never thought about that before.
I think if we have money
(that crossed my mind)
When that crossed in my mind
I said ômma
The interjection of ômma in (12) is classified as a cognitive aspect because it expresses thinking. It is similar to the interjection of aha in Indonesian, Aha! Saya ada ide! ‘Aha! I have an idea!’ (Shalika & Mulyadi, 2019). Aha is mentioned because the speaker suddenly thought of a brilliant idea that had not crossed his mind before. Likewise, the interjection of ômma is exclaimed spontaneously due to a thought that appeared in one’s mind, which was previously unthinkable. Examples from the data are displayed in (13), (14) and (15).

(13) Ômma! Meud éh jih jëut ta-yu jak awai ùro e noye.  
Intj. want he can 1-ask come early day this ‘Ômma! We should have asked him to early first today’.

(14) Ômma! Hana rôh meujôk seudeukah keu aneuk yatim nyan.  
Int. no cancel 1-give alms to child orphan that ‘Ômma! I forgot to give alms to the orphan’.

(15) Ômma! Teulat that trôhl kah, ka hana mereumpôk jatah.  
Int. late very arrive you exist not meet fortune ‘Ômma! You arrived very late; you are not in luck’.

In (13), it can be seen that after the event happened, it suddenly appeared in the speaker’s mind to ask the interlocutor to come earlier to the event that they were talking about. Previously, the speaker did not even think of telling the interlocutor to arrive earlier. The data show that by asking the interlocutor to come early, the speaker thought he could do something to help the speaker in the event. When the thought crossed the speaker’s mind, he said ômma to express his regret. In Acehnese, an interjection of ômma that expresses cognitive meaning is also accompanied by gestures, i.e., tapping the leg and/or holding the forehead. Likewise, data (14) and (15) show expressions of regret and guilt as cognitive expressions, which is in line with Shalika and Mulyadi’s (2019) findings.

5. DISCUSSION

The interjection of ômma can express all three semantic aspects of emotive, volitive and cognitive. The emotive aspect concerns feelings directly expressed at the time and location of the event. It refers to interjections that mainly express emotions (Goddard, 2014). For example, an ômma is uttered when someone recites the Quran in a melodious voice, which the speaker has never heard before. The ômma is spontaneously expressed, followed by other utterances, such as lagak that su aneuk nyan ‘the child has a wonderful voice’. But, in some cases, an interjection may not articulate all three of the semantic aspects. An example is the Indonesian interjection of aduh, which is used to express the emotive meaning of sickness/sadness (Kridalaksana, 2015). This interjection is only found to articulate the volitive and cognitive aspects.

The use of interjections are usually strongly related to context (Ameka, 2006). This interjection is delivered using a distinct intonation (Goddard, 2014), including facial expressions and certain gestures (Ameka, 1992; Wierzbicka, 2003; Wilkins, 1992). In the case of ômma, it can be accompanied by the gestures of hand-clap, head-shake, and thumbs-up, with a joyful voice and a happy facial expression to convey
amazement with a positive surprise reaction. However, if the emotive aspect is anger to display negative meaning (Goddard, 2014), ômma is usually accompanied by high intonation, bad facial expressions, and gestures such as lip-biting and eye-rolling. In the conversations between a superior and a subordinate, as presented in data (4), (5), and (6), the speakers uttered ômma with unpleasant facial expressions; hence, displaying negative meaning.

Apart from expressing the emotive aspect, the interjection of ômma also expresses the volitive and cognitive aspects. The volitive aspect is used when the speaker wants another person to do something he or she wants (Wierzbicka, 1992). In this study, the speaker expressed ômma before asking another person to do what he or she wanted the interlocutor to do for him or her. Gestures play a significant role in this aspect as well. In this case, it was carried out by pointing with the index finger and facial expressions.

Meanwhile, the feelings expressed by the cognitive aspect are the opposite of the emotive and volitive aspects, i.e., it does not occur at the event’s place and time, instead it happens through a thinking process (Chaplin & Kartono, 2006; Shalika & Mulyadi, 2019). Cognition is a mental process or activity in seeking and understanding information. Therefore, a cognitive interjection is oriented to cognition, which is usually related to familiar information resulting from the speaker’s thoughts, for example, wow, gosh, and many more (Devi & Tarmini, 2019). After the new thoughts and considerations appear in one’s mind, emotional expression emerges in the form of speech. In the data of this study, the interjection of ômma expressing cognition is delivered after an event had happened. In the case of ômma in (13), it can be said that it contained both the emotive and cognitive aspects. It initially expresses emotional feelings and new thoughts that appear in one’s mind after an event that is not supposed to happen. The latter happens after a thinking process, i.e., the cognitive aspect. It means that certain knowledge and new considerations appear in the speaker’s mind after an event happens to someone. Previous studies have only classified ômma or oma to have an emotive aspect that expresses amazement (Azharina et al., 2012; Wildan, 2010). Thus, this study showed that this interjection applies in in the cognitive aspect as well.

6. CONCLUSION

The interjection of ômma is used to express three semantic aspects. The first is the emotive aspect, including amazement, surprise, and anger. The second is the volitive aspect, which expresses desires directed at others. In other words, the volitive aspect is an expression that asks others to do what the speaker wants. The last one is the cognitive aspect which spontaneously expresses thoughts, ideas, or regrets immediately after an event occurs. Furthermore, context plays an essential role in determining the meaning of ômma, i.e., the meaning, either emotive, volitive, or cognitive, is revealed when in speech. The intonation, expressions, and gestures also determine the meaning of ômma. It is difficult to determine the meaning of ômma when not related to the context.

Many issues are not yet discussed, such as the variation of ômma described in the literature review. Further research focusing on these issues is expected to be carried out. It is hoped that by doing so, it can reveal the specific regions using the interjections.
and whether each interjection expresses similar semantic aspects as in the finding of this study. In addition, it is essential to examine the three semantic aspects of all Acehnese interjections that have not been explored.
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