



**GHÂNCARAN: JURNAL PENDIDIKAN  
BAHASA DAN SAstra INDONESIA**

<http://ejournal.iainmadura.ac.id/ghancaran>  
E-ISSN: 2715-9132; P-ISSN: 2714-8955  
DOI 10.19105/ghancaran.v5i2.8753



***Isinga*: Objectification and Abjection in Women**

**Abu Wafa\* & Ramayda Akmal\*\***

\*Master of Literature, Universitas Gadjah Mada

\*\*Doctor of Philosophy, Universität Hamburg and Universitas Gadjah Mada

Email: [abuwafa@mail.ugm.ac.id](mailto:abuwafa@mail.ugm.ac.id)

**Abstract**

**Keywords:**  
objectification;  
abjection;  
Kristeva;  
*Isinga*.

*Isinga* (2015) by Dorothea Rosa Herliany tells about the downturn of women so that they often become objects of the patriarchal system adopted by the local culture as well as the potential to cause abjection of female figures. This study attempts to analyze *Isinga* (2015) with Kristeva's perspective on abjection and Calogero's objectification of women. By using qualitative methods, this study used a feminist approach to see gender inequality in the novel. The results obtained from this study are that Irewa experienced objectification, which then continued to become an abjection. Irewa's objectification occurred because her husband, Malom, made her a sexual object. Jingi only received abjection since she was born because she was born with twins with Irewa, one of whom had to be thrown away so that the village would not be in danger.

**Abstrak:**

**Kata Kunci:**  
objektifikasi; abjeksi;  
Kristeva; *Isinga*.

*Isinga* (2015) karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany bercerita tentang keterpurukan perempuan sehingga seringkali menjadi objek atas sistem patriarkal yang dianut oleh budaya setempat sekaligus berpotensi menimbulkan abjeksi terhadap tokoh perempuan. Penelitian ini berusaha menganalisis *Isinga* (2015) dengan perspektif Kristeva untuk abjeksi dan Calogero untuk objektifikasi pada perempuan. Dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif, penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan feminis untuk melihat ketidaksetaraan gender yang di dalam novel tersebut. Hasil yang didapat dari penelitian ini adalah Irewa mengalami objektifikasi yang kemudian berlanjut menjadi abjeksi. Objektifikasi Irewa terjadi karena dia dijadikan objek seksual oleh suaminya, Malom. Jingi hanya mendapatkan abjeksi sejak dilahirkan karena dia terlahir kembar bersama Irewa yang mana salah satunya harus dibuang agar desa terhindar marabahaya.

Terkirim: 1 Mei 2023; Revisi: 24 November 2023; Diterima: 29 Januari 2024

©Ghâncaran: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia  
Tadris Bahasa Indonesia  
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Madura, Indonesia

**INTRODUCTION**

The word "patriarchy" literally means the rule of the father or the patriarch. Originally, it was used to describe a specific type of male-dominated family, the large household of the patriarch, which included women, junior men, children, enslaved people, and domestic servants, all under the rule of this dominant male. In contrast,

male domination is the power relationships by which men dominate women and characterizes a system whereby women are kept subordinate in several ways (Wiyatmi et al., 2019, 516). Because of this patriarchy, women's options are limited and keep them dependent on men; sexualization maintains women's subordinate societal position (Smolak & Murnen, 2011, 55).

The issue of women's position in patriarchal spaces tends to generate resistance, exactly in Papua. Anastasia (Anastasia, 2021, 2) believes that Papuan women still have the power to make decisions under challenging conditions, such as being protectors of the forest because they provide food for their families and can even act as peacemakers between two conflicting villages. On the other hand, women often find themselves in specific positions without the ability to choose, such as becoming sexual objects constantly co-opted by Papuan culture. Sexuality (Arivia & Gina, 2015, 63), in general, can be regulated through practiced traditional manner, defined by who can marry and who cannot, and exerting control over women's bodies.

This phenomenon is represented in the *Isinga* novel. *Isinga* (2015) by Dorothea Rosa Herliany contains the phenomenon of women's position, which is affected by being wrapped in local cultural values supported by male dominance and the patriarchal system within it. Without beating around the bush, Herliany mentions at the beginning that *Isinga* is for *isinga/isigna/nisinga* or mothers/women in Papua. This indicates that the *Isinga* novel is written to represent women in Papua.

Through Irewa, the phenomenon appears clearly and is the central point of the story. Initially, Irewa, who loves Meage because of his skill in playing the tifa, is forced to marry Malom, a young man from the village of Hobone. Irewa has no other choice except to accept Malom's proposal. If she refuses, the youth of Hobone will go to war again with Aitubu, the original village of Irewa and Meage, after years of peace. If she accepts, she has to endure an arranged marriage with someone she does not love and also become a mediator of peace (yonime) in both villages.

Irewa also has to suffer in her position as Malom's sexual object. She has to bear this suffering alone because a mother has to take care of the house, children, fields, and food, while Malom is free to leave the house, either to hunt or go into the forest without some aim. Because Irewa was cornered by the position of the object, her position would shift to being an object, isolated, both when she experienced childbirth alone and when she contracted AIDS due to Malom's transmission to her. Apart from Irewa, Jingi also experienced abjection. Since childhood, as Irewa's twin sister, Jingi had to be eliminated as a condition for the village to avoid danger.

Objectification in *Jingi* is not obvious because *Jingi* was introduced to the concept of loving with consent, which he received in a European environment, where he received his medical education. However, there is a tendency for *Jingi* to turn into a female subject who takes a full role through the intellectual she has acquired. Still, researchers only limit the focus of the problem to the objectification and abjection that befell the two characters.

Looking at the phenomenon in front, it can be seen that there is an imbalance in the position between men and women. Herliany directs readers (Sugihastuti, 1998, 28) as if the relationship between men and women is only a biological and socio-economic relationship. In reality, from a feminist perspective, women are actually equal to men in terms of getting rights, carrying out obligations, and gaining opportunities.

Based on the background explained above, the problem that will be discussed in this research is the objectification and abjection of women using the perspective of Calogero and Kristeva in the *Isinga* novel by Dorothea Rosa Herliany. This research aims to describe the objectification and abjection of women in the novel. Researchers separate literature reviews based on the material objects and formal objects used. *Isinga* as a material object has been researched before. Some of them are as follows.

First, Rahman (2016) researched *Isinga* with the title "*Diskriminasi Gender Perempuan Papua Dalam Novel Isinga Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany.*" In this research, the following results were obtained: 1) showing the existence of gender discrimination, which includes various things, both physical and sexual, and 2) characteristics of men in the *Isinga* novel by Dorothea Rosa Herliany. In other words, Rahman sees that there is discrimination occurs in Papua due to men's masculinity being placed too strongly within men. This research only explains gender discrimination without a clear theoretical basis.

Second, Irmawati (2017) researched the same material object titled "*Mitos Masyarakat Papua dalam Novel Isinga Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany.*" In this research, the following results were obtained: (1) the myth of two sisters, (2) the myth about women, (3) the myth of ancient pigs, (4) the myth of lard, (5) the myth of spirits, (6) the myth of the forbidden fruit, (7) myth about twins, (8) myth about smoke, (9) myth about sick people, (10) myth about birth blood. These myths are related to the ethnographic values held by the Papuan people. This research just explains the myth by using Barthes's perspective.

Third, Wardiningsih (2017), with research entitled "*Konstruksi Gender Dalam Novel Isinga Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany.*" This research showed that various gender

constructions can be seen from various aspects of society and the family. The factors that cause gender construction, namely myths, patriarchal culture, and the capitalist system, surround the lives of Papuan people. The difference with our research is that this research explains gender constructions, but our research focuses on the objectification and abjection of women, especially in *Isinga*.

Fourth, Putri (2018) with research entitled “*Realitas Sosial dalam Novel Isinga Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany (Kajian Sosiologi Sastra)*”. The results of this study indicate that objective social reality and subjective social reality contained in the novel *Isinga* by Dorothea Rosa Herliany have four aspects, including culture, economy, education, and oppression, by using George Ritzer’s social reality theory. The difference between each reality is that objective social reality occurs in everyday life and is often faced in certain societies, while subjective social reality is formed in individuals originating from objective social reality. It shows that there is a reciprocal relationship between objective social reality and subjective social reality.

Fifth, Maelani, and Fauziyah (2021) with research entitled “*Unsur Intrinsik dan Kebutuhan Primer Masyarakat Papua dalam Novel Isinga Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany.*” This research showed that primary, secondary, and tertiary needs in *Isinga* were integrated into the culture that grew there, using Koentjaraningrat’s perspective about ethnography. The difference with our research is this research looks at Papuan culture in general as written in the *Isinga*, while our research focuses more on women who are abjected and objectified in society.

Sixth, Batubara et al. (2022) with research entitled “*Feminisme dalam Novel Isinga Papua Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany.*” In this research, the results showed that radical feminism was found in terms of oppression between the sexes, in terms of caste, ethnicity, and religious systems. To strengthen the findings related to radical feminism, Batubara, et al. looked at the image of women, both physically and psychologically, and the image of women in domestic and public spaces, by using Mansour Fakhir’s perspective about radical feminism. The difference with our research is this research observes radical feminism, especially women who experience violence, while our research sees that women are getting violent because women are objectified and abjected by society.

Seventh, Nada (2023) with research entitled “*Peran Tokoh Perempuan Irewa dalam Roman Papua "Isinga" Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany: Kajian Feminisme*”. In this research, the result showed that several roles emerge for women, namely: (1) traditional role, (2) transitional role, (3) dual role, (4) egalitarian role, and (5) contemporary role, by

using Parson's social theory. The difference with our research is this research focuses on women's roles, while our research focuses on how women can get objectification and abjection in the *Isinga*.

Eighth, Nugroho, Sumartini, and Prabaningrum (2023) with research entitled “*Otoritas dan Kemandirian Perempuan dalam Karya Sastra Indonesia Modern*”. *Isinga* is only one of several novels studied. Some of these novels are *Bumi Manusia* (1980) by Pramoedya Ananta Toer, *Geni Jora* (2009) by Abidah al Khaelaqy, and *Namaku Teweraut* (2000) by Ani Sekarningsih, *Supernova 4: Partikel* (2012) and *Aroma Karsa* (2018) by Dewi Lestari. This research examines female characters who have this as a reflection of women's authority and independence in modern Indonesian literary works. The weakness of this research is it only explains the authority and independence of women in these novels without a clear theoretical basis.

All the research that has been presented discusses social reality, ethnography, and feminism. On social reality, there is Putri (2018) who uses George Ritzer's social reality theory. Next, the ethnography, there are Maelani and Fauziyah (2021), using Koentjaraningrat's perspective on ethnography, and Irmawati (2017), using Barthes's perspective. Then, feminism is discussed in various ways: 1) Rahman (2016) by using gender discrimination, 2) Wardiningsih (2017) by using gender construction, 3) Batubara, et al (2022) by using Mansour Fakhri's perspective about radical feminism, 4) Nada (2023) uses Parson's social theory to find women's role, 5) Nugroho, Sumartini, and Prabaningrum (2023) without theoretical basis but can explain women's authority and independence in modern Indonesian literary works. Even though much research on feminism in the *Isinga*, but no research observes the objectification and abjection of women in it.

The formal object used is an abjection from Kristeva's view supported by an objectification from Calogero's view. Several previous studies using formal objects in the form of Kristeva's abjections are as follows.

First, Arifin (2018) used Kristeva's abjection in his research entitled *Menelusuri Abjeksi Subjek Dalam Novel Ayah Karya Andrea Hirata: Kajian Semiotika Revolusioner Julia Kristeva*. In this research, the results showed that Zorro, as a subject, experienced pleasant abjection by not being able to forget his mother figure's love, warmth, and affection for him. This is preserved in his experiences during the Chora era, which is embedded in shirts, poems, and stories.

Second, Heriyati (2020) used Kristeva's abjections in research entitled “*Dekonstruksi Perempuan Abjek dalam Tiga Cerpen karangan Intan Paramaditha*”. This

research reveals that women who are represented as disgusting, frightening, and terrorizing monsters are a patriarchal construct. In this research, it was found that three short stories: 1) *Blind Woman without a Thumb*, 2) *Vampire*, 3) *Blood*, dismantle the construction of objects by blurring the boundaries between clean and dirty selves, monsters and humans, good women and bitch (or witch).

Regarding the formal object of Calogero's objectification, there are two studies that use similar formal objects. First, Intan (2021) with research entitled "*Objektifikasi dan Resiliensi Perempuan Dalam Novel Perempuan Bayangan Karya Netty Virgiantini*." The research showed that objectification was carried out by parents by forcing Ningrum to marry. Satria used Ningrum to get rid of loneliness and give vent to sexual desires.

Second, Razan and Erowati (2021) with research entitled "*Perlawanan Objektifikasi Perempuan Dalam Karya-karya Utuy Tatang Sontani*." In this research, the results showed that Utuy Tatang Sontani, through his three works, *Doger*, *Awal dan Mira*, and *Bunga Rumah Makan*, tried to fight objectivity towards women through his characters.

Research that uses these two formal objects at the same time is Artana's (2018) research entitled "The Woman Objectification And Abjection In Hannah Kent's Burial Rites". The research obtained the following results: 1) servants have their own right to do what they think is right even though they are still ignored by society, 2) servants are limited by the norms of the society they live in, 3) when servants make mistakes that have a detrimental impact employer's good name, they will be regarded with disdain. The difference with this research is the material object used.

By looking at material objects that have been widely researched as well as formal objects that are widely used, there is still a gap to examine *Isinga* from another, deeper perspective, namely by examining the abjection and objectification of women in the novel. The abjection promoted by Kristeva revolves around the act of alienating a person or group of people from society because their behavior or actions are considered dirty and not in accordance with societal norms. This rejection occurs because the values promoted by the subject are unacceptable to society so he is exiled from society. Kristeva (1982, 1–2) explains the difference between a subject experiencing objectification and falling on an object. Firstly, the subject who experiences objectification always places the subject in a fragile space of his desires, thereby making the subject continuously equalize values between himself. Next, the object is more like a subject that is discarded so that the values in it are not seen to exist. Subjects who experience this abjection are confined to their exile from society.

Furthermore, (Kristeva, 1982, 4) abjection is something (and someone) rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself from an object. Abject (Prabasmoro, 2006, 2) is considered deviant because abject does not comply with prohibitions, goes outside the rules, and does not conform to existing societal norms. It can be said that this abjection is not only limited to the process of society's exclusion of a person, but also the person himself can carry out abject actions in accordance with his inner urges. Therefore, all criminal acts, even lying, can be referred to as an object.

In the extreme point (Kristeva, 1982, 4), the abject is the equivalent of death or suicide, something rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object. It can be said that the suffering caused by exile experienced by the subject is equivalent to death. Because abjection is synonymous with dirty and sinful things, (Kristeva, 1982, 17) all religious rituals exist to purify them even though the boundaries (between the pure and the dirty) will eventually blur so that the meaning collapses (Prabasmoro, 2006, 2) and it is difficult to distinguish between what is pure and dirty in society. For Kristeva, objects (Carson, 2020, 51–52) are determined by a discourse that is strongly patriarchal, where it is important to see how sacred and taboo a culture is and how necessary it is to develop the concept of objects without resulting in exclusion, prohibition or regulation.

If traced earlier, the abjection coined by Kristeva was influenced by Lacanian and Freudian psychoanalysis. During the preoedipal period (Freud) or mirror stage (Lacan), children aged 6-18 months learn to differentiate between “me” and “not me” (Jones, 2007, 8). Children at that age do not yet have awareness of their own bodies. For example, a child only realizes that he has hands and feet when he is in front of a mirror, but when he leaves the mirror, he will lose awareness of his body.

Abjection in its most ancient form (Ross, 1997, 149) is an oral disgust, a refusal of a mother who is experienced as abject so that the child might expel itself from the mother-child dyad and become a subject. In other words, children who are born until the weaning period to their mother are a process of abjection from their own mother. A child who was previously in his mother's womb must be separated from his mother. This stage places the child in a narcissistic crisis (Handayani et al., 2013, 10), namely, the baby questions about his subject, between subject and object, self and others, and life and death.

The shape of the culturally abject body (Jones, 2007, 8) always takes the form of “the other,” either visible through its marked differences in shape, color, or stability or

invisible in its undifferentiated banality—all in comparison to culturally driven norms. In the context of feminism, women (Handayani et al., 2013, 18) must subvert the symbolic language dominated by patriarchal culture.

To support abjection while distinguishing between objects and objects, objectification is needed from Calogero's perspective. In fact, objectification revolves around placing subjects, in this case women, as objects for men. Developed by Fredrickson and Roberts (1997), objectification theory (Calogero et al., 2011, 9) is essentially a synthesis and formalization of the many disparate lines of theorizing and research on the sexual objectification of women, offering a focused and formal framework for investigating the consequences of living in such a sexually objectifying cultural milieu that socializes girls and women to view and treat themselves as objects to be evaluated on the basis of their appearance. Calogero, et al (2011, 5) states that objectification is creating and treating something that is not an object as an object or has objective reality. They emphasize that the objectified person must be realized only by and for others with three keywords: controlled, determined, and used. Philosopher Martha Nussbaum (*ibid*) states that objectification involves at least seven ways of treating other people, namely as follows: 1) as a tool for one's own purposes (instrumentality), 2) as lacking in autonomy and self-determination (denial of autonomy), 3) as lacking in agency and activity (inertness), 4) as interchangeable with others of the same or different types (fungibility), 5) as permissible to break, smash, or break into (violability), 6) as something that is owned by another (ownership), 7) as something whose experience and feelings do not need to be considered (denial of subjectivity).

Kahalon et al. (2018, 3) said that self-objectification is built from a psychological construct that links women's involvement in cultural practices of sexual objectification (for example, exposure to catcalls or beauty magazines) and their experiences, which result in the following four points: 1) embarrassment, 2) increased anxiety (especially anxiety about appearance and safety), 3) reduced range of movement, and 4) sensitivity to body signals. Objectified body consciousness (Lindner & Tantleff-Dunn, 2017, 2) has three components: 1) body surveillance, 2) internalization of body-cultural standards manifested as body shame, and 3) beliefs about appearance control. At a certain point, this objectification can impact women who view their bodies as objects or scenery to be appreciated by others (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997, 180).

With these definitions, it can be concluded that women, personally and physically, do not experience an equal position as experienced by men. Women are often seen as satisfying men's desires (male gaze), so they fall into objectification. This has an impact



on women's feelings of dissatisfaction with seeing their own bodies as well as limiting their safe space from the neutral gaze of men.

It can be said, there is a subtle difference between objectification and abjection. Objectification relates to placing female subjects as objects, which can be controlled, determined, and can be used like stuff. Women are considered valuable in the eyes of men. The effects of this objectification can have an impact and cause abjection. Objectified women who have value useful directly will eventually be discarded and exiled if this use value no longer fulfills men. The urgency of this research is combining two theories as formal objects, namely objectification, and abjection, so those theories are seen as holistic theories. Then, those theories used for observing material objects, *Isinga*, as an example case relevant to both theories.

## METHOD

By using material objects from the *Isinga* novel by Dorothea Rosa Herliany, this research is supported by formal objects in the form of Calogero's objectification and Kristeva's abjection. In addition, this research uses a feminist approach. This approach (Sugihastuti, 1998, 29) views literature with a special awareness of the existence of gender, which has a lot to do with culture, literature, and human life. In this case, the feminist approach is related to gender inequality in literary works that are related to reality.

Furthermore, this research uses qualitative methods. Qualitative methods focus on steps to utilize interpretation by presenting it in the form of descriptions (Ratna, 2006, 46). The data used in the research is descriptive, starting from dialogue and narrative in the *Isinga* novel. With this data, an interpretation will be carried out by the researcher.

The data collection technique used was the note-taking technique. Basically, data collection techniques are a set of methods or techniques for extending human senses because the aim is to collect empirical facts related to research problems (Faruk, 2012, 25). The steps taken are as follows: 1) reading the *Isinga* novel from beginning to end to obtain a complete picture of the contents of the novel; 2) recording data to support the perfection of analysis; 3) analysis according to grouped data. The researcher selected data for analysis by adjusting the theory used, namely Kristeva's abjection and Calogero's objectification so that analysis results can synchronize each other between material objects and formal objects.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The positions of objectification and abjection are intertwined; that is, objectification often occurs before abjection, and contrary, it can occur after it. Even so, researchers see a tendency for objectification to occur first so that abjection can emerge. On this basis, the researcher took a stance by placing the discussion of objectification on the characters in *Isinga* first so that it reads coherently, then discusses abjection.

### Wife and Slave: Objectification in *Isinga*

Objectification theory (Calogero et al., 2011, 10) takes as the starting point that cultural practices of sexual objectification (delineated earlier) create multiple opportunities for women to view themselves through the lens of an external observer. Furthermore, a cultural practice is considered harmful to women if the practice (a) is harmful to the health of women and girls, (b) arises from material power differences between the sexes, (c) is for the benefit of men, (d) creates stereotypes that thwart the opportunities of girls and women, and (e) is justified by tradition. In other word, objectification can happen if women in their cultural society got violence.

This objectification can be got by women who do not have more power to against patriarchal culture. According to the statement, objectification also happens in *Isinga*, marked by the tendency of the female characters, which is manifested through Irewa, to view wives only as satisfying their husband's desires. Since marrying Malom, Irewa has not been free with her body and herself. In other words, Irewa was placed by Malom as his sexual object.

Malom memeluk lengan Irewa. Irewa diam. Malom merengkuh tubuh Irewa. Irewa diam. Betis Malom mengikat dua kaki Irewa. Irewa diam. Malom menciumi tubuh Irewa. Irewa menolak.... Pergumulan dua manusia yang berbeda keinginan. Irewa menolak. Irewa menolak. Irewa menolak apa saja yang dilakukan Malom pada tubuhnya.... Irewa sudah makin tak bertenaga lagi. Malom berkuasa atas tubuh Irewa. Malom telah menjadi seorang suami. Laki-laki lko harus mengawini tubuh perempuan. (Herliany, 2015, 57)

This quote is related to Calogero's statement (2011, 10) that women come to take a view of themselves as objects virtually all of the time, whether they find themselves in public or private settings. In this case, Irewa was objected to in a private area by her husband, Malom. Because Irewa is Malom's wife, Malom thought can force Irewa to have sex. Therefore, even though Irewa is Malom's wife, she is like a slave.

In this quote, it is clear that Irewa did not consent and did not agree with Malom's sexual intercourse with her. This was marked and emphasized by Herliany's writing that Irewa was silent, and Irewa refused as a form of her refusal to have sexual relations

with Malom. Malom's objectification of Irewa does not only occur in bed, but Irewa also has to work without any rest periods. The compulsion to work, starting from looking for betatas and feeding pigs, places Irewa with limited resources and activities.

Malom mulai memarahinya. Irewa bilang, ia merasa tidak ada tenaga untuk bekerja. Malom mengatakan betatas harus selalu ada. Ia lapar. Babi-babi harus diberi makan. Irewa menjelaskan tentang sakitnya. Malom kesal. Irewa dianggap banyak bicara. Mulut Irewa yang sedang bicara itu ditamparnya. Malom bilang, besok Irewa harus sudah pergi ke kebun lagi.

Begitulah hari-hari Irewa. Seperti sudah ditetapkan bahwa ia harus terus-menerus bekerja. juga harus terus-menerus beranak. Setelah anaknya yang kedua itu, Irewa hamil lagi. Tapi karena pekerjaan yang berat dan makan kurang, kembali Irewa keguguran. Tak lama, Malom mengajak bersetubuh lagi. Lalu Irewa hamil lagi. ... Jadi dalam waktu singkat Irewa sudah punya tiga orang anak... Ia harus terus-menerus mau menerima ajakan Malom bersetubuh. Malom ingin anak laki-laki sebanyak-banyaknya.

...Dengan anak tiga orang yang semuanya masih kecil-kecil, Irewa merasa hidupnya semakin berat. Apalagi sekarang Malom sudah terbiasa memukul Irewa. (Herliany, 2015, 73)

As has been said previously, Irewa, as a wife, must obey Malom to have sexual relations. This coercion made Irewa feel like a slave and experience objectification. Irewa was present and made a central figure because she represents the phenomenon of women in Papua. In other words, this objectification also happens to other women in Papua. Herliany hid the actual name of the village to avoid exposing Papuan culture in that specific place to the world outside Papua.

Irewa memaksakan diri melayani permintaan Malom. Tak senang. Tegang. Kelaminnya terasa nyeri. Sakit. Irewa harus menghadapi apa saja yang terjadi atas dirinya. Begitulah juga yang dialami semua perempuan lain di bawah pegunungan Megafu. Mereka rata-rata mengalami hal sama. Harus terus-menerus melayani suami. Merawat anak jika nanti sudah lahir. Dan mengurus semua kebutuhan keluarga. Tak ada yang mengeluh. (Herliany, 2015, 69–70)

Malom really doesn't care what conditions are in the fields, so whatever happens in the fields, he has to be able to eat food. This repressed Irewa directly. Malom itself has no obligation to find food. Men in his village only hunt and go into the forest without having to bring game items. This culture positions women in a tight position between having to meet the family's living needs and, on the other hand, also having to fulfill their husband's biological needs whenever asked.

Malom marah. Irewa sudah menduga Malom akan marah. Irewa menjawab, *hamang nenacisde emei roibuyae helemende* yang artinya makanan tidak datang dengan sendirinya, tetapi harus diusahakan. Ini sebetulnya kata-kata biasa yang juga sering diucapkan para mama di Hobone untuk anaknya. Maksud kalimat itu untuk menyindir. Irewa sebenarnya tidak bermaksud melawan Malom. Ia tahu apa yang akan dialaminya kalau melawan. Tapi memang ia ingin sedikit memberi teguran halus Irewa melihat laki-laki lain di zaman sekarang mulai bekerja. Tidak diam saja seperti dilakukan Malom. Malom marah sekali mendapat sindiran itu. Dengan cepat ia mendekati Irewa. Bibir Irewa ditampar keras. Setelah itu Irewa dipukuli. Saat tubuh Irewa jatuh, ia ditendang berkali-kali. Irewa tak sempat membalas atau mengelak karena Malom mendekati padanya dengan sangat cepat. Irewa tersungkur, Tubuhnya meringkuk di tanah. Kedua kakinya terlipat. Tangan kanan dan kiri menyilang di pundak. Menahan segala kesakitan. Seluruh tubuhnya nyeri. (Herliany, 2015, 138)

Instead of openly refuting or even fighting back, Irewa did not have the power to do so. Irewa is trapped in a patriarchal culture where women are limited in their space and power, and full control is in the hands of men. Even so, Irewa still wants to be a good wife in Malom's eyes, with the parameter being how to prevent Malom from hitting her again. Irewa thinks that Malom hit Irewa because Irewa is not a good wife.

Sejak peristiwa hari itu, Irewa sama sekali tak bisa menolak ajakan bersetubuh dari Malom. Sejak itu pula, Malom juga jadi lebih mudah memukul Irewa. Salah sedikit saja, Irewa ditampar atau dipukul. Irewa sering mengingat kata-kata Mama Kame agar ia menjadi istri yang baik. Irewa merasa, sungguh tak mudah menjadi istri yang baik. (Herliany, 2015, 79)

This quote, according to Smolak & Murnen (2011, 55), states that the sexualization of girls and women is a ubiquitous phenomenon occurring in clothing, appearance-enhancing products and procedures, media, and messages from peers and parents. In other words, women in *Isinga* get sexualization, included in the act of objectification. For sure, sexualization in *Isinga* is supported by culture. The culture of continuing to reproduce in humans in *Isinga* is like that of livestock. They reproduced to create war soldiers and increase wealth. As a result, women are considered "child machines," so they have to give birth without pause continuously. It is also stated that boys are useful as soldiers, while girls are helpful for wealth, namely getting a dowry in the form of a plot of land and traditional property in the form of a pig. This tendency derails women from positions of value. It is useful if it can produce many children without paying attention to the woman's health.

Tugas yang diminta masyarakat. Suami harus mengawini istri agar menghasilkan anak. Perempuan adalah makhluk yang mendatangkan kesuburan. Anak laki-laki berguna untuk menuntut pengakuan akan tanah dan simbol penerus keturunan. Makin banyak anak laki-laki, makin berharga dan bermartabat. Tanah luas dan keturunan banyak. Anak laki-laki juga berguna agar prajurit mati ada yang menggantikan. Anak perempuan bernilai ekonomi. Perempuan berguna untuk mendapatkan mas kawin dan harta adat (babi). (Herliany, 2015, 90–91)

In the end, Irewa realizes that Malom's objectification of herself made her act like a slave. Irewa cannot have complete will and control over herself. Irewa realizes that before marriage, she is free to make choices, has desires, and has complete control over herself. At this point, Irewa gave up on Malom's treatment of her.

...Seorang budak tak bisa punya keinginan. Saat belum menikah, perempuan bisa punya keinginan. Dulu ia bisa. Dulu ia punya itu. Menolak atau menerima laki-laki yang menyatakan cinta padanya. (Herliany, 2015, 140)

Objectification of women does not only occur to individuals, to Irewa, but occurs as a consequence of community culture to strengthen the family, clan, and village. Women

were considered valuable because they could have sex as long as they were married and had to work to support the land, pigs, and family kitchen.

### **Body and Abjection in *Isinga***

Abjection (Kristeva, 1982, 4) is something (and someone) rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object. Abjection in *Isinga* is impact or reason of objectification. As a result of this objectification, women have two choices which both place them in a position of abjection: 1) they leave the village because they do not agree with the local culture, or 2) the village community gets rid of them because they violate the local culture. Due to a lack of strength and courage, women often continue living as prescribed by local culture.

On a broad scale, abjection can happen to everyone, without exception. This is because their life principle is to live to work. If there are people who are reluctant to work, society will get rid of them.

Sedang hal umum yang berlaku untuk laki-laki dan perempuan adalah *wali elae wakeyae* atau hidup untuk bekerja. Orang yang tidak bekerja akan disingkirkan oleh masyarakat. Masyarakat Hobone mengutamakan kerja keras dalam hidup (*meli/mekai*). Pantang menyerah. Hal itu berlaku bagi semua. Laki-laki. Perempuan. Tua-muda. Remaja dewasa. Anak-anak. Juga dukun. Orang berpengaruh. Juga bagi orang *obo yoku*. *Obo yoku* adalah orang yang hidupnya tak punya apa-apa, sederhana, baik itu orang Hobone sendiri atau orang yang baru datang dari luar Hobone. (Herliany, 2015, 66)

Unlike what happened to Irewa's twin sister, Jingi did not get objectification. Instead, she was objectified since she was a baby. This is because they are twins, one of whom had to be thrown away, eliminated, to avoid the danger that befell Hobone village. Apart from that, it is believed that twins can be born because a husband has sex with a woman other than his wife. This belief is what caused Jingi, from a young age, to have to accept acts that were abjected to herself.

Mereka juga percaya, bayi kembar itu terjadi karena seorang suami melakukan hubungan badan dengan perempuan lain waktu istrinya sedang hamil. Itu larangan yang tidak boleh dilanggar. Jadi kalau ada bayi kembar, bapak si bayi juga akan merasa malu.

...

Bayi yang lebih lemahlah yang harus dibuang. Bayi yang kemudian bernama Irewa itu dulu tampak lebih kuat. Maka bayi satunya yang kemudian bernama Jingi, ialah yang dibuang. Kini kondisinya berbalik. Jingi yang tampak lebih kuat. Bukan karena Irewa sedang sakit. Tapi secara keseluruhan, keduanya memang kelihatan berbeda. Irewa tampak lebih tua.... Sedang Jingi, sejak bayi mendapat susu dan makanan yang baik dari Suster Karolin dan selanjutnya dari Suster Wawuntu. Irewa hanya mendapat susu dari payudara Mama Kame. (Herliany, 2015, 88–89)

Lalu Suster Karolin mengatur siasat dengan Suster Wawuntu. Bayi kecil itu dihanyutkan di sungai. Tapi di tepi sungai yang lain. Suster Wawuntu sudah siap mengambil si bayi. Akhirnya Suster Karolin bisa memiliki bayi itu. Si bayi diberi nama Jingi Pigay. Jingi lala dirawat dan diasuh oleh Suster Karolin. (Herliany, 2015, 87)

Sejak itu, Suster Wawuntulah yang mengasuh bayi itu. Ketika Suster Karolin kembali ke Aitubu, ia tidak mengambil kembali anak asuhnya itu. Ia berpikir biar saja tetap di Manado, diasuh Suster Wawuntu. Supaya nanti kalau sudah agak besar bisa bersekolah di sana. Jadi, Jingi adalah anak asuh dua suster itu. Suster Karolin dan Suster Wawuntu. Kadang-kadang Suster Karolin datang ke Manado dan menengok anak asuhnya. Jingi tahu bahwa ia punya dua ibu. Mama Karolin dan Mama Wawuntu. (Herliany, 2015, 88)

Although Jingi got abjection since baby, Jingi did not suffer the same fate as Irewa. It because Jingi was rescued by Sister Karolin and Sister Wawuntu, then moved to Manado, then continued her studies in the Netherlands. Except have a good impact on Jingi's future fate, Jingi also did not get objectification like what Irewa got.

Jingi sudah tiba di Belanda. Mama Karolin tinggal di Maastricht, sebuah kota kecil yang berbatasan dengan negeri Jerman dan Belgia. Jingi mantap memperdalam ilmu kedokteran karena dari dosennya di Manado dan bacaan sejarah, ia tahu banyak tokoh Indonesia adalah lulusan sekolah kedokteran Belanda.

...ia memang sudah sejak kecil menyukai ilmu kedokteran dan ia ingin terus-menerus mempelajari ilmu ini. (Herliany, 2015, 191)

By living in Manado, studying there, and continuing her studies in the Netherlands, it shows that Jingi is detached from Papuan culture, in that she is not affected by the objectification that is rife there. In other words, the abjection that happened to Jingi included saving his life.

Irewa abjected herself by running for escape from Hobone village, through the forest, to find a hospital. This was due to a genital disease that happened to her because she was infected by Malom, who often went to Dolly, Surabaya, when Malom took part in a rowing competition.

Dolly ternyata sangat menggairahkan bagi Malom dan juga para laki-laki lain. Malom tak hanya mencoba satu perempuan. Hari-hari berikutnya sebelum kapal berangkat ke Papua, ia ke wisma lain. Ke perempuan lain. (Herliany, 2015, 134)

Irewa tak bisa menjawab pertanyaan Jingi karena ia juga tak tahu apa yang terjadi pada tubuhnya. Sakit muncul setelah Malom pulang dari Surabaya. Ia tak tahu bahwa di sana suaminya pergi ke tempat pelacuran.

...

Jingi memeriksa kondisi tubuh Irewa. Juga bagian kelaminnya. Ada bisul di vaginanya. Bernanah. Ada bintik-bintik merah di seluruh telapak tangan dan kakinya. Bintik merah yang lebih lebar juga ada di punggungnya. Ditanya Jingi, Irewa mengatakan penyakit itu sudah beberapa minggu dirasakannya. Jingi menjelaskan Irewa terkena sakit kelamin. Itu penyakit berbahaya. Irewa kaget. Penyakit kelamin? Setiap hari, waktu-waktunya hanya ke ladang saja. Bagaimana mungkin? Ia tak pernah berhubungan dengan laki-laki selain suaminya. Irewa tak mengerti. (Herliany, 2015, 135)

Irewa's suffering was continuous, starting from being Malom's sexual object, working to look for betatas and feeding pigs, and then getting violence at Malom's hands. This suffering caused Irewa to want to end her life by committing suicide. This urge can be said to be abjection because it wants to get out of the life order that confines it.

Kebosanan-kebosanan dan kesusahan-kesusahan hidup itu, sering memunculkan protes dalam hati Irewa. Irewa berjalan ke tempat yang tinggi. Dari situ ia memandang pegunungan Megafu. Apa sebenarnya hanya perempuan sajakah yang diminta Megafu untuk menjadi Iko? Menjadi orang kuat? Ia bertanya. Sekian tahun ia berusaha menjadi perempuan yang baik untuk Malom, tapi ia masih sering dipukuli.

...

Tak ada perempuan Megafu memikirkan tentang pisah dari suami. Tak ada yang melakukannya. Dulu pada saat menikah, ada pemberian babi sebagai mas kawin. Mas kawin tak ubahnya tanda bahwa perempuan telah dibeli. Karena sudah dibeli, laki-laki bisa melakukan apa saja terhadap perempuan. Cerai tak dikenal dalam kebiasaan di pegunungan Megafu. Apalagi kalau perempuan itu adalah yonime seperti Irewa. (Herliany, 2015, 139–140)

As a representative of Papuan women, Irewa's suicide is often carried out by other women. This shows that the most effective resistance carried out by women is through acts of abjection, namely suicide. As Kristeva said (1982, 4), suicide is included in the act of abjection. Moreover, the act of suicide also received support from the ancestors because many cases like this had happened before.

...Irewa lalu jadi terpikir untuk kembali memiliki keinginan sendiri. Kini ia ingin bunuh diri!

Di wilayah pegunungan Megafu, bunuh diri memang bukan hal baru bagi para perempuan. Bunuh diri biasa dilakukan para perempuan. Bahkan ini merupakan senjata terakhir atau cara yang banyak dipakai para perempuan untuk mengancam suami. Biasanya suami takut. Sebab kalau ini terjadi, maka suami harus memberikan sejumlah babi ke keluarga istri. Jika tidak, maka perang yang harus terjadi. Selain itu, bunuh diri para perempuan juga seperti mendapat dukungan dari nenek moyang. Hal ini berkaitan dengan cerita lama di Aitubu tentang babi purba. Babi purba rela mati demi hadirnya kehidupan lain, yaitu manusia. (Herliany 2015, 140–141)

Irewa continues to consider whether suicide can save him. Suicide for Irewa is not to lose her own life but to escape from all suffering.

Jadi bunuh diri adalah sesuatu yang tidak buruk. Seorang manusia sengsara dengan sukarela melakukan sesuatu untuk suatu hal lain. Yang penting bagi Irewa adalah ia bisa memiliki keinginan sendiri. Bunuh diri para perempuan biasanya dilakukan dengan cara melompat ke dalam sungai yang deras dan dalam airnya. Irewa memang sedang berada di garis putus asa. Ia merasa tak mampu lagi menanggung hidup yang begitu berat. (Herliany, 2015, 141)

Remembering her responsibility towards her children, Irewa decided to cancel her suicide. It can be said that abjection failed to occur for Irewa even though there had previously been encouragement to be abjected from local culture and objectification by Malom.

Irewa melihat dirinya lagi. Lalu anak-anak. Tanggung jawab! Ah! Irewa sekarang memikirkan tentang tanggung jawab manusia. Kini timbang-menimbang antara keinginan dan tanggung jawab. Irewa lalu ingat pada anak-anaknya. Ia sangat menyayangi mereka. Ah, Irewa marah! Kini pada dirinya sendiri. Bagaimana mungkin ia tega meninggalkan anak-anaknya?! Tidak, kata Irewa. Ia menolak keinginan kuat untuk bunuh diri. Irewa juga ingat tentang hidupnya lagi. Ia merasa harus menghargai dirinya sendiri. (Herliany, 2015, 142)

It can be said that abjection of women, especially Jingi and Irewa, occurs because of the three positions that surround each of them. Firstly, because they were born as twins, one of them, namely Jingi, had to be thrown into the river. Removal of the baby to

get rid of this evil is classified as abjection. One of the twins was considered dirty and needed to be removed. Secondly, because she contracted a genital disease, Irewa ran away from the village. This blurring process is included in Irewa's act of abjection. Venereal disease is considered dirty and taboo even though Irewa doesn't know anything about the origin of the disease because Irewa only has contact with Malom. Thirdly, because she was experiencing a lot of suffering, Irewa then intended to commit suicide as a process of getting rid of suffering. Even though suicide has the blessing of the ancestors, suicide is considered a form of removing oneself from life. In the end, Irewa gave up her intention because she felt responsible for all her children, not Malom.

## CONCLUSION

The objectification and abjection of women in *Isinga* is systemic. So, this is the conclusion of the result and discussion. Objectification can happen if women in their cultural society are violent, while abjection can happen before or after objectification. In other words, both occur because of the culture that binds them. Irewa got objectification after she married Malom. Irewa is just a sexual object in Malom's eye. Because Irewa is Malom's wife, Malom thought she could force Irewa to have sex. Therefore, although Irewa is Malom's wife, she is like a slave. Only Irewa gets objectified, while Jingi doesn't because Jingi left Hobone's village, so she is not involved in local culture.

After that, in the abjection, Irewa gets abjection after she has venereal disease and intends to commit suicide to relieve all her suffering. On the other hand, Jingi only got abject as a cultural consequence of getting rid of one of the twins so that the village could avoid disaster. Instead of harming Jingi, like what happened to Irewa, Jingi fared well, receiving medical education in Manado and continuing on to the Netherlands. The most important thing about the impact of this abjection is that Jingi did not experience objectification as Irewa experienced.

It can be said that Dorothea Rosa Herliany wants to show readers that the phenomenon of objectification and abjection of women is widespread in Papua. More than that, Dorothea Rosa Herliany wants to say that leaving Papua is the way to escape from this culture. From this research, it can be hoped that future research for all researchers can elaborate on two or more compatible theories to analyze appropriate material objects so that literary research can develop.

## REFERENCES

Anastasia, A. (2021). Agensi Perempuan Papua dalam Memperjuangkan Perdamaian.



- Imparsial.org*, 1–7.
- Arifin, M. Z. (2018). Menelusuri Abjeksi Subjek dalam Novel *Ayah Karya* Andrea Hirata: Kajian Semiotika Revolusioner Julia Kristeva. *Bebasan*, 5(2), 1–9.
- Arivia, G., & Gina, A. (2015). Culture, Sex and Religion: a Study of Contract-Marriage in Cisarua and Jakarta. *Jurnal Perempuan*, 2(1), 57–64.
- Artana, F. K. W. (2018). The Woman Objectification and Abjection in Hannah Kent's Burial Rites. *Language Horizon*, 6(1), 74–84.
- Batubara, P. A., Simangunsong, F., Panggabean, S., Saragih, E. L. L., & Simanjuntak, H. (2022). Analisis Feminisme Radikal dalam Novel *Isinga Roman Papua Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany*. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 6(2), 15558–15572.
- Calogero, R. M., Tantleff-Dunn, S., & Thompson, J. K. (2011). Self-Objectification in Women: Causes, Consequences, and Counteractions. In *American Psychological Association*. American Psychological Association.
- Carson, D. (2020). *Abjection and the Maternal Body: Rethinking Kristeva and Phenomenology*. University of Windsor.
- Faruk. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Sastra: Sebuah Penjelajahan Awal*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. A. (1997). Objectification Theory: Toward Understanding Women's Lived Experiences and Mental Health Risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(2), 173–206.
- Handayani, C. S., Arivia, G., Haryatmoko, & Robet, R. (2013). *Subyek yang Dikekang* (Y. A. Pareanom (ed.)). Komunitas Salihara-Hivos.
- Heriyati, N. (2020). Dekonstruksi Perempuan Abjek dalam Tiga Cerpen karangan Intan Paramaditha. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 12(2), 259–265.
- Herliany, D. R. (2015). *Isinga: Roman Papua*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Intan, T. (2021). Objektifikasi dan Resiliensi Perempuan dalam Novel Perempuan Bayangan Karya Netty Virgiantini. *Fon: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 17(2), 108–121.
- Irmawati. (2017). Mitos Masyarakat Papua dalam Novel *Isinga* Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany. *Bastra*, 1(4), 1–12.
- Jones, L. (2007). Women and Abjection: Margins of Difference, Bodies of Art. *Visual Culture & Gender*, 2, 6–15.
- Kahalon, R., Shnabel, N., & Becker, J. C. (2018). Experimental Studies on State Self-Objectification: A Review and an Integrative Process Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(AUG), 1–27.
- Kristeva, J. (1982). *Power of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (L. S. (translator) Roudiez (ed.)). Columbia University Press.
- Lindner, D., & Tantleff-Dunn, S. (2017). The Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the Self-Objectification Beliefs and Behaviors Scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 41(2), 1–19.
- Maelani, L., & Fauziah, N. (2021). Analisis Unsur Intrinsik dan Kebutuhan Primer Masyarakat Papua dalam Novel *Isinga* Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany. *Prosiding Samasta*, 464–477.
- Nada, A. Q. (2023). Peran Tokoh Perempuan Irewa dalam Roman Papua "Isinga" Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany: Kajian Feminisme. *J-SES: Journal of Science, Education, and Studies*, 02(2), 81–99.
- Nugroho, Y. E., Sumartini, & Prabaningrum, D. (2023). Otoritas dan Kemandirian Perempuan dalam Karya Sastra Indonesia Modern. *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*, 12(1), 48-55.
- Prabasmoro, A. P. (2006). Abjek dan Monstrous Feminine: Kisah Rahim, Liur, Tawa, dan Pembalut. in *Pustaka Unpad*. Jalasutra.
- Putri, D. S. (2018). Realitas Sosial dalam Novel *Isinga* Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany (Kajian Sosiologi Sastra). *Sapala*, 5(1), 1–16.

- Rahman, H. (2016). Diskriminasi Gender Perempuan Papua dalam Novel *Isinga* Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany. *Bahastra*, 35(2), 41–49.
- Ratna, N. K. (2006). *Teori, Metode, dan Teknik Penelitian Sastra*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Razan, V. F., & Erowati, R. (2021). Perlawanan Objektifikasi Perempuan dalam Karya Utuy Tatang Sontani. *Prosiding Samasta*, 885–898.
- Ross, C. (1997). Redefinitions of abjection in contemporary performances of the female body. *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, 31(Spring), 149–156.
- Smolak, L., & Murnen, S. K. (2011). The Sexualization of Girls and Women as a Primary Antecedent of Self-Objectification. In R. M. Calogero, S. Tantleff-Dunn, & J. K. Thompson (Ed.), *Self-Objectification on Women* (hal. 53–75). American Psychological Association.
- Sugihastuti. (1998). Penelitian Kualitatif Sastra Berperspektif Feminis. *Humaniora*, 8, Juni-Agustus, 28–32.
- Wardiningsih, V. S. W. (2017). Konstruksi Gender dalam Novel *Isinga* Karya Dorothea Rosa Herliany. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebudayaan Sintesis*, 11(1), 37–52.
- Wiyatmi, W., Suryaman, M., & Swatikasari, E. (2019). Developing an Ecofeminist Literary Criticism Model to Cultivate an Ecologically Aware and Feminist Generation. *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, 21(4), 515–531.