REDUPLICATION IN MODERN COLLOQUIAL JAKARTAN LANGUAGE: CHARACTERISTICS AND TYPOLOGIES

Alfonso Cesarano
"L'Orientale" University, Naples, Italy

Abstract

Reduplication is a recognized phenomenon that occurs in many languages, in particular the Austronesian-type ones. In Standard Indonesian language (SI) this phenomenon, although still poorly understood from a typological point of view, seems to assume a more standardized form which is characterized by a more clear subdivision in types and functions; in particular as regards the well-known process of *pluralization* (or *non-defined plurality*) (Sneddon, 1996), and the process of distribution of the action or quality expressed by the base word.

With this paper I intend to analyze the process of reduplication in Modern Colloquial Jakartan language (MCJ) spoken in the capital of Indonesia. Though all the forms of reduplication that are already codified and analyzed by scholars are present in both standard and colloquial Indonesian language, what I noticed is a difference in characteristics that occurs expecially in the *distributive form*. While in SI reduplication occurs in just one of the elements, in MCJ it may occurs in both the elements to which it relates *in the same sentence*.

Examples in SI like:

[1]   *Di   hutan   itu ada   pohon yang tinggi-tinggi.*
        LOC the forest that EXIST tree   REL   RED.tall
        In that forest there are trees that are tall.

[2]   *Di   hutan   itu ada   pohon-pohon yang tinggi.*
        LOC the forest that EXIST RED.tree   REL tall
        In that forest there are trees that are tall.[1]

Are different in characteristics from because of the focus on the adjectival element (example [1]) then on the nominal one (example [2]). In MCJ forms like the latters seem to be considered as a common reality, not a defined one. In facts, a MCJ example such as:

[3]   *Barang-barangnya lucu-lucu deh!*
        RED.stuff   DET RED.cute DEH
        (Those) stuffs are cute!

[4]   *Barang-barangnya lucu deh!*
        RED.stuff   DET cute DEH
        (Those) stuffs are cute!

[5]   *Barangnya lucu-lucu deh!*
        stuff   DET RED.cute DEH
        (Those) stuffs are cute!

Example [3] refers to a defined reality, not a common one, where *those* stuffs (*barang-barang*) are *actually* cute (*lucu-lucu*) *without exceptions*. In examples like [4] or [5] reduplication refers to something that is more common, where we find out that those stuffs

---

1   Problems in translation are evident and inevitable.

(*barang*) are [generally] cute (*lucu*), maybe there are few stuffs cuter than the others and/or viceversa. What I've noticed is that we don't find this kind of "ambiguity" in SI where, on the base of the two examples that I've given, the difference in pragmatics is clear and evident.

I've also analyzed reduplication forms of verbal bases in MCJ where typologies and functions seem to be implicit from a pragmatic point of view (see [6] for MCJ) (i.e. the use of reduplicated verbal bases with reciprocity or randomic meaning), where in SI that kind of verbs need to undergo to an affixation process, more properly with a circumfix (see [7] for SI) (that is *ber- BASE -an*):

[6]   *Ini   mainan gantung-gantung anak gue.*
        This play -AN RED.hang   child 1SGPOSS
        This is my son's hanging toy.

[7]   Surat dan foto   bergantung-gantungan di   kantornya.
        Letter and picture BER- RED.hang -AN   LOC office-3SGPOSS
        Letters and pictures are hanging in his office.

We don't find also the use of reduplicated verbal bases with the meaning of *more than one subject do something at the same time.* Thus non-formal forms like "*masak-masak*", "*main-main*", "*iseng-iseng*", and others relate to a different type of reduplication that we may not find clearly in standard language forms where those forms occur but with different meanings. Please look at the sentences below for both SI and MCJ:

[8]   *Ibu   kita   memasak-masak di   rumah.*
        Mother 1PLPOSS ME- RED.cook   LOC house.
        Our mother cooks [continuously] at home.

[9]   *Lu   enggak ikut   masak-masak ama temen-temen di   rumah Agoeng?*
        2SG NEG   follow RED.cook   with RED.friend   LOC house Agoeng?
        Won't you come to Agoeng's home for cooking [all together] with [our] friends?

Data used for the analysis have been formally provided by the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Jakarta Field Station, that gave me access to tons of examples and recordings useful to my purposes. In addiction I used correspondents taken from an on-line corpus provided by WebCorpus Live (*http://www.webcorp.org.uk/live/*).

With this paper I would demonstrate how reduplication is closely related to pragmatics in spite of syntax in MCJ spoken language and how this process makes reduplication more productive and widely meaningful rather than standard forms that we use to recognized.

References:
☺ Sneddon, James N. *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London, UK: Routeledge 1996.
☺ Johns, Yohanni. *Bahasa Indonesia*. Singapore: Periplus Editions 1977.
☺ Meladel, M., I W. Arka, T Baldwin, and A Andrews. "Double Double, Morphology and Trouble: Looking into Reduplication in Indonesian." In *Proceedings of the Australasian Language Technology Workshop (ALTW 2009).* Sydney, Australia, edited by L. Pizzato and R. Schwitter, 44-52. UNSW, Sydney 2009.
☺ Simatupang, M.S.D. *Reduplikasi Morfemis dalam bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta, Djambatan 1979.