2.1 Literary Review

Previous studies relevant and helpful to the present study on reduplication as the translation equivalence of English lexicons in Indonesian are reviewed below.

An article entitled “Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation” by Panou (2013) is helpful to this research for comparative materials since it presents critical evaluation for several influential theories on equivalence in translation, including theories proposed by Nida (1964) and Newmark (1981). It can be seen from the article that translation theories are based on two opposing ways of translating. With regard to equivalence, Nida (1964) distinguishes between formal and dynamic equivalence. Nida asserts that in formal equivalence the target language resembles very much the source language both form and content. Formal equivalence is therefore much of a word-for-word view of translation. Whereas in dynamic equivalence an effort is made to convey the source language message in the target language as naturally as possible. The idea of dynamic equivalence is to improve readability by rephrasing constructions that could be confusing when literally translated, but retain some faithfulness to the original text rather than creating a complete paraphrase.

However, Nida’s theory has been criticized by other scholars. Broeck (1978) questions how is it possible to measure the equivalent effect since no text can have the same effect or elicit the same response in two different cultures in different periods of time. Then, Gentzler (2001)
criticizes Nida for using the concept of dynamic equivalence in order to proselytize readers regardless of their culture to endorse the ideas of Protestant Christianity. The fact is Nida at the time at which he proffered his views about equivalence was translating the Bible, hence trying to produce the same impact on various different audiences he was simultaneously addressing. Despite these criticisms, Nida’s theory can be useful as a procedure for translators working with all kinds of texts with a receptor-based direction to the task of translating.

Furthermore, Panou (2013) mentions that Newmark (1981) distinguishes equivalence in translation between semantic and communicative translations. Semantic translation focuses on meaning whereas communicative translation concentrates on effect. Semantic translation looks back on the SL and tries to retain its characteristics as much as possible. Communicative translation looks towards the needs of the addressees. In this respect, it tends to be easier to read. The distinction between the meaning (semantic translation) and effect (communicative translation) is not about which method is better than the other. Both methods may be used in parallel, with varying focuses where each is employed. It may be the case that a particular sentence requires a communicative translation whereas another sentence may require a semantic translation. An illustration of this point can be seen in the following example of the common sign in German by Newmark (1981: 39) *bissinger Hund* and *chien mechant*, which should be translated communicatively as *beware the dog!* instead semantically as ‘dog that bites!’ and ‘bad dog!’ so that the message is communicated effectively.

Overall, this article evaluates that the linguistic-oriented approaches to translation assume that the source text occupies a supreme position and is considered to be crucial importance in determining not only the translation process but also the extent to which it has been successful. Whereas target-oriented approaches view the source text as the point of departure for the
translation and mostly focus on the cultural, historical, and socio-political factors surrounding the translation, thus looking at it as a culture-bound phenomenon. Whether useful or not, the concepts of equivalence to the translation process varies according to the stance of the translators concerned on what they regard are the virtues of equivalence itself (Panou, 2013).

After reviewing this article, the researcher of this study concludes that the linguistic-oriented approaches to translation equivalence are related to the source text and meaning intended by the source text. Formal equivalence (Nida, 1964) and semantic translation (Newmark, 1981) can be considered as the linguistic-oriented approaches to translation as these theories rely on word-for-word or literal translation. Dynamic equivalence (Nida, 1964) and communicative translation (Newmark, 1981) can be considered as the target-oriented approaches to translation as these theories view the readability and naturalness of the translation are crucial for the target readers. The target-oriented approaches consider external factors surrounding the translation such as cultural context and communication situation. Translators may use any concept of equivalence that is useful and applicable to their translation project.

Another literary review that is relevant for this research is taken from an article entitled “Plural Semantics, Reduplication, and Numeral Modification in Indonesian” (Dalrymple and Mofu, 2011). In relation to reduplication, cited from this article in Indonesian both plural marking as reduplication and classifiers in numeral modification constructions are optional, and bare (non-reduplicated) Indonesian nouns are best analyzed as exhibiting a general number (Greenberg, 1972; Corbett, 2000; Carson, 2000). Indonesian exhibits no mass-count distinction: notionally “mass” and notionally “count” nouns do not differ in their grammatical behaviour, and participate equally in reduplication and numeral modification constructions. This article provides an analysis of the semantics of reduplication, classifiers, and numeral modification in Indonesian
which rests on the lack of mass/count distinction and explains the strong dispreference on numeral modification of reduplicated nouns.

Dalrymple and Mofu (2011) indicate that Indonesian bare nouns can also refer to pluralities:

(1)  
Saya merebus telur.  
‘I am boiling eggs’  
(Darlymple and Mofu, 2011: 2).

From the example above, on the one hand, the non-reduplicated telur ‘egg’ can be interpreted as plural despite the fact that telur is a base form or a singular noun. On the other hand, Saya merebus telur can also be interpreted in English as ‘I am boiling an egg’. Telur refers to a whole class of things. In Indonesian, when such context occurs, reduplication indicating plurality generally does not apply.

Furthermore, Dalrymple and Mofu (2011) exemplify that in Indonesian, reduplication of notionally “mass” noun like air ‘water’ is possible to refer to multiple quantities, see the following example:

(2)  
Mereka telah kemasukan air laut terlalu banyak dan air-air itu sudah berhasil dikeluarkan.  
‘They have ingested too much sea water, and those amounts of water have successfully been taken away.’  
(Darlymple and Mofu, 2011: 8)

From the example above, air ‘water’ reduplicated as air-air ‘amounts of water’ indicates the quantity of water. The reduplication also indicates an emphasis of the great amount of water involved in the context of the sentence. Whereas in English, the emphasis that indicates the
quantity of water is classified by ‘amounts of water’. It is therefore seen in this context that mass nouns in English do not inflect to refer to multiple quantities.

Furthermore, Darlymple and Mofu (2011) mention that the use of the reduplicated form in numerical modification is uncommon and dispreferred relative to the use of the non reduplicated form. Carson (2000) claims that the reduplicated form is ungrammatical in numeral modifier construction. Plural formations with numeral modifications of reduplicated nouns are rare, but are sometimes found, as seen in the following example:

(3) \textit{Tim ini terdiri dari empat siswa-siswa yakni...}  
‘This team consists of four students, namely...’  
\url{http://www.lamongan.go.id/Report/article_excel.cfr?articleid=4858}  
(Darlymple and Mofu, 2011: 6)

From the example above, the numeral modifier \textit{empat} ‘four’ indicates that the noun \textit{siswa} ‘student’ it modifies is plural. The reduplication of the noun is considered redundant and dispreferred. Unlike plural morphology in English which dictates that the numeral modifier agree with a plural noun, in Indonesian such a construction is uncommon.

In conclusion, Darlymple and Mofu’s (2011) article presents information on the optionality of plural markings used in reduplication by looking at the context of a sentence; the possibility to refer to multiple quantities of mass nouns by reduplication; and the dispreference of numeral modifications use in reduplicated nouns.

Another article investigating Indonesian reduplication that is helpful for this research is from Mistica et al. (2009) with their article entitled “Double-Double, Morphology and Trouble: Looking into Reduplication in Indonesian.” This article specifically investigates two main issues
in reduplication of verbs. First, verbs which have agentive voice affix \textit{meN}- and second, word formation construction of derived words exhibiting reduplication.

Cited from this article, reciprocal meaning is formed by marking two verbs with undergoer voice and agentive voice, which forms a linking between the agent and the patient of the action. Moreover, according to Arka and Manning (2008), in Indonesian, the undergoer voice (UV) is the unmarked bare verb, and the agentive voice (AV) is marked with \textit{meN}-, as seen in the following example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Mereka pukul-memukul}
     \begin{itemize}
       \item They \hspace{0.5cm} \textit{UV.hit-AV+hit}
       \item ‘They hit each other.’
     \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}

(4) \hspace{0.5cm} \textit{(Arka and Manning, 2008: 45-69)}

From the example above, the reciprocal meaning must have a plural subject, as seen in \textit{mereka} ‘they’, for the derived reciprocal verb \textit{pukul-memukul} ‘hit each other’. The undergoer voice (UV) is the unmarked bare verb \textit{pukul} ‘hit’ and the agentive voice (AV) is marked with \textit{meN}- as seen in \textit{memukul}. The prefix \textit{meN}- in \textit{mereka pukul-memukul} occurs in an intransitive construction as the subject \textit{mereka} ‘they’ encodes both the agent and patient. (The capital ‘\textit{N}’ in \textit{meN}- signals the sound change. ‘\textit{N}’ becomes ‘\textit{m}’ if the verb base begins with initial \textit{b}, \textit{p}, \textit{f} (Sneddon et al, 2010), thus \textit{mem}- occurs in \textit{memukul} and the initial ‘\textit{p}’ in the base \textit{pukul} is lost).

Another function of reduplication of verbs is to derive a distributive reading of repetition in meaning as seen below:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Dia memukul-mukul temannya.}
     \begin{itemize}
       \item He \hspace{0.5cm} \textit{AV+hit-hit} \hspace{0.5cm} \textit{his.friend}
       \item ‘He hit his friend repeatedly’
     \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}

(5) \hspace{0.5cm} \textit{(Mistica et al, 2009: 44-52)}

From the example above, the agentive voice (AV) is marked with \textit{meN}- as seen in \textit{memukul}. The prefix \textit{meN}- in \textit{dia memukul-mukul temannya} signals a transitive construction as there is a
presence of an object in the sentence as the patient. In *memukul-mukul*, the initial ‘p’ from the verb base *pukul* is lost and substituted by ‘m’ due to the morphophonemic assimilation to both parts of reduplicated verbs. The reduplication indicates a repetitive action or pluractionality (Corbett, 2000) of the verb where the action done is over multiple times to affected objects.

It can be concluded from this article that the reciprocal meaning by reduplication and the distributive meaning by reduplication are independent from each other, with respect to their realization. The reciprocal reduplication requires a plural subject to encode as both agent and patient of the resulting derived intransitive reciprocal verb. The undergoer voice (UV) is the unmarked bare verb and the agentive voice (AV) is realized as *meN*-verb. Whereas in the distributive reduplication to derive meaning of repetition, the agentive voice (AV) of *meN*-verbs in this construction signals the transitivity of the verb and the subject of the sentence can be singular or plural.

Another paper that is beneficial for the writer is about reduplication of nouns and adjectives. Rafferty (2002), on the article “Reduplication of Nouns and Adjectives in Indonesian” reviewed several other literatures on reduplication of nouns and adjectives which commonly occur, along with its implications on meaning. This article also presents extensive examples for many types of noun and adjective reduplications.

Rafferty (2002) includes the work of Moeliono (1988: 166-167) on two primary meanings associated with reduplicated nouns. 1) non singular with a sense of plurality, collectivity, or diversity; 2) facsimile or resemblance. For example, *rumah-rumah* ‘houses’ may have any of the three non-singular meanings: houses, a group of houses, or various houses. *Rumah-rumah* is categorized as a full reduplication of nouns.
Another example of a reduplication of noun is the construction like *dedaunan* ‘foliage’ from the word base *daun* ‘leaf’, that is exemplifying another form for expressing the collective meaning. *Dedaunan* is categorized as a partial reduplication of noun (Sneddon et al, 2010). This construction involves placing the base a syllable consisting of the first consonant of the base followed by ‘e’. Thus the base *daun* is partially reduplicated as *dedaunan*. The suffix –*an* co-occurs in this construction to indicate a variety of what is indicated by the base. *Dedaunan* can indicate plurality, collectivity or diversity.

The second basic meaning of reduplicated nouns is to derive meaning of facsimile or resemblance, illustrated by the reduplicated construction *mobil-mobilan* ‘toy car’ from the noun base *mobil* ‘car’. The meaning associated with this construction is diminutive. The reduplication carries the meaning of the pseudo-noun of the base. The suffix –*an* involved in this construction indicates the derived meaning of resemblance.

Furthermore in the article, Moeliono (1988: 212) briefly characterizes reduplication of adjectives as having two functions: modifying verbs and modifying nominal. 1) modifying verbs, thus becoming adverbs. For instance, see the adjective *cepat* ‘quick’ below:

(6)  
\[ \text{Dia lari cepat-cepat} \]  
‘He runs quickly’  
(Moeliono, 1988: 212)

From the example above, reduplication of adjectives apply. The adjective *cepat* ‘quick’ is reduplicated to derive an adverb *cepat-cepat* ‘quickly’. The function of the adverb is to modify the verb *lari* ‘run’. 2) modifying nominals and in this function, exhibiting the meaning of diversity or plurality of the noun modified by the adjective. For example, see the following adjective *mudah* ‘easy’:
From the example above, the reduplication of adjective *mudah* as *mudah-mudah* indicates that the noun it modifies is plural.

This article concludes that reduplication of nouns and adjectives can carry various meanings. Reduplication of nouns can carry semantic elements including plurality, collectivity, diversity and resemblance, whereas reduplication of adjectives can be applied to derive adverbs and to modify nominals exhibiting the meaning of diversity or plurality of the noun modified by the adjective.

### 2.2 Concepts

A concept as the abstract or the general idea of the study consists of short explanation or definition related to the topic being discussed. There are some concepts to be presented below regarding the title and the problems of this study. They are the concepts of reduplication in Indonesian, translation equivalence, lexical items, inflectional and derivational morphology, morpheme, base, and affix.

#### 2.2.1 Concepts of Reduplications in Indonesian

Sneddon et al (2010) categorize three main types of reduplications in Indonesian, namely: full, partial, and imitative reduplications. Full reduplication can involve reduplication of *simple words* (or free bases), reduplication of *complex words* (consisting of an affix or more than one affix plus base) and reduplication of the *bases within a complex word*. Full reduplication
involves repeating an entire word. The resulting two bases or words are separated by a hyphen in writing. The second base or word is treated as the reduplicated part.

Examples of reduplicated simple words (free bases) are:

(8)  \emph{buku-buku} ‘books’ (from the noun base \emph{buku} ‘book’)
\emph{tinggi-tinggi} ‘tall objects’ (from the adjective base \emph{tinggi} ‘tall’)
\emph{duduk-duduk} ‘sit around’ (from the verb base \emph{duduk} ‘sit’)

Examples of reduplicated complex words are:

(9)  \emph{perubahan-perubahan} ‘changes’ (from the verb base \emph{ubah} ‘change’)
\emph{tulisan-tulisan} ‘writings’ (from the verb base \emph{tulis} ‘write’)

Examples of reduplicated bases within a complex word are:

(10) \emph{kemerah-merahan} ‘reddish’ (from the adjective base \emph{merah} ‘red’)
\emph{sebesar-besarnya} ‘as big as possible’ (from the adjective base \emph{besar} ‘big’)
\emph{melihat-lihat} ‘sightsee’ (from the verb base \emph{lihat} ‘see’)
(Sneddon et al, 2010: 19).

A more thorough description on reduplications in Indonesian is described at the later section in theoretical framework section 2.3.5.

2.2.2 Concepts of Translation Equivalence

Translation equivalence is distinguished between, on the one hand, translation equivalence as an empirical phenomenon, discovered by comparing SL and TL texts and, on the other hand, the underlying conditions, or justification, of translation equivalence (Catford, 1965). A more thorough description on translation equivalence is described at the later section in theoretical framework section 2.3.2.
2.2.3 Concepts of Lexical Items

According to Larson (1998), lexical items include words, phrases, etc. Lexical items in this study relate to meaning components that are classified semantically into four principles groups: THINGS (nouns, pronouns), EVENTS (verbs), ATTRIBUTES (adjectives, adverbs), and RELATIONS (conjunctions, prepositions, particles, enclitics, etc).

2.2.4 Concepts of Inflectional and Derivational Morphology

Inflectional morphology is concerned with syntactically driven word-formation. An inflectional morpheme does not alter the word-class of the base to which it is attached. Inflectional morphemes are only able to modify the form of a word so that it can fit into a particular syntactic slot (Katamba, 1993).

Greenberg (1954) proposed the criterion of obligatoriness to characterize inflection. He argued that inflection occurs when, at different points in a sentence, syntax imposes obligatory choices from a menu of affixes. If the right choice is not made, an ungrammatical sentence results.

Derivational morphology is used to create new lexical items. Derivational morphemes form new words either by changing the meaning of the base to which they are attached, e.g. kind vs un-kind (both are adjectives but with opposite meanings); obey vs dis-obey (both are verbs but with opposite meanings), or by changing the word-class that a base belongs to, e.g. the addition of –ly to the adjectives kind and simple produces the adverbs kind-ly and simp-ly. As a rule, it is possible to derive an adverb by adding the suffix –ly to an adjectival base (Katamba, 1993).
2.2.5 Concepts of Morpheme

A morpheme is the smallest, indivisible units of semantic content or grammatical function which words are made of. A morpheme cannot be decomposed into smaller units which are either meaningful by themselves or mark a grammatical function (Katamba, 1993). Morphemes fall into two primary classes in terms of their operation in the structure of words: base morphemes and affix morphemes (Catford, 1965).

2.2.6 Concepts of Base

Any unit whatsoever to which affixes of any kind can be added. The affixes attached to a base may be inflectional affixes selected for syntactic reasons or derivational affixes which alter the meaning or grammatical category of the base (Katamba, 1993).

2.2.7 Concepts of Affix

An affix is a morpheme which only occurs when attached to some other morpheme or morphemes such as a root or stem or base. Affixes are bound morphemes: they can not occur independently. There are three types of affixes (1) Prefixes: A prefix is an affix attached before a root or stem or base. (2) Suffixes: A suffix is an affix attached after a root (or stem or base). (3) Infixes: An infix is an affix inserted into the root itself (Katamba, 1993).

2.3 Theoretical Framework

This research attempts to provide descriptions regarding reduplication as the translation equivalence of English lexicons in Indonesian. The analysis conducted focuses on presenting
explanations on the types of Indonesian reduplication to their corresponding English lexicons and how the English lexicons are translated into Indonesian reduplications.

The main theoretical foundations for this study are drawn from theories of translation, translation equivalence and conditions of translation equivalence from linguistic point of view (Catford, 1965). Supporting theories are drawn from form and meaning (Larson, 1998), theories of reduplication (Sapir, 1921; Katamba, 1993) and the types of Indonesian reduplications (Sneddon et al, 2010). The adoption of these theoretical frameworks is considered relevant and appropriate for coping with the scope and objectives of the research. These theories are used as references in identifying and analyzing the data of the research as well as assessing the conditions of the translation equivalence. The descriptions of the adopted theories are presented at the sub-sections below.

2.3.1 Theories of Translation

Catford (1965) defines translation from a linguistic point of view as “the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL).” From this definition, two lexical items in it call for comment. These are ‘textual material’ and ‘equivalent’. ‘Text’ is any stretch of language, spoken or written, which is under discussion. According to circumstances a text may thus be a whole library of books, a single volume, a chapter, a paragraph, a sentence, a clause … etc. The use of the term ‘textual material’ underlines the fact that a text is expected in order to be processed as the translation material from the source language to the target language. The term ‘equivalent’ is the expectation for the result of the translation in the target language as intended by the source language.
The next term used by Catford (1965) in the definition of translation is the term ‘equivalent’. The descriptions on translation equivalence and conditions of translation equivalence will be presented at the sub-section below.

2.3.2 Translation Equivalence and Its Conditions

According to Catford (1965), the central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL translation equivalents. A central task of translation theory is that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence.

Catford (1965) makes distinction regarding translation equivalence, on the one hand, translation equivalence as an empirical phenomenon, discovered by comparing SL and TL texts and on the other hand, as the underlying conditions, or justification, of translation equivalence. Translation as an empirical phenomenon has its distinction between textual equivalence and formal correspondence: “a textual equivalent is any TL text or portion of text which is observed on a particular occasion to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text.” A formal correspondence is “any TL category (unit, class, structure, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the ‘same’ place in the ‘economy’ of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL.” It can be considered that the term ‘economy’ in formal correspondence as any element of the SL text that is occupied in the TL text as the translation equivalence at corresponding ranks of verbs, adverbs, adjectives, nouns etc. The discovery of textual equivalents is based on the authority of a competent bilingual informant or translator, with the help of dictionaries.

Regarding the conditions of translation equivalence, Catford (1965) states that the TL text must be relatable to at least some of the situational features to which the SL text is relatable.
Presumably, the greater the number of situational features common to the contextual meanings of both SL and TL text, the better the translation. It is possible to generalize to the conditions of translation equivalence as follows: “translation equivalence occurs when an SL and a TL texts or items are relatable to (at least some of) the same features of substance.” The type of ‘substance’ depends on the scope of translation. In this study, ‘substance’ is the situational features such as inflections or derivations of the SL and the TL that particularly correspond in their textual meanings or contextual meanings. The condition of translation equivalence can be justified when the SL substance has some relatable contextual meanings with the TL substance.

2.3.3 Form and Meaning

According to Larson (1998), one of the basic assumptions is that there is a valid distinction between the surface (grammatical, lexical, phonological) and the deep (semantic) structures of languages. The form of language refers to the actual words, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, etc., which are spoken or written. These forms are referred to as the surface structure of language. It is the structural part of language which is actually seen in print or heard in speech. Behind the surface structure is the deep structure, the meaning. It is the meaning that serves as the base for translation into another language. A second basic assumption is that meaning is structured. It can be analyzed and represented in ways that are useful for the translator.

Furthermore, Larson (1998) states that translation consists of transferring the meaning of the source language into the receptor language. This is done by going from the form of the first language to the form of a second language by way of semantic structure. It is meaning which is being transferred and must be held constant. Only the form changes. Translation, then, consists
of studying the lexicons, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of
the source language text, analyzing it in order to determine its meaning, and then reconstructing
this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the
receptor language and its cultural context.

From the statement of Larson above, it can be concluded that forms of languages may be
very different from one to another but the pivotal point in translation is the transfer of meaning.
In this study, the surface structure of language can be correlated to the morphology of English
lexicons and its corresponding translation in the morphology of Indonesian reduplications. The
deep structure of language is correlated to the meaning behind the deep structure. The discovery
of meaning is conveyed by analyzing the components of the SL text under discussion
morphologically and semantically and then rendering the results of the analysis into the
components of the TL text morphologically and semantically. Communication situations and
cultural contexts of the SL text must also be considered in the reconstruction process of the TL
text, in order to keep the intended meaning of the SL text rendered appropriately in the TL text.
In other words, the reconstruction process in translation may be influenced by the
communication situation, relevant to who the speaker is, who the audience is, the traditions of
the culture, etc.

Larson (1998) describes in surface structure, units are grouped into increasingly larger
units in hierarchy of grammatical structures. Morphemes unite to form words, words unite to
form phrases, phrases unite into clauses, clauses into a sentence, sentences into paragraph,
paragraph into discourse units of various kinds, and these unite to form a text-story, letter,
sermon, or whatever. This statement recognizes that any text originates from a single unit of
language form in surface structure. A single unit then can be formed into larger units exhibiting any grammatical forms of language.

Furthermore, Larson (1998) mentions in the deep structure that the smallest unit in the semantic structure is a meaning component. Meaning components relate to morphemes (roots and affixes) that group together to form concepts (words). Meaning components and concepts are classified semantically into four principle groups: things (nouns, pronouns), events (verbs), attributes (adjectives, adverbs), and relations (conjunctions, prepositions, particles, enclitics, etc.). These notions of Larson’s Illustrate that a text is manifested from the smallest units of language forms with meaning components that are grouped in a hierarchy of grammatical structures. Thus, language is structured. In translation, meaning is structured and therefore the SL text can be analyzed and represented in the TL.

2.3.4 Universal Theories of Reduplication

In Katamba (1993); Sapir (1921) observes that “nothing is more natural than the prevalence of reduplication, in other words, the repetition of all or part or of the radical element. The process is generally employed, with self-evident symbolism, to indicate such concepts as distribution, plurality, repetition, customary activity, increase in size, added intensity, and continuance.” Sapir’s theory indicates that reduplication is a natural phenomenon in languages. The evidence of reduplication involves the repetition of all part or a part of the radical element. The radical element itself is all part or a part of the word that is reduplicated. It can be of any word-class, such as nouns, verbs, or adjectives. Concepts indicated by reduplication proposed by Sapir can be incorporated in Indonesian reduplication. Concepts of meaning indicated by
reduplication will be more thoroughly described in the section of types of Indonesian reduplication proposed by Sneddon et al (2010).

A second theory on reduplication is proposed by Katamba (1993). Katamba uses the term of reduplication in a morphological sense, that “reduplication is restricted to situations where the repeated part of the word serves some derivational or inflectional purpose.” The incorporation of the statement in Indonesian reduplications can be applied in ways that for the purpose of derivation, another class of word is derived from a base or another meaning is derived from a base. Then, this derived form can productively participate in reduplication. Whereas for the purpose of inflection, reduplication occurs without altering the word-class of the base. Inflection by reduplication modifies the form of a word to fit into a particular obligatoriness of syntax. However, since languages have their own characteristics and have their own rules of what is obligatory to the syntax, sometimes what is obligatory in one language does not apply in another.

In the parallel context of English inflections and Indonesian reduplications, an illustration is presented by the example below. It is shown that what is obligatory to the syntax of English is optional in Indonesian:

(11) SL: Reindeer could fly, there were fairies in the garden, [pets] were like people, [toys] had personalities, [dreams] came true, and you could touch the stars. (Byrne, 2012: 1).


From the SL sentence above, noun inflections carrying meaning in plurality include: ‘fairies’, ‘pets’, ‘toys’, ‘dreams’, and ‘stars’. In the case of regular count-noun in English, the plural suffix must be attached to a noun to form a plural noun that is grammatical and agreeable
in English syntactic slot. While in TL translation, only ‘fairies’ peri-peri and ‘stars’ bintang-bintang that are translated in the reduplicated form of nouns indicating plurality. The SL lexicons of noun inflections carrying meaning in plurality typed in square brackets above: [pets] hewan peliharaan, [toys] mainan, and [dreams] impian are not translated in the reduplicated form as plurals. This occurrence can be explained as a plural marking is optional in Indonesian nouns. According to Sneddon et al (2010), concerning plurality of nouns in Indonesian: (1) a noun is not usually reduplicated unless it is unclear from context whether one or more than one is referred to and then only if this is important to what the speaker wishes to convey (2) sometimes, however, a speaker does use reduplication even though plurality is clear from context (3) reduplication does not occur if a whole class of things is referred to (4) it is sometimes stated that reduplication of nouns indicates variety rather than plurality (although plurality is implied by variety) (5) reduplication is not normally used in reference to things which come in pairs.

In the TL data sentence typed in square brackets above, the translator chooses not to apply reduplication of plural nouns for the corresponding SL plural nouns for the reason of the optionality in plural markings in Indonesian. The translator chooses to apply reduplication only to certain nouns considered important to what the translator wishes to convey as plural e.g. peri-peri ‘fairies’ and bintang-bintang ‘stars’ and not to all of the corresponding SL plural nouns as reduplication does not occur if a whole class of things is referred to e.g. [hewan peliharaan] ‘pets’, [mainan] ‘toys’ and [impian] ‘dreams’

Katamba (1993) summarizes the common functions served by reduplication with the concept such as plurality of nouns. In verbs, reduplication often indicates continuation, frequency or repetition of an event or action. Often reduplication has an augmentative meaning. It signals an increase in size, frequency or intensity. Conversely, reduplication may have a
diminutive effect, often with connotations of endearments or simply of attenuation. The concepts indicated by reduplication proposed by Katamba can mostly be incorporated in Indonesian reduplications. The discussions of the types of Indonesian reduplications are presented at the sub-sections below.

2.3.5 The Types of Reduplications in Indonesian

Sneddon et al (2010) categorize three main types of reduplication in Indonesian, namely: full, partial, and imitative reduplication. These three types of reduplications will be described as follow:

1) Full Reduplication

Full reduplication may include simple words (or free bases), complex words (consisting of an affix or more than one affix plus base) and the bases of complex words. Full reduplication involves repeating an entire word. The resulting two bases or words are separated by a hyphen in writing. The second base or word is treated as the reduplicated part. Sneddon et al (2010) furthermore state that full reduplication can consist of reduplication without corresponding single bases, reduplication of nouns, reduplication of pronouns, reduplication of adjectives, reduplication of verbs, and reduplication of numbers. In particular, in relation to the data of the study found, reduplication without corresponding single bases, reduplication of nouns, adjectives, and verbs will be described below:

a) Reduplication without Corresponding Single Bases
Sneddon et al (2010) describe that sometimes reduplicated forms have no unreduplicated counterparts to which they can be related. Such forms are often treated as single bases in dictionaries, although usually written with a hyphen. Such forms include:

(12)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>laba-laba (n)</td>
<td>‘spider’ (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiba-tiba (adj.)</td>
<td>‘suddenly’ (adv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sia-sia (adj.)</td>
<td>‘futile’ (adj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pura-pura (v)</td>
<td>‘pretend’ (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>megap-megap (v)</td>
<td>‘pant’ (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masing-masing (adj.)</td>
<td>‘each’ (adj.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sneddon et al, 2010: 19)

Although single bases with the same form sometimes occur, these are chance similarities. Thus the word *tiba* ‘arrive’ has no relationship to *tiba-tiba* ‘suddenly’ and the single base *pura* functions as a noun which means ‘temple’, thus, *pura-pura* can also mean ‘temples’. From the instances above, it can be seen that the reduplication without corresponding single bases can refer to nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs, with the same corresponding English word-classes.

b) Reduplication of Nouns

The major function of noun reduplication is to indicate plurality. Both simple (e.g. *piring-piring* ‘plates’, *rumah-rumah* ‘houses’) and complex nouns consisting of an affix or more than one affix plus base (e.g. *singkatan-singkatan* ‘abbreviations’, *perubahan-perubahan* ‘changes’) can be reduplicated to indicate plurality. A noun is not usually reduplicated unless it is unclear from context whether one or more than one is referred to and then only if this is important to what the speaker wishes to convey. In the first example below the number makes plurality specific, while in the second sentence plurality is clear from the general context that one does not usually buy a single shoe, and as in Indonesian, reduplication of nouns is not normally used in reference to things which come in pairs.
Menteri mengunjungi tiga negeri asing.
‘The minister visited three foreign countries’.

Saya harus membeli sepatu baru.
I must buy new shoes.
(Sneddon et al, 2010: 20).

Sneddon et al (2010) furthermore state that it is sometimes stated that reduplication of nouns indicates variety rather than plurality (although plurality is implied by variety). Reduplication can be used where variety is of no importance. In the following sentence there is no focus at all on variation among the trees, what is stressed is that there is more than one:

Rumahnya dekat pohon-pohon mangga itu.
‘His house is near those mango trees’.
(Sneddon et al, 2010: 21).

Reduplication of nouns may produce a meaning which is different but nevertheless related to the meaning of the single base. Such forms include:

(15) \[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Unreduplicated} & \text{Reduplicated} \\
gula & \text{‘sugar’} \\
mata & \text{‘eye’} \\
kuda & \text{‘horse’} \\
langit & \text{‘sky’} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{ll}
gula-gula & \text{‘sweets’} \\
mata-mata & \text{‘spy’} \\
kuda-kuda & \text{‘easel, trestle’} \\
langit-langit & \text{‘ceiling’} \\
\end{array}
\]
(Sneddon et al, 2010: 20)

In a few cases, such words can also indicate plurality. Thus kuda-kuda ‘horses’ and mata-mata rantai ‘links of chain’ indicate plurality.

c) Reduplication of Adjectives

Reduplication of adjectives can function as adverbs, as exemplified below:

(16) Anak itu berteriak keras-keras
‘The child screamed loudly’.
(Sneddon et al, 2010: 23).
Reduplication of an adjective can also occur when the noun it describes is plural. Reduplication indicates that the characteristic indicated by the adjective applies to the noun it modifies:

(17)  *Hutan-rimba yang pohonnya tinggi-tinggi sekali.*  
‘A forest whose trees are very tall’.

*Gambarmu bagus-bagus.*  
‘Your drawings are beautiful’.
(Sneddon et al, 2010: 22).

**d) Reduplication of Verbs**

With some verbs reduplication gives a connotation of action done in a casual or leisurely way:

(18)  | Unreduplicated | Reduplicated |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jalan</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td><em>jalan-jalan</em> ‘walk about, go for a stroll’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lihat</em> ‘see’</td>
<td><em>lihat-lihat</em> ‘have a look around’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Sneddon et al, 2010: 23).

Sneddon et al (2010) assert that reduplication of verbs can indicate continued action, either an action done over a period of time or an action performed repeatedly:

(19)  *Potongan kayu itu terapung-apung di atas air.*  
‘The piece of wood floated on the water’

*Dia berteriak-teriak minta tolong.*  
‘He shouted and shouted for help’
(Sneddon et al, 2010: 23).

From the examples above, *terapung-apung* indicates a continued action. In addition, the prefix *ter-...* indicates a construction of *ter-* verbs with accidental meaning. According to Sneddon et al

* The verb base *jalan* can also function as a noun, thus, *jalan-jalan* can mean ‘streets’ as the plural form of the noun base *jalan* ‘street’.
(2010), verbs in English do not distinguish between accidental and deliberate action. Thus, *terapung-apung* may refer to an unintended act. Second, *berteriak-teriak* indicates a repeated action. The prefix *ber-* indicates intransitivity of the verb. From the examples above, it can also be seen that unlike complex nouns, complex verbs (consisting of an affix or more than one affix plus base) only undergo full reduplication of the bases; that is, bases are reduplicated then the unreduplicated affixes are attached to the reduplicated bases.

Furthermore, Sneddon et al (2010) state that reduplication of verbs can give meaning which somewhat different from that of the single form, usually conveying a sense of intensity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unreduplicated</th>
<th>Reduplicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>menjadi</em> ‘become’</td>
<td><em>menjadi-jadi</em> ‘get worse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>meminta</em> ‘request’</td>
<td><em>meminta-minta</em> ‘beg’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sneddon et al, 2010: 24).

2) Partial Reduplication

According to Sneddon et al (2010), partial reduplication occurs only with bases which begin with a consonant. It involves placing before the base a syllable consisting of the first consonant of the base followed by ‘e’. This type of reduplication is no longer productive in the language; it occurs with a few bases, mainly nouns, and cannot be applied to others. The reduplicated word has a meaning which is the same as that of the single form or is related to it. Sometimes, the historical relationship is not obvious:

| (21) | *tangga* ‘ladder’ | *tetangga* ‘neighbor’ |
|      | *jaka* ‘bachelor’  | *jejaka* ‘bachelor’  |
|      | *laki* ‘husband’   | *lelaki* ‘man’       |
|      | *luhur* ‘noble’    | *leluhur* ‘ancestor’ |
|      | *tapi* ‘but’       | *tetapi* ‘but’       |

(Sneddon, 2010: 25).
3) Imitative Reduplication

Referring to Sneddon et al (2010), in imitative reduplication the two parts of the word are not identical, though they are similar. Nouns, adjectives and verbs can all undergo imitative reduplication. The variation between the two parts of the word can involve either consonants or vowels. Imitative reduplication is not productive; new forms cannot be created, nor can the two parts of the word change places. Frequently only the first component of the word occurs as a simple word. In some cases, neither part can occur alone. The reduplication usually indicates variety or emphasizes the meaning of the first component.

Sneddon et al (2010) illustrate imitative reduplication in the following examples by contrasting its differences that may be in the first consonant or in the vowels. The difference may be only the first consonant as seen below:

(22)  
\begin{align*}
\text{sayur-mayur} & \text{ ‘vegetables’} \\
\text{lauk-pauk} & \text{ ‘side dishes’} \\
\text{ramah-tamah} & \text{ ‘hospitable and friendly’} \\
\end{align*}

(Sneddon et al, 2010: 25)

From the examples above, in \textit{sayur-mayur} only the base \textit{sayur} ‘vegetable’ can occur independently. Imitative reduplication of \textit{sayur-mayur} ‘vegetables’ may indicate plurality or variety, in \textit{lauk-pauk} only the base \textit{lauk} ‘side dish’ can occur independently. Imitative reduplication of \textit{lauk-pauk} ‘side dishes’ may indicate plurality or variety, and in \textit{ramah-tamah} only the base \textit{ramah} ‘friendly’ can occur alone as an adjective. Imitative reduplication of \textit{ramah-tamah} derives an augmentative meaning. It signals an increase in quality of the adjective \textit{ramah} ‘friendly’ as seen in \textit{ramah-tamah} ‘hospitable and friendly’.

Some combinations may be considered as instances of imitative reduplication, although they actually consist of two existing independent parts, such as:
(23) kaya-raya ‘very wealthy’ (kaya ‘rich’, raya ‘great’)
(24) desas-desus ‘rumor’
    warna-warni ‘all kinds of colors’
    gerak-gerik ‘movements, gestures’

Kaya-raya derives an augmentative meaning. It signals an increase in quality of the adjective kaya ‘rich’ as seen in kaya-raya ‘very wealthy’.

In imitative reduplication, the difference may also be in the vowels and there may be only one vowel difference:

(24) desas-desus ‘rumor’
    warna-warni ‘all kinds of colors’
    gerak-gerik ‘movements, gestures’

From the examples above, neither part of desas-desus can occur alone; in warna-warni, only warna ‘color’ can occur alone as a singular noun. Imitative reduplication of warna-warni ‘all kinds of colors’ indicates a variety of colors, and; in gerak-gerik only gerak ‘move’ can occur alone as a verb. Imitative reduplication of gerak-gerak ‘movements, gestures’ indicates a repeated action.

It is also common for the first component to contain the vowels o…a and the second component to contain the vowels a…i, although these are not the only combinations. Often, with this type of imitative reduplication, neither part of the word can occur alone:

(25) bolak-balik ‘to and fro’
    pontang-panting ‘run helter skelter’
    obrak-abrik ‘destroy, smash to pieces’
    mondar-mandir ‘back and forth’

From the examples above, in bolak-balik only balik ‘return’ can occur alone as a verb; in pontang-panting, obrak-abrik, mondar-mandir neither part of the word can occur alone. Bolak-balik ‘to and fro’ and mondar-mandir may indicate a continuous or repeated action, whereas
"pontang-panting" ‘run helter skelter’ and "obrak-abrik" ‘destroy, smash to pieces’ derive augmentative meaning, signaling an increase in intensity of the verb.

2.3 Research Model

The research model diagram below shows the relations between the topic of the study, problem of the study, theoretical framework, research method, analysis, and result of the study. The study concentrates on answering the problems of the study. To make the study more focused, the scope of the study is limited to finding Indonesian reduplications in the translation version of the book and categorizing the types of the reduplications found with their corresponding English lexical items. The study is intended to analyze how English lexical items are translated into Indonesian reduplications.

Research approach applied to this study was qualitative method. Observation method proposed by Sudaryanto (1993) was used in collecting the data. Observation method was applied by observing carefully the entire source of data. Translational identity method proposed by Sudaryanto (1993) was used to analyze the data of the research. This method was applied to compare between one language with another language to find and analyze the equivalence. Formal and informal methods proposed by Sudaryanto (1993) were used in presenting the result of data analysis in this research. Formal method was used for the presentation of the data in a diagram, tables and patterns with mathematical symbols such as + (plus) and ➔ (become). Informal method dealt with presenting a topic by applying explanation using words to describe findings in ways intended for readers to easily understand.
To analyze the results of the translation as shown in the data of this research, relevant theories adopted as the main theoretical foundations include: theories of translation, translation equivalence and its conditions from linguistic point of view (Catford, 1965). Supporting theories in this study include form and meaning (Larson, 1998) to identify the forms and meaning components indicated by English lexical items in the forms and meaning components of Indonesian reduplications, theories of reduplication (Sapir, 1921; Katamba, 1993) to describe morphological processes of English lexical items and their corresponding translation in Indonesian reduplications and concepts of meaning carried by the processes, and theories of Indonesian reduplication (Sneddon et al, 2010) to identify and explain the types of Indonesian reduplications. Research model for this study is shown by the diagram below:
RESEARCH MODEL DIAGRAM

REPRODUCTIONS AS THE TRANSLATION EQUIVALENCE

SOURCE LANGUAGE
Certain English
Lexical Items

TARGET LANGUAGE
Indonesian
Reduplications

METHODS
Data Collection:
- Library Research.

Data Analysis:
- Qualitative.

THEORIES
1. Types of reduplications in Indonesian (Sneddon et al, 2010).

2. Universal theories of reduplication (Sapir, 1921; Katamba, 1993).

3. Form and meaning (Larson, 1998).


PROBLEMS
1. Types of reduplications in Indonesian serve as the translation equivalence.

2. The ways certain English lexical items translated into Indonesian reduplications.

ANALYSIS

FINDING/RESULT