

# REDUPLICATION AND NEGATION IN INDONESIAN \*

Joan M. Rosen

## Précis:

This article deals with the relation between negation and reduplication in Indonesian. The attempt is made to show that negative presuppositions are associated with four different types of reduplication. Various tests by contradiction are used to try to establish that such presuppositions are semantically part of the reduplicated forms. A test by redundancy is also used for the same purpose. There seem to be exceptions to both of these tests which are also discussed. A definition of reduplication is proposed which distinguishes between accidental and functional reduplication. It is the hope of the author of this articles to spur further investigation into the underlying relationship between negation and reduplication.

## 1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to illustrate that negation is related to or occurs along with reduplication in several ways and to suggest that this is not an accident, i.e. there must be something in the basic nature of reduplication which makes this possible. We will not go into an explanation of the latter here. The ways in which reduplication may be associated with negation or with negative presuppositions are as follows:

1. Part of the basic meaning of a word may be negated, as in hedges.
2. Negative presuppositions may be associated with reduplication in verbs for "pretend", and with verbs that have the basic meaning "to make something appear to be what it is not".
3. Negative expectation may be associated with reduplication, i.e. reduplication may be used to express the feeling that something is unexpected.
4. Reduplication may sometimes be used to reduce the truth-value of an embedded sentence.

In order to illustrate how negative presuppositions and reduplication are related in each case we will refer to the underlying semantics of each type of reduplication mentioned above and will use various semantic tests to prove that negative presuppositions are essential to the meanings of these types of reduplication. Before we go on to the main discussion of this paper let us consider briefly the basic functions of reduplication.

## 2. THE BASIC FUNCTIONS OF REDUPLICATION

In another paper I ascribe the following three basic functions to reduplication: 1) distributive force, indefiniteness or diffuseness in which the goal of the verb is not definite, 2) simile in which one thing is implied to be like something else through the use of reduplication, and 3) intensiveness in which there is the underlying idea of approaching a limit. Examples of the three basic functions: 1) An example of the first type is jalan-jalan 'to stroll, to walk without a

specific destination'. 2) An example of the second type is ke-kanak-kanak-an 'childish', 'to be like a child'. 3) An example of the third type is se-banyak-banyak-nya 'as much as possible'. The third type seems to contain the idea of approaching a limit in that it seems to imply that something almost contains the greatest amount possible of something and that the amount has almost reached its maximum limit.

In section 4.2 of this paper we will discuss the definition of reduplication since at that point in the discussion it seems necessary. However, for the present let us go on to hedges.

3. HEDGES: Reduplication may be used to negate part of the basic meaning of a word

If reduplication is applied to certain adjectives and nouns, the effect is often to negate part of the meaning of these words. Reduplication conveys the idea that the noun referred to by a certain adjective only approximates that adjective and is "not really ... (that adjective)." Some adjectives of this type are as follows:

- (1) Ia ber-sikap ke-muda-muda-an.  
he attitude young RED -ish  
'He acts youthful.'

In example (1) it is implied that the person spoken about is actually old, and is not really young. The use of reduplication (and the suffix-prefix combination ke- + -- + -an) therefore implies a contradiction.

- (2) ke- abu-abu -an  
dust RED -ish  
'greyish'
- (3) Warna bajunya putih ke-abu-abu-an.  
color clothes-his white gray RED  
'The color of his clothes is greyish white.'

Words of this type seem to contain the idea that a person or thing in some sense possesses a quality, but does not possess it in a "real", "literal" or "absolute" sense.

## HEDGES AS DEFINED BY LAKOFF

In his article on "Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts" (in Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 1972) George Lakoff says that natural language concepts have vague boundaries, that natural language sentences can be true or false to a certain extent (Op. Cit., pg. 183) and that there are central and peripheral members of a category, which can be hierarchically ranked (Ibid., pg. 184). He goes on to give a list of "hedges", or words that affect the truth value of sentences by qualifying the degree to which a noun under discussion belongs to a certain category. Some of the hedges he gives are as follows: 'sort of', 'kind of', 'a real', 'a regular', 'nominally', '-like', '-ish', 'pseudo-', 'crypto-' and so forth. I should like to suggest that the reduplication of color terms like ke-abu-abu-an 'greyish' in Indonesian

is parallel in function to the addition of '-ish' in English. (Although I do not mean to imply by this statement that the semantics of the two forms can be assumed to be exactly alike in both languages.) Lakoff goes on to say that "Bolinger (in press) has suggested that 'regular' picks out certain 'metaphorical' properties" of words. He gives the following example:

- (4a) John is a bachelor.  
(4b) John is a regular bachelor.

He says that "'regular' seems to assert the connotations of 'bachelor', while presupposing the negation of the literal meaning" (Ibid., p. 197-198). The negative presupposition of (4b) above is

- (5) John is not really a bachelor.

### 3.1 TEST OF HEDGES IN INDONESIAN: CONTRADICT THE NEGATIVE PRESUPPOSITION OF THE HEDGE IN A SENTENCE

In order to prove that hedges have the same impact in Indonesian as they are asserted by Lakoff and Bolinger to have in English, and to prove that negative presuppositions are an essential part of the semantics of hedges, we would have to devise appropriate tests. The tests by contradiction which are proposed in this paper are based on the idea that illogical sentences should be anomalous in any language (Robin Lakoff, "If's, And's and But's About Conjunction," pg. 115.) The form of one such test would be to contradict the negative presupposition of the hedge in a sentence, to conjoin that sentence with one containing the hedge and then to see whether the result was illogical or not. The form of such a test can be represented as follows:

(i) The Presupposition:

$S_0$  --- presupposes  $\rightarrow S_1$

Let  $S_0$  be example (4b) above. (4b) presupposes  $S_1$ , which is (5) above. The negative of (5) is (6) below

- (6) John is a bachelor.

What will happen if we combine (4b) with (6) which is the negation of (5)? The result should be an illogical sentence as the diagram below indicates:

(ii) Test by Contradiction of the Presupposition:

$S_0$  + neg  $S_1$  --- (results in)  $\rightarrow$  \*an illogical sentence

or

$S_0$  (a hedge) + neg neg presupposition of the hedge  
--- (results in)  $\rightarrow$  \*an illogical sentence

The following is an example of the test indicated in the diagram:

- (7) \*John is a regular bachelor, but he's really a bachelor.

Not surprisingly such sentences are rejected by Indonesian informants as being illogical. The acceptable version of (7), i.e. the negation of the first phrase of (7) combined with the second phrase in Indonesian is as follows:

- (8) John bukan bujangan gadungan, tetapi  
name not bachelor pseudo- but

bujangan betul  
bachelor real

'John is not a pseudo-bachelor, but a real bachelor.'

If we apply this same test to sentence (1), we get the following result:

- (9) \*Ia bersikap ke-muda-muda-an,  
he attitude young RED -ish

tetapi sebetulnya ia muda.  
but actually he young

\*'He/she acts youthful, but actually is young.'

If we combine sentence (1) with its presupposition, we get the following result:

- (10) Ia bersikap ke-muda-muda-an,  
he attitude young RED -ish

tetapi sebetulnya tidak muda.  
but actually not young

'He/she acts youthful, but actually is not young.'

These sentences correspond to the results we, as English speakers, feel are to be expected. (It is not always the case that what we might expect to happen in Indonesian will always actually happen, since there are semantic differences between English and Indonesian.) We find another semantic correspondence between Indonesian and English if we substitute ber-pura-pura 'pretend' for ber-sikap 'to have the attitude' in a sentence frame similar to (9) above. The change in the conjunction from "but" to "and" is crucial in this case.

- (11) Ia ber-pura-pura muda, dan memang  
she pretend RED young and indeed

ia sebetulnya muda.  
she actually young

'She pretends to be young, and indeed she is young.'

Although sentence (11) should be contradictory it is not, because the use of the predicate "young" seems to allow for degrees of interpretation. (Sentences like (11) will be discussed further on page 5 of this paper.)

### 3.2 EXAMPLES OF KE- + -- + -AN WITH COUNTERFACTUAL PROPERTIES WHICH FALL UNDER THE HEADING OF HEDGES

A further example of the test by contradiction is as follows:

(12) \*Warna bajunya putih ke-abu-abu-an,  
color clothes-his white ash RED

tetapi sebetulnya warnanya putih.  
but actually color-the white

\*'The color of his clothes is grayish white,  
but actually it is white.'

We will see that sentence (13) is ungrammatical, although the second phrase does not contradict the first.

(13) \*Warna bajunya putih ke-abu-abu-an,  
color clothes white dust RED

tetapi sebetulnya tidak putih.  
but actually not white

\*'The color of his clothes is grayish white,  
but actually it is not white.'

However, although sentence (14) below is almost in all respects similar to (13), i. e. the second phrase does not contradict the first, yet unlike (13) sentence (14) is acceptable. How can we account for this fact?

(14) Warna bajunya putih ke-abu-abu-an,  
color clothes-his white dust RED

dan memang betul tidak putih.  
and indeed true not white

'The color of his clothes is grayish white,  
and indeed they are truly not white.'

In order to account for this fact we will have to use what I call a redundancy test, since the second phrase of both (13) and (14) is the negative presupposition behind ke-abu-abu-an 'grayish'. The form of the redundancy test is as follows:

(i) The Presupposition:

$S_0$  ---presupposes---  $S_1$

(ii) The Redundancy Test:

$S_0 + S_1$  --- (results in) ---> \*a redundant sentence  
or  
an emphatic sentence

The purpose of the redundancy test is to try to ascertain whether a grammatical process has a particular function by making this function lexically explicit in a sentence. As indicated above the redundancy test may have two kinds of results: 1) The sentence which results from the combination of  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  may be completely unacceptable, or 2) There may be a change in the emphasis and intonation

of a sentence, and recognition by speakers of the language that the sentence is redundant, but in an acceptable fashion.

Sentence (13) is therefore redundant and unacceptable. One gets the feeling in sentence (13) that the tetapi 'but' is being used in a contrastive sense in this sentence and the reiteration of the negative presupposition behind ke-abu-abu-an seems to thwart this sense of contrast. However, sentence (14) is acceptable because in this particular example the repetition of the negative presupposition in the second phrase creates a feeling of emphasis.

### 3.3 HEDGES OF NOUNS

On page 1 I mentioned that the reduplication of certain nouns also has the effect of negating part of the meaning of the word. The effect of reduplication on concrete nouns often gives the meaning "to be like ... (the noun)" or "to be a toy ... (noun)" which could also be interpreted as "not to really be ... (the noun), but only to resemble it in some way." Some examples of this type are as follows:

(15) kuda-kuda-an  
horse RED  
'toy horse' or 'trestle'

(16) ayam-ayam-an  
chicken RED  
'weather cock'

I should like to suggest that Lakoff's theory of hedges applies not only to adjectives in Indonesian, but also to nouns. The following sentences are put forth as tests by contradiction of nouns, just as such a test was used on sentences (7), (9), and (12) above:

(17) \*Ini bukan kuda-kuda-an, tetapi  
this not horse RED but

sebetulnya ini kuda tiruan saja.  
actually this horse imitation just

\*'This is not a toy horse, but an imitation horse.'

(18) \*Tempat duduk yang dibuat dari  
place sit which made from

batang pohon pisang itu bukan  
trunk tree banana that not

kursi-kursi-an, tetapi kursi tiruan saja.  
chair RED but chair imitation just

\*'That place to sit on which was made from the trunk of a banana tree is not an imitation chair, but an imitation chair.'

Although the English word 'toy' is not on Lakoff's list of hedges, I believe that with the exception of some uses of the word like 'toy poodle', it could also be put on the list and that the same comments which held for '-ish' and reduplication above (page 1) also hold for the concept 'toy' or 'imitation' and reduplication.

To recapitulate the argument thus far: Reduplication lends an idea of unreality to both adjectives and nouns, be-

cause negative presuppositions are associated with it just as they are with English hedges. In the next section I should like to discuss effects of reduplication on verbs, which parallel the effect it has on adjectives and nouns.

4. VERBS EXPRESSING PRETENSE, FEIGNING OR FALSENESS: These represent the verbal equivalent of hedges in nouns and adjectives. Counterfactual verbs like 'pretend' presuppose the falsity of their complements in English

The main point of the preceding section was that reduplication and negative presupposition are associated in certain cases of the reduplication of nouns and adjectives in a way that corresponds to "presupposing the negation of the literal meaning" of words (G. Lakoff, *Op. Cit.* p. 197-198.) which occur with hedges in English. Negative presuppositions are also associated with certain reduplicated verbs in Indonesian. Just as there are counterfactual verbs, such as 'pretend', which presuppose the falsity of their complements in English, there are also such verbs in Indonesian. In this section I hope to show that negative presuppositions are associated with verbs for 'pretend' in Indonesian just as they are in English, and that frequently when a speaker wishes to express that an action is pretended, feigned or false he will use a reduplicated form of the verb, and that in some cases he must use the reduplicated form of the verb in order to convey this meaning.

4.1 Just in the preceding section we made reference to a test by contradiction for hedges in English and Indonesian, in this section we will use a counterfactual test for verbs for 'pretend'. The purpose of this test is to show that verbs for 'pretend' in Indonesian have a semantic property similar to verbs for 'pretend' in English. The test can take the following form:

(i) The Presupposition:

He is pretending  $S_1$  --- presupposes ---  $S_1$  is not true  
(the negative presupposition  
of the complement of  
'pretend')

(ii) Counterfactual Test:

He is pretending  $S_1$  + neg neg presupposition ---  
(results in) --- of 'pretend'  
-----> \*an illogical sentence

The counterfactual test can be illustrated by the following: Let us consider the following sentence (19) which contains a counterfactual verb in English.

(19) Bill pretended to come.

When a speaker hears such a sentence, he usually assumes (20).

(20) Bill didn't really come.

(20), therefore, can be taken to represent the negative pre-

supposition of the complement of 'pretend' in (19). What is the negative of the negative presupposition of (19)? It is represented by (21).

(21) Bill really came.

If we conjoin (19) with (21), which would be equivalent to conjoining a counterfactual verb with the negation of the negative presupposition of its complement, according to the counterfactual test we should expect to get an anomalous or ungrammatical sentence. Please take a look at sentence (22):

(22) \*Bill pretended to come, but he really came.

By comparison with (23) and (24) we can see that something is wrong with (22) (as long as unusual contexts or dual meanings of words are not taken into account as they might be in humor).

(23) Bill pretended to come, but he really didn't do it.

(24) Bill pretended to come, but he really went home.

The Indonesian equivalent of (22) is also ungrammatical:

(25) \*Ia pura-pura datang, tetapi sebetulnya  
he pretend RED come but really

ia datang.  
he come

\*'He pretended to come, but he really came.'

By contrast with (25), (26) is found acceptable:

(26) Ia pura-pura tidak datang, tetapi  
he pretend RED not come but

sebetulnya datang.  
really come

'She/he pretended not to come, but she really came.'

In the sentences above I have used what I call a counterfactual test, which consists of conjoining a counterfactual verb with the positive presupposition (the negation of the negative presupposition) of its complement. In both English and Indonesian straight forward representations, i.e. those which do not take complex contexts or interpretations into account, of this conjoining, such as sentence (22) and (25) yield ungrammatical sentences.

There are, however, apparent counter-examples to the counterfactual test proposed above which are due to the possibility of attributing more than one role to a noun in two conjoined sentences, or to attributing one role to a noun as it occurs in one of several conjoined sentences, and attributing another role to the same noun in another conjoined sentence. Examples of this phenomenon occur in both English and Indonesian:

(27) Gregory Peck is pretending to be a carpenter in that movie, but actually he is a carpenter.

In sentence (27) the understanding is that in some other



(28) Dalam pilem itu Gregory Peck  
in film that name name

tetapi sebetulnya ia tukang kayu juga.  
but actually he craftsman wood also

(29) Ia ber-pura-pura muda, dan memang  
she pretend RED young and indeed

Defense of ber-pura-pura, se-olah-olah and se-akan-akan as legitimate reduplicated forms

5

#### 4.3 DI-BIKIN-BIKIN AND DI-BUAT-BUAT

These occur with verbs that do not seem able to convey the idea of pretense if reduplicated by themselves

There are, however, many words in Indonesian which occur in both reduplicated and unreduplicated forms, and which, when reduplicated convey the idea that the action is feigned. In these cases it seems that there is a clear relation between reduplication and the negative presupposition of the complement of the reduplicated verb. The first examples are of buat 'make, do', which occurs in the standard language, and of bikin 'make, do', which occurs in the nonstandard language. When reduplicated both of these words mean 'to feign' or 'pretend'. In the case of these words it seems that there is quite a gap between the meanings of the reduplicated and unreduplicated forms, such that the unreduplicated form cannot occur in the same semantic context as the reduplicated form. The unreduplicated form of bikin or buat can occur in the same syntactic context as bikin-bikin or buat-buat, but the meaning of the sentence would be radically different. For example,

- (37) Jalannya dibuat dari aspal.  
road-the made from asphalt  
'The road is made from asphalt.'
- (38) Jalannya di-buat-buat.  
walk-his make RED (feigned)  
'He walks in a different way from usual to attract attention.'
- (39) Sakitnya di-buat-buat saja.  
sick-the make RED (feigned) just  
'His sickness was just feigned.'

#### 4.4 VERBS WHICH CONVEY A SENSE OF PRETENSE WHEN REDUPLICATED

Many of the verbs in this category mean "to play verb"

In this section I will discuss verbs which convey a sense of pretense when reduplicated. The following are verbs which when reduplicated mean "to play verb".

- (40) Anak-anak sedang main sulap-  
child RED progressive play  
sulap-sulap-an dengan kartu.  
magic RED with card  
'The children are pretending to do magic tricks with cards.'

The sentence above implies that the children cannot really do tricks with cards. The counterfactual test works here as one would expect:

- (41) Anak-anak sedang main sulap  
child RED progressive play magic  
dengan kartu.  
with cards  
'The children are doing magic tricks with cards.'

(41) can be taken, in a sense, to be the contradiction of (40). When (41) is conjoined with (40) the result is an illogical and therefore anomalous sentence.

- (42) \*Anak-anak sedang main sulap-  
child RED progressive play magic

-sulap-an dengan kartu, dan memang  
RED with card and indeed  
sedang main sulap.  
progressive play magic  
\*'The children are pretending to do magic tricks, and indeed they are doing magic tricks.'

An acceptable version of (40) conjoined with the negation of (41) is as follows. Please notice that the conjunction in (43) is karena 'because' and that the affirmative dan memang 'and indeed' did not work in (42).

- (43) Anak-anak sedang main sulap-  
child RED progressive play magic  
-sulap-an dengan kartu, karena  
RED with card because  
sebetulnya mereka tidak bisa main  
actually they not able play  
sulap.  
magic  
'The children are pretending to do magic tricks with cards, because actually they are not able to do magic tricks.'

A further example of the same type is:

- (44) Anak-anak perempuan biasanya senang  
child RED female usual-the like  
sekali main masak-masak-an.  
very play cook RED  
'Girls usually like to play that they are cooking.'

The counterfactual test works here as it does in (42), as is illustrated in (45).

- (45) \*Anak-anak perempuan sedang  
child RED female progressive  
main masak-masak-an, dan memang  
play cook RED and indeed  
sedang masak.  
progress. cook  
'The girls are pretending to cook and indeed they are cooking.'

#### 4.5 THE COMBINATION KE-noun-noun-AN CAN BE USED TO MEAN "TO ACT LIKE ..... (NOUN)"

The affixes ke- + -- + -an, which lend the meaning of '-ish' to colors, (which has already been mentioned on page 1, 2 and 3 of this paper), act like English hedges. When combined with words for roles or with terms that indicate a certain type of behavior the ke- + -- + -an forms seem to imply that the person spoken about is acting in an unnatural fashion, and they often seem to imply disapproval. Some examples of this type are as follows:

- (46) Ia bersikap ke-barat-barat-an.  
she/he attitude west RED  
'She acts in a Western manner.'

(46) implies that she is overacting, and is not behaving in a genuine way, but is pretending.

- (47) Ia bersikap ke-timur-timur-an.  
he attitude east RED  
'He acts in an Eastern manner.'

The sentence above (47) would be said of a westerner and is not pejorative as is sentence (46).

- (48) laki-laki itu berlaku ke-wanita-  
man that act woman  
-wanita-an.  
RED  
'That man acts like a woman.'

- (49) Ibu itu berlaku ke-gadis-gadis-an.  
mother that behave maiden RED  
'That (married) woman acts like a young  
(single) girl.'

The counterfactual test may yield different results with the affirmative conjunction dan memang 'and indeed' than with the conjunction tetapi 'but'. The difference in these results occurs when it is possible for there to be a difference in the degree to which an NP possesses a property or conforms to an identity. I believe the following examples will help to make this point clear.

- (50) \*Ia bersikap ke-barat-barat-an, tetapi  
she attitude west RED but  
sebetulnya ia orang barat.  
actually she person west  
'She acts in a Western manner, but she is  
really a Westerner.'
- (51) Ia bersikap ke-barat-barat-an, dan  
she attitude west RED and  
memang ia orang barat.  
indeed she person west  
'She acts in a Western manner, and indeed she  
is a Westerner.'

The use of tetapi 'but' does not allow for positive degrees of interpretation in sentence (50). Apparently only a contradiction of the first clause is allowable in this case. However, where it is possible to have degrees of class membership, i.e. such as in sentence (51) above where it is possible for a person to act like a Westerner to various degrees, a dan memang clause is possible. I believe this is the reason why sentence (29) on page 5 is also acceptable, i.e. because the adjective muda 'young' allows for degrees of interpretation. Where the type of identity is absolute, i.e. where a person or a thing is usually conceived of as either being or not being X, then a dan memang clause does not seem to work:

- (52) \*Iaki-laki itu berlaku ke-wanita-  
man that act woman  
-wanita-an, dan memang ia wanita.  
RED and indeed he woman  
\* 'That man acts like a woman, and indeed  
he is a woman.'

Where there is a direct contradiction between the dan memang clause and the introductory clause as in sentence (52) above, the resulting sentence will be illogical and therefore ungrammatical or anomalous.

#### 4.6 CAUSATIVE ATTRIBUTIVE VERES WITH THE MEANING "TO PRETEND" OR "TO CAUSE SOMETHING TO APPEAR TO BE WHAT IT IS NOT"

There is another group of verbs, which when reduplicated, give the meaning 'to pretend to do verb' in the sense of 'to make something or someone appear to be what it is not.' Many of these examples seem to have an implicit causative, whereas others have a causative marked by the suffix -kan. In these examples the reduplicated verb conveys the meaning of pretense or falseness, which is not conveyed by the non-reduplicated verb. Some examples of this type are as follows:

- (53) Ia mem-bagus-bagus-kan pekerjaannya.  
he fine RED -causative work-his  
'He makes his work sound better than it really is.'
- (54) Ia mem-bagus-kan pekerjaannya.  
she fine -causative work-her  
'She improves her work.'

In (53) there is a sense of lying or exaggerating which is not found in (54).

- (55) Ia meng-ada-ada.  
he exist RED  
'He invents stories.'
- (56) \*Ia meng-ada.  
he exist  
(This sentence has no meaning.)
- (57) Tidak bisa datang karena tidak  
not able come because not  
punya uang adalah alasan yang  
have money be -pt. reason which  
di-cari-cari saja.  
seek RED -pass. just  
'Not to be able to come, because of not having money is just an excuse.'
- (58) \*Tidak bisa datang karena tidak  
not able come because not  
punya uang adalah alasan yang  
have money be -pt. reason which  
dicari saja.  
seek-pass. just  
(no translation)

In sentences (53) - (58) above the reduplicated forms of the verb convey the idea that the person spoken about is lying or exaggerating. In the next group of sentences reduplication is the means by which the idea of making oneself appear to be what one is not is realized.

- (59) Ia mem-bodoh-bodoh-kan diri.  
he stupid RED -causative self  
'He makes himself appear stupid.'
- (60) Ia mem-bodoh-kan diri.  
he ignorant -causative self  
'He causes himself to be stupid.'

In sentence (59) the person discussed knows the facts, but appears stupid. Whereas in (60) the implication is that the subject makes himself ignorant by turning away from the facts.

- (61) Ia me-mandai-mandai-kan diri.  
she skillful RED -causative self  
'She makes herself appear more intelligent than she is.'



- (62) Ia me-mandai-kan diri.  
she skillful-causative self  
'She makes herself intelligent.'
- (63) Ia me--ngecil-ngecil-kan diri.  
he small RED -causative self  
'He humbles himself.'
- (64) Ia me-ngecil-kan diri.  
he small -causative self  
'He makes himself small by scrunching down.'

This process will not work for all speakers, nor will it work with all adjectives, for example, the adjective sombong 'proud' does not appear to be susceptible to the causative formation with or without reduplication, since sombong seems to refer to an unimitable or 'absolute' state. According to one informant, 'one either is proud or is not, one cannot appear to be proud.' Sombong also does not seem to work with the causative suffix -kan.

- (65) \*Ia me-nyombong-nyombong-kan diri.  
he proud RED -causative self  
'He makes himself appear proud.'
- (66) \*Ia me-nyombong-kan diri.  
he proud -causative self  
'He causes himself to be proud.'

#### 4.7 SUMMARY OF FIVE TYPES OF COUNTERFACTUAL VERBS

In the preceding section I have discussed the reduplication of verbs which have a common semantic bond in that they all convey a sense of pretense, and have negative presuppositions associated with them. These verbs were of five types: 1) the type typified by ber-pura-pura and se-olah-olah in which the stem is obligatorily reduplicated to convey the sense of pretense. The nonreduplicated form of the verb cannot be used with the affixes that occur with the reduplicated form and produce acceptable grammatical forms as a result. 2) A second type is represented by mem-bikin-bikin and mem-buat-buat (or di-bikin-bikin and di-buat-buat). These forms differ from ber-pura-pura in that the non-reduplicated form of the root can occur with the prefix meN- or di-. However, the meaning of such forms is radically different from that which occurs with the reduplicated form of the stem. Both types 1) and 2) seem to be used with main verbs which when reduplicated by themselves cannot convey the sense of pretense, but convey the ideas of repetition, intensity, diffuseness (in the sense of having a multiplicity of objects or locations), and non-serious intent (which can also be interpreted as a kind of diffuseness.) 3) The third type seems to be typified by the presense of the affix -an, and by the semantic function of giving a verb the meaning 'to play verb'. 4) The fourth type is marked by having the affixes ke- + -- + -an (which have also been discussed on pages 1, 2, and 3 of this paper) and is of limited productivity. The presupposition of acting like something which someone is not is carried by this form. 5) In this type the main verb is reduplicated and the meaning of the reduplicated form of the verb differs from the unreduplicated form in that the reduplicated form gives the verb the meaning 'to appear to be something someone or something is not', or 'to cause something to appear to be what it is not'. Morphologically this type seems to be accompanied by the affixes meN- + -- + -kan, and semantically this type seems to have an implicit

causative.

#### 5. REDUPLICATION CAN CONVEY ASTONISHMENT OR SURPRISE

Reduplication can be used to convey astonishment or surprise. One would not be surprised if events were not contrary to what one have expected. In these cases the expectation of the speaker is that the situation commented on should be the reverse of what it actually is.

- (67) Ia sudah kakek-kakek!  
he already old RED  
'Oh, he's really old!'

(67) could be said in response to a question about someone's boyfriend. The sentence shows astonishment at the difference in the ages of the people discussed.

- (68) \*Ia sudah kakek-kakek.  
he already old RED  
'He's already old.'

(68) cannot be said as a straight statement giving information about someone.

- (69) Ia sudah kakek.  
he already grandfather  
'He's already a grandfather.'

A type of negative presupposition is involved in both the expression of astonishment and annoyance in that in both cases the speaker either did not expect the complement sentences to be true, i.e. to actually happen in the real world, or he feels that the complement sentence should not be true, i.e. that the existing situation should not be.

- (70) Kok tahu-tahu-nya!  
surprise pt. know RED -the  
'How did you know that!'

(70) shows surprise that the person spoken to knows something. (71) is also possible:

- (71) Kok tahu!  
surprise pt. know  
'How did you know that!'

The cases presented thus far seem to be relatively simple expressions of surprise whose presuppositional nature seems to be relatively straight forward. We can apply here what I call a counter-expective test which is parallel to the counterfactual and contradictive tests mentioned earlier. The purpose of the counter-expective test is to show that negative presupposition is associated with reduplication when it is used to express astonishment or surprise. The form of such a test might be as follows:

(see following page)

5.1 Example: \*How did you know that!--I expected you to!  
The test above can be illustrated as follows:

- (72) How did you know that I played in the gamelan!



(i) The Presupposition:

How did you know that  $S_1$  ---presupposition involves  
the expectation that ----> Speaker did not expect  
the listener to know  $S_1$

(ii) The Counter-Expective Test:

How did you know that  $S_1$ ! + neg neg presupposi-  
tion --- of the expectation behind  $S_1$   
--- (results in) ----> \*an anomalous sentence

The presupposition or expectation behind (72) is represented by (73).

(73) I did not expect you to know that I played in the gamelan.

We can combine (72) and the expression of its presupposition (73) into a single sentence which is not ungrammatical (see (74)).

(74) How did you know that I played in the gamelan!  
--I did not expect you to know that!

However, if we combine (72) with the negation of (73) we will get an anomalous sentence, as illustrated by (75).

(75) \*How did you know that I played in the gamelan!  
--I expected you to know that!

The second phrase in (75) is actually the negative of (73). Therefore we can see that in this example the counter-expective test works as we would expect it to.

The Indonesian equivalents of (74) and (75) can be seen below in (76) and (77) respectively.

(76) Kok tahu-tahu-nya!--saya tidak  
surprise pt. know RED-the I not  
menduga kamu bisa tahu.  
guess you able know  
'How did you know!--I did not think you could know (that)!'

(77) \*Kok tahu!--saya menduga  
surprise pt. know I guess  
kamu bisa tahu.  
you able know  
\*'How did you know!--I thought you could!'

We can see from (76) and (77) that the counter-expective test seems to work in Indonesian as it does in English.

## 5.2 MULTIPLE OR CONTRADICTORY PROPERTIES

The following refers to a construction of limited productivity in Indonesian in which two properties are linked through the use of reduplication. The two properties linked usually consist of characteristics which one would not expect to find together. For example:

(78) Anak itu kecil-kecil kuat. (rare)  
child that small RED strong  
'That child is small but strong.'

Usually people would not expect a small child to be strong. The expectation behind the sentence is that one would not expect the subject to be strong. The presuppositions behind the following sentences are similar:

(79) Laki-laki itu tua-tua nakal.  
man that old RED naughty  
'That man is already old, but he is still naughty, i.e. he still likes women.'

Sentence (79) is probably derived from sentence (80) which occurs rarely and which is part of a proverb with the same meaning as (79).

(80) Laki-laki itu tua-tua keladi.  
man that old RED a kind of plant  
'That man gets better as he gets older.'

A further example of the type is:

(81) Ia kecil-kecil berani.  
she small RED brave  
'She is small but brave.'

The presupposition or expectation behind (81) is that small people are usually not expected to be brave.

Let us look again at sentence (78). What is the presupposition behind this sentence? The presupposition behind (78) should be that people are surprised by the child's strength. This presupposition could be expressed in the following form, shown in (82).

(82) Orang heran bahwa ia kuat.  
people surprised that he strong  
'People are surprised that he is strong.'

When this presupposition, as represented by (82) is combined with (78) by use of the coordinate conjunction dan 'and' the resulting sentence (83) is redundant and is therefore marked as being ungrammatical.

(83) \*Anak itu kecil-kecil kuat, dan  
child that small RED strong and  
orang heran bahwa ia kuat.  
people surprised that he strong  
\*'That child is small but strong, and people are surprised that he is strong.'

In the example above we have again made use of the redundancy test which was discussed on pages 2 and 3 in conjunction with sentences (13) and (14). As mentioned before the redundancy test may have two possible results: 1) a sentence may either become unacceptable, or 2) the emphases of the sentence may change. In this case sentence (83) has simply become unacceptable. Therefore we can conclude that the presupposition as represented by (82) is probably a viable semantic part of sentence (78).

What happens when we try to apply a test by contradiction to sentence (81)? If we look back to the test by contradiction, the counterfactual test and the counter-expective

test, we will see that they are similar in form, as is illustrated below:

Test by Contradiction:

$S_0$  (a hedge) + neg neg presupposition --- (results of the hedge  
in) ----> \*an illogical sentence

Counterfactual Test:

He is pretending  $S_1$  + neg neg presupposition --- (results in) ----> \*an illogical sentence

Counter-Expective Test:

How did you know that  $S_1$ ! + neg neg presupposition of the expectation behind  $S_1$   
--- (results in) ----> \*an anomalous sentence

Each of the three tests involves the negation of a negative presupposition. Since the negation of a negative is like a double negative, which is in turn a positive, we can try to combine a sentence (81) with a positive presupposition. Let us assume that sentence (84) represents the negation of the negative presupposition behind (81).

(84) Orang yakin bahwa is sungguh-  
people certain that he really  
-sungguh berani.  
RED brave  
'People are certain that he is really brave.'

When (84) is combined with (81), we get the result which is predicted by the counter-expective test and other tests by contradiction:

(85) \*Ia kecil-kecil berani, tetapi orang  
he small RED brave but people  
barangkali yakin bahwa ia  
probably certain that he  
sungguh-sungguh berani.  
really RED brave  
\*'He is small but brave, but people are probably certain that he is really brave.'

At this point it is necessary to mention that since we are dealing with natural language in the form of sentences which native speakers find acceptable, we cannot force informants to utter sentences which might fit a mathematically logical system, but must try to deal with those utterances which might actually be spoken. For example, in (84) above the word yakin 'to be certain' might not be the direct opposite of heran 'surprised', however that is what was volunteered to me by an informant. In addition the reader will notice that the word barangkali 'probably' is used in (85). The logical nature of (85) is of course affected by the use of this word.

Let us see what will happen if we combine the positive form of the presupposition behind (81) with (81). Let us

assume that (86) represents the positive form of the presupposition.

(86) Orang barangkali tidak yakin bahwa  
people probably not certain that  
ia sungguh-sungguh berani.  
he really RED brave  
'People probably are not certain that he is really brave.'

When we combine (81) and (86) using the conjunction tetapi 'but', we get the following result:

(87) Ia kecil-kecil berani, tetapi orang  
he small RED brave but people  
tidak yakin bahwa ia sungguh-sungguh  
not certain that he really RED  
berani.  
brave  
'He is small but brave, but people are not certain that he is really brave.'

We see that (87) is acceptable, whereas (85) is not. These results seem to be consistent with each other, since the conjunction tetapi 'but' is used in both cases. As is illustrated by (88) below, the same combination used in (87), i. e. (81) plus its positive presupposition, will not yield a grammatical sentence if conjoined by the conjunction dan 'and'.

(88) \*Ia kecil-kecil berani, dan orang  
he small RED brave and people  
barangkali tidak yakin bahwa ia  
probably not certain that he  
sungguh-sungguh berani.  
really RED brave  
\*'He is small but brave, and people are probably not certain that he is really brave.'

Why is sentence (88) ungrammatical or unacceptable? Sentence (88) seems to be unacceptable, because it is redundant. The second clause of (88) contains what seems to be a positive version of the presupposition associated with (81) to which it has been conjoined. We have drawn the conclusion above that sentence (85) is ungrammatical, because it conforms to the counter-expective test. The question then arises as to why sentence (87) is not unacceptable, since it also seems to violate the redundancy test. If the reader will look back to sentence (13) page 2, he will see that in (13) we seem to have an example of a sentence (3) which is conjoined with the positive form of the presupposition associated with it through the use of tetapi 'but' and which is as a result unacceptable. Sentence (87) seems to differ from sentence (13) in two respects: 1) in sentence (13) we seem to have conjoined a sentence with its direct presupposition, whereas in (87) we seem to have conjoined a sentence with an indirect presupposition or with something that can be implied from the original sentence (81). Therefore, degrees of interpretation are possible with (87) which are not apparently possible with (13). 2) (87) may also be acceptable as an emphatic statement.

Let us see what kind of results we get with different redundant sentences. We can begin from a sentence containing the verb "pretend":

(a) John is pretending to hide.

The presupposition behind sentence (a) is represented by (b).

(b) John is not hiding.

Let us conjoin (a) with (b) using both "but" and "and" and see what happens:

(c) \*John is pretending to hide, and he is not hiding.

(d) \*John is pretending to hide, and he is not really hiding.

When (a) and (b) are nonjoined using "and", the result is an unacceptably redundant sentence (c). When (a) and (b) are conjoined using "and" and the emphatic "really", the result (d) is still an unacceptably redundant sentence, since in this example it does not seem possible for there to be degrees of interpretation. When (a) and (b) are conjoined using "but" as in sentence (e)

(e) \*John is pretending to hide, but he is not hiding.

the result is an unacceptable sentence. In sentence (e) the listener would tend to feel uneasy, because there is no contrast where contrast is expected.

(f) John is pretending to hide, but he is really not hiding.

However, there seem to be some cases such as sentence (f) in which (a) and (b) may be conjoined by "but" and yield an acceptable sentence. Sentence (f) seems to be acceptable, because of the special emphasis put on the word "not". Therefore, we may conclude that sentence (f) is acceptable as an emphatic sentence. Sentence (87) seems also to be of this type, which could be labelled redundant, but acceptable.

Other examples similar to (78), (79), (80) and (81) above are *kecil-kecil cabai rawit* 'small but peppery', and *besar-besar penakut* 'big but cowardly'. This type of construction does not seem to be very productive in Indonesian and could be due to the influence of Javanese on Indonesian.

Bambang Kaswanti Purwo has suggested that the adjectives involved in the construction above cannot be direct opposites, but that the second adjective usually seems to refer to an attribute which is not usually associated with the first adjective in the construction. This suggestion seems to be valid for Indonesian. (However, a similar construction in which the adjectives are direct opposites is possible in Javanese.)

In the preceding two sections, i.e. that in which reduplication can convey astonishment or surprise and that on multiple properties. We have seen that reduplication can be associated with statements about events that the speaker does not expect to happen. In the following section we will see that reduplication can be associated with sentences in which the activities described would normally not be expected.

### 5.3 THE CONJUNCTIVE FUNCTION OF REDUPLICATION AND PROVERBS

We find some examples of reduplication in Indonesian in

which the phrase in which reduplication occurs cannot stand alone, but must be followed by a phrase which is introduced by the conjunction *tetapi* 'but'. An example of this type can be seen below in sentence (89).

(89) Saya sudah capai-capai mengarang,  
I already tired RED write  
tetapi tidak dibayar.  
but not pay -passive  
'I am already tired of writing, but have not been paid yet.'

The first phrase of (89) cannot occur alone as shown in (90).

(90) \*Saya sudah capai-capai mengarang.  
I already tired RED write  
\*'I am already tired of writing.'

However, the unreduplicated version of (90) is acceptable.

(91) Saya sudah capai-capai mengarang.  
I already tired RED write  
'I am already tired of writing.'

The difference between (91) and (89) is that annoyance, disappointment and irritation are conveyed by the former and not by the latter. Disappointment is usually felt when we hope or expect something to happen and it does not happen. The same may also be true for annoyance and irritation. Therefore we can see that a type of negative expectation is also associated with this type of reduplication.

The "conjunctive function" of reduplication has been noticed by other writers. For example Gonda mentions that Father Arndt said that reduplication may have a conjunctive function in Ngad'a, and he (Gonda) criticizes Kiliaan for saying that it has a concessive function, but he does not settle this point.

Kiliaan, who was a master of nonsensical interpretation, held that in Javanese duplication "may do duty for a concessive clause" and tried to account for that supposed fact in a complicated and totally unconvincing argument. Father Arndt pointed out that in Ngad'a repetition of the verb may express "verschiedene konjunktionale Verhältnisse". Now in the Javanese sentence *mentah-mentah iya dipangan* 'Though they are unripe, he eats them' and in similar sentences having a duplicated verb-form in Ngad'a (and in other IN languages) the predicate has been emphasized by the process of doubling: "unripe... he eats them" "they are unripe, it is true, yet he eats them". ... Father Verheyen, the author of a copious paper on reduplication in Manggarai, correctly remarks that a sentence like *cai-cais ise one golo hitu poka lise ca haju* 'they came to the hill (i.e. "as soon as they came came...), they cut down a tree" consists of two coordinated clauses.

(Gonda, "The Functions of Word Duplication in Indonesian Languages", p. 197.)

It seems that the writers mentioned above are pointing

out that there is some type of relationship between reduplication and the conjunction "but" in Indonesian, which in my opinion may be related to the presuppositional nature of Indonesian. The type of presupposition involved in these cases is that of negative expectation. The following are examples in Indonesian of proverbs in which reduplication seems to have a conjunctive function. Apparently, this conjunctive process is fairly productive in Indonesian. In these examples the predicates are emphasized and the subjects are often left out and could be either second or third persons.

- (92) Mentah-mentah di-makan-nya.  
unripe RED eat- passive. -anaphoric  
pronoun  
'Though they are unripe, he eats them.'

This sentence is the Indonesian equivalent of the Javanese example given by Gonda above. Further examples of the same type are:

- (93) Bangun-bangun sudah minta makan.  
wake up RED already ask eat  
'You have just woken up, why do you already ask for breakfast? !'  
(94) Panas-panas minum air kelapa.  
hot RED drink water coconut  
'Why do you drink the juice of (a particular heat-inducing coconut) when it is hot? !'

The presupposition behind sentence (94) is that people are not supposed to drink this kind of coconut juice when it is hot, because that particular type of juice will make the person feel hotter. In all the sentences above ((92) - (94)) the presuppositions are that people are not ordinarily supposed to do the activity mentioned in the sentence, which is contrary to the normal expectations of people in that culture. The activity described in the sentence in which reduplication occurs is the negation or opposite of what would normally be assumed that one would do. In these examples reduplication again occurs in association with negative expectation.

#### 6. REDUPLICATION OF THE MAIN VERB TENDS TO REDUCE THE TRUTH-VALUE OF THE COMPLEMENT SENTENCE

There are expressions in which, for some speakers, the reduplication of the main verb tends to reduce the truth value of the complement sentence. Some examples of this type are as follows:

- (95) Dia mencari alasan supaya tidak  
she look for reason so that not  
datang ke rapat.  
come to meeting  
'She is looking for a reason not to come to the meeting.'

The sentence above is a statement of fact. Compare this with the sentence below.

- (96) Dia men-cari-cari alasan supaya  
she look for RED reason so that

tidak hadir di dalam rapat.  
not be present in meeting  
'She is looking for excuses not to be present at the meeting.'

In (96) the person spoken about is clearly looking for false reasons not to come to the meeting, because the reasons which she has are not enough to support her. (96) is a more emotional statement than (95), and in (96) one can clearly feel the skepticism which the speaker feels about the person discussed. Other examples of the same type are as follows:

- (97) Dia menduga bahwa si Anu  
he thinks that the what's-her-name  
sakit.  
sick  
'He thinks that what's-her-name is sick.'

(97) is a statement of fact. The speaker's opinion of the situation referred to in sentence (97) is not expressed. Contrast (97) with (98).

- (98) Dia men-duga-duga bahwa si  
he think RED that the  
Anu sakit. Saya kurang  
what's-her-name sick I lack  
yakin kalau dugaan itu benar.  
certain whether guess that true  
'He thinks that what's-her-name is sick.  
I'm not so sure that that idea is true.'

In sentence (98) the presence of reduplication in the sentence expresses the speaker's feeling that the complement of men-duga-duga 'guess' or 'think' is probably not true. Another example of the same type is:

- (99) Oh, dia hanya me-nyangka bahwa  
oh she only think that  
saya mencuri benda itu.  
I steal thing that  
'Oh, she only thinks that I stole that thing.'

Sentence (99) is an unemotional statement of fact. If the verb menyangka 'think' or 'suppose' is reduplicated, the character of the sentence will change as is shown in (100).

- (100) Oh, dia hanya me-nyangka-nyangka  
oh she only think RED  
bahwa saya mencuri benda itu.  
that I steal thing that  
'Oh, she only suspects that I stole that thing.'

In sentence (100) the complement of me-nyangka-nyangka 'think' is presupposed to be false, and some emotionality is conveyed by the sentence.

The examples in this section, sentences (95) - (100), are similar to other examples of reduplication in other sections of this paper in that through the use of reduplication the complement of the main verb is presupposed to be false.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper I have tried to show that reduplication is often



associated with negative presuppositions. The first type of reduplication discussed was what Lakoff calls hedges in which part of the basic meaning of a word may be negated. Hedges may occur in Indonesian with adjectives and nouns. In order to demonstrate that negative presupposition is really a semantic part of such hedges, I have used what I call a test by contradiction. In a test by contradiction the negative presupposition which is assumed to be a vital part of the hedge is itself negated and combined with a statement including the hedge. If the result of such a combination is an illogical sentence, we then assume that the negative presupposition really is part of the meaning of the hedge. The next type of reduplication discussed was verbs expressing pretense, feigning or falseness. In this section are also included verbs which when reduplicated mean "to act like something which one is not" and "to make something appear to be what it is not". These are all called counter-factual verbs, and in order to prove that a negative presupposition is associated with the underlying semantics of these verbs, I apply what is called here a counter-factual test.

The counter-factual test is essentially similar to the test by contradiction. The negative presupposition of the verb for "pretend" is conjoined with a statement containing that verb. If the result is an illogical sentence, we then draw the conclusion that the negative presupposition is a genuine semantic part of the verb. As an aside in this section it was necessary to propose and discuss a definition of reduplication which would justify the classification of ber-pura-pura 'pretend', se-olah-olah 'as if' and se-akan-akan 'as if' as genuine forms of reduplication. The next type of reduplication is that used to express astonishment or surprise. In this section we use a counter-expective test to see whether negative presupposition is indeed a part of such expressions. It should be fairly clear, I believe, from this paper that the test by contradiction, the counter-expective and the counter-factual tests are basically the same. The last type of reduplication is that which is used to reduce the truth-value of an embedded sentence. When using this type a speaker presupposes and expresses the feeling that the complement sentence of the reduplicated verb is not true. Thus we can see that negative presuppositions occur with these four types of reduplication. The question then arises is this something that happens just by chance? I should like to suggest that there must be something in the very nature of reduplication which makes this phenomenon possible, and I hope other linguists may feel impelled to pursue this question.

Department of Linguistics  
University of Michigan

Editor's Note : There will be a sequel to this article, entitled "The functions of reduplication in Indonesian", to appear in a subsequent volume of the Series NUSA.

NOTE

- \*1. The present paper is a revised version of one presented to the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, Hawaii, 1974.
- 2. My thanks to my Indonesian friends at the University of Michigan who acted as my informants and without whose help I could not have written this paper. They were

Monica Djohansyah and I Gusti Ngurah Oka, Harun and Diah Al Rasjid, Professor Wojowasito, Danielo Ajamisaba, and Diyan Surjotjondro. I should also like to thank Mr. Harimurti Kridalaksana of the University of Indonesia, and Professor Alton Becker of the University of Michigan for their criticism and advice. In addition I should like to thank Professor Soenjono Dardjowidjojo of the Department of Indo-Pacific Linguistics of the University of Hawaii and Bambang Kaswanti Purwo, who have been kind enough to criticize the paper for me, and my fellow students at the University of Michigan, Ann Borkin and Fred Lupke, who criticized it from the theoretical point of view. My thanks also to other friends and associates who have helped with this paper.

3. Copyright 1974 Joan Marice Rosen.

ADDENDA

The symbol \* has been used in this paper to indicate ungrammatical sentences. The reasons why a sentence may not be acceptable differ. A sentence may be unacceptable for morphological reasons, i.e. the particular combination of morphemes used in a sentence may not be permitted in the language, and for other reasons including logical reasons. Below is a partial list of the numbers of some of the sentences used as data in this paper with the reason why the sentence is not acceptable. Those sentences which seem to be exceptions are also listed.

Sentence	Acceptability	Grammatical or Logical Reason	Conjunction
(9)	*	contradiction	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'
(10)	ok	redundant-emphatic	<u>tetapi</u> <u>sebetulnya</u> 'but actually'
(11)	ok	redundant-emphatic	<u>dan</u> <u>memang</u> 'and indeed'
(12)	*	contradiction	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'
(13)	*	redundant	<u>tetapi</u> 'but' (contrast not fulfilled)
(14)	ok	redundant-emphatic	<u>dan</u> <u>memang</u> 'and indeed'
(17)	*	contradiction	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'
(18)	*	contradiction	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'
(22)	*	contradiction	"but"
(25)	*	contradiction	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'
(26)	ok	redundant-emphatic	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'
(27)	ok	contradictory	"but"
		ok because of interpretation of contexts.	
(28)	ok	contradictory (same reason as (27))	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'
(29)	ok	contradictory ok because of interpretation of manner and degree.	<u>dan</u> <u>memang</u> 'and indeed'
(31)	*	form does not occur	
(32)	*	form does not occur	
(42)	*	contradictory	<u>dan</u> <u>memang</u> 'and indeed'
(45)	*	contradictory	<u>dan</u> <u>memang</u> 'and indeed'
(50)	*	contradictory	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'

ADDENDA (continued)

<u>Sentence</u>	<u>Accept- ability</u>	<u>Grammatical or Logical Reason</u>	<u>Conjunction</u>
(51)	ok	contradictory- emphatic	<u>dan memang</u> 'and indeed'
(52)	*	contradictory Predicate implies absolute class mem- bership.	<u>dan memang</u> 'and indeed'
(56)	*	Form does not exist.	
(58)	*	Unreduplicated form is incompatible with implication of sentence. Predicate which im- plies absolute class membership is incom- patible with reduplica- tion.	
(66)	*	Morphological restric- tion. Predicate cannot occur with causative suffix -kan.	
(68)	*	Reduplicated form can- not be used in simple statement. This is explained with respect to the speech act. Felicity condition.	
(75)	*	contradictory	none
(77)	*	contradictory	none
(83)	*	redundant	<u>dan</u> 'and'
(85)	*	contradictory	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'
(87)	ok	redundant-emphatic	<u>tetapi</u> 'but'
(88)	*	redundant	<u>dan</u> 'and'
( c )	*	redundant	"and"
( d )	*	redundant	"and really"
( e )	*	redundant	"but"

<u>Sentence</u>	<u>Accept- ability</u>	<u>Grammatical or Logical Reason</u>	<u>Conjunction</u>
( f )	ok	redundant-emphatic	"but really"
(90)	*	syntactical reason.	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gonda, Jan. "The Functions of Word Duplication in Indone-  
sian Languages," Lingua II (1950), p.170-197.

Lakoff, George. "Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria  
and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts," in Papers from  
the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguis-  
tic Society," Chicago: University of Illinois Press,  
1972.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Pronominalization, Negation and the  
Analysis of Adverbs," in Jacobs and Rosenbaum,  
eds. Readings in English Transformational Gram-  
mar. Waltham, Mass.: Cinn and Company, 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. David Perlmutter, and John Robert Ross.  
"Why are Negatives Like Factive Predicates?  
(unpublished paper University of Michigan).

Lakoff, Robin. "If's, And's and Buts About Conjunction.  
in Filmore and Langendoen, eds. Studies in Linguis-  
tic Semantics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and  
Winston, 1971.

Leach, Edmund. "Anthropological Aspects of Language:  
Animal Categories and Verbal Abuse," in Eric  
Lenneberg, ed. New Dimensions in the Study of  
Language. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M. I. T.  
Press, 1964.

Öhman, Suzanne. "Theories of the Linguistic Field,"  
Word (1953), 9.123-34.

Uhlenbeck, E. M. "Verdubbelingsprocede's bij het Javaanse  
Werkwoord." Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en  
Volkenkunde. Vol. 110. 'S-Gravenhage, 1954:  
369-387.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Woordverdubbeling in het Javaans,"  
Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde.  
Vol. 109. 'S-Gravenhage, 1953: 52-61.

\* \* \*

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE TYPOLOGY OF FOCUS AND ASPECT IN  
NARRATIVE LANGUAGE

Paul J. Hopper

A number of languages possess morphosyntactic devices  
which indicate that the event or action signalled by a particu-  
lar sentence is of especial relevance to the discourse of  
which the sentence is a part, as opposed to other sentences  
which, not being so marked, are signalled as being inciden-  
tal, descriptive, or supportive of the main events of the nar-  
rative or discourse. These morphosyntactic devices assume

typologically a rather wide range of forms, some of which  
intersect with tense-aspect systems and other parameters,  
such as transitivity and definiteness. In this paper I shall  
discuss several types of foregrounding<sup>1</sup> constructions, and  
shall attempt to show that in at least one case--Malay--it is  
possible to trace the beginnings of a process whereby a dis-  
course particle has become a tense-aspect marker in some