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**Abstract**

This paper seeks to describe the conversion (one of word formation processes) from proper words to common words in Indonesian. By the time this paper was written, JONRU ‘to lie’ and TEDJO ‘to be reckless’ were quote infamous: the frequency of occurrence was quite productive especially in social media. In terms of the morphological forms, the word formation follows the affix formation in Indonesian. The semantic features of these words refer to the negative prosodies that these words carry, which seem to root from how people assess their quality. I argue that the conversion is aimed at performing evaluation on personal quality regardless of its morphological forms. The trigger of this phenomenon seems to be the events where mass media mostly pay attention to; and this is commonly negative in meaning. Consider also *di-munirkan* ‘to be assasinated’ and *di-gusdurkan* ‘to be impeached’ where MUNIR (a human right activist) was assassinated and GUSDUR (4th Indonesian President) was impeached. There are some other cases when they do not specifically relate to the evaluation but using the person’s fame to make it widely used such as SUDOMO, which is an acronym of *Susu Doi Montok* (sexy breasts). However, it is important to realize that the objects of the research in this paper 1) are not used in formal situation 2) are productive in a short span of time and 3) are understood in condition that the knowledge is shared among speakers.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Google, a well-known search engine, has become increasingly popular although there are several other search engines. The brand ‘Google’ originated from goggle, a large eye-glasses. Besides its function as a noun, goggle can also be used as a verb as in ‘she goggled at me’. This has become recently applicable for Google as well as in ‘she goggled me’.

 Similar situation was also observed in Indonesian where some proper words have undergone conversion to common words. In this research, I focused on the semantic and morpho-syntactic description of the conversion of people’s names to common words. The names that I study in this paper are ‘Sudomo’, ‘Jonru’, ‘Tedjo’, ‘Munir’, ‘Gusdur’ and ‘Grace Simon’.

Some names were quite popular at some point of times in the past such as ‘Sudomo’ (a prominent military official in new order era) and Grace Simon (a singer). In the not-too-distant past or even these days, ‘Gusdur’ (Indonesian 4th President) and Munir (a human right activist) were also popular. The infamous ‘Jonru’ is popular since the 2014 presidential election. Tedjo, (which refers to one of the ministers in the recent cabinet of Indonesian government) has gained popularity recently.

This research is aimed at describing the lexical aspect of the conversion of words and describing the motive that drive the conversion to take place. Unlike ‘Google’ that, at least, has a chance to be considered as a formal entry for English lexicon, these lexicons can contribute optimally in the area of informal lexicon; as they require extremely high context to support understanding.

 Conversion is one of the word formation strategies that change the POS (Part of Speech). This phenomenon is discussed in almost any introductory textbooks about morphology as in Aranoff & Fudeman, (2011), or morphology section in introductory books to linguistics as in Fromkin, et al (2011). The detail is most likely to be found in word formation related books as Hilpert, (2013) or Plag (2002).

 Proper noun is a named entity that is present in the encyclopedic knowledge. It refers to one unique entity that is definite; thus, it cannot be used in generic terms (Hopper, 2014). In English, it begins with uppercase (Birjand et al, 2004), also in Indonesian. The identification and extraction of proper noun is one of the most frequent topics in computational linguistics; see recent works by Ritter, et al (2011) or Nothman, et al (2013). However, these days, we found that people often use certain proper names as common word. See ‘to google’ and ‘to xerox’ in Radin (2011).

 Names studied in this paper are all person’s name in Indonesia. A study about Javanese (one of the dominating vernaculars) names (Duggan, 2011) provided a complex and dynamic processes. And to some extent, the dynamic processes may apply to all Indonesian names. In the discussion section, I will show the linguistic aspects of the conversion, and what factors that drove it.

**METHODOLOGY**

Data in this paper is obtained from digital texts widely distributed on internet. The proper names were used in the retrieval as keywords. Texts containing these keywords were extracted and carefully analyzed to separate ones that are intact (not undergoing any conversion) and ones that have undergone conversion. Morphological analyzers or POS taggers for Indonesian will definitely mark them as PN (Proper Noun). Therefore, a manual close reading to these texts was required as they need to be analyzed contextually.

Once the classification is completed, names that have undergone conversion are discussed one by one in the discussion section. The discussion here would focus on 1) factor(s) that drive the conversion, 2) the word formation processes, and 3) semantic value(s) that are transferred to the lexicons.

The source of the text was also observed to see whether there is a correlative tendency between the text domain and the conversion. This is important to confirm my hypothesis that the conversion applies optimally in informal texts.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSSION**

The findings have shown that the linguistic aspects of the conversion might be summarized as shown by figure 1. The proper noun, the names, might be converted without having to undergo surface form modification; however, meaning transfer must take place either fully or partially. This also applies to other word formation strategies, including affix attachment and acronym reference. Acronym reference is different from common acronym; where multi words expressions are reduced to single words in acronym, acronym reference refers to the opposite process. Multi words expressions that refer to the name is created. The semantic, then, will fully refer to the multi words instead of the names.

Figure 1. Conversion from Names to Common Words

|  |
| --- |
| Proper Noun >>> Linguistic Aspects >>> Common Words |
| Names | Word Formation * Pure Conversion
* Affix Attachment
* Acronym Reference
 | Meaning Transfer * Full Alternation
* Partial Alternation
 | Usage in phrase and sentence context |

Now, we will discuss the names, one by one. Sudomo refers to a prominent military figure in new order era (1965-1998) in Indonesia. An example of how this name converted to common words is illustrated by the following example (*Suara Merdeka* 8/2/2015)

1. *Gile, sudomo banget cewek lu*

Crazy, sudomo really girlfriend you

‘wow, you girlfriend’s breasts are so sexy’

Here, Sudomo is used as an evaluative adjective to assess an entity’s quality as in (1). It refers to the quality of female breasts that are very sexy. This is quite odd in the beginning as Sudomo is a male and his prominence came with the authoritarian regime of Suharto, which makes the impression of fear should have been much proper than sexy. But Sudomo in (1) was actually popular as an acronym of *Susu Doi Montok*. See the gloss on (2):

1. *Susu Doi Montok*

Milk her sexy

‘sexy breasts’

*Susu* refers to female breasts as they can produce milk, *Doi* is the slang for girlfriend, and *montok* is the positive evaluative adjective means sexy. It is interesting that *montok* is marked by *susu.* Originally, this evaluative adjective can refer to other female body parts (usually breasts and butts). But the presence of *susu* localizes its reference only to breasts. The words *sudomo* in (2) is semantically complex that, unlike sexy, it refers to specific body parts. The use of *sudomo* seems to be an irony, where the value of fear has changed to sex. Interestingly, this evaluative adjective has managed to ‘survive’ in the authoritarian regime. That only females can take this attribute might have contributed to this survival, I believe. Sudomo could tolerate this as the evaluative adjective cannot be attributed to him (he is male).

 I have not found any sample where *sudomo* can be used as other POS than adjective. I cannot also find examples where it takes affix. We will see how it differs with other names discussed in this paper.

 The word formation strategy of Grace Simon is similar to that of Sudomo. They are made of acronym. Grace Simon refers to *grepean* (prostitute) *Silang Monas*. *Grepean* is a prostitute and *Silang Monas* is a place where, in the past, many prostitutes were waiting their potential clients. However, unlike *sudomo*, *grace simon* is used as a noun. In (3), what the speaker refers to is not the singer Grace Simon but a prostitute.

1. *Sekarang susah cari grace simon*

These days difficult find grace simon (prostitutes)

 ‘it is difficult to find prostitutes the days’

Grace Simon and Sudomo are two examples where we can trace the contribution of acronym to word formation. However, unlike other acronyms, these two items do not refer to themselves (ones who retain the names). Rather, it can be used in generic terms. This is against common sense of acronyms where the acronyms are usually (but not always) proper words.

Munir and Gusdur are interesting examples of how names may change to common words. Unlike Sudomo and Grace Simon, the occurrence of these words with affix(es) is quite productive. Consider the headline from one of citizen journalism writings, Kompasiana:

1. *Jokowi: digusdurkan atau dimunirkan?*

Jokowi: PASS-gusdur-by or PASS-munir-by

Jokowi, get impeached or get killed?

Here, *gusdur* and *munir* function have been converted to verbs that takes passive prefix *di*-. Suffix *–kan* indicates there is an agent who is responsible for the action. As for the meaning of the verbs, it relates to a very crucial event in for the two people, who already passed away. Gusdur is the 4th president of Indonesia, where his controversial policy of releasing presidential decree to cease house of representative from being operational led to his own impeachment by the house of the representative. Munir, is one of human right activist that was murdered on a flight. Many believe that the murder was well arranged by the government at that time; what actually happened and who was behind the murder were still shady up to this present moment.

The writer in (4) was trying to predict how Jokowi, Indonesian current president, is going to end; by an impeachment or by a murder. Therefore, we can simply deduce the meaning of the verbs *gusdur* and *munir* as ‘to impeach’ and ‘to kill’. The choice of the affix is interesting as passive construction allows the sentence to let the agent omitted. The writer, in this case, wants to make the agents suspected for the impeachment and the murder remain hidden; this is his/her strategy to play safe, avoiding explicit blaming. But what we may conclude from Gusdur and Munir that they are really productive in taking affix(es). Consider other examples taken from mostly from personal blogs, online forum, and news portal:

1. *saat citra jokowi buruk, banteng bisa bergerak atas nama rakyat* meng-gusdur*-kan jokowi*
2. *Anas punya kesempatan untuk* meng-Gusdur*-kan SBY. Itu benar.*
3. *bukan dalam rangka secara instan* meng-GUSDUR*-kan Indonesia, dan meng-Indonesia-kan Gus Dur*
4. *Komite Etik pun Khawatir Nazaruddin 'Di-*Munir-kan’
5. *Salah satu usulan yang muncul pertama kali adalah usulan untuk 'memunirkan' Dahlan Iskan*
6. *Paspampres Hampir "Memunirkan" Koordinator KontraS*

Unlike *sudomo* and *grace* *simon* which were obtained mostly from spoken data, the occurrence of *gusdur* and *munir* can easily traced by internet. This is because the fact that when *sudomo* and *grace* *simon* were popular in the past, no technology can support the documentation as accessible as internet nowadays.

The source of data has shown words discussed so far are informal. The closest to formal source is a news portal, but the news portal itself relies largely on updateness rather than accuracy. Language control seems to be low in this kind of news portal. At least for these four names that are also common words, we can confirm that they are used in informal setting. To validate this with the most recent phenomena, we will look into two other words from names of people: Jonru and Tedjo.

Among other names studied in this paper, the retrieval of ‘jonru’ yielded the most considerable results in terms of number. Jonru is an acronym of a person’s name. This person seems to be the center of attention during presidential election as he is known to provocatively show aggression to Jokowi the governor of Jakarta (now the president of Indonesia) who ran for president of Indonesia in 2014 election. He was known for using both negative and black campaign methods. However, these made him infamous. Once, a person made a mime about him by using similar interface to Indonesian dictionary, where JONRU is a lemma, and defined it as equal to ‘to spread lies’. Since then, people started using this name as common word.

1. *Bayangkan kalau orangtua sampeyan yang dijonru begitu*

imagine if parents your PASS-spread lies that way

‘imagine when someone fabricate such news about your parents

1. *Kalau masih menjonru di thread ini, saya akan blacklist.*

If still ACT-spread lie in thread this I will blacklist

‘if you keep spreading lies in this thread, you will be blacklisted’

1. *Kita jangan sampai terlibat pada penjonruan*

We don’t arrive involve at *NOM-spread lies-NOM*

‘Don’t let you get involved in spreading lies’

The use of *jonru* as a verb dominate among other POS as in (11) and (12), although in (13) the nominalization by circumfixing is also used; but the most frequent conversion is to a verb, especially with *meN*- prefix, which is one of the most productive prefixes in Indonesian.

Unlike *jonru*, *tedjo* is not productive in terms of affixing. Tedjo is the first name of one of the ministers in the recent cabinet. Once, he mentioned that people who supported Corruption Eradication Committee were obscure. Since then, the conversion of the name to common word also involves the transfer of this semantic feature.

1. *Gambarnya tedjo banget, benerin antenanya dong*

Picture not clear really, fix antenna please

‘the picture is not clear, please fix the antenna’

1. *Dia kalo ngomong tedjo banget, capek deh yang dengerin*

s/he when talk not clear really, tired listen

‘her/his talk is gibberish ; those who listen must be tired’

In (14) and (15), *tedjo* is converted to an adjective where the meaning is almost equal to obscure, as not clear in (14) and gibberish (15). The result gave no indication that the conversion lead to other POS than an adjective. Nor it gave an indication that it can take prefix/es.

**CONCLUSION**

The data has shown that proper words that are converted from names of people are most frequently used in informal texts such as conversation, social media, and text messages. There are some data obtained from newspaper, but the words are marked to show that they are non-formal. The markings were shown by uppercases (7), overt quotation (9 and 10), dash (6, 7 and 8), or italic.

These expressions are much alive in a very short span. Consider *sudomo* and *grace simon*; these days, except the elders, not many Indonesians are aware that they used to be used as proper words. Others like *gusdur, munir, jonru* and *tedjo* might still be understood; however, they are no longer productive. The productivity seems to positively correlate to what mass media is distributing. When news relating to these names are frequent and unusual (positive or negative) they might get very productive. When the news about these names is no longer present, the productivity may cease.
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