THE IDIOMATIC CONSTRUCTIONS OF "*BAPAK*" IN BAHASA INDONESIA

Danang Satria Nugraha
Department of Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Sanata Dharma University Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Jalan Afandi, No.25 Mrican, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: d.s.nugraha@usd.ac.id

RETORIKA
JURNAL BAHASA, SASTRA, DAN PENGAJARANNYA

Article History:
Submitted: 13 March 2020; **Revised:** 19 April 2020; **Accepted:** 29 April 2020
DOI: 10.26858/retorika.v13i2.13099

ISSN: 2614-2716 (print), ISSN: 2301-4768 (online)
http://ojs.unm.ac.id/retorika

Abstract: This research aimed to describe the idiomatic constructions of lexeme of BAPAK in Bahasa Indonesia (BI). The language description method used in this study was adopted from the semantic analysis model suggested by Langlotz (2006). The sources of the data were the corpus websites that provided the BI data-set. Observation was used to collect the data and a distributional technique was used to analyze the data. The results of the analysis described that the idiomatic constructions of lexeme of BAPAK had two patterns of constructions and three types of proposition that were embedded in them. Thus, it can be inferred that the idiomatic constructions of BAPAK can be described through their structural patterns and types of proposition.

Keywords: idiomatic constructions, lexeme of BAPAK, Bahasa Indonesia

The use of language is influenced by the creativity of speakers in creating language meanings. One kind of meaning that tends to be popular among language speakers is idiomatic meaning (Langlotz, 2006). Idiomatic sense can be manifested through the constructions with a characteristic complexity of meaning rather than the lexical meaning of the entity its elements. The idiomatic constructions are types of the multiword conventional expressions. In other reference, that constructions are called multi-word expression (MWEs) (Kay, Berkeley, & Sag, 2014:1). Etymologically, the uniqueness of idiomatic constructions can be justified in the fact that the word *idioms* means *private, own, peculiar* in Greek, the language of the word (Wilkosz, 2015:114). Semantically, the main characteristic of such constructions is that it does not contain any literal or direct meaning (Tabossi, Fanari, & Wolf, 2009:529). Regarding the presence of such language phenomenon, Elman (2011) states, "Convey in recent decades the study of the word covering the history of formation, meaning, and use has always been a major focus in linguistic research." In addition to the

Elman's statement, as a complement for the background of the phenomenon, Lakoff (1986) suggested:

> As a matter of language, rather than thought, it was viewed as dispensible. If you have something to say, you could presumeably say it straightforwardly without metaphor; if you chose metaphor it was for some poetic or rhetorical purpose, perhaps for elegance or economy, but not for plain speech and ordinary thought (Lakoff, 1986:215).

Therefore, idioms are regarded as the constructions phenomenon that marked by the complexity of structures and meanings (Gogichev, 2016: 343). Since the period of Bloomfield, it has been revealed the idea of *the idiosyncratic information* realized in various language construct-ions, such as the idiomatic constructions (Gillon, 2009:148). In other words, it can be stated that idiomatic constructions were made in the context of specific language use for particular meanings.

Furthermore, in Bahasa Indonesia (BI), there are a variety of idomatic constructions that are formed using the elements of lexemes that are referencing the family identity, such as (a) *ibu pertiwi* on the sentence of *kulihat ibu pertiwi sedang bersusah hati*, (b) *anak emas* on the sentence of *Menperin tak ingin Esemka jadi anak emas pemerintah*, and (c) *bapak bangsa* on the sentence of *kini sang bapak bangsa itu telah pergi*. The idiomatic constructions of lexeme of ANAK as presented on (a) has been described by Nugraha (2016). The idiomatic constructions of lexeme of IBU as presented on (b) has been analyzed by Nugraha (2018). In addition to these studies, two other researchers have described the idiomatic constructions phenomenon in BI. Khak' (2011) has found BI-based idioms, by its structures, can be divided into three types, namely complex words, idiomatic expressions, and idiomatic phrases. In addition to Khak's findings, Isodarus (2017) has found that the word HATI is one of the most productive words in the idiomatic constructions of BI. In particular, departing from some of the previous researches, the study was compiled to describe idiomatic constructions that use the word element in the realm of kinship structure or family identity, namely the lexeme of BAPAK. Consider the examples of *bapak rakyat* on (1) and *bapak pariwisata Bali* on (2) as follow.

(1) Bapak Gubernur bahagia menjadi *bapak rakyat* daerah yang semakmur ini.
[Mr. Governor is glad to be the *bapak rakyat* of this properous region]

(2) Pandji Tisna juga diakui sebagai *bapak pariwisata Bali* pada tahun 2003.
[Pandji Tisna is also recognized as the *bapak pariwisata Bali* in the year 2003]

In this study, the constructions of idiomatic of BAPAK was examined to describe the type of constructions and propositions type based on the semantic theoretical model that introduced by Langlotz (2006). The theoretical framework is chosen because the idiomatic constructions as an automatic speech does not necessarily be analyzed morphologically and synthetically (Nenonen, Niemi, & Laine, 2002:43). As a grand theory, semantics were positioned as analysis tools for research objects. Based on semantic point of view, the meaning of idiomatic constructions forming elements tends not to be used to determine the overall meaning of constructions. The nature of the existence of the element of the constructions form is a clue to the overall meaning (Al-Khawaldeh, Jaradat, Al-momani, & Bani-Khair, 2016:119). Therefore, the principle of semantic analysis required in this study is to identify the meaning of constructions, not the meaning of the elements of forming constructions. In a relation to the analysis principle of semantic phenomenon, Almohizea (2016) hypothesized one of the semantic behaviors of idiomatic constructions is the irregularities or the nature of not general. Completing Almohizea's reminder, Liu (2012:105) stated that, "Idiom variation is a ubiquitous linguistic phenomenon which has raised a lot of research questions". In terminology of Ibáñez & Lozano-Palacio (2019), the varieties of idiomatic constructions called as figurative uses of language. Liang & Pascual (2019) concluded that the existence of the type of constructions above is to express out-of-control natural phenomena.

In this study, theoretically, this purpose of study is to present the complement examples of semantic analysis of the idiomatic constructions phenomenon in BI. Practically, the results of this research increase the amount of descriptive research on the constructions of idiomatic in BI. In addition, findings in this study can be utilized in subsequent linguistic studies. Thus, it is understandable that research on the idiomatic constructions of lexeme of BAPAK in BI is important to do. Richie (2016:428) believed that there is a question beyond the phenomenon in all languages viz why can languages have idiomatic constructions? In sum, taking into

consideration, based on the theoretical background, methodological, and context of the linguistic phenomena that have been addressed in the previous sections, through this study, the question was tried to be answered through analysis of a constructions phenomenon of the BAPAK in BI.

METHOD

This descriptive research was conducted in three phases: data collection, data analysis, and presentation of data analysis. The three phases were arranged with reference to method formulation of language research (Sudaryanto, 2015) and based on the semantic theoretical framework, especially Idiomatic Creativity (Langlotz, 2006). *First*, the first stage was data collection. The research data was in a form of linguistic constructions contained the lexeme of BAPAK in BI. The data source was the written discourse of Bahasa Indonesia collected from the site of the provider of the BI corpus, namely (a) www.sealang.net, (b) www.corpora.uni-leipzig.de, and (c) *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (KBBI) at kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id. The documents observation method (or *simak* on Indonesian linguistics context terminology) was used during data collection. The instrument used during data collection was a matrix or data collection table. The instrument was used to record the idiomatic constructions and the lingual contexts. The lingual contexts ware clauses and sentences of BI.

Second, the second stage was data analysis. Data analysis was done in three steps. The first step was to reduce data based on the validity aspect. There are two categories of validity aspect, namely (a) filled idiomatic lexeme of BAPAK the on clauses and sentences and (b) does not have laxical meaning of *orang tua laki-laki* or *ayah.* The second step was identifying idiomatic constructions based on the elements of the constituent. The analysis was performed to determine the categororial patterns of the idiomatic constructions that is examined. The third step was to identify the type of proposition used in the idiomatic constructions of BAPAK. These three steps were implemented using the method of distributional (or *agih* on Indonesian linguistics con-text terminology) (Sudaryanto, 2015).

Third, the third stage was the presentation of data analysis. The results of the data analysis in this study were presented by utilizing two models, namely the descriptive exposure model and the pattern chart model. The descriptive exposure model was embodied in the selected sample description paragraph serving of the data which was supplemented with relevant research justifications and relevant theories on the idiomatic constructions. Meanwhile, the model chart of conventions was used to present illustrations of data patterns. The three phases of the research were done sequentially to identify and to describe the constructions of the BAPAK in BI.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the semantic analysis, this study describes the idiomatic constructions of lexeme of BAPAK in Bahasa Indonesia (BI) (a) were composed of forming elements and (b) were consisted of several classifications based on the type of constructions proposition. As a semantic meaning, the idiomatic constructions of BAPAK in BI is a unity of inseparable form. In Langlotz (2006) statement, that kind of form called as *the colorful linguistics spectrum*. That to illustrate how the meaning of idiomatic constructions is depending on the semantic context of the lexeme joining with. In addition to Langlot'z spectrum of meaning, Liu (2012:105) argues, "Different from ordinary phrases, idioms tend to be frozen in form and meaning and do not allow change in structure and meaning". How does the description of idiomatic constructions of BAPAK in BI are frozen or intact in shape but contain meaning as in the spectrum proposition? The complete description of the results and the discussions related to the forming elements and the propositions type are presented in the following sections.

Findings

The analysis produced at least two main semantic characteristics on the constructions of idiomatic BAPAK in BI. *First,* characteristic of the pattern. There were two patterns of forming elements in the semantic structure of idiomatic constructions. These two patterns are (a) [BAPAK + {N}] and (b) [BAPAK + {N} + {N}]. The code of {N} indicates the noun class or categorization of noun that embedded on the idiomatic constructions of BAPAK in BI. As a forming patterns, both patterns found in the data analyzed. For examples, as a kind of the realization that extracted from data, the pattern of (a) presented on example of (3) and the pattern of (b) presented on example of (4).

(3) Ia tetap dianggap sebagai *bapak pencetus* teori atom modern.
[He is still regarded as the *bapak pencetus* of modern atomic theory]

(4) Hippocrates, dia adalah *bapak ilmu kedokteran*.
[Hippocrates, he is the *bapak ilmu kedokteran*]

Based on presentation of (3), it can be traced that the idiomatic construction of *bapak pencetus* was constructed from the combinations of lexeme BAPAK and the word of noun class viz *pencetus*. The construction of *bapak pencetus* itself is based on the pattern of [BAPAK + {N}]. The pattern is not interchangeable in its position, such as **pencetus bapak;* there is no meanings in this form. In addition to the first pattern, the more complex pattern also found on the idiomatic constructions of BAPAK in BI. As presented on (4), the construction of *bapak manajemen ilmiah* was constructed from the combination of lexeme of BAPAK and the form of noun phrase viz *manajemen ilmiah.* On these context, the pattern is not interchangeable in its position. If one used the constructions of **manajemen ilmiah bapak* or **manajemen bapak ilmiah,* it can be concluded that the meaning of idiomatic constructions disappeared. The order of the pattern also cannot be substituted with other constituents. In other words, idiomatic constructions sequence patterns are distinctive and unenlightened or cannot be substituted.

Table 1. The 1st Proposition Type of Lexeme of BAPAK

No.	Constructions	Sample of Data
1.	Bapak rakyat	Bapak Gubernur bahagia menjadi bapak rakyat daerah yang semakmur ini.
2.	Bapak bangsa Arab	Mereka juga menganggapnya sebagai bapak bangsa Arab melalui anaknya Ismail.
3.	Bapak rohani	Bahkan bapak rohani saya meyakinkan akan adanya....

Second, characteristic of the proposition types. Based on proposition types there are three types of idiomatic constructions of BAPAK in BI. The type's proposition refers to the classifying meaning of constructions. As presented on table 1, the type I represents the meaning cluster of '*orang yang dipandang sebagai orang tua atau orang yang dihormati sebagai pelindung'.* Some forms of constructions that belong to type I are *bapak rakyat, bapak bangsa Arab,* and *bapak rohani.* For clear example of sentences, check the examples of these constructions in table 1.

Table. 2 The 2nd Proposition Type of Lexeme of BAPAK

No.	Constructions	Sample of Data
1.	Bapak Ekonomi	Adam Smith yang kita kenal sebagai bapak ekonomi
2.	Bapak Pendidikan Modern	Apa yang dapat kita pelajari dari pria yang disebut bapak pendidikan modern?
3.	Bapak Kemerdekaan Meksiko	Ia disebut sebagai bapak kemerdekaan Meksiko.
4.	Bapak Komik Indonesia	Sebagai Bapak Komik Indonesia, memulai karirnya....
5.	Bapak Bilangan	Dikenal sebagai bapak bilangan, dia memberikan sumbangan.
6.	Bapak Disk Jockey Indonesia	Laki-laki yang ditahbiskan sebagai bapak komik itu berpulang.
7.	Bapak ilmu kedokteran	Hippocrates, dia adalah bapak ilmu kedokteran.

As presented on table 2, the type II represents the meaning of '*orang yang menjadi pemimpin/ perintis jalan'.* Some forms of construction that belong to type I are *bapak ekonomi, bapak ilmu kedokteran,* and *bapak kemerdekaan.* Another example data is presented in table 2. In addition to the type I and type II, there is the type III of idiomatic constructions. As the last proposition group, the third type represents a cluster of meanings of '*pejabat atau dalam status suatu struktur'.* Some examples of constructions compiled on the cluster are *bapak presiden RI, bapak pendeta,* and *bapak angkat.* The other data realization is provided on table 3.

Table 3. The 3rd Proposition Type of Lexeme of BAPAK

No.	Constructions	Sample of Data
1.	Bapak Presiden RI	Ada dukungan dari bapak presiden RI
2.	Bapak angkat	Bukan hanya itu, pihak perusahaan perkebunan sebagai bapak angkat juga diundang.
3.	Bapak pendeta	Bola itu pun mendekat pada bapak pendeta
4.	Bapak tiri	Dialah bapak tiri anak itu.
5.	Bapak kandung	Bersama bapak kandungnya, Arya memulai kehidupan baru.

Both of that two parts of result were the semantic characteristic of idiomatic constructions of lexeme of BAPAK in BI. By considering the main theory of research and justifcation from several previous studies, the results of the study were discussed in the next subchapter of article.

Discussion

The idiomatic constructions of lexeme BAPAK in BI as a semantic unity described based on (a) the pattern of forming elements and (b) the projection of proposition types. Based on the analysis model of idiomatic creativity that composed by the basis of structurally fixed and semantically opaque (Langlotz, 2006:2), this study found at least two forming patterns and three types of propositions in the idiomatic constructions of lexeme of BAPAK in BI. In connection with the results of the analysis, Järvikivi, Pyykkönen-Klauck, & Laine (2014:142) states, "Idiomatic constructions represents the relationship between the word as a lexical entity and as a synthetical-semantical entity." Therefore, the discussion of idiomatic constructions need to be done by placing it on the context of the form structure and meaning structure. In addition to Järvikivi, Pyykkönen-Klauck, & Laine's statement, Peng, Feldman, & Vylomova (2018) argued that proper context identification is the best way to analyze idiomatic constructions. Technically, purposing a analysis, the two common identifiers of the idiomatic constructions are *decomposability* and *how figurative phrases are processed* (Findlay & Carrol, 2018). Thus, the discussion on the study of idioms is first done to outline the formation patterns and types of proposition. Further, the following is a discussion of idiomatic constructions of lexeme BAPAK in BI.

Patterns of the Idiomatic Constructions of BAPAK

Essentially, the linguistic analysis unit in word form always contains three levels of structures consisting of a semantic structure, the syntax feature, and the phonological aspect. Jackendoff & Audring (2016:469) hypothesized, "In practically every linguistic theory, a word contains pieces of structure on three levels: its semantic structure, its syntactic features, and its phonology". As an element of forming semantic structure, the word can be present in idiomatic as in the constructions of the lexeme of BAPAK in BI. To identify the presence of words as a forming element, in order to describe the idiomatic constructions, Laurent, et. al. (2006) suggested two model of techniques, namely compositional and non-compositional. The model compositional also kwon as *relevant property based categorization* (Gogichev, 2016:353). Although idiomatic constructions-forming elements can be composed, the analysis principle of "idioms are the expressions the elements of which cannot be changed or replaced by other elements" (Yusifova, 2013:133) applied to the analysis phase of the pattern of idiomatic constructions forming of BAPAK. Therefore, the analysis of the forming element in the constructions of the BAPAK is only used to identify the category of the lexical units, not the meaning of the element/word itself. The lexical category of the forming element is used to determine the patterns of idiomatic constructions. Potts & Semino (2019:81) argues, "Crucially, even though many metaphors (and idioms) become conventionalized, metaphor (and idioms) choices are seldom neutral." In addition to Potts & Semino's argument, in the perspective of Cacciari (2014), the element of the idiomatic constructions is in a semantic structure called the semantics schema as stated in the statement below.

> "Natural language has plenty of expressions formed by more than a single word. These word clusters, often termed multiword expressions (henceforth MWEs), are overlearned, literal and non-literal sequences of words whose representations are stored in semantic memory." (Cacciari, 2014:266)

Further more, the two patterns of forming element on idiomatic constructions of BAPAK in BI explained as follow. *First,* the pattern of [BAPAK + {N}]. The pattern can be classified as a pattern commonly encountered. Underlying assumptions that speakers of a language are not necessarily aware of (Lambek, 2009:150). Any {N} symbol refers to the noun category in BI. In particular, the first pattern formed an intact and independent idiomatic constructions. Regarding the first pattern, Turvey & Moreno (2006:9) called the pattern "as a self-organizing, self-regulating system". As a complement to the explanation, consider to the construction of *bapak rohani* in the presentation of (5).

(5) Bahkan *bapak rohani* saya meyakinkan akan adanya...
[Even *bapak rohani* of mine assured that...]
(5a) *Bahkan *paman rohani* saya meyakinkan akan adanya....
(5c) *Bahkan *bapak dengan rohani* saya meyakinkan akan adanya....

Presentation of (5) has an idiomatic construction of *bapak rohani* that defined the meaning as a '*sosok pelindung dalam aspek kerohanian atau religiositas.'* The constructions consist of the distribution of lexeme of BAPAK and a noun class of *rohani.* In particular, constructions (5a) and (5b) cannot be understood as an idiomatic expression. Changing the constructions implicate the chaos of the system of idiomatic meaning of the constructions. Related to this pattern, Szczepaniak & Lew (2011:324) argues, "In the light of the Idiomaticity Theory, all idioms, whether opaque, transparent, or partially transparent, are considered figurative by definition." In addition to Szczepaniak & Lew's argument, Karlsson (2014) states:

> "In principle, the words complex, complexity, and complexify refer to systems whose elements are in a hierarchical and highly organized state." (Karlsson, 2014:145)

Based on two arguments already mentioned, it can be stated that the presence of the first pattern as a complex word form is a figurative manifestation of meaning.

Second, the pattern of [BAPAK + {N} + {N}]. If the previous pattern was found that the lexeme of BAPAK could be accompanied by an element of {N} in the constructions, the presentation (4) indicates there is a more complex variation. The lexeme of BAPAK can co distribute the serial-{N}. According to Szczepaniak & Lew (2011:323), the pattern closed to lend themselves perfectly to a graphical presentation. To understand the second pattern, consider again the idiomatic construction of *bapak ilmu kedokteran* on presentation (4). Based on the context of the sentence of (4), the construction *bapak ilmu kedokteran* constructed by the pattern of [BAPAK + {N} + {N}]. As the pattern is more complex than the first pattern, the second pattern has a variation of [BAPAK + {N} + {Adj.}] as presented by the construction of *bapak manajemen ilmiah* on illustration of (6).

(6) Frederick Taylor disebut *bapak manajemen ilmiah.*
[Frederick Taylor called the *bapak manajemen ilmiah.*]
(6a) *Frederick Taylor disebut ibu manajemen ilmiah.
(6b) *Frederick Taylor disebut bapak dengan manajemen ilmiah.

Presentation of (6a) and (6b) are the trial version of sentence (6). Both examples at (6a) and (6b) are not understood to mean. Combination of information built in (6a) and (6b) are not arranged in a semantic structure of *bapak manajemen ilmiah.* It should be stated that "idioms are distinct from literal language. Idioms do not form a syntactically or semantically homogeneous class" (Hyun, Conner, & Obler, 2014:294). In addition to the Hyun, Corner, & Obler's statement, Boulenger, Hauk, & Pulvermuller (2009:1905) argues, "The meaning of abstract sentences is computed from the meaning of words included in these sentences and from combustible information". Regarding the two argument, technically, in perception of Kay, et. al (2014), the pattern of [BAPAK + {N} + {Adj.}] as a variation of second pattern classified as semi-fixed expressions. In their explanation, Kay, et. al states as follow:

> "(a) fixed expressions: expressions which appear to contain more than one word but which display idiosyncratic syntactic combination, (b) semi-fixed expressions: idioms which obey normal syntactic constraints but which are nonetheless quite frozen as well as semantically non-compositional, & (c) syntactically flexible expressions." (Kay et al., 2014:4–5).

The presence of these patterns is a part that will be a material of understanding for speakers and partners in a communication event. Cacciari & Levorato (1998:159) concludes, "In the extent to which the meanings of the words forming an idiom contribute to its overall figurative interpretation." Thus, two patterns of idiomatic constructions-formation are the plot of meanings. As an entity of meaning, the pattern provides the way for meaning formations.

Types of Proposition as a Semantic Structure

In addition to the first feature of idiomatic constructions of lexeme BAPAK in BI, the second feature is about the type of proposisition embedded on the form of constructions. In the context of this research,

the proposition can be limited as "tight correlations between fundamental dimensions of human experience" (Yu & Huang, 2019:111). Proposition is an entity of meaning that can be labeled with the word as a representative of the humanities experience. The term proposition is used to refer to a cluster of meanings represented by an idiomatic constructions of lexeme of BAPAK in bI. The term also limits the Langlotz analogy (2006) to refer to idiomatic constructions as a spectrum of language meanings. Other theorist, for example, in the view of Hanks (2004), stated that idiomatic constructions have varying degrees of metaphorical, as expressed in the following fragments:

> "It is often said that an idiom, strictly defined, is semantically distinct from the sum of its parts, that is its meaning cannot be derived from analysis of the literal meanings of the words of which it is composed. This is a useful generalization as fas as it goes, but it is of course an oversimplification. There are degrees of metaphoricity." (Hanks, 2004:256).

In the meantime, Caillies & Butcher (2007:79) claimed idiomatic constructions as a frozen semantic structure. In the context of the freeze structure of semantic, there appears to be degrees or a spectrum of meaning that is then limited by the term proposition. In this study, idiomatic constructions of the BAPAK in BI is positioned in a spectrum of meanings that have degrees of metaphorical. Classifying proposition is based on the sense or degree of such metaphorical.

Furthermore, the explanation of the three types of proposition of lexeme of BAPAK in bI presented as follow. *First,* the first type proposition is '*orang yang dipandang sebagai orang tua atau orang yang dihormati sebagai pelindung'.* Some construction examples are presented by the table 1. The construction of '*bapak bangsa Arab',* for example, can be understood by explaining the following example (7).

(7) Mereka juga menganggapnya sebagai bapak bangsa Arab melalui anaknya Ismail.
[They also regarded his as the *bapak bangsa Arab* through his son Ismail.]
(7a) *Mereka juga menganggapnya sebagai anak bangsa Arab....
(7b) *Mereka juga menganggapnya sebagai bapak dari bangsa Arab....

The presentation (7a) and (7b) are form of constructions that is not idiomatic. Both are built upon literal understanding. Meanwhile, the presentation of (7) with the construction can only be understood by looking at the context of the sentence. Regarding the first type of proposition, Skoufaki (2008:22) argues, "It is common knowledge that idiom forms are arbitrarily linked to their meanings." In addition ot Skoufaki's argument, Li & Sporleder (2009:315) claim, "Whether a particular occurrence of a potentially ambiguous expression has literal or nonliteral meaning has to be inferred from the context (token-based idiom classification)". In sum, it can be concluded that the context of sentences is a key in understanding idiomatic constructions which are meant to be arranged arbitrarily.

Second, the first type proposition is '*orang yang menjadi pemimpin/ perintis jalan'.* The second type of proposition tends to be commonly used by BI speakers. During the data collection, I found ex-amples of second-type proposition more number than the other two types of propositions. However, it should be noted that "words do not have meaning, they are cues to meaning" (Ellis, 2008:381). The different forms of construction may represent the same type of proposition. Consider to the description (8) below.

(8) Hippocrates, dia adalah bapak ilmu kedokteran.
[Hippocrates, he is the *bapak ilmu kedokteran.*]
(8a) *Hippocrates, dia adalah anak ilmu kedokteran
(8b) *Hippocrates, dia adalah bapak pemilik ilmu kedokteran

Presentation of (8a) and (8b) does not contain the same meaning with the sentence of (8). These sentences do not have a same proposition. Alteration of the semantic structure (8a) and (8b) eliminates the type of proposition from construction. In connection with the second type of proposition, Cermak (2001: 6) argues, "As far as form, or rather formal aspects, of the idioms are concerned... At least five of these should be raised, including the Idiom's identification, stability (fixedness), variability, multi-word character and derivations." In other words, the proposition in idiomatic construction is always being addressed by certain structural devices, such as the type of forming pattern. The type of forming pattern has been discussed in the previous article.

Third, the first type proposition is '*pejabat atau dalam status suatu struktur'.* The third type of proposition found is that of the BAPAK's idiomatic constructions that are used to represent the meaning of officials or in the status of a structure. Spalding & Gagn (2007:25) reminds such a proposition can happen only because of the distribution of a few words to create a whole meaning. Consider to (9) with the following items.

(9) Ada dukungan dari bapak presiden RI.
[There is support from the *bapak presiden RI*]
(9a) *Ada dukungan dari ibu presiden RI.
(9b) *Ada dukungan ~~dari~~ kepada bapak dari. presiden RI

Considering the presentation of (9), it can be noted that the sentences (9a) and (9b) are of different proposition types. The structure of semantic (9a) and (9b) is not the same as on (9). The change of the forming element of idiomatic constructions implicate the immutability of the proposition or meaning. Similarly, it is quite obvious that the proposition created by the constructions of the idiomatic of the BAPAK in BI is intact and does not replace each other. Of the three types of proposition that have been discussed, there is a general scheme as the foundation of the third projection of the proposition. The three classifications of idiomatic constructions proposition of the BAPAK in BI is built on a general, namely the PERSONA proposition. In other words, the formation of idiomatic constructions could be due to the motivation of semantic to personalize the structure of biological and social identity. Without such background, "The goal of manually creating a complete lexicon of idioms and idiomatics usage patterns in any language is unattainable" (Widdows & Dorow, 2005:47). In fact, as presented by Carston Carston (2018:198), "They experience imagery when they process metaphors and other figurative language." As a frozen structure, the idiomatic constructions of the BAPAK in BI has a spectrum of meanings that can be described through its semantic features. Thus, it can be stated that idiomatic structures of BI contain a spectrum of meanings that can be identified and described through their lexemes.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion part of the study consisted of summary and suggestions. *First,* the summary of the study. Based on the semantics model of idiomatic creativity (Langlotz, 2006), the phenomenon of idiomatic constructions of BAPAK in bI can be described through two aspects of semantic features. The two characteristics are (a) pattern of forming elements and (b) projection type proposition. In general, the idiomatic constructions of lexeme of BAPAK in BI tends to distribute together with the lexical element of noun or {N} to create a unity of meaning through two patterns as presented on earlier part of this article. In addition to the pattern of semantic structure, there is an other feature related to the projection types of proposition. Meanwhile, the the type of constructions proposition is consisting three types as its subclassifications., namely (a) meaning of '*orang yang dipandang sebagai orang tua atau orang yang dihormati sebagai pelindung'*, (b) meaning of *'orang yang menjadi pemimpin/ perintis jalan'*, and (c) meaning of *'pejabat atau orang dalam suatu sistem/struktur'.* These three subclassification is a specific level derived from the general meanings. In other words, the core of the proposition embedded on idiomatic constructions of lexeme of BAPAK is the meaning of PERSONA. *Second*, the suggestion of this study. For further studies, the idiomatic constructions as a linguistic phenomenon can be studied by using a pragmatic theoretical method to describe the variation of its usage in speaker community of BI. Another alternative study is to analyze various forms of idiomatic constructions in BI that are domain-based on kinship terms.

REFERENCES

Al-Khawaldeh, N., Jaradat, A., Al-momani, H., & Bani-Khair, B. (2016). Figurative Idiomatic Language: Strategies and Difficulties of Understanding English Idioms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *5* (6): 119–325 https://doi.org/ 10. 7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.6p.119

Almohizea, M. I. (2016). The Placement of Idioms in Traditional and Non-Traditional Approaches. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *3* (5): 10.

Boulenger, V., Hauk, O., & Pulvermuller, F. (2009). Grasping Ideas with the Motor System: Semantic Somatotopy in Idiom Comprehen-sion. *Cerebral Cortex*, *19* (8): 1905–1914. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhn217

Cacciari, C. (2014). Processing multiword idiomatic strings: Many words in one? *The Mental Lexicon*, *9* (2): 267–293. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.9.2.05cac

Cacciari, C., & Levorato, M. C. (1998). The Effect of Semantic Analyzability of Idioms in Metalinguistic Tasks. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *13* (3): 159–177. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1303_1

Caillies, S., & Butcher, K. (2007). Processing of Idiomatic Expressions: Evidence for a New Hybrid View. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *22* (1): 79–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709 336754

Carston, R. (2018). Figurative Language, Mental Imagery, and Pragmatics. *Metaphor and Sym-bol*, *33* (3): 198–217. https://doi.org/10. 1080/ 1092 6488.2018.1481257

Cermak, F. (2001). SUBSTANCE OF IDIOMS: PERENNIAL PROBLEMS, LACK OF DATA OR THEORY? *International Journal of Lexicography*, *14* (1): 1–20. https://doi.org/10. 1093/ ijl/ 14.1.1

Ellis, N. C. (2008). Words and their usage: Commentary on the special issue on the bilingual mental lexicon. *The Mental Lexicon*, *3* (3): 375–385. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.3.3.07ell

Elman, J. L. (2011). Lexical knowledge without a lexicon? *The Mental Lexicon*, *6* (1): 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.6.1.01elm

Findlay, H., & Carrol, G. (2018). Contributions of semantic richness to the processing of idioms. *The Mental Lexicon*, *13* (3): 311–332. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.18014.fin

Gillon, B. (2009). Introduction to "The syntax–semantics interface and the origins of philosophy." *The Mental Lexicon*, *4* (1): 147–148. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.4.1.06gil

Gogichev, C. (2016). Two categorization patterns in idiom semantics. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, *23* (2): 343–358. https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.23.2.08gor

Hanks, P. (2004). THE SYNTAGMATICS OF METAPHOR AND IDIOM. *International Journal of Lexicography*, *17* (3): 245–274. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/17.3.245

Hyun, J., Conner, P. S., & Obler, L. K. (2014). Idiom properties influencing idiom production in younger and older adults. *The Mental Lexicon*, *9* (2): 294–315. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.9.2.06hyu

Ibáñez, F. J. R. de M., & Lozano-Palacio, I. (2019). A Cognitive-Linguistic Approach to Complexity in Irony: Dissecting the Ironic Echo. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *34*(2): 127–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2019.1611714

Isodarus, P. (2017). IDIOMS CONTAINING THE WORD HATI AND TRANSITIVE VERBS IN INDONESIAN LANGUAGE. *International Journal of Humanity Studies*, *1* (1): 71–83. https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.2017.010108

Jackendoff, R., & Audring, J. (2016). Morphological schemas: Theoretical and psycholinguistic issues. *The Mental Lexicon*, *11* (3): 467–493. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.11.3.06jac

Järvikivi, J., Pyykkönen-Klauck, P., & Laine, M. (2014). Introduction: Words & constructions: Language complexity in linguistics and psychology. *The Mental Lexicon*, *9* (2): 141–143. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.9.2.00jar

Karlsson, F. (2014). Complexity in linguistic theorizing. *The Mental Lexicon*, *9* (2): 144–169. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.9.2.01kar

Kay, P., Berkeley, U. C., & Sag, I. A. (2014). *A Lexical Theory of Phrasal Idioms*. Stanford University.

Khak', M. A. (2011). IDIOM DALAM BAHASA INDONESIA: STRUKTUR DAN MAKNAI.). *WIDYAPARWA*, *39* (2): 141–154.

Lakoff, G. (1986). A Figure of Thought. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, *1* (3): 215–225. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms0103_4

Lambek, J. (2009). The syntax–semantics interface and the origins of philosophy. *The Mental Lexicon*, *4* (1): 149–156. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.4.1.07lam

Langlotz, A. (2006). *Idiomatic creativity: A cognitive-linguistic model of idiom-representation and idiom-variation in English*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

Laurent, J.-P., Denhières, G., Passerieux, C., Iakimova, G., & Hardy-Baylé, M.-C. (2006). On understanding idiomatic language: The salience hypothesis assessed by ERPs. *Brain Research*, *1068* (1): 151–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2005.10.076

Li, L., & Sporleder, C. (2009). Classifier combination for contextual idiom detection without labelled data. *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing Volume 1 - EMNLP '09*, *1*, 315–323. https://doi.org/10.3115/1699510.1699552

Liang, Y., & Pascual, E. (2019). Mixed metaphors: Their use and abuse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *34* (2): 139–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2019.1611716

Liu, Z. (2012). Analysis of Idiom Variation in the Framework of Linguistic Subjectivity. *English Language Teaching*, *5* (6): 105. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n6p105

Nenonen, M., Niemi, J., & Laine, M. (2002). Representation and processing of idioms: Evidence from aphasia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *15* (1): 43–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0911-6044(01)00005-7

Nugraha, D. S. (2016). Perluasan Makna Leksem Anak dalam Bahasa Indonesia. *Sirok Bastra*, *4* (1): 7–16.

Nugraha, D. S. (2018). PERLUASAN LEKSEM IBU DALAM BAHASA INDONESIA: TINJAUAN SEMANTIK. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pertemuan Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia XL*, 661–672. Pekalongan: Unikal Press.

Peng, J., Feldman, A., & Vylomova, E. (2018). Classifying Idiomatic and Literal Expressions Using Topic Models and Intensity of Emotions. *ArXiv:1802.09961[Cs]*. Retrieved from http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.09961

Potts, A., & Semino, E. (2019). Cancer as a Metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *34* (2): 81–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2019.1611723

Richie, R. (2016). Functionalism in the lexicon: Where is it, and how did it get there? *The Mental Lexicon*, *11* (3): 429–466. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.11.3.05ric

Skoufaki, S. (2008). Investigating the Source of Idiom Transparency Intuitions. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *24* (1): 20–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480802568448

Spalding, T. L., & Gagn, C. L. (2007). Semantic property activation during the interpretation of combined concepts. *The Mental Lexicon*, *2* (1): 25–47.

Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistis*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.

Szczepaniak, R., & Lew, R. (2011). The Role of Imagery in Dictionaries of Idioms. *Applied Linguistics*, *32* (3): 323–347. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amr001

Tabossi, P., Fanari, R., & Wolf, K. (2009). Why are idioms recognized fast? *Memory & Cognition*, *37* (4): 529–540. https://doi.org/10.3758/MC.37.4.529

Turvey, M. T., & Moreno, M. A. (2006). Physical metaphors for the mental lexicon. *The Mental Lexicon*, *1* (1): 7–33. https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.1.1.04tur

Widdows, D., & Dorow, B. (2005). Automatic extraction of idioms using graph analysis and asymmetric lexicosyntactic patterns. *Proceedings of the ACL-SIGLEX Workshop on Deep Lexical Acquisition - DeepLA '05*: 48–56. https://doi.org/10.3115/1631850.1631856

Wilkosz, S. (2015). A comparative analysis of Polish and English idioms containing words from bird class. *Studia Anglica Resoviensia*, *12*: 109–124. https://doi.org/10.15584/sar.2015.12.10

Yu, N., & Huang, J. (2019). Primary Metaphors across Languages: Difficulty as Weight and Solidity. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *34* (2): 111–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2019.1611725

Yusifova, G. I. (2013). Syntactic Features of English Idioms. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *3* (3): p133. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v3n3p133