



Article

Possessive Construction in Russian and Indonesian Noun Phrases: Contrastive Analysis and Translation

Tri Yulianty Karyaningsih^{1,2}

¹Doctoral Student of Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

²Russian Department, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia

SUBMISSION TRACK

Received: January 15, 2020
Final Revision: March 20, 2020
Available Online: April 26, 2020

KEYWORD

Possessive construction, noun phrase, Russian and Indonesian, contrastive analysis, translation

CORRESPONDENCE

Phone: 08122006207
E-mail: t.yulianty@unpad.ac.id

A B S T R A C T

This paper aims to discuss the comparison between possessive constructions in Russian and Indonesian noun phrases. Since both of the languages have different grammatical systems, their possessive constructions may also be different. The differences are discussed using a contrastive analysis approach. However, the similarities between them are also taken into consideration following one of the practical purposes of contrastive analysis, namely, to aid the translation process. The theory employed in this research is eclectic. The research method employed in this research is descriptive method with contrastive analysis model. In addition, for translation analysis, word-for-word and literal methods are used here. The data in this research are collected from the Russian National Corpus and some selected literary works in Russian and Indonesian. The result suggests that there are some structural differences and similarities between Russian and Indonesian in terms of word order, attributive categories, and grammatical categories of the elements constituting noun phrases. The results of this comparison can be referred to in the translation of possessive construction of both languages so that the closest equivalent is found following the rules of each language.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the era of globalization, cooperation between countries is increasingly open. Russia and Indonesia have maintained cooperation in various fields and continue to increase. Even though there have been various technological aids and tools that help overcome a language barrier, language as a means of communication is still relevant in an interaction. Therefore, being fluent in the Russian language helps support these cooperations. However, for Indonesians speakers who learn Russian as a foreign language, the most difficult challenge they usually face is the difference between the grammatical systems of the two languages. This situation is in line with the assumption of contrastive analysis, which views grammatical differences is one of the significant factors in language learning.

Contrastive analysis is a branch of linguistics that compares languages by focusing on contrast (James, 1980: 2). Comparison through contrastive analysis can be applied to certain levels or units of language, including possessive construction. Possessive construction is a universal phenomenon (Setiawan, 2015: 1) found in many languages.

Possessive, narrowly-defined, refers to the semantic relationship of ownership, whereas its broader definition encompasses genitive semantic relationships in general, including partitives, subjective, and objectives (Kobozeva, 2015: 249-251). The semantic relationship of possessive can be in the form of predicative and attributive or adnominal constructions (Stassen, 2001, in Wang and Xu, 2013: 8). The scope of this research is limited to the discussion on the possessive

construction asserting ownership and focused on possessive construction in noun phrases (NPs) or in the form of attributive construction.

Possessive construction in NPs is also found in many languages as reviewed by Grashenkov (2007) on a cross-language typology of possessive construction and by Helmbrecht (2016) on Siouan languages. However, since every language has a different grammatical system, possessive construction in every language may vary, including in Russian (RU) and Indonesian (IN). The following are some examples of possessive constructions in RU and IN (translation) NPs.

- (1) a. *moja komnata*
 my room
 Pron.1s.f.s.nom N.f.s.nom
 b. *kamar saya*
 room my
 N Pron.1s
 'my room'

- (2) a. *otčova komnata*
 father room
 Adj.f.s.nom N.f.s.nom
 b. *kamar ayah*
 room father
 N N
 'father's room'

For example (1) and (2), RU possessive constructions *moja komnata* and *otčova komnata* are both NP with the noun *komnata* 'room' serving as the head. Similarly, in the IN translation, the possessive construction is an NP with the noun *kamar* 'room' serving as the head element of the phrase. For example (1), both attributive elements in RU (*moja* 'my') and in IN (*saya* 'I/my') are pronouns (Pron). However, in example (2), the attributive element of the RU noun phrase, *otčova* '(owned by) father,' is an adjective, whereas in the IN translation, it is a noun. This is one of the differentiating characteristics between RU and IN. In addition to that, nouns, pronouns, and adjectives (Adj) in RU have grammatical categories of gender, number, and case, whereas in IN, they do not. These grammatical categories form a syntactic connection between the nouns as the head and their attributes (Kostomarov & Maksimov, 2010: 482; Walgina, 2003: 50). As

indicated by the linguistic markers below each RU NPs above, pronouns and adjectives correspond with their feminine (f) gender, singular (s), and nominative (nom) case. Grammatical categories that constitute the concordance connection are also related to the word order in that the head is placed after the attribute (Krylova & Kavronina, 1988: 33, 40). Such a category also does not exist in the Indonesian grammatical system. In the IN, word order generally follows the rules of the modified-modifier rule (DM). That is another differentiating character between the two languages.

Differences between the two languages can be understood as the uniqueness of each language. Even more, Russian and Indonesian are genetically, morphologically, and syntactically different. As stated by Karyaningsih (2018: 2), these differences can be a problem when both languages are used simultaneously as in language learning and translation activities. Although contrastive analysis focuses more on the differences as stated above, but for practical purposes such as translation, contrastive analysis also considers the similarities. Therefore, this research focuses on the contrastive analysis of possessive construction in RU and IN noun phrases to identify the differences and similarities.

Based on the examples above, there are differences in terms of attributive categories and word order and how they are determined. Other than those three, possessive construction in NP has a specific use, which may also involve cultural factors. For example, the IN personal pronoun *saya* 'I/my' in example (1), has a variant, namely *aku/-ku*, which is usually used in a more intimate conversation. Such variant does not exist in RU. They will be observed in this research in a view to getting a proper comparison model that serves the purpose of contrastive analysis.

Comparison model derived from this contrastive analysis is the characteristic of contrastive analysis as "pure" or theoretical linguistics (James, 1980: 8), the result of the analysis can be utilized in the field of translation (Nur, 2016: 4) as the application of contrastive analysis (James, 1980: 8). Baker (1998, in Sukirmiyadi, 2018: 32) states that the relationship between contrastive analysis and translation was bidirectional, i.e., specific pieces from translation result can provide the data for

contrastive analysis. Otherwise, contrastive analysis can provide explanations of difficulties encountered in translation. Williams and Chesterman (2002, in Karyaningsih 2018: 5) explain that the comparison model is one of the theoretical models in seeking translation equivalence. This model also views translation as an alignment problem through the selection of the target language elements that are more equivalent to ones in the source language. Therefore, this approach is closely related to contrastive analysis.

In any language, the relation of possessive meaning is usually expressed by more than one construction (Helmbrecht, 2016: 423). Different possessive constructions and their various uses can be a problem in translation (Kostadni, 2012: 104). In light of that, by making use of the contrastive analysis result of possessive constructions in RU and IN noun phrases, this research will also discuss the translation of that possessive construction in both languages.

Discussions on possessive constructions are usually found in grammar books, such as conducted by Alwi (2003) and Kostomarov and Maksimov (2010), especially the ones specialized in a syntax such as conducted by Chaer (2015) and Walgina (2003), in the chapter about phrases. However, very few of them discuss this topic in detail. There has been some previous relevant research on possessive construction in RU. Kobozeva (2015) and Sushkova (2007) discussed the semantic relations of predicative and attributive possession. Also, Kakvaeva (2009) discussed possessive construction in the comparative study of the genitive meaning in Lak and RU. IN possessive construction has been discussed by Setiawan in his research (2015), in which he described the possessive constructions used in LTE's in some newspapers in Indonesia. In addition, Salamun (2019) also made a comparison between the possessive patterns in Ambon dialect IN dan standard IN. A contrastive analysis of the RU and IN in translating the noun phrase with an adjective as its attribute (Karyaningsih, 2018). These sources are used as references in this study.

There have not been any specific discussions on the comparison between RU and IN possessive constructions. Therefore, this research aims to obtain a more accurate and more detailed description of the subject in finding the adequate equivalences

which can be used in RU-IN translation and vice versa. Furthermore, this research can also be used as a model of language studies through contrastive analysis for other language phenomena, specifically in RU and IN, the results of which can be used for theoretical and practical purposes.

II. METHODS

The method employed in this research is descriptive method. The data are collected through reading and writing techniques, as stated by Sudaryanto (2015: 6-8). The data are texts derived from the Russian National Corpus (www.ruscorpora.ru). They are then analyzed using the contrastive analysis method with two main steps, namely description, and comparison (James, 1980: 27).

At the step of description, possessive construction in NPs of each language is described in detail. The sentences/clauses in which there are noun phrases with possessive construction are provided as supporting data. This is carried out to get the proper context related to the NP as a language unit that serves the syntactic function in a clause/sentence, as well as concerning grammatical categories, particularly in RU. Therefore, syntactic analysis is carried out in this step of the research with the immediate constituent analysis as the basic technique (in Sudaryanto, 2015: 35) to determine the syntactic function of NP with possessive construction in a clause/sentence, as well as morphological analysis related to grammatical categories.

In the comparison step, it includes

the description of the differences and similarities of possessive constructions in NP of both languages. At this step, the equivalence method is used with determinant in the form of another language (Sudaryanto, 2015: 15-18). To reach a form that does not exist in IN, RU is used as the point of departure in the comparison by providing equivalent lingual units in IN to identify the differences and similarities. NP with possessive construction that is compared is derived from the data in the form of clauses/sentences. The final stage in this step is formulating the comparison.

The final step in this research is to translate NP with possessive construction in a RU and IN clause/

sentence. In translation, the term *source language (SL)* and *target language (TL)* are known. In this research, both RU and IN can be the *SL* and *TL* because in this research, observed how possessive construction on RU noun phrases translated into IN, and vice versa. The method applied in this translation is a word-for-word translation method, then a literal translation method to reach the nearest grammatical equivalences (see Newmark, 1988: 45-46). The data as an example of the translation material derived from the Russian and Indonesian literary works.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Contrastive Analysis of Possessive Construction in Russian and Indonesian NPs

Semantic relation in possessive construction, both in RU and IN, is generally a *possessum* (possessed) relationship with the *possessor* (Kobozeva, 2015: 1; Setiawan, 2015: 77). In NP, the *possessum* as the head is a noun, while the *possessor* can be certain categories.

Possessive Construction in Russian NPs

Possessive construction stating the meaning of ownership in RU NPs can be realized through the relation of meaning between the head noun with adjectives, pronouns, and nouns as attributes of the phrase (Sushkova, 2007: 118).

1). NP with adjectives as attributes

Adjectives are categories that are generally used as an attribute on the NP because of its main function in characterizing objects. In general, adjectives are categorized into three types: (1) qualitative adjectives that directly characterize objects such as *krasivyj* ‘beautiful’, *sinij* ‘blue’; (2) relative adjectives that indirectly characterize objects, employing their relation to something else such as material (*kirpichnaja stena* ‘brick wall’), time (*utrennij spektakl* ‘morning performance’); and (3) possessive adjectives asserting ownership by a person or animal (Kostomarov & Maksimov, 2010: 483-484). Of the three types, possessive adjectives are particularly used to express the possessive meaning. Possessive adjectives are formed morphologically from nouns by adding suffixes and adjectival flexion, as can be seen in

the following data sample.

- (3) *Dedova krovat’ stojala*
grandfather bed stood
 Adj.f.s.nom N.f.s.nom
 S P
v perednem uglu, ...
 in front corner
 Adv
 (Maksim Gorky. *Detstvo*. In [Russian National Corpus](#))
 ‘**Grandfather’s bed** was in the front corner, ...’
- (4) *I on pošel v kuhnju, nadejas’*
 and he went to kitchen hoping
nayti tam maminu sumku.
 find there **mother bag**
 Adj.f.s.ac N.f.s.ac
 P Adv O
 (V.F. Panova. *Pro Mityu i Nastyu*. In [Russian National Corpus](#))
 ‘And he went into the kitchen, hoping to find **mother’s bag** there.’

On the data (3) it seems that the function of the syntactic subject (S) filled by NP with possessive construction *dedova krovat’* ‘grandfather’s bed’. The attributive adjective *dedova* is formed from noun *ded* ‘grandfather’ by adding suffix and adjectival flexion as the marker of grammatical categories of gender, number and case. Similarly, in example (4), the NP *maminu sumku* ‘mama’s bag’ is a possessive construction, in which the adjective *maminu* is formed from noun *Mama* ‘mama’. However, the syntactic function of that possessive construction is object (O). The syntactic functions can also be seen through the grammatical category of cases, namely nominative to S, accusative (ac) for O. Besides, as shown in the linguistic markers listed under these phrases, the head corresponds to the attribute in terms of grammatical categories of gender, number and case, thus form a concordance relation. Therefore, the noun’s position is behind the attributive adjective so that the pattern of the possessive construction is Adj + N.

2). NP with pronouns as attributes

Pronouns are classified into nine different types. One of them is possessive pronoun ‘*prityazatel’nye mestoimeniya*’, which in its combination with nouns in an NP expresses the meaning of

ownership (Kostomarov & Maksimov, 2010: 515) of property by someone or something. As well as personal pronouns, possessive pronouns also refer to 1st, 2nd, 3rd person, singular, and plural (p). However, they are different in forms, namely *ja* ‘I’, *ty* ‘you’, *on/ona/ono* ‘he/she/it(m/f/n)’, *my* ‘we’, *vy* ‘you’, and *oni* ‘they’. These forms are classified as personal pronouns, whereas *moj* ‘my’, *tvoj* ‘your’, *ego/ejo* ‘his/her’, *naš* ‘our’, *vaš* ‘your’, *ih* ‘their’ are possessive pronouns. Moreover, the possessive pronoun *svoj* ‘own’ used in a sentence/clause refers to a person’s own self, for example, *Nina ubrala svoju komnatu*. ‘Nina cleaned her **own** room’. The possessive pronoun has the grammatical categories of gender, number, and case, which in combination with the noun, indicates the concordance relation through the flexion (except the third person). Therefore, the noun head is placed behind the attribute (Pron+N). Here are examples of possessive constructions in NP with a possessive pronoun as attributes.

(5) *Moj brat ros krasivym*
my brother grew handsome
 Pron.1s.m.s.nom N.m.s.nom
 S P
podrostkom zapadnoevropejskogo
 teenager West Europe
tipa. (Sergey Dovlatov. 1983. *Nashi*.
 type
 In [Russian National Corpus](#))
 ‘**My brother** grew up as a handsome
 teenager of the West European type.’

(6) *Kažetsja, ja ljublju*
 it seems I love
 S P
tvoego syna, ...
your son
 Pron.2s.m.s.ac N.m.s.ac
 O
 (Galina Shcherbakova. 2001. *Mal’cik i*
Devočka. In [Russian National Corpus](#))
 ‘I think I love **your son**,...’

In example (5), *moj brat*, as the subject of the sentence, is the NP, which possessive pronoun *moj* ‘my’ as its attribute. The flexion *-oj* is a grammatical category’s marker of masculine (*m*), singular, and nominative case, which shows the concordance relation with the head noun *brat* ‘brother’. Hence, the position of the head is after the attribute. Except that, through nominative case can be determined by

the syntactic function of the subject. While in (6), NP with possessive construction *tvoego syna* ‘your son’ has a syntactic function as an object. It can be seen from the accusative case. As in (5), pronoun as the attribute of NP in (6) shows the concordance relation in gender, number, and case with the noun. Therefore, its position is in front of the head (Pron + N).

3). NP with Nouns as Attributes

Nouns are also used to express the possessive construction in the NP. The attributive noun is standing in the genitive (gen) form of grammatical categories as the possessor (Sushkova, 2007: 118), and morphologically differentiator of the head noun. The syntactic relation between these phrase’s elements is government relation, i.e., the attribute takes the form of certain cases due to the head demands (Kostomarov & Maksimov, 2010: 449). In related phrases such, the head is placed in front of the attribute. It can be said that the possessive construction in NPs is patterned N + N. Here are some examples of sentences with NP as the possessive construction.

(7) *Komnata otča stojala pustaja,*
room father stood empty
 N.f.s.nom N.m.s.gen
 S P Comp
 (D. S. Likhachev. *Vospominaniya*. In [Russian National Corpus](#))
 ‘**Father’s room** was empty,...’

(8) *Valja razvešivaet na vereocke*
 Valya hangs on string
 S P ADV
postirannoe bel’je – rubašku
 washed clothes **shirt**
 N.f.s.ac
Sergeja i dve mayki.
Sergei and two T-shirt
 N.m.s.gen
 (A. N. Arbuzov. *Irkutskaya Istoriya*. In [Russian National Corpus](#))
 ‘On the line, Valya hangs the washed clothes
 – **Sergej’s shirt** and two T-shirt.’

In sentence (7) and (8), *komnata otča* ‘father’s room,’ as the subject, and *rubašku Sergeja* ‘Sergei’s shirt’, as an object, are NP with *otča* ‘father’ and *Sergeja* ‘Sergei’ as the attributive nouns. The

flexion of a genitive case on the attributive noun, i.e., *a* or *-ja*, can express the possessive meaning explicitly. The establishment of an attributive noun, in this case, forms the head noun demands that the syntactic relation of which is government. In such relation, the head positioned in front of the attribute, as shown in (7) and (8), so that the pattern of possessive constructions in this phrase is N + N. The syntactic function of phrases can be viewed through the flexion of the head noun cases. In (7), *-a* (*komnata* ‘room’) is a marker of the nominative case that shows the function of the subject. In (8), *-u* (*rubašku* ‘shirt’) is a marker of the accusative case that shows the function of the object.

Possessive construction patterned N + N such as *komnata otča* ‘Dad’s room’ synonymous with (possessive) Adj + N pattern such data (2) above, namely *otčova komnata* ‘Dad’s room’ (Walgina, 2003: 38). However, such a possessive construction used in colloquial (Kostomarov & Maksimov, 2010: 484). Possessive constructions patterned N+N can be expanded as additional explanatory of other elements, such as *komnata otča* ‘Dad’s room’ becomes *komnata moego otča* ‘My dad’s room,’ but possessive constructions patterned Adj+N can not be expanded to **moja otčova komnata*.

Possessive Construction in Indonesian NPs

Possessive construction of IN can be realized by NPs with nouns and pronouns as its attributes (Setiawan, 2015: 81).

1). NPs with nouns as attributes

The grammatical meaning of ownership to the NP has a pattern of N+N (Chaer, 2015: 123) with N, who plays behind an attribute as the owner (Wijana, 1991: 13). Chaer (2015: 123) said that the first N has a meaning component (+possessed objects), and the second N is (+human) or (+institution). McGregor (2009, in Setiawan, 2015: 78) and Wijana (1991: 13) adds that the second N might also not human beings, but animals. Word order as a pointer of the relation between phrase’s elements is generally patterned DM (modified-modifier) (Salamun, 2018: 54) and applies strictly, so changing the word order in a phrase can significantly change the meaning or even bring a non-grammatical form. Therefore, word order in this NP with possessive construction cannot be exchanged. The relation of possessive meaning in NP can be made explicit

with the insertion of the word *milik* ‘belong to’ or *dari* ‘from’ as a relator (Chaer, 2015: 123). The following are some examples in which there is NP with possessive construction.

- (9) **Rumah Maria** *agak jauh dari*
house Maria rather far from
 N N
 S P
kampus, di sebelah selatan kota.
 campus on side south city
 (Damono. 2015: 98)
 ‘**Maria’s house** is rather a distance from the campus, in the south of the city.’

- (10) *Di kantor polisi ia diterima*
 in office police he received
baik-baik karena menyatakan
 well because state
bahwa ia kakak Rusdi.
 that he **brother Rusdi**
 N N
 S P
 (Damono. 2015: 108)
 ‘At the police station, he was well received because he said that he was **Rusdi’s brother**.’

In sentence (9) and (10), NPs *rumah Maria* ‘Maria’s house’ and *kakak Rusdi* ‘Rusdi’s brother’ are constructed with nouns (*Maria* and *Rusdi*) as the attributes. The attributive noun phrases are determined by its placement behind the head noun (DM pattern) is fixed. This can be seen in repositions of the phrase elements, which will bring the non-grammatical form (**Maria rumah, *Rusdi kakak*). The possessive meaning in that both phrases can be made explicit with the insertion of the word *milik* ‘belong to’ or *dari* ‘from’ (*rumah milik Maria, kakak dari Rusdi*). NP serves the syntactic function in a sentence and in IN is generally determined by word order. Shown in (9), *rumah Maria* is a subject in the sentence and the position is in front of the predicate. In (10), *kakak Rusdi* is a predicate, which the position is behind the subject of the sentence.

2). NPs with pronouns as attributes

Attributes of the NPs with the possessive meaning can be realized by personal pronouns and can also be enclitic as its variant forms, such as *-ku* ‘my’,

-mu ‘your’, -nya ‘his/her’, -kau ‘your’ (Wijana, 1991: 13). Attributive pronouns in these FNs are positioned behind the head noun or patterned DM (Salamun, 2019: 54). The 1st, 2nd, 3rd person, singular and plural of personal pronouns can have more than one form, such as *saya/aku* ‘I’, *kamu/engkau/Anda* ‘you’, *ia/dia/beliau* ‘he/she’, the use of which related to the formality, social relationships such as age, social status, and familiarity. Also, the 1st plural person, there are two forms, namely *kami* (exclusive) and *kita* (inclusive); on the 2nd plural person there are *kalian* ‘you’, *kamu sekalian*, *anda sekalian* ‘you all’ which also the use is related to age and social status (Alwi et al, 2003: 249-258). The following are examples of the noun phrase with possessive construction in a sentence.

- (11) *Saya sungguh tidak tahu apakah*
 I do not know whether
segalanya itu menunjukkan bahwa
 everything that shows that
nasib saya telah menjadi
fate my has become
 N Pron.1s
 S P
korban takdir manusia.
 victim destiny human
 Comp
 (Damono. 2015: 5)
 ‘I do not know whether everything shows that **my fate** has fallen victim to human destiny.’

- (12) ***Orang tua mereka merasa bangga***
parents their feel proud
 N Pron.3p
 S P
anak-anak mereka ikut berjuang...
children their join struggle
 N Pron.3p
 S P
 (Damono. 2015: 26)
 ‘**Their parents** feel proud that **their children** join in the struggle.’

In the sentences above, NPs *nasib saya* ‘my fate’ in (11) and *orang tua mereka* ‘their parents’ and *anak-anak mereka* ‘their children’ in (12) are the possessive constructions. The attributive personal pronouns are a 1st singular person (11) and 3rd

plural person (12), which is positioned after the head noun (DM pattern). The exchange of that position can cause grammatical errors (**saya nasib*) or change the structure of the phrase into a sentence/clause or change the attributive structure into predicative (*mereka (adalah) orang tua* ‘they are parents’, *mereka (adalah) anak-anak* ‘they are children’). The positioning of the pronouns after the head can be argued as a possessive marker in both of the sentences above. In order to make the possessive meaning more explicit, one can insert the word *milik/dari* (*nasib milik/dari saya, orang tua/anak-anak dari mereka*). Like phrases in general, this NP construction is a single unit with one syntactic function in a sentence and generally can be determined by the word order. In the sentences above, *nasib saya, orang tua mereka, anak-anak mereka* are noun phrases that serve as the subjects and are placed before the predicates.

Comparison of Possessive Construction in Russian and Indonesian Noun Phrases

Based on the description in the previous section, the following is the comparison of possessive construction in RU and IN NPs. The RU possessive constructions, which are classified by attributive categories, are used as the point of departure in this following discussion. Each lingual unit in the IN possessive construction counterparts is compared here.

NPs with adjectives as attributes

For example, the RU noun phrase in (3) *dedova krovat* ‘grandfather’s bed’ suggests possessive meaning. It’s similar to the same lingual unit in IN noun phrase in (9), *rumah Maria* ‘Maria’s house’. The phrases above are compared as follows.

Russian	Indonesian
<i>dedova krovat</i> grandfather bed Adj.f.s.nom N.f.s.nom ‘grandfather’s bed’	rumah (milik) Maria house(belongs to) Maria N rel N ‘Maria’s house.’

It can be seen that in the RU possessive construction, the attribute is expressed by adjective, whereas IN uses noun to express possessive. In RU, this attribute is placed in front of the head related with the grammatical categories of gender, number, and case. Through these grammatical categories, this phrase shows the syntactic relation of concordance

between noun and adjective, namely masculine, singular, and nominative case. On the other hand, such grammatical categories do not exist in the IN. The relation between phrase elements is determined by word order, in that attribute is placed after the head, following the rule of IN. Possessive meaning in the RU noun phrase can be seen from the possessive adjective implying ownership. No relator is required. On the other hand, possessive meaning in the IN noun phrase is implicit in that a relator can be inserted between the phrase elements.

Based on the above description, the formula of comparison between RU and IN possessive construction can be argued as follows:

Russian	Indonesian
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pattern of possessive construction in NP with attributive adjectives is Adj+N. There are grammatical categories of gender, number, and case forming concordance relation related to word order. Relator is not inserted among the elements of the phrase. The relation of meaning can be determined through the basic lexical meaning of the possessive adjective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pattern of possessive construction in NP with attributive nouns is N+N. No grammatical categories. Word order follows the general formal rules of modified-modifier (DM). A relator can be inserted (optional) to make possessive meaning explicit.

NPs with pronouns as attributes

Following is the comparison of possessive construction in NPs with the attributive pronouns in RU and IN. Russian NP in example (5) and Indonesian NP in example (11), are used here as an example.

Russian	Indonesian
<p><i>moj brat</i> my brother Pron.1s.m.s.nom N.m.t.nom 'my brother'</p>	<p><i>nasib saya</i> fate my N Pron.1s 'my fate.'</p>

It can be seen that the RU possessive construction is constituted by a noun serving as the head and a possessive pronoun, i.e. 1st singular person *moj*

'my', serving as the attribute. Like an adjective, a pronoun is placed before the noun related to the grammatical categories of gender, number, and case, so that the syntactic relation between phrase elements is a concordance. As seen in the linguistic markers of the NP above, the grammatical category it is masculine, singular, and nominative. Possessive meaning is explicitly expressed morphologically by the possessive pronoun that inherently expresses the meaning of ownership. While the counterpart in the IN, the possessive construction in NP is attributed to a personal pronoun with a position behind the noun (DM rule). It also applies as the revealer of a possessive relation. There are variants of this possessive form so that the possessive construction can also have variants, namely personal pronoun *saya* (*nasib saya* 'my fate') and enclitic *-ku* 'my' which derived from *aku* (*nasibku, nasib aku* 'my fate'). The use of both variants must be observed related to the social status, age, or proximity, i.e., *aku* further demonstrates familiarity.

Based on the descriptions of possessive constructions in NPs with attributive pronouns, the following is the formulations of the comparative results.

Russian	Indonesian
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pattern of possessive construction in NP with attributive (possessive) pronouns is Pron+N. No variations. There are grammatical categories of gender, number, and case forming concordance relation related to word order. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pattern of possessive construction in NP with attributive (personal) pronouns is N+Pron. There are variations associated with formality, social status, age, familiarity. There is no grammatical category. Word order follows the general formal rules of modifier-modified (DM).

NPs with nouns as attributes

The following example is the possessive construction in NP derived from the RU data (8), as well as a comparable lingual unit in IN derived from the data (9).

Russian	Indonesian
<i>rubašku Sergeja</i> shirt Sergei N.f.s.ac N.m.s.gen 'Sergei's shirt'	<i>rumah (milik) Maria</i> house(belongs to) Maria N rel N 'Maria's house'

For example (8), attributive noun is placed behind the head noun. It appears that the noun has grammatical categories of gender, number and case, but this does not form a concordance relation to the NP. Relation between phrase elements is the government relation, which is the head noun demanding attributive noun standing in the genitive case. This case can explicitly express the possessive meaning. Therefore, the attribute is placed behind the head. At comparable in IN, possessive construction in the NP (9) is also attributed by noun with the position behind the head. This word order tends to be strict with DM rule. Possessive meaning can be made explicit with the insertion of the word *milik* 'belong to' (*rumah milik Mari* 'house belong to Maria) as an optional relator.

Referring to the explanation, the comparison of possessive construction in NPs with attributive noun can be formulated as follows.

Russian	Indonesian
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pattern of possessive construction in NP with attributive nouns is N+N. Attributive noun standing in the genitive case form due to the syntactic relation of government, which is related to the word order and making possessive meaning explicit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pattern of possessive construction in NP with attributive nouns is N+N. There is no grammatical category of cases. Word order follows the general formal rules of modified-modifier (DM). The relator can be inserted to make the possessive meaning explicit.

Translation of Possessive Construction

Translation from Russian to Indonesian

Here are some examples of the RU clause in which there are possessive constructions in the NP to be translated into IN. The data are taken from the short story by Anton Chekhov entitled *Ispoved* ' and *Na Gvozde*.

(13) *Cerez mesjač ejo mamen'ka*
selang bulan dia mama
after month her mother
Pron.3s.m N.f.s.nom
Adv S
byla už moej teščej ...
become has my mother-in-law
Pron.1s.f.s.ins N.f.s.ins
P Comp
(Chekov, *Ispoved*)

In data (13) there are two possessive constructions in the NP, namely:

<i>ejo</i>	<i>mamen'ka</i>	and
<i>dia</i>	<i>ibu</i>	
her	mother	
Pron.3s.m.nom	N.f.s.nom	
<i>moej</i>	<i>teščej</i>	
<i>saya</i>	<i>mertua</i>	
my	mother-in-law	
Pron.1s.f.s.ins	N.f.s.ins	

The possessive constructions are built from nouns serving as the head and possessive pronouns serving as the attributes which are positioned in front of the head. In the linguistic markers under Russian NPs, grammatical categories can be related to the word order based on the syntactic relation of concordance between the head noun and the attributive pronoun. In the translation into IN, possessive constructions in both of the above phrases can also be expressed by the third person of personal pronoun, namely enclitic *-nya* 'his/her' instead *dia* 'he/she-his/her', and the first person, i.e. *saya* 'I/my' or enclitic *-ku* 'my' used when showing intimacy. The absence of grammatical categories of gender, number and case in Indonesian grammar led to a relation of phrase elements is based on the word order in general, that the attribute is follow the head (DM rule). So, possessive constructions in the NP in IN are:

<i>'ibunya'</i>	and	<i>'mertua saya/-ku'</i>
mother her		mother-in-law my
N	Pron.3s	N Pron.1s

Syntactic function in the RU can be seen through a grammatical category of cases. NP possessive constructions in the data (13), *ejo mamenka* 'her mother' stands in the nominative case as a pointer function of the subject, while the phrase *moej teščej* 'my mother-in-law' stands in the

instrumental case (ins) that in the clause serves as a complement (Comp) predicate *byla uz* 'has become'. Meanwhile, the syntactic function of words in IN is based on the pattern of word order in sentences that generally puts the subject in front of the predicate and complement accompanying predicate. Based on this, the RU clause (13) can be translated into IN becomes *Sebulan kemudian ibunya sudah menjadi mertua saya: ...* or *Sebulan kemudian ibunya sudah menjadi mertuaku: ...* 'A month later her mother became my mother-in-law'.

- (14) *Cinovnye želudki szalis' pegawai perut mengerut*
 clerk stomach constrict
 Adj.p.nom N.p.nom
 S P
ot gorja: golod ne tetka, ...
karena derita lapar bukan main
 because suffer hungry extreme
 Adv
 (Chekov, *Ispoved'*)

Possessive construction in data (14) is:

- cinovnye želudki*
pegawai perut
 clerk stomach
 Adj.j.nom N.j.nom

Attribute in NP above, *cinovnye*, is a possessive adjective formed from noun *cinovnik* 'clerk' by adding suffix and adjektival flexion *-ye*. The linguistic markers under the NP show that between phrase elements appears the syntactic relation of concordance. This relation can be determined through the grammatical categories that can be related to the word order in a phrase, that is the attribute is positioned in front of the head. In the translation into IN, possessive construction on that NP embodied by the noun serving as attribute. The absence of grammatical categories in IN makes the relation between phrase elements based only on the word order in general, that the attribute is behind the head (DM rule). Therefore, possessive construction in the NP in IN is:

- '*perut pegawai*'
 stomach clerk
 N.s N.s

However, the adjektival flexion of *-ye* and nominal flexion *-i* in the RU noun phrase show the plural.

Therefore, to express the meaning of the plural in the IN can be realized among others through lexical reduplication or by adding a word with the plural meaning. Therefore, the RU phrase in IN becomes:

- '*perut para pegawai*'
 stomach clerks
 N.s NP

Grammatical categories of cases in RU can be the marker of syntactic functions, namely nominative case as the marker function of the subject. While the syntactic function of words in IN, as well as the word order in a phrase, referring to pattern of the word order, which is the subject generally precedes the predicate. Therefore, the RU clause in (14) can be translated into IN becomes *Perut para pegawai mengerut karena menderitanya: lapar bukan main, ...* 'The clerk's stomachs constricted because of suffering: extremely hungry ...'

- (15) *..., vsjo pereportila kar'era semua merusak karier*
 everything ruined career
 N.f.s.nom
 O P S
Struckova!
Struchkkov
 N.m.s.gen
 (Chekov, *Na Gvozde*)

In clause (15), the possessive construction is:

- kar'era Struckova*
karier Struchkkov
 career Struchkov
 N.f.s.nom N.m.s.gen

As seen above, NP is constructed of a head with a noun as an attribute to the position behind the head. The linguistic markers show that there are grammatical categories in the RU phrase that can be related to the word order based on the syntactic relation between the phrase elements. In (15), NP forms a government relation, which is the head noun demands the attributive noun standing in the genitive case. This case inherently can also contain the grammatical meaning of possession. In their translation into IN, possessive construction in the NP is also expressed by a noun that is also positioned behind the head. However, this position is not related to the grammatical category that

does not exist in the IN grammar. It is based on the general rules of the word order in IN phrase, which is the attribute is behind the head (DM rule). Therefore, the possessive construction such as RU in IN are:

'karier Struchkov'
 career Struchkov
 N.s N.s

NP syntactic function can be seen from the grammatical category of noun cases in the head noun. In (15), the head noun *kar'era* 'career' stands in the nominative case, so this syntactic function of NP is subject, although the NP position after the predicate in that sentence. While the syntactic function of words in the IN can be viewed through the word order in a sentence, which is usually the subject is placed before the predicate. Therefore, the clause RU in data (15) can be translated into IN: ..., **karier Struchkov** *telah merusak segalanya!* 'Struchkov's career has ruined everything.' or can be expressed in passive: ..., *semua telah dirusak oleh karier Struchkov.* 'Everything has been ruined by Struchkov's career.'

Translation from Indonesian to Russian

Here's an example of a sentence that included a possessive construction in IN noun phrase, which translates into RU. Sentence of this data is taken from the novel of Sapardi Djoko Damono entitled *Trilogi Soekram* (2015).

(16) Dan kau kan sudah menjual
 i ty ved' uže prodal
 S P
 barang- barangmu ...
 vešč'
 N.j Pron.2s
 O
 (Damono, 2015: 10)

Possessive construction in sentence (16) is:

barang-barangmu
 vešč' tvoj
 belonging your
 N.p Pron.2s

Attribute of the NP above provided by pronoun are prepared by the enclitic *-mu* 'your' as shortening of *kamu* 'you/your'. Attribute stands behind the head corresponding general rule of the word order

in an IN phrase, which is patterned DM. While the translation into RU, possessive pronoun serves as the attribute on this phrase, but with the position in front of the head. It is because of having the grammatical categories which is it must conform to the grammatical categories of noun or forming a syntactic relation of concordance. Therefore, the possessive construction in RU is:

tvoj vešč'
kamu barang
 your belonging
 Pron.2s.m.s.nom N.f.s.nom

However, because between the noun and pronoun is connected by the concordance relation, the pronoun must adjust to the grammatical categories of the noun. The head noun in the IN phrase, namely *barang-barang* 'belongings', indicating the plural, then the translation in RU morphologically manifested through flexion of the plural marker. Thus, IN possessive construction is translated to the RU becomes:

tvoi vešč'i
kamu barang
 your belonging
 Pron.2t.j.nom N.j.nom

Syntactic functions in IN sentence are generally determined by the word order in a sentence, while in RU syntactic functions can be seen from the grammatical categories of cases so that the word order is not the primary determinant. In sentence (16), the syntactic function of possessive construction is the object, which in IN generally stands after the predicate. While the RU, the object function is expressed by the accusative case. Because the form of the accusative case of the unanimate nouns (*barang* 'belongings') equal to the form of the nominative case, then the NP structure above can be used. Therefore, IN sentence in (16) is translated into RU: *I ty ved' uže prodal tvoi vešč'i.* .. 'And you've already sold your belongings to go home'. However, please note that the sentence contained personal pronoun *kamu/ty* 'you' as subject or agent. In such sentences in the RU, the existence of a possessive pronoun usually refers to the subject/agent so used the possessive pronoun *svoj* 'own'. Thus, IN sentence in (16) is usually translated into RU becomes: '*I ty ved' uže prodal svoi vešč'i....* 'And you've already sold your belongings ...'.

- (17) **Suara Soekram** *menghentikan*
golos Sukram ostanovil
 voice Sukram stopped
 N.s N.s
 S P
khayalan ibunya.
grezy materi ego
 daydreams mother his
 N.s N.s Pron3s
 O
 (Damono, 2015: 18)

Possessive constructions in the sentence on the data (17) are:

suara Soekram and **khayalan ibunya**
golos Sukram grezy mat'ego
 voice Sukram daydreams mother his
 N.s N.s N.s N.s Pron3s

The first possessive construction is a combination of head noun with the noun as the attribute standing behind the head according to the rule of the word order in an IN phrase, which is patterned DM. The possessive meaning in this NP is implicit. In their translation into RU, possessive construction in this phrase can be noun as the attribute with a position behind the head. However, this placement is related to the syntactic relation between phrase elements, namely the government, which is the head demands the form of the attributive noun cases. It also deals with the relation of meaning. The meaning of possession in the RU can be made explicit by a genitive grammatical category through the flexion *-a* as a marker of the masculine, singular. So, this IN possessive construction in the RU is:

golos Sukrama
suara Soekram
 voice Sukram
 N.m.s.nom N.m.s.gen

Meanwhile, the construction of the 2nd NP is contained of the head noun and the combination of noun and pronoun. The pattern of this phrase is N + NP (N + Pron), with enclitics pronoun *-nya* 'her/his'. This pattern corresponding general rule of the word order in an IN phrase, which is patterned DM. In their translation into RU, possessive construction with the noun head in front of the attributive noun is also combined with possessive pronoun. This word order is related to the syntactic relation between

phrase elements, namely the government relation, which is the noun head demands the form of the attributive case, such as the genitive as a marker of the possessive meaning. While the combination of noun and pronoun also form a possessive meaning, pronoun are placed in front of the noun. Therefore, the 2nd IN possessive construction of (17) in RU patterned N + NP (Pron + N), with the 2nd N, *mat'* 'mother', stands in the genitive case becomes *materi*. As an attribute, possessive pronoun *ego* 'his' is the 3rd singular person, masculine, which is refers to *Soekram* (Soekram's/his mother). So, this second IN possessive construction in the RU becomes:

grezy ego materi
khayalan -nya ibu
 daydreams his mother
 N.j.nom Pron3s.m N.f.s.gen

Syntactic functions of phrases in IN are determined by the word order in a sentence, which is generally subject precedes predicate and an object behind the predicate. While in RU, syntactic function in the sentence is related to the grammatical category of cases in the head noun. Since both the NP in IN sentence occupy the function of subject and object, the head noun in translation in the RU must stand in the nominative case (subject) and accusative case (object) that's unanimate nouns of the same form with the nominative case. Therefore, IN sentence in (17), can be translated into RU becomes **Golos Sukrama ostanovil grezy ego materi.** 'Sukram's voice stopped her mother's daydreams.'

IV. CONCLUSION

Possessive construction in RU and IN noun phrases show the differences, that is, in word order, attributive categories, and grammatical categories, which relate to each other in the RU. Grammatical categories can be related to make possessive meaning explicit and the syntactic relation between phrase elements that affect the word order. So, the syntactic function of the phrase in the sentence, which can be seen from the grammatical category of cases. While the system of grammatical category does not exist in IN, the relation between phrase elements is indicated through the word order. It is generally patterned DM strictly so that the relation of meaning to the phrase is more implicit. Similarly,

the syntactic function in the sentence is determined by word order. While the similarities are in the construction of NP with the noun head attributed by a noun and the word order (N+N). However, this is merely due to the nature of language itself, not because of their similarity in grammatical.

In contrast, differences in the two languages related to the possessive construction are due to the differences in grammatical. This can be seen as the difference of language typology, i.e., the RU is an inflected type, whereas IN is an agglutinative one. The formulation of the comparison results showed these contrasts could help in the translation of the possessive constructions in both languages, so we get an adequate translation following the rules of each language. RU translation of IN to more grammatically complex, because it is not only the categories and word order can be different, but it should also be observed grammatical categories

in the RU, which does not exist in IN. While the translation of possessive constructions with the pronoun serving as an attribute of IN to RU, should be examined variants that may be related to social distance, formality, and intimacy.

In this study, the semantic aspect of possessive relations is not discussed thoroughly. Also, there are different forms, but synonymous. It can be traced through the semantic features of the phrase elements so that various types of semantic relations of possessiveness can be specified, and the forms of synonym can be distinguished.

Acknowledgments

Some material of this article has been written as part of the author's ongoing dissertation project. For that, the authors would like to thank Prof. Dr. I Dewa Putu Wijana, S.U., M.A. and Dr. Amir Ma'Ruf, M.Hum. as the promoter and co-promoter.

REFERENCES

- Alwi, Hasan, et al. (2003). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Chaer, Abdul. (2015). *Sintaksis Bahasa Indonesia. Pendekatan Proses*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Grashenkov, Pavel. (2007). "Tipologija Possessivnyh Konstruktsija". *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, No. 3, pp. 25-54. Retrieved from www.vja.ruslang.ru.
- Helmbrecht, Johannes. (2016). "NP-internal Possessive Constructions in Hoocak and other Siouan Languages" in Catherine Rudin & Bryan Gordon (Editor). *Advances in the Study of Siouan Languages and Linguistics* (423-460). Berlin: Language Science Press. <https://dx.doi.org/doi/10.17169/langsci.b94.180>.
- James, Carl. (1980). *Contrastive Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Kakvaeva, S. B. (2009). "Substantivnye Slovosocetaniya s Priimennym Genitivom v Lakskom i Russkom Jazykah". *Izvestija DGPU*, No. 2. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru>.
- Karyaningsih, Tri Yulianty. (2018). "Frasa Nomina Endosentris Atributif Berpewatas Adjektiva dalam Bahasa Rusia dan Bahasa Indonesia: Aplikasi Analisis Kontrastif dalam Penerjemahan". *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan, Polinema*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 1-20. Retrieved from <http://jlt-polinema.org>.
- Kobozeva, I. M. (2015). "O Possessivnosti v Russkom Jazyke: Possessivnye Predikaty vs Genitif". *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*, Vol. 2. No. 1, pp. 250-271. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru>
- Kostadni, Elizaveta. (2012). "Pragmatika Atributivnyh Slovosocetaniy: Problemy Perevoda". *Valoda*, No. 22, pp. 104-109. Retrieved from <http://www.maailmakeeled.ut.ee>.
- Kostomarov, V.G., Maksimov, V.I. (Eds). (2010). *Sovremennyj Russkij Literaturnyj Jazyk*. Moskwa: Yurait.
- Krylova, O and S. Khavronina. (1988). *Word Order in Russian*. Moscow: Russky Yazyk Publisher.
- Newmark, Peter. (1988). *A Text Book of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nur, Tajudin. (2016). "Analisis Kontrastif dalam Studi Bahasa". *Journal of Arabic Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 65-74. Retrieved from <http://journal.imla.or.id>.
- Salamun, Taufik. (2019). "Perbandingan Pola Konstruksi Posesif Dialek Ambon dengan Bahasa Indonesia Baku". *Totobuang*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 43-56. DOI: 10.26499/tbng.v7i1.123.

- Setiawan, Teguh. (2015). “Konstruksi Posesif Bahasa Indonesia dalam Rubrik Suara Pembaca”. *Litera*, Vol. 15, No.1, pp. 76-86. <https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v15i1.9767>.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Sukirmiyadi . (2018). “The Role of Contastive Analysis in Translation Study”. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, Vol. 6, No. 9, pp. 30-34. <https://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0609004>.
- Sushkova , I.M. (2007). “O Nekotoryh Sredstvah Vyrazhenija Possessivnyh Otnoshenij v Sovremennom Russkom Yazyke”. *Vestnik VGU. Serija Filologija, Zhurnalistika*, No.2, pp. 118-122. Retrieved from www.vestnik.vsu.ru.
- Walgina, N.S. (2003). *Sintaksis Sovremennogo Russkogo Yazyka*. Moskwa: Vyshaja Shkola.
- Wang, Yong and Xu, Jie. (2013). “A Systemic Typology of Existential and Possessive Contructions”. *Functions of Language*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ fol.20.1.01wan>.
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu. (1991). *Frase Nomina Beratribut Nomina*. Laporan Penelitian. Fakultas Sastra Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.