

Javanese Influenced Indonesian: Features from two conversations

Thomas J. CONNERS and Claudia M. BRUGMAN

University of Maryland

This paper presents features of Indonesian as spoken by two groups of native East Javanese speakers. The Indonesian spoken is colloquial, and the speech setting is informal. We highlight those linguistic aspects of the conversation that diverge or differ from Standard Indonesian and which have correlates in East Javanese speech. We make no attempt to define a particular language variety, as features are used with different frequencies and with different patterns across speakers. We note that many of the features documented here are shared by other emerging contact varieties across Indonesia, often with patterns that are cross-linguistically unexpected, thereby raising issues for contemporary theories of language contact.

1. Introduction¹

Since its development and adoption as the national language, Standard Indonesian has come into contact with many local languages of Indonesia, many for the first time. As a result of this contact, new and dynamic forms of Indonesian continue to emerge, with highly contextualized deployment or use of features from these local languages with which, at a population level, the Standard language is now in contact.

This paper characterizes one such emergent variety, exemplified in two conversations, which we are calling “Javanese influenced Indonesian (JII).” These multi-participant conversations took place in natural, informal home settings. We posit that this speech variety is broadly representative of the Indonesian spoken by East Javanese native speakers in informal contexts. Importantly, our characterization includes the speech setting, approximately as described by Clark (1996), in which social identity is both expressed and enhanced by the use of markers of Javanese, whereas the “language” is clearly identifiable as Indonesian. In section 3 we provide some distinctively Javanese features found in these conversations. We then discuss the implications of these deeply context-dependent usage patterns for theories of contact varieties, raising the broader question of what is meant by “contact variety” and whether contact varieties are constrained as to their feature types.

1.1. Traditional understandings of language contact

At the population level, languages come into contact under a wide variety of circumstances, ranging from limited trade between monolingual groups, to stable and long-term bilingualism. The outcomes of these contact situations can be anything from

¹ We would like to thank the audiences at the Second International Workshop on Malay Varieties held at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies in 2018 and the International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics 14 at the University of Antananarivo for their comments and feedback on earlier versions of this paper. Additionally, we would like to thank our collaborator, A.C., who collected one of the conversations, and of course, our biggest debt goes to the native speakers who agreed to participate in this project. All errors and omissions belong to the authors, alone.

stable maintenance of multiple languages to pidgin and creole varieties. These processes are well studied, and their outcomes well documented.

The contact situation exemplified in the present article is closer to one of stable bilingualism, where all speakers command both languages to high fluency, and they all have the same native language. Sankoff (2001) describes expected and unexpected features of the result of this kind of contact. Her claim is that some features of grammars are more privileged (i.e., available for loaning) than others — specifically, phonology and lexicon are privileged, and morphology and syntax less so. From this model, phonological adaptation results in the most readily borrowed features. According to Poplack & Meechan (1998:127), “major-class content words such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives are the most likely to be borrowed.” Terms for items of the material culture, such as artifacts, are also readily borrowed (cf. Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009), as well as “non-systemic elements [including] pragmatic markers, sentence adverbials, or other free-floating elements which ... do not require integration into the system of the borrowing language.” (Hickey 2010:10)

In contrast, contact varieties of the type exemplified in this article are purported to characteristically resist the sharing of morphology and syntax. The adoption of bound morphemes has been stated by many authors to be the among the features of language most resistant to contact-induced change. Sankoff notes, “after reviewing the literature, I am more convinced than ever that this is true. Only a few cases came to light, and almost all involved morphemes that are, if not entirely free, not really bound either.” (Sankoff 2001:17) Whether or not “grammar” or “syntax” can be borrowed at all is still an open question. Although the Thomason & Kaufman (1988) view — that morphological and syntactic borrowing is rare but possible — has its proponents (e.g. Campbell 1993), many scholars of language contact are convinced that grammatical or syntactic borrowing is impossible or close to it (e.g. Lefebvre 1986; Prince 1988; King 2000).

These discussions entail that individual features resulting from this type of contact are more and less predictable. Cross-linguistically, the less predictable include:

- use of closed-class items (for instance, pronouns, determiners) as items from the lexical inventory;
- use of any morphosyntactically complex constructions;
- use of any productive inflectional morphology;
- use of special syntactic constructions (morphosyntax + semantics/ pragmatics).

We will demonstrate in section 4 that the outcomes in the JII case do not align with these entailed outcomes. Taken together with other descriptions in the current volume (e.g. Ewing; Soriente; Shiohara & Yanti; McDonnell) that document the outcomes of other regional languages in contact with Indonesian, we can deduce a pattern of contact outcomes none of which align with the above idealization. This invites the question of whether we are seeing a set of scenarios (in the sense of Curnow 2001) that are not productively considered within a more traditional framework of language contact; or is there something special about these languages’ typological features or sociolinguistic setting that distinguish them from a more canonical contact scenario? In the service of answering this question, we provide examples of language mixing phenomena from two naturally occurring conversations.

1.2 Mixed languages and language mixing in Indonesia

This study is very much in keeping with the framing of Ewing (this volume), in that we do not intend to identify a nameable variety of Indonesian – the naming is a matter of convenience. Rather, these settings too show how interactants with particular demographic features and social relations form fluid and fleeting communities of practice in which they deploy language practices that mark their shared social and regional context. Ewing’s invocation of the construct of heteroglossia, characterized in terms of the non-distinctness and fluidity of specific features of language use, very aptly delimits the claims we make here regarding an identifiable language variety. That observation notwithstanding, we see the set of uses sketched here as importantly associating its users with a regionally identified set of features. Our presentation roughly parallels Ewing’s in that we can differentiate features at the phonetic, morphological, lexical, and morphosyntactic levels of grammatical organization.

Informally, we want to differentiate between “language mixing” and “mixed language.” The first of these we see as describing a practice; the second is the outcome of enough such events to be understood as a conventionalized set of distinguishers. Our description here is in the former set, not the latter, and is rationalized partly in terms of the safe assumption that both Javanese and Indonesian are stable and distinct languages, and are recognized as such by individual speakers (as well as socially), whereas the other varieties invoked here may not be recognized as such. We will, in one instance, additionally consider the phenomenon of code-switching, the deliberate shift out of one language and into another for a specific effect. In all the cases considered here, the recognition of each as a stable language exists (by language scholars and language users) within the context of wide intra-language variation; therefore it is worthwhile to touch on the varieties of each language that are deployed in the conversations described here, and how they relate socially to the interactants.

2. Background

As might be expected in a nation with 700 languages, Indonesia exhibits multiple complex regional linguistic ecosystems that range widely in their sociolinguistic profiles, from multilingual and multiethnic to monolingual and monoethnic. Some have a single dominant language, while others have no dominant language at all. For example, Tarakan, in Kalimantan, is home to at least seven distinct ethnic/linguistic groups, with none currently dominant. Riau, in Sumatra (within the Malay speaking homeland) supports a complex mix of local Malay, regional Malay, regional Indonesian, and Standard Indonesian. Similar in some respects is Manado, in Sulawesi, a traditional locus of multiple Minahasan languages, that has more recently accepted a post-creole/trade Malay variety as dominant, as mixed with the Minahasan languages and Standard Indonesian. In contrast with each of these cases stands Java, with three dominant languages — Sundanese, with 32 million, Madurese, with 8 million, and Javanese,² most dominant with 68 million speakers (Vander Klok *to appear*). Javanese has a long-written history and a historical relationship with Malay. The majority of

² The Badan Pusat Statistik (2011) gives the number of native Javanese speakers as 98 million. The discrepancy may be due to issues in how the surveys are conducted. Many Javanese feel that if they do not fully control all the features of the speech level system, then they are not actual speakers. The true number is probably somewhere in the middle of 68–98 million.

speakers of these three languages will only have come into significant contact with any Malay variety through contact with Standard Indonesian.

In these varied language ecologies, all have come within the last 70 years into increasing contact with Standard Indonesian, against a varied historical relationship to Malay. They exhibit some interestingly similar outcomes from these different contact histories — types of features that would not be predicted to emerge from these different contact stories. Given the unique paths, examining these common outcomes will interestingly inform our understanding of contact varieties.

2.1 Standard Indonesian

Standard Indonesian is the national language of Indonesia, having been adopted in 1928 as part of the nationalist independence movement, and has been enshrined as the official language since independence in 1945 (Sneddon 2003). It is a highly engineered variety based on the Riau dialect of Malay, designed to allow for modernization of government, education, technology, and other relevant domains (Collins 1998). The language has played an increasing role not only in national institutions, but also in entertainment and media. While a language planning board maintains a prescriptive Standard, many local or regional varieties continue to emerge. The vast majority of Indonesians are either L1 or L2 speakers of some form of Indonesian (Badan Pusat Statistik 2013). Yet as recently as a generation ago, Indonesian would not have been a language of most Javanese speakers, who would have likely been either monolingual or speakers of a Sundanese or Madurese variety on those border regions (Nothofer 2009).

2.2 Regional Indonesians

The emergence of regional varieties of Indonesian or Malay has long been noted among linguistic scholars; however, documentation of either features or speech contexts of these varieties has lagged behind, with notable exceptions (KILTV Middle Indonesian project (ca. 2008) documented the emergence of regional varieties of Indonesian amongst the middle class; other exceptions include collection in Pontianak, Kupang, and Ternate (Errington 2013); Gil's work (1994, 2001, 2009, 2013) on Riau; Djenar's work (Djenar 2012, 2014; Djenar, Ewing, & Manns 2018) on pronouns; Goebel, Cole, & Manns' (2016) study of contact register).³

The current study explores speakers from Surabaya and Sidoarjo, contiguous urban areas that comprise the largest urban area of East Java, and the second largest in Indonesia. The language of interaction of the region is colloquial East Javanese, which differs notably from Standard Javanese — a prestige variety based on the speech of the courtly centers of Yogyakarta and Surakarta in Central Java (some recent studies on East Javanese varieties include Hoogevoorst 2010). The Surabaya/Sidoarjo region is also home to a large number of native Madurese speakers, whose influence can be seen in East Javanese (Stevens 1965: 294–302; Davies 2010:13).

³ Not relevant to the current discussion are varieties resulting from contact between Indo-European and Austronesian languages (Javindo [De Gruiter, 1994], Petjo [Riyanto, 1996]); nor Tibeto-Burman and Austronesian languages (Peranakan Malay varieties [Wolff 1997, *inter alia*]).

2.3. The speech setting

Our two conversations were conducted by multiple participants.⁴ In both cases, the participants were well known to one another, with the participant observers filling a role of family intimate. In the first conversation, the participant observer is unaware of the purpose of making the recording and did so on the request of the first author because of his native-like command of this linguistic repertoire; he is more of a participant than an observer. In the second conversation, the first author is the participant observer. All participants, other than the first author, were ethnic Javanese. The conversational topics were domestic and intimate in nature. No prompts were given, nor were any participants directed to use any particular language or variety. Recordings were made in the front rooms, where families tend to receive guests. Recorded in Jakarta in April 2018, the first conversation consists of 1.5 hours of continuous, spontaneous conversation. It is relevant to note that Jakarta was simply the meeting place of this family, not its residence. Its four main participants were (the fifth, listed in parentheses, contributed only a small amount to the conversation).

- Father: ~85; Jombang, East Java; 2nd grade elementary school education
- Mother: ~80; Surabaya, East Java; 3rd grade elementary school education
- Aunt: ~60; Surabaya, East Java; middle school education
- Male Family Friend: 33; Malang, East Java; university education (participant observer)
- (Daughter: 35; Surabaya, East Java: high school education)

Other than the participant observer, these participants have resided in Surabaya for the majority of their lives.

The second conversation, recorded in Sidoarjo, East Java, in March 2019, consists of 1.2 hours of continuous, spontaneous conversation. Its four main participants were:

- Father: 65; Yogyakarta, Central Java; secondary education
- Mother: 62; Surabaya, East Java; secondary education
- Son: 32; Sidoarjo, East Java; university education
- Family friend, non-native fluent Javanese speaker (participant observer: the first author)

Except for the participant observer, the participants in this conversation have spent the majority of their lives in Sidoarjo.

Our two conversations evidence a range of deployed features displaying specifically Javanese influence. All participants are native speakers of Javanese, and native or fluent speakers of Indonesian, and, importantly, aware of all participants' status as such. We recognize here a distinction in how we characterize the set of features displayed in each conversation. The speech patterns in Conversation 1 include more morphological, lexical, and complex morphosyntactic structures, while those in Conversation 2 are limited almost entirely to the expected phonological and phonetic markers of Javanese influence.

⁴ A questionnaire on speakers' language attitudes and self-assessments on a range of linguistic practices was also collected. The questionnaire was taken from Cohn et al. (2013). All speakers assess themselves as being fluent in both Javanese and Indonesian, though they display a range of attitudes towards the two.

2.4 Analytical Method

The data presented in this study have been qualitatively analyzed. Due to time and financial constraints, the two conversations remain untranscribed. They have been listened to by both participant-observers, with clarifications provided by participants, when needed. All phonetic analysis is impressionistic. The recordings are currently available upon request from the first author. Once transcribed, they will be placed in a publicly available archive.

We note here the difficulty of eliciting the features that will be discussed, since they emerge naturally from interactional situations. Some speakers will comfortably control distinct registers, with Standard Indonesian as a clear acrolect, and as contextually appropriate, a “lower” or less formal register with more features of the local languages. In contrast, other speakers will not control the higher register. This difference is attributable to multiple social factors, including age and education. We are examining contexts where all speakers are known to be native or comfortably fluent speakers of Javanese, and yet where some form of Indonesian is the preferred mode in a subset of communicative contexts. The difficulty with eliciting this mode is that it is likely that speakers are aware of “good,” uninfluenced Indonesian, and that is the variety whose features would appear in an elicitation context.

3. Description

In this section we highlight salient Javanese features the utilization of which are sensitive to the relationships of the particular people in the conversation, as well as the physical setting and the content domain of the conversation.

3.1 Phonological Features

We first describe a set of phonological features, present in both conversations reported here, that are characteristic of East Javanese. The phonology of East Javanese is well described (Yannuar 2019; Hoogervorst 2010; Krausse 2017; Matthews 2015; Thurgood 2004); as is the phonetics of the Indonesian spoken by East Javanese (Adisasmito-Smith 2004).

3.1.1 Vowel lowering

Vowel lowering is found in lax, high, front and back vowels in the closed second syllable of the root.⁵ The pattern is generalizable as below.

[ɪ] > [ɛ]/(C)V(C).(C)__(C)

- (1) [masɪh] ‘still’ > [masɛh]
- (2) [səlɪsɪh] ‘remainder’ > [səlɪsɛh]

and

[ʊ] > [ɔ]/(C)V(C).(C)__(C)

- (3) [tutʊp] ‘close’ > [tutɔp]
- (4) [mabʊʔ] ‘intoxicated’ > [mabɔʔ]

⁵ The lax quality is already sensitive to the closed syllable structure. Phonemically, it is non-distinct from /i/ and /u/ respectively, the open-syllable allophones.

Examples (1)–(4) show the phonetic values first of the Standard Indonesian and second of the variety characterized here. The lowering phenomenon shows the influence of East Javanese, which has vowel lowering that is similar both in quality and in environment, when compared with other varieties, for example Central Javanese:

- (5) *isih* ‘still’ is realized as [isth] in Central Javanese, but as [iseh] in Eastern Javanese.
- (6) *utuh* ‘whole’ is realized as [utoh] in Central Javanese and as [utoh] in Eastern Javanese.

We believe this feature is robust, in being found frequently and among multiple speakers.

3.1.2. Slack voice realization

In most varieties of Javanese, most historically voiced stops are realized as voiceless unaspirated stops with what is described as “slack voice,” a kind of breathy-voice quality, on the subsequent vowel. An example of this influence in JII is shown by the difference between the Standard Indonesian transcription on the left and the realization on the right. (Example (8) also exhibits the vowel lowering described above.)

- (7) *gang* [gaŋ] ‘alley’ > [kaŋ]
- (8) *duduk* [dudʊʔ] ‘to sit’ > [tʊdʊʔ]

3.1.3. Alveolar /d/ is realized as dental [d̪]

Almost all varieties of Javanese maintain a four-way phonemic distinction between voiced and voiceless stops, at both a dental and an alveolar place of articulation, making the dental value an available part of the phonetic inventory. Standard Indonesian shows a typologically interesting asymmetry, having a voiced alveolar stop contrasting with a voiceless dental stop; the other two combinations do not exist. However, our data shows the Javanese influence of the voiced dental stop in proper names and place names including the name *Dewi* mentioned in the conversation: Standard [dewi] > JII and Javanese [d̪ewi].

The other non-occurring member of the set of Standard Indonesian, the alveolar [t], is also rare in Javanese, and does not occur at all in our data.

3.1.4. Realization of [a] as schwa

In JII, [a] is realized as [ə] in closed second syllables of the root. Standard Indonesian *malas* ‘lazy, reluctant’ is realized as [malas] in Standard Indonesian, which prohibits schwa in final syllables. By contrast, the JII realization is [maləs]; it is therefore relevant that Javanese has no such prohibition on the second-syllable appearance of schwa.

There is a set of lexemes held in common by Javanese and Indonesian, probably inherited from the common ancestor. Where the Javanese variant of these words is pronounced with schwa, this pronunciation is a feature of JII. Some additional examples are in (9)–(11) (the tilde indicates that the forms are variants).

- (9) *benar* [bənər] ~ *bener* [bənər] ‘right [correct]’
- (10) *enam* [ənəm] ~ *enem* [ənəm] ‘six’
- (11) *dapat* [dapat] ~ *dapet* [dapət] ‘to get’

An example showing that this is lexically conditioned on the presence of the Javanese doublet is found in (12), where **kember* is not a Javanese word.

(12) *kembar* ‘twins’ [kəmbər] /*[kəmbər]

The four features given in (3.1.1–3.1.4) provide examples of within-speaker vs. cross-speaker variation. Some are particularly characteristic of, or are more frequent among, certain speakers, while the last, in particular, is used by all speakers. The phenomena in sections 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 appear most frequently in the speech of the older speakers who, while fluent speakers of Indonesian, were at some point monolingual in Javanese; this situation probably did not hold of the younger speakers.

3.2 Lexical borrowings

The lexical influences of Javanese on JII range from the highly expected to the rather surprising, from a typological point of view (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009). All the attested examples below come from closed-class inventories, and in some cases provide doublets with the Standard Indonesian. Examples are:

- Javanese adverbial modifiers: *ae* ‘only’; *thok* QUANT DELIMITER; *kayak* ‘like [comparative]’
- Pronouns: *aku* 1SG, *kowe* 2SG.INFML, *sampeyan* 2SG.FML
- EXIST modal: *ada* (Indonesian) vs. *ana* [ənə] (Javanese)
- Javanese kin terms, used both referentially and as terms of address: *mas* ‘older brother’, *mbak* ‘older sister’, *besan* ‘[the relationship of] spouses’ parents to each other’
- Discourse particles: *lho*, *lha*
- Negator: *tidak* (Indonesian) vs. *ga*, *nggak* (Eastern Javanese)
- Demonstratives: *ini*, *itu* (Indonesian) vs. *iki*, *iku* (Eastern Javanese)

The appearance of pronouns and kin terms, though coming from closed classes, is not surprising in this context, since they primarily index social status and social relations. In fact, we have claimed elsewhere (Conners, Brugman & Adams 2016) that as functional items, these belong to open classes, making this borrowing less surprising on two grounds. It is of note that the item *sampeyan* 2SG.FML originates from within Javanese’s speech level system, and this term is the only reflex of this system in any of the conversations, deployed as a respect marker.

3.3 Morphological borrowings

3.3.1 Agent-focus marking

The Standard Indonesian agent-focus verbal prefix *meN-* frequently appears in both conversations and is used by all speakers. Alongside that standard form also appear *N-*marked and unmarked verb forms with the same agent-focus function. An example with the prefix comes from Conversation 2:

(13) *Cina ngirim barang sini*
 China AGFOC.send goods here
 ‘China sends products here’

The same speaker in the same conversation also produces the morphologically unmarked agent focus construction:

(14) *mereka isi semua-nya ...*
 3PL fill all-ASS
 ‘they fill up everything’

Many Malay varieties have agent-focus function expressed with either bare verbs or the *N*-prefix; however, these do not appear in Standard Indonesian (other than in exceptionally occurring bare verbs). Javanese then, is the clear source of the *N*-prefixed form in (13) and is most likely the source of the bare verb construction in (14). (For both of these constructions in Javanese see Connors 2020).

3.3.2 The “accidental passive” marker

The accidental passive prefix *ter-* in Standard Indonesian corresponds to the Javanese form *ke-*, with both occurring in many varieties of Indonesian. In our data, we find both alternates of the accidental passive marker:

- (15.a) *ke-inget*
 (15.b) *ter-inget*
 ACCPASS-remember
 ‘to be reminded of’

3.3.3 The associative marker

The Javanese associative marker *-(n)e* is used occasionally by most of the speakers in the two conversations, all of whom also use the Standard Indonesian associative *-nya*. Two occurring examples of JII lexical items are given in (16), contrasted with both standard languages:

- (16.a) *bahasa-ne* ‘language-ASS’ Javanese *basa-ne* StdInd *bahasa-nya*.
 (16.b) *banyak-e* ‘many-ASS’ Javanese *ake-he* StdInd *banyak-nya*.

3.3.4 Other morphological markers

The Standard Indonesian *se-* ‘one; unit’ is sometimes replaced in these conversations with Javanese *sa’-*, as in (17):

- (17) *se-gini* ~ *sa’-gini* ‘like this’.

We note a single instance in the two conversations of the Javanese intensifier infix *-u-* shown in (18):

- (18) *d-u-ingin!* ‘really cold’.

3.4 Morphosyntax

Contrary to the common view of borrowing (see discussion in section 1.1), we have found borrowing of systems of morphemes and corresponding word order, exemplified with two constructions: the patient focus and the propositive. Interestingly, the latter expresses morphosyntactically what is accomplished in Standard Indonesian only pragmatically; in this case, we can say that the complex construction is borrowed. In the former construction, a morphosyntactic correlate does exist in Standard Indonesian.

3.4.1 First person proclitic in the patient-focus construction

In one instance in Conversation 2, the mother uses the Javanese first person proclitic *tak=*, rather than the Indonesian clitic *aku=*, in the patient focus construction:

- (19) ... *Ga mau. tak=pikir aku=begini...*
 NEG want 1SG=think 1SG=like.this
 ‘(he) didn’t want to. I thought I should do this...’

Note that she does use the Indonesian form *aku=* in the complement clause.

The following example from Conversation 1 provides an explicit patient preceding the predicate, showing the word order characteristic of this construction.

(20) M: [about the father wearing adult diapers]

itu belum tak=ganti
that not.yet 1SG=change
'I haven't changed them [the adult diapers] yet.'

3.4.2 Propositive construction

The Javanese propositive construction consists of the proclitic *tak=* (homophonous with the pronoun clitic above), which also affects prenasalization on the verb. Its agent is restricted to first person, and it has no correspondent in Indonesian; this function might be fulfilled through pragmatic means in Standard Indonesian. The following two utterances comprise a turn by a single speaker; however, we have heard this construction used by other speakers in the two conversations.

(21.a) Aku tak-mandi dulu ya.
1SG PROPOS-AGFOC.bathe first AFF
'Let me take a bath [before everyone else].'

(21.b) ... [sarapan-nya] tak-m-buat-na-e
[breakfast-ASS] PROPOS-AGFOC-make-APPL1-ASS
'I'll make [breakfast] first.'

Example (21.b) consists of all Javanese morphemes except the verb root *buat*, which is from Standard Indonesian.

Morphosyntactically, the propositive is an isolated phenomenon. We will advance no hypothesis as to whether other illocutionary/mood constructions would be transferred like this.

Javanese, unlike Indonesian, has an applicative paradigm that is sensitive to voice, mood, transitivity, and person. Neither conversation exhibited any form of the Javanese applicative morpheme other than the generalized forms that are analogous to the Indonesian forms. The APPL1 morpheme in (21.b) is an applicative without these other conditions. The Javanese APPL2 is homophonous with the Indonesian applicative (*-i*), so we are not able to discern whether it is Javanese or Indonesian: an example of the indeterminacy of language identification noted also by Ewing.

4. Discussion

4.1 Who uses what: the frequency and productivity of constructions

The discussion presented here is largely impressionistic. The participants in Conversation 2 generally had a higher education level than those in Conversation 1. We noticed fewer features of Javanese in this conversation. The participants were also more closely spaced in age than those in Conversation 1, ranging from the 55-year-old father to the 33-year-old son, whereas in Conversation 1, ages ranged from the 85-year-old father to the 34-year-old participant observer.

We note also that the older speakers (father and mother in both conversations) show fewer Jakarta Indonesian features than might be expected: for example, we find use of the Standard forms shown in Table 1, Column 1, against the Jakartan forms shown in Column 2:

Table 1. Standard and Jakarta Indonesian lexemes

Standard Indonesian	Jakarta Indonesian
<i>habis</i> 'finished'	<i>abis</i>
<i>sudah</i> 'already'	<i>udah</i>
<i>dengan</i> 'with'	<i>sama</i>
<i>tidak</i> NEG	<i>nggak/ga</i>

We also found that the older speakers never used the Jakarta Indonesian applicative suffix *-in*, but only the Standard Indonesian correspondents *-i* and *-kan*. The older speakers in Conversation 1 are a generation older than those in Conversation 2; we speculate that this reflects the more recent spread of Jakarta Indonesian as a prestige variety.

It was unexpected to discover that the speaker who has the fewest distinguishers of JII is the father in Conversation 1, who has a long history of monolingualism in Javanese. While his speech is the most heavily “accented” – i.e. has the greatest number of phonetic and phonological features identified with JII – it contains almost none of the features at other levels. We hypothesize that this reflects his metalinguistic understanding of the two as distinct languages, and his practice reflects a learned and heavily accented variety of Indonesian rather than the more heterogenous variety spoken by the others in this conversation. He may not, in his own mind, be introducing Javanese at all into his Indonesian.⁶ His questionnaire reflects consciousness of both language and varietal differentiation: for example, he lists his native variety as *Bahasa Surabaya*, rather than simply Javanese. Moreover, he has clear associations of his languages with specific activities – for example, he claims to read in Indonesian (despite the existence of reading materials – though fewer – in Javanese), but to watch television and send text messages in both Indonesian and Javanese. This metalinguistic consciousness of the distinctiveness of Javanese and Indonesian shows up interestingly in a part of the conversation that we discuss in the next section.

4.2 Language switching and mixing

In the two conversations, we found different levels of mixed language, and less overall than was expected by the first author. The majority of both exchanges took place in JII.⁷ Conversation 1 also contains a fairly convincing performance of switching, during an exchange assessing the Father’s mental status.⁸ We show below a short segment demonstrating code-switching used distinctively in acts of reiteration.

There are four participants in this segment: A, the participant observer, B, the Father, I, the Mother, and M, the niece. Elements which are exclusively Javanese are marked via

⁶ We found some weak confirmatory evidence for this perspective in that some of his phonetic features belong to neither Standard Indonesian nor Javanese, nor JII: e.g. [bilum] *bilum*, otherwise [bəlʊm].

⁷ Had the participant observers not been present, it is likely that a significant amount of these exchanges would have taken place in East Javanese, which itself is characterized by the inclusion of many elements of Indonesian.

⁸ The participant observer has a background in medicine and health and during this conversation applies a standard protocol to assess the Father's mental competence.

underlining; elements that are exclusively Standard Indonesian are marked via double underlining.

- (22.a) A: *Ya nggak tahu, pernah nikah atau nggak?*
 AFF NEG know ever married or NEG
 ‘Yeah, I don’t know, has she ever been married?’
- (22.b) I: *Pernah kawin?*
 ever married
 ‘Has she ever been married?’
- (22.c) M: *Bojo-ne sopo?*
 spouse-ASS who
 ‘Who is her husband?’
- (22.d) I: *Bojo-ne sopo?*
 spouse-ASS who
 ‘Who is her husband?’
- (22.e) B: *Pernah kawin.*
 ever married
 ‘She has been married.’
- (22.f) A: *Pernah ya. Punya anak gak?*
 ever AFF have child NEG
 ‘Right, she’s been married. Does she have any children?’
- (22.g) B: *Punya.*
 have
 ‘She has children.’
- (22.h) A: *Punya ok.*
 have ok
 ‘She has, ok.’
- (22.i) I: *Bojo-ne jeneng-e sopo, pak?*
 Spouse-ASS name-ASS who Father
 ‘What’s her husband’s name?’
- (22.j) B: *Nama Gimán.*
 name Gimán
 ‘His name is Gimán.’
- ...
- (22.k) A: *Trus bapak punya cucu gak?*
 then Father have grandchild NEG
 ‘Then do you have grandchildren?’
- (22.l) M: *N-duwe cucu?*
 AGFOC-have grandchild
 ‘Do you have grandchildren?’
- (22.m) B: *Saya?*
 1SG
 ‘Me?’

(22.n) A: *He-eh*
AFF
'Yes.'

(22.o) B: *Banyak*
many
'I have many.'

As we see, unmixed Javanese was used in multiple attempts by the mother and the niece to elicit information from the Father, reiterating a previous request for information that had been given using JII or Indonesian. Lines (22.a–d) contain four instances of the same question asked by different people: (a) and (b) in Indonesian, and (c) and (d) in Javanese. This appears to reflect a judgment on the part of these speakers that the father had either not heard or not understood the original request in Indonesian and would respond more reliably to a Javanese utterance, reflecting their presumption that he controls these two languages distinctly and differentially. However, while the conversationalists directed Javanese to the father, he responded in Indonesian — his second language; for instance, in (e) he responds in Indonesian to the immediately preceding query in Javanese. (Some of the morphemes he uses are common to two or three of the Standard Indonesian, JII, and Javanese, and are therefore indeterminate; but none of his morphemes are exclusively Javanese.) In some ways, the Father appears to be performing in Standard Indonesian in a context where JII would more comfortably fit the context. We have to conclude that in this stretch, all of the participants are making some conscious choices.

Similarly, in turn (k) we see a query in Indonesian that is reiterated in Javanese. The Father's response, in (o), is given in Indonesian (after a brief metalinguistic exchange).

This switching performance exists within a context of high heteroglossia — even the most highly educated, highly restricted attempt at using Standard Indonesian by a speaker of a similar background is Javanized to some degree, with both native and non-native users exhibiting JII features.

A different point on this heteroglossic spectrum exists in the totality of Conversation 2. Spoken among a group of more highly educated Indonesian/Javanese bilinguals, the conversation shows consistent Javanization of the Indonesian, but never shows segments of pure Javanese.

4.3 What does this tell us about theories of language contact?

The debate on grammatical universals goes back some time (cf. Greenberg 1963). Muysken (2010) provides an interesting summary taking us from early structuralists, through Greenberg and generativists, through to the current day (as of 2010). In many ways, the data presented here add further evidence to arguments such as those of Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Campbell (1993), who argue against the notion that there are intrinsic constraints on language contact. Curnow (2001:434 [cited in Hickey 2010]) notes, 'It is possible that a variety of constraints on borrowing in particular contexts can be developed. But the attempt to develop any universal hierarchy of borrowing should perhaps be abandoned.'

In response to this, scholars have attempted to account for the strong tendencies that are seen in the outcomes across different contact situations. Nichols (2003:285), for example, adopts a view of the stability of linguistic properties that is relative. She

highlights four factors that characterize this stability: the likelihood that a feature is inherited, borrowed, retained as a substrate feature, and the likelihood a feature is selected due to typological pressure.

Muysken (2010: 271) similarly notes, “even if we are critical of the idea that there [are] absolute constraints, independent of scenario, it still makes sense to see whether we can formulate scenario-specific and probabilistic constraints.” (On the notion of contact scenario, see Curnow 2001:412-413.)

In terms of scenario types, the JII contact situation differs from others noted in this volume in that it involves contact between the Standard Indonesian and a language that has had a large and stably monolingual population until recently. Other scenarios described in the current volume include contact between Standard Indonesian and closely-related regional Malay varieties (Miyaki this vol.; Utsumi this vol.); and between Standard Indonesian and a number of disparate regional languages (Soriente this vol.). This gives us three exemplary situations, which would not *prima facie* be expected to result in the same kinds of mixing. However, all three show otherwise features of borrowing into the Indonesian matrix that, even within a frame of tendencies rather than universals, amount to unexpected outcomes. We have shown borrowings of complex morphosyntactic structures; complex verbal morphology; first and second person pronouns; determiners; simple kinship terms: all of these features are claimed by Muysken to be unexpected.

This raises the possibility that it is something specific to Indonesian that invites “unexpected” elements of borrowing. As three possible perspectives, it may be that Indonesian, as a Malay-based language, has certain typological properties (such as exceptionally low differentiation of lexical categories) that allow for freer borrowing than other languages; or that Indonesian, as an engineered language, is understood by its users to be amenable to atypical borrowing; or that Indonesian, as introduced and disseminated over time, space, communicative channel, and socioeconomic strata, would be encountered by its populations in some way that made it permeable to regionally distinctive and atypical elements. Even raising these possibilities presents details for theories of language contact that may be heretofore underappreciated.

5. Conclusion

Similar findings have been reported in work examining the outcomes of contact situations in many other parts of the archipelago between Standard Indonesian and local languages. These situations contrast with one another in their pre-contact linguistic ecologies, ranging from those with complex multilingual and multiethnic environments to the situation described here, with a largely monolingual and monoethnic pre-contact population in Eastern Java. Of note from these varied backgrounds and varied contact situations is the similarity of a number of the outcomes. For example, many researchers have identified that both personal and demonstrative pronouns from the local languages become frequent and emblematic features of the emerging contact varieties of Indonesian. (Studies include Connors 2010, 2020 (Javanese); Soriente this vol. (Tarakan); Gil 1994, 2001, 2003, 2013 (Riau); Utsumi this vol. (Manado); Ewing, 2016, this vol. (Sundanese).) These observations exist in contrast with the cross-linguistic prediction that closed-class items are resistant to borrowing or replacement. Future work will determine both how stable and how widespread these phenomena are. This volume represents a preliminary attempt to describe and document a few of the features of these contact varieties, of which this paper provides one scenario.

Our identification of characteristics — highly preliminary to a full description of a JII variety, if one ever stabilizes — shows that even in the absence of a stable variety, we see exceptionality in the characteristic features. More generally, it may highlight Indonesian as a host language that deserves acute attention as theories of contact outcomes approach explanatory adequacy.

Abbreviations

1SG	first person singular	APPL2	applicative 2
2SG	second person singular	ASS	associative
3PL	third person plural	EXIST	existential
ACCPASS	accidental passive	FML	formal
	marker	INFML	informal
AGFOC	agent focus marker	NEG	negator
AFF	affirmative; affirmation	QUANT	quantity
APPL1	applicative 1	PROPOS	propositive marker

References

- Adisasmito-Smith, Niken. 2004. Phonetic and phonological influences of Javanese on Indonesian. Ph.D. theses. Cornell University
- Badan Pusat Statistik. 2011. Kewarganegaraan, Suku Bangsa, Agama dan Bahasa Sehari-hari Penduduk Indonesia – Hasil Sensus Penduduk 2010. Archived from the original July 10, 2017. Accessed on May 26, 2010.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. 2013. Penduduk Indonesia Hasil Sensus Penduduk 2010. 421, 427. Archived from the original on April 2, 2015. Retrieved May 26, 2020.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1993. On Proposed Universals of Grammatical Borrowing. In Aertsen, Henk & Robert Jeffers (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1989*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Cohn, Abigail, John Bowden, Timothy McKinnon, Maya Ravindranath, Rindu Simanjuntak, Bradley Taylor, & Yanti. 2013. Kuesioner Penggunaan Bahasa Sehari-hari. Available at <http://lingweb.eva.mpg.de/jakarta/kuesioner.php>.
- Collins, James. 1998. *Malay, World Language: A short history*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Connors, Thomas J. 2010. Standard vs. peripheral Javanese dialects: the lexical evidence. In *Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya*. 96–106. Pusat Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya.
- Connors, Thomas J. 2020. Javanese undressed: ‘peripheral’ dialects in typological perspective. In Gil, David & Antoinette Schapper (eds.), *Austronesian Undressed*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Connors, Thomas J., Brugman, Claudia M. & Adams, Nikki. 2016. Reference tracking and non-canonical referring expressions in Indonesian. *Studies in Language Typology and Change, NUSA* 60. 59–88.

- Curnow, T.J. 2001. What Language Features Can Be Borrowed. *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: Problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 412-434.
- Davies, W. D., 2010. *A grammar of Madurese* (Vol. 50). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- de Gruiter, Miel. 1994. Javindo, a contact language in pre-war Semarang. In Bakker, Peter and Mous, Maarten (eds.), *Mixed Languages: 15 Case Studies in Language Intertwining*. 151–159. Amsterdam: IFOTT.
- Djenar, Dwi Noverini. 2012. Almost unbridled: Indonesian youth language and its critics. *South East Asia Research* 20(1). 35–51.
- Djenar, Dwi Noverini. 2014. Adolescent social media interaction and authorial stance in Indonesian teen fiction. *Wacana* 15(1). 166–180.
- Djenar, Dwi Noverini, Michael C. Ewing & Howard Manns. 2018. *Style and intersubjectivity in youth interaction*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Errington, J. Joseph. 2013. In search of Middle Indonesian: Linguistic dynamics in an urban periphery. In van Klinken, G. & W. Berenshcot (eds.), *In search of modern Indonesian: middle classes in provincial towns*. Amsterdam: Brill.
- Ewing, Michael. 2016. Localizing person reference among Indonesian youth. Margins, hubs, and peripheries in a decentralizing Indonesia. 26.
- Gil, David. 1994. The structure of Riau Indonesian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 17(2). 179–200.
- Gil, David. 2001. Creoles, complexity and Riau Indonesian. *Linguistic Typology* 5. 325–371.
- Gil, David. 2009. Riau Indonesian: what kind of a language is it? In *Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia*. Vol. 2009. p. 113.
- Gil, David. 2013. Riau Indonesian: A language without nouns and verbs. In Rijkhoff, Jan & Eva van Lier (eds.), *Flexible word classes: Typological studies of underspecified parts of speech*. 89–130. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goebel, Zane, Deborah Cole & Howard Manns (eds.). 2019. *Contact talk: The discursive organization of contact and boundaries in Indonesia*. London: Routledge.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1963. Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaning Elements. In Joseph Greenberg, ed., *University of Language*, 73-113. London: MIT Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Uri Tadmor (eds.). 2009. *Loanwords in the world's languages: a comparative handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hickey, Raymond (ed.). 2010. *Handbook of language contact*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hoogervorst, Tom. 2010. Describing Surabaya's Linguistic Ecology. M.A. Thesis, Leiden University.
- King, Ruth Elizabeth. 2000. *The lexical basis of grammatical borrowing: A Prince Edward Island French case study*. Vol. 209. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

- Krausse, Daniel. 2017. A description of Surabayan Javanese with special reference to its linguistic etiquette. M.A. Thesis, Goethe Universität.
- Lefebvre, Claire. 1986. Relexification in creole genesis revisited: The case of Haitian Creole. In Muysken, P. & Norval Smith (eds.), *Substrata versus Universals in Creole Genesis: Papers from the Amsterdam Creole Workshop, 1985*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Matthews, Mark. 2015. An acoustic investigation of Javanese stop consonant clusters. *AFLA 21 Proceedings*. Canberra: Asia Pacific Linguistics. p. 201-219.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2010. Scenarios for Language Contact. In Hickey, Raymond (ed), *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nichols, Johanna. 2003. Diversity and Stability in language. In Joseph, Brian D. & Richard Janda (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 283–310.
- Nothofer, Berndt. 2009. Javanese. In Keith Brown & Sarah Ogilvie (eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World*. Oxford: Elsevier. 560–561.
- Poplack, Shana & Marjory Meechan. 1998. Introduction: How languages fit together in codemixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 1998 2:2. 127–138.
- Prince, Ellen. 1988. On pragmatic change: The borrowing of discourse functions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12. 505–518.
- Riyanto, Sugeng. 1996: Het ontstaan en de structuur van het Petjoek, In: Darmojuwono, Setiawati & Lilie Suratminto (eds.), *Duapuluh lima tahun studi Belanda di Indonesia/ Vijfentwintig jaar studie Nederlands in Indonesië*. 209–218.
- Sankoff, Gillian. 2001. Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In J. K. Chambers, P. Trudgill & Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 638–668.
- Sneddon, James N. 2003. *The Indonesian Language: Its History and Role in Modern Society*. Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press.
- Stevens, A. M. 1965. Language levels in Madurese. *Language* 41(2). 279–300.
- Thomason, S. K. & T. Kaufman. 1998. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thurgood, Gloria. 2004. *Phonation types in Javanese*. Oceanic Linguistics.
- Vander Klok, Jozina. To Appear. Typology of the Languages of Java. In, Adelaar, S. & Antoinette Schapper (eds.), *Typology of the Languages of Indonesia*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Wolff, John U. 1997. Peranakan Chinese speech and identify. *Indonesia* 64. 29–44.
- Yannuar, Nurenzia. 2019. *Bòsò Walikan Malangan: Structure and development of a Javanese reversed language*. Amsterdam: LOT.