

Javanese Influenced Indonesian: a case study and its implications for theories of contact varieties

Thomas J Conners
University of Maryland

MALAY VARIETIES WORKSHOP

TUFS, Tokyo

Oct. 2018



Background

- Indonesia is a multilingual country, with multiple complex regional linguistic ecosystems, including
 - Java: single dominant language (Javanese), with a long written history and a historical relationship to Malay
 - Riau, Sumatra: local Malay, regional Malay, regional Indonesian, Standard Indonesian
 - Tarakan, Borneo: some 7+ ethnic/linguistic groups, with none currently dominant
 - Manado, Sulawesi: historical Minahasan languages replaced by post-creole Malay

Talk outline

- ▶ Provide brief background and history of Indonesian and some well attested contact varieties
- ▶ Place the Indonesian situation in a broader context, both:
 - ▶ in terms of comparative/contrasting contact situations, and
 - ▶ in terms Of expected/unexpected outcomes (in linguistic features) of contact
- ▶ Describe our case study, where we attempted to capture a neutral situation to collect Javanese speakers using Indonesian
- ▶ Implications of results
- ▶ Further explorations

Standard Indonesian

- 1928 *Sumpah pemuda* 'youth pledge': Indonesian was adopted as the unifying language for the anti-colonial movement
- 1945 Indonesian was made the national language in the first constitution (native language of ~5% of population)
- Language planning board engineered Indonesian as the language of national institutions, e.g. government, education
- Indonesian plays a gradually increasing role in entertainment, media
- Indonesian in universal education (rolled out gradually)
- 2010 Indonesian Census shows that only 19.94% of people over five years old speak mainly Indonesian at home

Outcomes of Indonesian's language contact situation

- Emergence of regional Indonesians or regional Malay varieties has long been noted (in forums like ISMIL)
- Yet there is little actual documentation on either the features or the contexts of these emergent varieties
- Exceptions:
 - KILTV Middle Indonesian project (ca. 2008) documented the emergence of regional varieties of Indonesian amongst the middle class; collection in Pontianak, Kupang, and Ternate
 - Gil's work on Riau
 - Djenar's work on pronoun choice
- Other studies: Goebel, Cole, & Manns' (2016) contact registers



Contrasting contact situations

- E.g. post-colonial Englishes (not creole Englishes)
 - Malaysian, Philippine, Indian, Kenyan
- Swahili as a lingua franca that went from L2 to L1 for a majority of speakers of multiple prior L1s
- Compare to language revitalization scenarios: like Indonesian, there are “no” L1 speakers >> a generation of transition
 - Hebrew, Māori, Manx (dead-dead! >>> engineered single standard variety)

What outcomes of language contact are expected?

- A cline of features that correlates with the depth and the nature of the language contact
- Phonology and lexicon are “privileged” (Sankoff 2001) i.e. more available for borrowing
- Phonology: “accent”, phonological adaptation, most readily borrowed features
- Lexicon: “major-class content words such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives are the most likely to be borrowed” (Poplack & Meechan 1998:127)
 - Terms for items of the material culture, such as artifacts (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009)
 - “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 p.10)



What borrowing outcomes of contact are not expected?

- Morphology: 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. “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)
- Syntax: Whether or not “grammar” or “syntax” can be borrowed at all is still very much in question. Although the Thomason & Kaufman (1990) view has its proponents (e.g. Campbell 1993), many students of language contact are convinced that grammatical or syntactic borrowing is impossible or close to it (e.g. Lefebvre 1985; Prince 1988; King 2000).

Contact in the Indonesian context

- ▶ Sankoff's situation—also the situation we're talking about—is when there is a matrix language whose features are more or less resistant to “change”, i.e. replacement with elements of the loan-source language
- ▶ Javanese is loan-source and Indonesian is matrix language



Outcomes of Indonesian contact that would be notable

- Borrowing of closed-class items* as robust as borrowing from the lexical inventory
 - ✓ *e.g. pronouns, determiners
- ✓ Borrowing of any morphosyntactically complex constructions
- ✓ Borrowing of any productive inflectional morphology
- ✓ Borrowing of special syntactic constructions (morphosyntax + semantics/pragmatics)

Case Study: Javanese Accented Indonesian

- Consists of a recorded multi-part conversation and a subsequent questionnaire on language use and attitudes filled out by participants
- Recorded in Jakarta, April 2018
- 1.5 hours of continuous, spontaneous conversation
- Oral consent to record
- Four main participants, one minor
 - 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
 - (Daughter: 35; Surabaya, East Java: high school education)



Data situation and collection

- All speakers native Javanese speakers, same variety of Javanese
- All speakers aware that other speakers are all native Javanese speakers, and in other situations may use Javanese
- Across range of different topics, with multiple interlocutors, Indonesian is used -- Javanese accented Indonesian
- Other situations that evoke Indonesian, e.g. government or educational interaction would tend toward Standard Indonesian
- Why Javanese accented Indonesian here?
 - Location: Jakarta
 - One interlocutor, the visitor, has known preference for Indonesian



Questionnaire

- Used questionnaire developed by Cohn et al. (2013)
- Speaker demographic basics plus language use and attitudes
- Both father and mother list themselves as fully fluent in Javanese and Indonesian in reading, writing, speaking, and listening
 - Mother further lists Madurese
 - Father further lists Suroboyoan (city variety of Javanese)
- Mother uses Javanese everywhere except to send SMS (Indonesian) and pray in public (Arabic)
- Father reads in Indonesian, watches TV in both, and sends SMS in both

Questionnaire: language attitudes

- Mother agreed strongly with all statements other than these (disagreed strongly):
 - Speaking your local language is old-fashioned
 - Speaking foreign languages other than English is important
- Father agreed or agreed strongly with all statements other than these (disagreed strongly):
 - Speaking your local language in front of people who don't understand that language is not polite
 - Speaking your local language is old-fashioned



What follows is not intended to characterize a variety. I am not even claiming that this is a variety with a fixed inventory of distinctive items/features. This is a quick overview of Javanese features that are sensitive to the relationships of the particular people in the conversation.

Informally, we want to differentiate between “language mixing” and “mixed language”.

Pidgin varieties and creoles are different end-states than the one we’re talking about here: stable bilingualism > shifting bilingualism, something clearly dynamic: an opportunistic, emergent contact register.

The case study: phonological features of Javanese that appear in JII

- Vowel lowering: [ɪ] > [ɛ]/(C)V(C).(C)__(C) e.g. [masɪh] > [masɛh]
- [ʊ] > [ɔ]/(C)V(C).(C)__(C) e.g. [tutʊp] > [tutɔp]
- --All older speakers, occasionally among younger speakers
- Voiced stops > voiceless + slack voice on subsequent vowel,
 - e.g. [gaŋ] > [kaŋ] 'gang'
 - [dudʊʔ] > [tʊdʊʔ]
- -- Pronounced among older speakers, esp. father
- Alveolar [d] > dental [ɖ] e.g. [dewi] > [ɖewi]
- -- Pronounced among older speakers, esp. father

Phonological shift, age-neutral

- Schwa: [a] > [ə] /(C)V(C).(C)_C,
e.g. [kəjam] > [kəjəm]
- Older speakers learned Indonesian, younger speakers acquired it?



Lexical borrowings

- Javanese adverbial modifiers: ae 'only'; thok 'quant delimiter'; kayak 'like [comparative]'
- Pronouns: aku 1SG, kowe 2SG.INFORMAL, sampeyan 2SG.FORMAL
- Existential modal: ada (Indonesian) > ana [ɔnɔ] (Javanese)
- Javanese kin terms
- Discourse particles: lho, lha
- Negator: ga, nggak
- Demonstratives: iki, iku

Morphological borrowings

- Elimination of meN- prefix, either N- or bare verbs
 - Javanese is the source here, though other Malay varieties also use N-
- ter- > ke- , e.g. teringat > keingat 'reminded.ACCPASS'
- Occasional use of Javanese associative-(n)e, esp. from mother (who also uses -nya)
- se- > sa' 'one, as', e.g. segini > sa'gini 'like this'
- Intensifier infix-u-, e.g. d-u-ingin! 'really cold'

Morpho-syntactic

► 1st Person Patient Focus:

... Ga mau. Tak=pikir aku begini...

Neg want 1SG=think 1SG like.this

‘(he) didn’t want to. I thought I should do this...’

► One instance, from mother



Borrowing of complex syntactic construction

- Javanese propositive construction: tak-
Aku tak-mandi dulu ya.
'1SG PROPOSITIVE-N.bathe first AFFIRM'
'Let me take a bath first.'
... [sarapannya] tak-buat-na-e
- This fills a functional gap in Indonesian
(proposals just done pragmatically)
(~"transfer": Hickey 2010)
- Affects prenasalization of verb; restricted to
1SG subjects

Borrowing of complex syntactic construction

- ▶ Morphosyntactically, the propositive is an isolated thing. No hypothesis as to whether other illocutionary/mood constructions would be transferred like this
- ▶ Jav has an applicative paradigm that is sensitive to mood, transitivity, and person – did not hear any of this in the conversation. Vs. Indonesian applicatives which don't have all this fancy stuff, which did appear in the conversation.



Notable features/ impressionistic observations

- Relatively less code-switching than expected (by researcher); mostly when attempting to clarify information from Father (Javanese directed to father, father rarely uses Javanese)
 - Long conversation about senility of father
- Older speakers (father and mother) show fewer Jakarta Indonesian features than expected: abis vs. habis, udah vs. sudah, sama vs. dengan, -in vs. -i/-kan; nggak/ga vs. tidak/nggak/ga



Different contact situations, same notable morphosyntactic & lexical borrowings.

- All of the things in the preceding slides are notable in their own right; more notable, even unexpected, is that many of these borrowed items/systems are reportedly found across contact situations
 - Javanese: single dominant language clearly distinct from Malay/Indonesian (Conners 2008, 2012)
 - Tarakan Kalimantan: original Tidung Dayak now minority, Bugis plurality, large Javanese, Chinese
 - Riau: local Malay, regional Malay, regional Indonesian, standard Indonesian (Gil 2002, 2003, 2012)
 - Manado: local Minahasan languages, post-creole Malay

Future study

- Identification of additional features
- Closer consideration of “borrowing” vs. “transfer” (Hickey 2010)
- Frequency of non-Indonesian features (statistics)
- Are the outcomes the same in contact situations with non-Austronesian languages (vs. “koineization”: Siegel, 1985)?
- Comparison of categories of borrowing/contact outcomes with other language situations, e.g. Jambi, Tarakan, Manado
- Corpus comparisons on syntactic (and other) structures, e.g. SV vs. VS orders, in Javanese vs. JII vs. Indonesian varieties
- What is the range of situations in which similar features are borrowed?
- What is the best angle to view these sorts of outcomes: speech community (Weinreich 1968) vs. individual (Errington 1998)?

Evans et al. (2014) Linguistic Diversity

- ▶ Q1: Can we discover a relationship between macrovariation and microvariation? I.e. can we detect, in progress, the micro-processes that engender macroeffects, by looking at different levels of variation within speech communities?
- ▶ Q2: Is there a relationship between microdiversity and macrodiversity, is this due to differences in variability of production, in the variability of evaluation, or in both?
- ▶ Q3: Are there social factors which engender diversity in some speech communities and retard it in others?
- ▶ Q4: Do situations where structurally disparate languages are in stable, intimate contact produce greater levels of micro-diversification and micro-diparification? I.e. are processes of diversification affected not just by social setting but also by the repertoire of existing language patterns that are fed into processes of learning and using language

Conclusions

- Typologically, the Indonesian contact situations may well render unique outcomes.
- Contrary to expected outcomes, we find closed-class lexical items, bound morphology, and even morpho-syntactic constructions borrowed
- Some Indonesian contact situations may more closely resemble koineization (Riau, Jambi, etc.) (Kertswell 2001)
- Linguistic outcomes of language contact are determined in large part by the history of social relations among populations, including economic, political and demographic factors (Sankoff 2001), and the current situation is clearly transitional

Thank you!
ありがとう
Terima kasih!
Grazie!
Matur nuwun!

Contact:

Thomas J. Conners, tconners@umd.edu

