Javanese Accented Indonesian

Since its original promotion in 1928, and its subsequent standardization and adoption as a national language, Standard Indonesian has come into contact with hundreds of other languages through both institutional modes such as education and government, and individual interactions between L1 and, largely, L2 speakers. Unlike European colonial languages, the Standard Indonesian case has in most instances not led to a process of pidginization/creolization. In fact, the outcomes of contact in the Indonesian case are in many ways unique and therefore of great interest for example to current debates in understanding effects of contact and degrees of language restructuring (McWhorter 2018, Kouwenberg 2018).

In particular in this talk, we are interested in that variety of Indonesian that has arisen among native speakers of Javanese as the result of recent contact. This variety represents both a very recent contact situation, and one result of contact not between native speakers in conversation, but rather of Javanese speakers in a public milieu of Indonesian. We call this variety Javanese Accented Indonesian (JAI). This contact situation finds an imperfect analogue in comparison to English in India and the Philippines, where some elements of local languages have been adopted into the English variety of the region, without having gone through any simplification process. However, unlike in those varieties, where borrowings come in the common way—from open classes—in JAI, as for other regional Indonesians, it is often the closed-class items such as pronouns, particles, modals and auxiliaries, etc. which are salient in being borrowed (see pronouns in the example below). This seems to be borne out across most regional Indonesians. In addition to lexical items, regional Indonesians are influenced by the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the languages with which they come into contact. This paper aims to document salient features that distinguish JAI from both SI and other regional Indonesian varieties, adding to the small body of literature on regional Indonesians (Errington 2014, Fields 2010, Gil 2006, 2010, Sneddon 2002, 2006). We further provide a typological perspective, contrasting regional Indonesians categorically with creoles and blended languages. To do this, we analyze a corpus of spoken Javanese from Malang and Semarang.

We give as an example the propositive proclitic TAK in JAI. In most varieties of Indonesian and Malay, TAK represents negation, but not in JAI. In Javanese, proclitic TAK is used to signal a propositive construction (licensing additional verbal morphosyntax), meaning essentially 'let me be the one who X' or 'let me X'.

1. aku tak mandi dulu

1 NEG bath first Indonesian

'I won't bathe first'

1 PROPOSITIVE bath first IAI

'I want to/am going to bathe first'

2. sava mandi dulu Standard Indonesian¹

1 bath first

'I [propose to] bathe first'

¹ Example (2), provided for comparison, shows that the illocutionary force conveyed by TAK in JAI goes linguistically unexpressed in Standard Indonesian.

As shown in the glosses to (1), the string means one thing as a sentence of SI and another as a sentence of JAI. In JAI, the Javanese morpheme has crowded out the Standard Indonesian negative meaning, such that these sentences can be considered unambiguous in their respective languages, which in turn presupposes a communicative situation in which the interlocutors agree on which language they are using.

Errington, J. Joseph. 2014. In search of Middle Indonesian: Linguistic dynamics in a provincial town. In Gerry van Klinken and Ward Berenschot, eds. *In Search of Middle Indonesia*. Brill: Amsterdam.

Fields, Phil. 2010. *Papuan Colloquial Indonesian*. SIL International.

Gil, David. 2006. Distinctly Mesolectal Properties in Malay/Indonesian Dialects. Paper presented at SEALS XVI, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Gil, David. 2010. What Is Riau Indonesian? Ms. Leipzig.

Goebel, Zane. 2007. Enregisterment and appropriation in Javanese-Indonesian bilingual talk. *In Language in Society*, 36: 511-531.

Kouwenberg, Silvia and John Victor Singler. 2018. Creolization in Context: Historical and Typological Perspectives. In *Annual Review of Linguistics*, v. 4:213-232.

McWhorter, John. 2018. The Creole Debate. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Sneddon, James N. 2002. Diglossia in Indonesian, Paper presented at the Sixth International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics, Bintan, Riau, Indonesia.

Sneddon, James N. 2006. *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian*. Pacific Linguistics: Canberra.