

**Contact induced change: The varying effects of Indonesian on Javanese Dialects**

Thomas J. Connors

Yale University and Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

This paper explores the nature and intensity of contact between varieties of Indonesian (generalized) and two distinct, large, generalized sub-dialects of Javanese, namely East Javanese (EJ) and Central Javanese (CJ). The basic claim I explore is that EJ shows a greater degree of contact phenomena, in terms of borrowing, interference, simplification, etc, than does the CJ dialect. Javanese and Indonesian/Malay have a long history of mutual influence, however, in the modern Javanese dialects, it is EJ that shows greater influence from Indonesian. This can be seen in the lexicon, morphosyntax, and syntax of EJ, though interestingly, not particularly in the phonology. Here I present data demonstrating that this is the case, and I present several sociolinguistic and historical reasons explaining why this is the case.

EJ has borrowed lexical items much more heavily from Indonesian than CJ. This can be seen in the high occurrence of a number of high frequency lexical items found in the EJ recordings, such as *nggak/ga* ‘no, not’; *kan* ‘right, particle’; *tapi* ‘but’; *temen* ‘friend’, among many others. These are all borrowed from Indonesian; the CJ equivalents being *ora*, *rak*, *nanging*, and *kanca*. In fact, the borrowing of *tapi* and *temen* creates lexical ambiguity, in Javanese *tapi* is ‘to winnow’ [cognate with Indonesian *tampi*] and *temen* is ‘very, indeed’.

The verbal paradigm of EJ is much reduced compared to that of CJ, though both show significant diachronic simplification. Historically, the Javanese verbal paradigm is more elaborate than that of Indonesian/Malay, containing distinct endings for different moods, valences, and semantic argument structure on the verb. In modern Javanese, CJ has maintained some of these distinctions. But the EJ paradigm has been completely reduced, and I argue this is on analogy with Indonesian, where the forms are almost completely parallel.

Another area where EJ diverges from CJ is the lack, or at least extreme rarity of the propositive construction, especially compared to its frequency in CJ. Again, the lack of such a construction in Indonesian is a possible source of influence for the loss of the propositive in EJ.

In this paper, I present data from two sets of recordings. The first is from Malang, which I, idealistically, take to represent at least a large area of the East Javanese dialect chain. The second is from Yogyakarta, which I take to represent the Central Javanese dialect chain. These two cities make for a rather felicitous comparison in that they share much in common. Both are associated with past, large Javanese empires: Majapahit centered near Malang, Mataram near Yogyakarta. They are comparable in size, though Malang is larger. They are both inland cities, and therefore farther from the trade cities along the north coast which had more significant contact with trade varieties of Malay. Currently both are home to a large number of universities, and hence have significant populations of non-Javanese speaking populations. With so many similarities, why should there be such a difference in the contact phenomena? I explore the relevance of three major distinctions where EJ, as opposed to CJ, has a longer period of significant interethnic contact (i.e. with Madurese); a weaker courtly tradition; and a much less

rigidly stratified codification of social status within the language (i.e. less use of *krama*, *krama inggil*).