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Abstract

The Indonesian spoken on a daily basis in Jakarta, the national capital, shows considerable divergence from Standard Indonesian as it has been codified by the Centre of Language Development. A regional dialect appears to be developing, resulting from contact between superposed Standard Indonesian and a number of regional varieties. This paper documents one part of this development, the interaction of Standard Indonesian and the native Jakarta variety, Betawi. An analysis of verb morphology, and the effect of register shift on its use, show that a process of koineization has taken place, and that Jakarta Indonesian is crystallizing into a separate variety of Indonesian, a nativized koine, with fixed norms of usage. © 1998 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved
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1. Introduction

Indonesia is a multilingual nation, with a large proportion of multilingual speakers. Regional languages, regional lingua francas and the superposed national
language, Standard Indonesian, create a range of choices of code for most interchanges throughout the country, a situation no less true for the capital city, Jakarta, than it is for the hinterlands. The population of Jakarta includes several major groups. First, there are the natives of the region (an ethnic group called Betawi after the old Dutch name of the capital, Batavia), who speak a variety of Malay also known as Betawi. Then there are the adult, first-generation immigrants from the rest of Indonesia, all of whom speak their own regional languages (most frequently Javanese and Sundanese—which are distinct languages, not simply varieties of Malay), as well as, usually, some variety of Indonesian. Next are the children of these immigrants, some of whom are monolingual in Indonesian, while others are bilinguals who tend to have greater fluency in Indonesian than in the other languages that they speak. Finally, there is a large ethnic Chinese minority, which dates back at least to the seventeenth century, and has spoken and written a variety of Malay since that time. These groups combine to provide a bewildering array of language options for everyday use. Listening in the streets and shops, one hears a combination of a number of regional languages and a number of different varieties of Malay, including Betawi and both standard and non-standard Indonesian.

It is this non-standard, colloquial, Jakarta Indonesian, and not Betawi, that has developed as the language of inter-ethnic communication among immigrants of other language backgrounds to the area, and it is Jakarta Indonesian, rather than Betawi, that their children learn as a first language. This colloquial Indonesian, the dialect spoken in everyday life, diverges markedly from the Standard Indonesian promoted by the Centre for Language Development and utilized in speeches and news broadcasts. In fact, it would be fair to say that Standard Indonesian is basically a written dialect, spoken by native and non-native speakers alike only in the most formal circumstances, far more formal than those in which the data discussed in this paper was collected. Colloquial Indonesian, in Jakarta and elsewhere, has developed through a process of accommodation between this highly restricted dialect and whatever other varieties are present in a given location. In Jakarta, the most significant source varieties would be Betawi, Chinese Malay, Javanese, and Sundanese. A full study of language contact in Jakarta would have to consider all of these sources. The present study, however, is

---

1 In this paper, I use Malay as a cover term for a wide variety of dialects and/or closely related languages, including the national languages of Indonesia and Malaysia, as well as a number of regional languages of Indonesia, both those which developed more or less continuously in the same location, such as some of the languages of Sumatra and Kalimantan, and those that arose as the result of contact in earlier centuries, such as those of the Moluccas. Indonesian refers to Standard Indonesian, and any regional varieties, either native or second language speaker, that have developed since the Sumpah Pemuda (roughly, the oath of the young revolutionaries) identified Indonesian as the language of Indonesia in 1928.

2 There is some disagreement as to whether this Malay is a distinctive variety. It has generally been believed to be so, but Salmon (1981) and Oetomo (1991) disagree.

3 These Malay varieties may be classed either as dialects of the same language or as separate but very closely related languages, depending on one's perspective.
restricted to a consideration of possible Betawi influences on the verbal system of Jakarta Indonesian.

The histories of the two source dialects discussed in this paper, Betawi and Standard Indonesian are highly complex, each variety itself being the result of considerable language contact and mixture, and often quite controversial. While fascinating in their own right, the histories are not really relevant to this investigation, and therefore are not discussed further.4

Situations of language and dialect contact such as are found in Jakarta may lead to language shift, language convergence, or to a wide variety of patterns of multilingual language use. All of these processes probably contribute to the current Jakarta situation, but relatively little work has been done on unraveling the no doubt complex histories involved. While most observers are aware that there seem to be peculiarities associated with Jakarta Indonesian (or Jakarta slang, as it is often called), and make impressionistic observations about these peculiarities, the ' Jakarta variety' has not been a subject for in-depth investigation, nor, for that matter, has its existence as a separate dialect been either confirmed or disproved.

Thus the syntactic patterns described in this paper, which seem to combine aspects of Standard Indonesian and of Betawi, and perhaps also of some regional languages such as Javanese or Sundanese, might be seen as reflecting a situation of alternation among varieties, either as diglossia or as code switching. A more careful examination of the situation has however made it clear to me that what is taking place is not code alternation, but rather the formation of a single, compromise code — some sort of regional dialect — resulting from contact between different dialects of Malay as well as between those dialects of Malay and other languages of Indonesia.

I will here document a small part of that process through the examination of one particular area of Indonesian morpho-syntax, the use of verb morphology,5 in terms of possible contributions to it from two source varieties, Standard Indonesian and Betawi. I will show that the data are best interpreted as the result of dialect contact between Standard Indonesian and Betawi.6 I will show that Jakarta Indonesian makes use of most of the verbal morphology of two source dialects, Standard Indonesian and Betawi. I will then describe the effect of register shift on the use of verb morphology in colloquial Jakarta Indonesian speech. I will argue briefly that a code-switching analysis cannot be applied to this situation. I will then

---


5 A fuller study, involving other aspects of the language, would strengthen the arguments presented, but is beyond the scope of this paper. Grijns (1991) provides a brief survey of phonological, morphophonemic and lexical differences among Betawi, Jakarta Indonesian and Standard Indonesian.

6 A full examination of the language contact situation in Jakarta, including the influences of the major regional languages, is beyond the scope of this paper.
describe the koineization model of dialect mixture, and draw on the register shift
evidence and on facts about usage to show that koineization has in fact taken
place\footnote{I suggest that this is a regional dialect, rather than simply a register, because use of this speech is
largely restricted to the Jakarta area. In the rest of Indonesia, it is not employed by most speakers,
other than some teenagers apparently influenced by some of the more popular teen-oriented movies.}
with stabilization occurring, and that the speech described in this paper is
crystallizing into a separate variety of Indonesian with \§xed norms of usage.

The corpus on which my description of Jakarta Indonesian is based consists of
the speech of twenty-four Jakarta natives, twelve male and twelve female, who are
the children of immigrants from other parts of Indonesia. They were roughly
matched for age, socio-economic status and level of education, and all had been
born and raised in Jakarta in the post-Independence era. They spoke colloquial
Indonesian as a native language, along with, in some cases, a regional language
(usually, but not always, Javanese or Sundanese). The data on which this analysis
is based was collected as part of a larger study of verb morphology in Jakarta
Indonesian over a period of several months in late 1986 and early 1987,\footnote{Funding for the study was provided by the Fulbright-Hayes Foundation and the Wenner-Gren
Foundation for Anthropological Research.} and
consist of conversations within groups of two, three, or four speakers.

Because of the difficulty, if not to say impossibility, of recording naturally
occurring conversations where all the participants would be native speakers of
Jakarta Indonesian, or of \$nding \$cient existing groups of friends who met that
criterion through my own social networks, I decided that it was necessary to
sacrifice some degree of naturalness in order to obtain speech samples from
speakers of the appropriate background. Most of the consultants did not know
each other at the beginning of the study, although the majority had a ready made basis for acquaintance through some sort of connection with Atma Jaya
University, on whose campus most recordings were made; and one group
consisted of long-time friends and co-workers at a nearby hospital, who were
recorded at their work place. The consultants met in groups of three, each group
meeting several times, and were asked to discuss assigned topics. They were told
that they did not have to stick strictly to the topic, as it was also of interest for
the study to see what other topics these initial ones led to. Thus, the task was
fairly loosely structured. Furthermore, the tape recorders were turned on (with the
participants' knowledge) from the time the consultants arrived, not at the time
they began their 'assigned task', which was often up to 30 minutes later.

Although the recording situations were thus not entirely natural, the resulting
conversations were generally relaxed and casual, as indicated by, among others, such
measures as the degree of laughter and joking, the amount of interruption, the
amount of discussion of personal topics, and the terms of address used between
speakers. The speech was consistently colloquial, similar to my own and other
impressionistic accounts of Jakarta speech, and I have taken it as representative of
the "Jakarta variety" of Indonesian. It di ers from Standard Indonesian in a
number of ways, including the incorporation of aspects of Betawi lexicon\(^9\) and phonology,\(^10\) in addition to the verb morphology which is the focus of this study.\(^11\)

One of the conversations was unusual in that it contained considerable variation in register, ranging from quite formal to quite colloquial. The discussion of register variation is based on a close examination of that conversation. This interaction consisted of a ninety-minute discussion among three male speakers, all of whom had met previously, along with a small amount of facilitation from the research assistant who conducted the session. For approximately thirty minutes they conversed freely on topics of general interest. They then turned to the suggested topic of discussion, sports in Indonesia. Having misinterpreted their task for that day as holding a debate, rather than as having a conversation, they begin to speak in a quite formal style, using formulaic expressions which approximately translate as ‘thank you for this opportunity to speak’ to introduce their turns. However, they quickly returned to normal turn-taking and a more colloquial style of speech. Several times in the course of the next forty minutes they remind themselves or each other of the ‘assigned task’, and return to formal style for short periods, only to slip back into free conversation a short while later. Towards the end of the conversation, they notice that the tape is running out and decide that they have not properly discussed the topic, as they have spent most of the time exchanging stories about their personal experiences related to sports. The last part of the tape is then devoted to what they consider a full discussion of the topic, and a formal style is maintained throughout this section. This tape is strikingly different from the other tapes produced by this group, as well as the conversations of other groups, in the use of the debating style.

In analyzing the data from this conversation, the separation into formal and colloquial was based on a combination of criteria: turn-taking patterns, interruptions and laughter, the topic being discussed, use of formulaic expressions, and specific references to the ‘assigned task’\(^12\) – but not on verb morphology,

\(^9\) For example, the Betawi first and second person pronouns gue and lu.

\(^10\) For example, the dropping of word initial /s/ in a restricted set of frequently used function words such as the preposition sama (with) and the aspect marker sudah (completive).

\(^11\) A reviewer raised a question as to the naturalness of these conversations. While one might have wished for data representing the ideal and elusive ‘casual speech’ often seen as the sociolinguist’s Holy Grail, the fact is that it is not ethically acceptable to use surreptitiously recorded data, and so the speakers are always necessarily aware of being taped. This in no way prevents the production of interesting, informative and relevant results. Much of the fundamental sociolinguistic work on register variation has been based on just this type of data, or the even less natural sociolinguistic interview. Furthermore, it can be argued (Cameron et al., 1993) that the concept of natural data itself is false and simplistic, since all speech is produced with reference to some audience or other. This is not the place to even try to resolve these issues, and I leave it to the reader to judge the quality and relevance of this effort.

\(^12\) The data was originally divided into 5 different categories based on these criteria. Statistical analysis of the use of the variables showed no difference among 4 of those categories, which were then combined and labeled colloquial. The remaining category showed statistically significant variation from each of the other four, and from all four combined, and so it was retained as a separate category and labeled formal.
which has always been the dependent variable in this study. Once the data had been divided in this way, the frequency of occurrence of each aÂx in formal and colloquial speech could be tabulated. The colloquial speech sections of this group showed no substantive differences from the speech of other groups in the study in terms of frequency or function of verbal morphology, nor impressionistically in terms of other aspects of colloquial style; thus I have taken it as representative of colloquial Jakarta Indonesian. It would appear that there are two registers which function more or less independently of one another, and that the episodes of more formal speech have no noticeable effect on the colloquial speech which preceded and followed them.

2. Verb morphology

In this section I will present a brief outline of the verbal aÂxes of Standard Indonesian (hereafter SI), Betawi, and Jakartan Indonesian (hereafter JI). The SI examples are taken from a variety of modern novels. The Betawi aÂx information and examples come from Wallace (1977), Ikranegara (1980), and Muhadjir (1981). The statements concerning JI are based on an analysis of the corpus of conversations described above, and examples are taken from this corpus.

2.1. Intransitive verbs

Intransitive (1 argument) roots can be roughly divided into three classes: those that never take a preÂx, those that characteristically occur with a stative preÂx, and those that characteristically occur with an active preÂx.14 In SI15 the active preÂx is meng- (Example 1) and the stative preÂx is ber- (Example 2).16

Example 1 Seorang sopir ber-diri di muka pintu ruang tamu
one driver ber-stand in front door room guest
A driver was standing in front of the living room door.

---

13 In addition to the aÂxes considered here, which all sources agree exist in Betawi, Muhadjir (1981) also discusses the use of ter- and meng- in Betawi data, suggesting that meng- is found in formal register, and ter- is a recent borrowing from Indonesian.
14 These two preÂx types are diÂcult to characterize in terms of meaning; I have labeled them active and stative for convenience.
15 Standard Indonesian examples are taken from written Indonesian texts.
16 Ber- also occurs in some apparently two-argument constructions. However, the second argument in these cases is non-referential, and may be considered to be incorporated, as in the following example.
Saya ber-buru rusa
I ber-hunt deer
I hunt deer/I am a deer-hunter.
Example 2  Aku me-mandang kepada mereka
1sg meng-look to 3pl
I looked at them.

The forms of the two Betawi prefixes are ng- (Example 3) and be- (Example 4).

Example 3  saya yang n-ari
1sg rel ng-dance
I’m the one that dances.

Example 4  memang kita mau duduk aje, be-diri diluar sono yo
really 1pl want sit just, be-stand outside there let’s
Are we just going to sit, come on, let’s stand outside there.

In both varieties there are some roots that may appear either with the active
prefix or with no prefix. Such roots are relatively rare in SI, but quite common in
Betawi, and most roots which can occur with ng- can also occur with no prefix
(Example 5 illustrates this type of construction). Additionally, many roots which
require ber- in SI can occur with no prefix in Betawi (Example 6).

Example 5  ape die anyut sendiri
q,m. 3sg drift self
Did he drift away by himself (prefix form: nganyut)

Example 6  mak Buyung kan kerje di sane
mother name agrmt work at there
Mrs. Buyung works there you know (prefix form: bekerje)

In JI,17 as evidenced in my corpus, aixed intransitive verbs occurred with ber-
(Example 7), meng- (Example 8), and ng- (Example 9).18 There are no examples of
verbs with be-.19

17 All examples in this section are quotes taken from my data, and translations reflect the entire
context of the conversation, which cannot be reproduced in full for reasons of space. Some of the
examples may appear incomplete, in the absence of the full context, as only the portion necessary to
illustrate each point is included. The initials preceding the quotes identify the speaker. Punctuation
used in the English translation reflects the intonation patterns of the Indonesian original, not the
syntactic structures of either language.

18 Poedjosodarmo (1982) has suggested that the use of N- in the colloquial speech of native speakers
of Indonesia is due to the influence of Javanese, rather than of Betawi. Given that the form is found in
both source varieties, it would be diacult if not impossible to prove that one, rather than the other,
was the source of the form in Jakarta Indonesian. Most likely both Betawi and Javanese influence
were involved. Prefixless transitive verbs, on the other hand, are not found in Javanese (Uhlenbeck,
1978; Bintoro, 1980), but are widespread in both non-standard spoken Indonesian and non-standard
spoken Malay. Just as the use of N- is doubtless a case of convergent influence from Betawi and
Javanese, the use of prefixless transitive verbs certainly reflects convergent influence from Betawi and
other varieties of colloquial Malay.

19 This may not be significant, as an examination of a larger corpus might well turn up examples of
this form.
Example 7  
Y: tanah ngga ber-tuan dong ber-arti tuh
   land neg ber-owner emph ber-meaning that
S: hah, huh
Y: tanah ngga ber-tuan dong.
   land neg ber-owner emph
S: iya, (laugh)
   yes
Y: that means it was land nobody owned then.
S: huh
Y: land nobody owned then.
S: yes (laugh)

Example 8  
B: tadinya ha misalnya, dari hanya komplex itu, trus
   before ha example from only complex that then
   me-rambat jadi,
   meng-spread so
B: Before (it was) on- for example, only from that (housing)
   complex, then (it) spread out (to other areas) so,

Example 9  
B: untuk ny-ebrang kesananya tu bayar.
   for ng-cross to there that pay
   (standard form: menyebrang)
B: To cross over to there (you have to) pay.

In JI, as in Betawi, many roots which require a prełx in SI, either meng- or
ber-, may occur with no prełx (Examples 10, 11).^[20]

Example 10  
D: itu memang keungulan-nya itu emang mata-nya tu
   that really advantage-3sg that really eye-3sg that
   jadi waspada
   become alert
D: That's really the great thing about it really your eyes
   become sharp (standard form: menjadi)

Example 11  
S: pas saya keluarga, kebetulan di situ ada rumah
   exactly 1sg family coincidentally at there exist house
   kosong, empty

^[20] It could not be determined from my data, but the non-occurrence appears to be lexically
conditioned, and may relate to frequency of use (Kaswanti Purwo, personal communication).
2.2. Transitive prefixes

Transitive (2 or 3 argument) verbs may consist of roots which are inherently prefixless, or of roots preceded by one of a set of prefixes, traditionally called focus prefixes, but here referred to as trigger prefixes.\(^{22}\) The prefixes of Si are meng- (Example 12), and di- (Example 13). Verbs with meng- are actor-trigger, those with di- are patient-trigger. Patient trigger verbs may also be preceded by a criticized actor pronoun or term of address,\(^{23}\) rather than by di- (Examples 14 and 15).

Example 12 Semacam perasaan kacau men-cekik leher-ku
type feeling confused meng-strangle neck-1sg
A feeling of confusion strangled my neck.

Example 13 Irwan masih perlu di-dorong dan di-bantu
Irwan still need di-push and di-help
Irwan still needs to be pushed and helped.

Example 14 Lalu ku-peluk adik-ku perempuan
then 1sg-embrace younger sibling-1sg female
then I embraced my younger sister

Example 15 Ibu, benar bukan apa yang pernah An\(^{24}\) cemas-kan
mother true neg what rel once name worry-kan
Mom, it’s true, isn’t it, what I was worried about

\(^{21}\) Keluarga ‘family’ is generally considered a nominal root, which must take the prefix ber- to be considered a verb. However, in this case it is being used verbally without any prefix. This fact is reflected by the difference between the gloss and the translation.

\(^{22}\) These prefixes operate as part of a set of opposing clause types which allows nouns of different semantic roles to become accessible to certain syntactic processes. Because the term focus has functional implications that are inappropriate to the dynamics of the Indonesian verbal system, I will not use that term here. Instead, I will use the term trigger system, referring to the syntactically most accessible NP of a clause (often called the subject) as its trigger, and to the two main clause types as actor-trigger and patient-trigger. I use actor and patient as cover terms, not as semantic primitives. The most accessible NP of an actor-trigger clause is likely to be an actor, but this is not necessary. Likewise, the most accessible NP of a patient-trigger clause is not always a patient.

\(^{23}\) For reasons of politeness, in face-to-face interaction pronouns are often replaced by titles, kin terms, personal names and other terms of address.

\(^{24}\) In spoken Indonesian, and as in this case in constructed dialog in novels, speakers often refer to themselves by first name rather than using a first person pronoun, for reasons of politeness.
The prexes used in Betawi are ng- (Example 16), and di- (Example 17). Verbs with ng- prexes are actor-trigger, those with di- are patient-trigger. In Betawi, as in SI, patient trigger verbs may be preceded by a cliticized actor pronoun or term of address, rather than by di- (Example 18). Unlike SI, where the root is always either prexed or has a clitic attached to it, roots in Betawi may also occur independently (Example 19). In such cases, it is not possible, on the basis of the verb form alone, to label the clause either actor-trigger or patient-trigger.25

Example 16 die m-injem uang ame gue
she ng-borrow money prep 1sg
She borrowed money from me

Example 17 tu baju baru mau di-beli Amat
that clothes new want di-buy name
Amat will buy those new clothes

Example 18 Loni lu bawa ke mane
Loni 2sg take to where
Where did you take Loni?

Example 19 kalo gue yang petik kembang di-marah-in
if 1sg rel pick Øower di-angry-in26
If I pick Øowers I get scolded.

The prexes meng- (Example 20), ng- (Example 21), and di- (Example 22) all occur in Jl. Furthermore, just as in SI and Betawi, patient trigger verbs may be preceded by a cliticized actor pronoun or term of address, rather than by di- (Example 23). And as in Betawi, verbs may appear with neither prex nor clitic. (Example 24)

Example 20 T nach, kalo interior design tuh me-rencana-kan bagian
well if interior design that meng-plan-kan section
ruang dalamnya.
space inside-3sg
T: Well, in interior design you design the interior.

Example 21 B dari dulu dulu remaja selalu ya yang,
from before before youth always rel
S: iya, yes
B: yang ng-urus deh gitu27 ya.
rel ng-arrange emph like yes
B: It’s always been the young people yeah who,
S: yeah,

25 I cannot comment on the status of these verbs in the trigger system of Betawi. For a discussion of their status in the trigger system of Jakarta Indonesian, see Wouk (1989), where I argue, based on syntactic and discourse distributional evidence, that they should be considered a sub-type of actor trigger.

26 The transitivizing suÅx -in described in the next section, allows the formation of a transitive verb from an adjectival root.

27 Gitu (literally 'like that') is used in Jl much as 'like' is used in colloquial English.
B: who like run things and all that yeah.

Example 22 S: jadi, (.75)²⁸ seperti: apah, (.75) apa itu kenangan
so like what what that memory
yang ngga bisa di-lupa-in tu lapangan
rel neg can di-forget-in that field
badminton tuh
badminton that
S: so, (.75) (it's) like what, (.75) what is it a memory that
can't be forgotten about that badminton field

Example 23 S: ada rumah kosong, ya udah akan saya kontrak,
exist house empty, yes already will 1sg rent
S: there's an empty house, ok then I'll rent (it),

Example 24 Y: mereka juga perhitung-kan, (.25) apa:
3pl also count-kan what
untuk (.75) sirkulasi uang itu kan,
for circulation money that agrmt
Y: they also calculate for, (.25) what: for (.75)
the circulation of money you know,
(standard form: memperhitungkan)

2.3. Transitive suÂxes

SI has two verbal suÂxes, -i and -kan (Example 25). These suÂxes alter the
argument structure of a verb, often increasing its valency by allowing an
additional direct argument. When used with a patient-trigger form they may allow
a participant that would normally be oblique to become trigger. In certain cases
the two suÂxes have an aspectual component, indicating perfectivity or
imperfectivity. The two suÂxes also give some indication of the semantic role of
the argument in question, but only in very general terms. The suÂx -i is
associated with recipients and locations, the suÂx -kan with causes and
beneficiaries. The exact effect of the use of -i or -kan varies considerably with the
individual root or group of roots.

Example 25 Sekali lagi hati-ku di-limpah-i perasaan iba
once again heart-1sg di-0ood-i feeling moved
yang tidak dapat ku-tapsir-kan

²⁸ These numbers indicate pause length. For an explanation of how pause lengths are determined,
refer to the Appendix.
Betawi has a single transitive suÂ-x -in (Example 26), which neutralizes the semantic distinctions maintained by -i and -kan in SI.

**Example 26**

apa die anyut sendiri apa di-anyut-in
q.m. 3sg drift self q.m. di-drift-in
Did he drift away by himself or was he washed away?

Jl makes use of -i, -kan and -in (Example 27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N:</th>
<th>kîta</th>
<th>ng-ada-in</th>
<th>arisan</th>
<th>dua</th>
<th>minggu</th>
<th>sekali</th>
<th>na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>ng-exist-in</td>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di</td>
<td>dalam</td>
<td>arisan</td>
<td>itu</td>
<td>yang</td>
<td>kita</td>
<td>mem-punya-i</td>
<td>waktu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>inside</td>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>thât</td>
<td>rel</td>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>meng-have-i</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banyak</td>
<td>gitu</td>
<td>ya,</td>
<td>untuk</td>
<td>me-mecah-kan</td>
<td>masalah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>meng-break-kan</td>
<td>problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masalah</td>
<td>gitu,</td>
<td>problem</td>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: We have a meeting every two weeks, well (it’s) in those meetings that we have lots of time like yeah, to solve problems like. (standard form: mengadakan)

### 2.4. Non-volitional forms

Many transitive verbs, and some intransitives, may be used in what can be termed the ‘non-volitional’ form. Non-volitional forms are verb forms which prototypically indicate a lack of volition or lack of deliberateness on the part of the actor. They are usually stative and low in discourse transitivity (as defined in Hopper and Thompson, 1980).

SI has two non-volitional aÂxes, the preÂx ter- (Example 28) and the circumÂx ke-an (Example 29).

**Example 28**

Ingat waktu kau ter-tidur ketika kita
remember time 2sg ter-sleep when 1pl inc
pulang dari Borobudur?
go home from Borobudur
Do you remember the time you fell asleep when we were coming home from Borobudur?

**Example 29**

3sg ke-takut-an me-lihat guru-nya
He was terrified upon seeing his teacher
The non-violitional forms of Betawi are the circumflex ke-an (Example 30) and the preflex ke- (Example 31).

Example 30 rapi-rapi-in jangan sampe ada yang ke-tinggal-an
neat-neat-in don’t until exist rel ke-leave-an
Clean up, don’t let anything be left behind

Example 31 rumah lu ke-bakar nggak
house 2sg ke-burn neg
Did your house get burned down or not?

Jl makes use of the preflex ter- (Example 32), the circumflex ke-an (Example 33), and the preflex ke- (Example 34).

Example 32 B: Beda hanya lagi ng-incr Dufan, pokoknya, harus
name only process ng-want Dufan main must
tertegih,29
ter-reach
B: I still really want (to go to) Dufan [Fantasy World
Amusement Park], the thing is, I’ve got to get there,

Example 33 S: kalo ngga bilang juga ya ngga ke-tau-an tu
if neg say also yes neg ke-know-an that
S: If I hadn’t said anything I wouldn’t have been found out

Example 34 M: kasian tu orang lagi sembayang ke-ganggu,
pity that person process pray ke-disturb
M: Those poor people get disturbed while they’re praying,

Table 1 compares the aAxation possibilities of Sl (Sl), Jakarta Indonesian (the
data in my corpus, Jl), and Betawi. As Table 1 shows, Jakartan speech makes use
of a rich system of verbal aAxes, considerably richer than the systems found in
the other two varieties, since it combines the morphology of the standard variety
of Indonesian with that of Betawi. Only one form, the Betawi be-, does not occur
in my data.

2.5. Morphophonemics

The preflexes meng- and ng-, which are used with both intransitive and transitive
verbs, contain an underlying nasal velar nasal. Both this nasal and the following
root undergo morphophonemic alternations when aAxation occurs. The
alternations are the same for both transitive and intransitive verbs. The details of
those alternations vary depending on the variety in question.

29 The root tegih does not occur by itself, only with the preflex.
In Standard Indonesian the following rules apply to the a\textsuperscript{x}lation of meng-. The \textael{nal} nasal, which is underlyingly velar, is deleted before liquids, glides and nasals, assimilates to the place of articulation of following stops, and partially assimilates to the place of articulation of other following sounds. Before a ricate it becomes alveolar, and before the fricative /\textit{t}/ it becomes labial. Before the fricative /\textit{s}/ it becomes a palatal. In addition, voiceless stops and the fricative /\textit{s}/ are deleted following nasal assimilation. Thus, for example, tulis 'write' produces menulis, baca 'read' produces membaca, lihat 'see' produces melihat and sewa 'rent' produces menyewa. This set of rules is summarized in Table 2.

In Betawi the following morphophonemic rules apply to the a\textsuperscript{x}lation of ng-. It is deleted before nasals. A schwa is inserted before roots beginning with liquids and glides, and also before monosyllabic roots beginning in a stop, fricative or a ricate. Thus tik 'type' produces ngetik and liat 'see' produces ngeliat. In bisyllabic roots it assimilates to the place of articulation of the following voiceless stops and becomes a palatal before the fricative /\textit{s}/. Voiceless stops and /\textit{s}/ are deleted following nasal assimilation. Thus tarik 'pull' produces narik, sikat 'brush' produces nyikat. If the root begins with a voiced stop either schwa insertion may occur or assimilation occurs to the place of the following voiced stop. Beli 'buy' usually produces mbeli, but may produce ngebeli. If the root begins with an a ricate, either schwa insertion occurs or the nasal is realized as a palatal before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial phoneme of root</th>
<th>Pre\textsuperscript{Ex}</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>mem-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b,f</td>
<td>mem-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>men-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d,c,j</td>
<td>men-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>meng-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g,h, all vowels</td>
<td>meng-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>meny-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r, l, w, y, m, n, ng, ny</td>
<td>me-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
A\textsuperscript{X}es of SI, JI and Betawi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitives</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>JI</th>
<th>Betawi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Static</td>
<td>ber</td>
<td>ber, 0</td>
<td>be, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>meng</td>
<td>meng, ng, 0</td>
<td>ng, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre\textsuperscript{Exes}</td>
<td>meng, di</td>
<td>meng, ng, di, 0</td>
<td>ng, di, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su\textsuperscript{Exes}</td>
<td>i, kan</td>
<td>i, kan, in</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-volitional</td>
<td>ter, ke-an</td>
<td>ter, ke-an, ke</td>
<td>ke-an, ke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Morphophonemics of Betawi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial phoneme of root</th>
<th>PreEx</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d, c, j</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>ng-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g, all vowels</td>
<td>ng-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s, c</td>
<td>ny-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r, l, w, y, b, d, c, j, g</td>
<td>nge-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m, n, ng, ny</td>
<td>no preEx</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-syllable roots</td>
<td>nge-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Chart adapted from Chaer 1982.

the a ricate, with optional deletion of the voiceless a ricate. Jual 'sell' may result in either ngejual or njual, and cium 'kiss' may result in ncium, nyium, or ngeciium. This set of rules is summarized in Table 3.

JI does not appear to have separate morphophonemic rules. In general, when SL a Âxes are used, the morphophonemic rules of SL apply, and when Betawi a Âxes are used, the morphophonemic rules of Betawi apply. The majority of verbs used either SL a Âxes, or Betawi a Âxes, so there were no conflicts. Cases of verbs which contained a Âxes from both source varieties are discussed below.

2.6. Mixed forms

There are exceptions to the generalization given above, which are evidenced as mixed forms. Several types of such mixed forms are described here. Some involve combining morphemes from the two varieties in a single word. Others involve morphophonemics. The assimilation rules of Betawi can be used with meng-, instead of those of SL. Such a case is found in Example 35, where the verb is menyari from the root cari (look for).

Example 35 Y: dan saya memang ngga menyari musuh
and I really neg meng-look-for enemy
Y: and I really don't look for enemies (standard form: mencari)

There were also a few cases of SL roots not found in Betawi, but found in the corpus with Betawi a Âxes.³⁰ In Example 36 and Example 37 below, Y is

³⁰ The determination of whether a root was or was not found in Betawi was based largely on it's presence or absence in 2 dictionaries of Betawi (Chaer, 1982; Kahler, 1966). Checking with a number of native speakers would have been a desirable step, but was not possible, as this analysis was completed after I had left the Aeld and did not have access to native speakers of Betawi.
discussing the problems he has with the quality of water from his well. The root endap 'settle, become sediment' (Example 36) which is found in Si but apparently is absent in Betawi, is found in the corpus with the Betawi ng- prefx. The root larut 'dissolve' (Example 37) is not found in Betawi, but is found in Si. It occurs here with the Betawi suÂx -in rather than the Si suÂx -kan.

Example 36  Y: nanti ng-endap tu itunya, kotoran semua
later ng-settle that that-3sg dirt all
Y: All the dirt will settle out later on

Example 37  Y: trus, kasi satu sendok, (.25) ini aja satu
then give one spoon this only one
sendok makan gitu. (.50) di-larut-in gitu.
spoon eat like di-dissolve-in like
Y: Then, add one spoonful, (.25) just this much
like one tablespoon. (.50) Let it like dissolve.
(standard form: dilarutkan)

Roots found in Si, where prefxation is obligatory, and not found in Betawi, nevertheless can occur in the corpus with no prefx. In Example 38, Y is discussing the development of sports in Indonesia, and Ænds himself at a loss for words to complete his utterance. D and S both Æer suggested completions, both of which are rejected by Y, who later goes on to complete the thought himself in the section following this example. The root andil, a nominal root found with no aÂx, is a Si root which requires the prefx ber- in order to be used as a verb.31 This root is not found in Betawi, yet here it appears with a Betawi 'aÂx', or rather the absence of an aÂx as permitted in Betawi but not in Si.32

Example 38  Y: kita ber-harap hal hal yang begini; bisa
we ber-hope thing thing rel like this can
D: ber-tahan
ber-endure
Y: bukan, di samping itu bukan: soal ber-tahan-nya ya,
no besides that no matter ber-endure-gen yes
S: ikut andil (standard form: berandil)
follow Æhare
Y: e bukan,
uh no
Y: We hope that this kind of thing can

31 A reviewer has raised a question as to whether, in fact, berandil is a Si form. There is some disagreement about what constitutes Si. I have been guided by a number of Indonesian dictionaries, and do not have independent information as to their reliability in this particular case.
32 Omission of a morpheme is not the same process as morpheme use. However, the result is basically the same, the use of a Standard Indonesian root in a form which is acceptable in the morphological system of Betawi but not acceptable in the morphological system of Standard Indonesian.
D: endure
Y: no, besides it's not a question of its enduring
S: participate.
Y: uh no,

In addition, there are occurrences of perhitung-less verbs (a Betawi construction) with -i and -kan suAxes (from SI). This can be seen in Example 24, repeated here as Example 39, and also in Example 40. The root perhitung 'calculate' is used in Example 39 with the transitivizing suAx -kan, but there is no corresponding transitive preAx, which would be required in SI. In Example 40 S is discussing his experiences playing badminton. The root jelas 'clear' is used in this example with the transitivizing suAx -kan, but there is no corresponding transitive preAx, which would be expected in SI.

Example 39 Y: mereka juga perhitung-kan, (.25) apa:
they also count-kan what
untuk (.75) sirkulasi uang itu kan, for circulation money that agrmt
Y: they also calculate, (.25) what for (.75) the circulation of
money you know. (standard form: memperhitungkan)

Example 40 S: jadi, disini, di-tanya-kan, kenapa, yaitu tadi saya
so here di-ask-kan why that: is just: now I
udah jelas-kan kenapa senang, (.25) olahraga
already clear-kan why like sport
badminton
badminton
S: so, here, it asks, why, that is just now I already
explained why I like, badminton

There is also an instance of a root occurring with the SI preAx meng- and the
Betawi suAx -in (Example 41).

Example 41 Y: mungkin saya rasa, (.25) bangsa tujuh puluh
maybe I feel approximately seventy
per lima persen atau enam puluh persen itu
percent or
per Rve percent or
udah meng-uasa-in dia,
already meng-power-in 3sg
Y: I think probably if you control 75 or 60 percent,
(standard form: menguasai)
3. Conversational usage of verbal affixes

This section is concerned with the relationship, if any, between register (formal vs. informal) and the frequencies of use of the various possible aÂxes for each verb type. All of the data and calculations are presented in Table 4.

3.1. Transitive preÂxes

The effects of register are seen most clearly with transitive preÂxes. First, we note that it made a large difference in whether or not an aÂx was used; absence (possible in Betawi, but not in SI) was almost twice as likely in the informal than in the formal, and the difference is highly significant. Second, the SI meng- is some 4±5 times more likely than the Betawi ng- to appear in formal register, while the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Register Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intransitives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no aÂx</td>
<td>16 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ber-</td>
<td>27 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no aÂx</td>
<td>10 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meng-</td>
<td>20 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ng-</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no aÂx</td>
<td>26 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total aÂxes</td>
<td>48 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no preÂxes</td>
<td>28 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total preÂxes</td>
<td>123 (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di-/cleftic</td>
<td>46 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meng-</td>
<td>72 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ng-</td>
<td>5 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuÂxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i</td>
<td>9 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kan</td>
<td>47 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-in</td>
<td>10 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-volitional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ke</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke-an</td>
<td>5 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ter-</td>
<td>14 (70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
converse is true in informal. Finally, the use of di- or a clitic seems not to be
register-sensitive.

3.2. Transitive suÃxes

With the transitive suÃxes, there is no question of presence or absence, but
rather one of choice of suÃx, and these choices follow the patterns just noted.
The SI -kan appears twice as often as the Betawi -in in formal register, while -in
appears four times more often than -kan in informal.

3.3. Active intransitives

Again we see the same effect of register on choice of aÃx with the SI meng- far
more likely (20 examples as compared to 1) to occur in formal register, while the
Betawi ng- was far more likely (33 to 6) to appear in informal. There was no
statistically significant effect of register on whether or not an aÃx was used,
although the tendency paralleled the situation for transitive preÃxes; a preÃx was
more likely to be present in formal register than in informal.

3.4. Stative intransitives

There is no effect of register on whether or not an aÃx is used.

3.5. Non-volitionals

With the non-volitional forms we are again not concerned with presence or
absence of aÃxes, but rather with the choice of aÃx. The sample size is really too
small for any statistically robust results; though it is interesting that the largest
difference between the two registers is seen for the Betawi ke-, which appears only
once in the formal; in other words, the direction of difference is again the same as
for the other cases.

In summary, then, for all aÃx types except stative intransitives SI forms were
much more common in formal register, and Betawi forms in informal. But this is
a statement of probabilities; SI forms were present in the informal, and Betawi
forms did occur in the formal ones. What we have then is not a categorical
alternation between two varieties, but rather simultaneous alternations in
frequency between forms from two systems.

3.6. Other aspects of usage

Although the aÃxes found in the data are identical in form to the aÃxes of
Betawi and SI, their usage is not always entirely parallel. Upon closer examination
certain differences emerge between Betawi and the data of this paper, one relating
to the use of ber-, and the other relating to the use of ng-.
In Betawi be- may be omitted, and in the Jakarta data, ber- was sometimes omitted, but the circumstances of omission differ in the two cases. In Betawi be- is considered optional with verbs formed from verbal roots, but obligatory with nominal verbs (Muhadjirj, 1981). However, when looking at the nature of the individual verbs from which ber- is omitted in this corpus, we and it omitted not only from some constructions with verbal roots, but also from some with nominal roots. Out of 209 intransitive clauses with no prex where ber- would be expected in SI, 22 (10%) contain roots which are clearly nominal.33

In Betawi, the alternation between prexless and ng- prexed forms of both transitive and intransitive verbs expresses an aspectual distinction, prexless roots expressing states, and ng- prexed roots expressing processes (Wallace, 1977). In the Jakarta data there were too few intransitive roots with ng- to determine what sort of distinction was being expressed. There were, however, sufficient transitive roots to make this determination. A study of the discourse distribution of transitive prexes (Wouk, 1989) showed that transitive roots with ng- as well as those with no prex are found in clauses that are virtually identical aspectually. The significant difference between the two is related to the degree of individuation of the patient, which tends to be low with ng- and high with prexless verbs. The functions of the two forms thus appear to be different in Betawi and in the corpus under consideration.

4. Dialect mixing

4.1. Arguments against code alternation

As mentioned in the introduction, at first glance one might think that the speech described in this paper represents a case of diglossia or codeswitching. However, such a conclusion does not hold up to more careful scrutiny. Language usage in this corpus follows neither the patterns usually described for diglossia (Ferguson, 1959; Fishman, 1967; Fasold, 1984) nor those for codeswitching (Gumperz, 1982; Grosjean, 1982). For example, although the distribution of variant forms of verbal axes is clearly register sensitive, and the registers cleanly separable, they do not show the type of simple separation into two source varieties that is characteristic of diglossia or situational codeswitching. Rather, as has already been noted on several occasions, what we end is an intermingling of forms from both source varieties in both registers.

This intermingling is similar to the type of mixing often found in metaphorical codeswitching, but there are certain important differences. In examples 35 through 41 above I have presented evidence of what would, if this were codeswitching, constitute morpheme-level codeswitching of a type that is not supposed to be

33 The 22 instances include 7 roots. They are olahraga ‘sports’: 3 instances, mupakat ‘concensus’: 1 instance, keluarga ‘family’: 4 instances, pesta ‘party’: 1 instance, andil ‘part, quota’: 1 instance, cerita ‘story’: 2 instances, and jalan ‘road’: 10 instances.
possible in codeswitching situations (Poplack, 1980, 1981; McClure, 1981; Berk-Seligson, 1986). There I have described certain â€œaxes being used in ways that are different either distributionally or functionally from their uses in either of the source varieties, a feature that has not been attested to in other studies of codeswitching. Additionally, the mixing takes place not only in the casual sections of the interaction, where codeswitching might be expected, but also in the formal sections, where it would not (Forson, 1979; Grosjean, 1982). Also, the mixing that occurred in the corpus did not seem to coincide with most of the types of functions that are normally given for metaphorical codeswitching (Grosjean, 1982; Gumperz, 1982). Finally, perhaps the most convincing observation against the codeswitching interpretation is that in such situations the speakers in question can, and generally do, claim a degree of competence in both varieties. This was not true here. No participant mentioned Betawi among the languages he or she spoke. There are thus several strong arguments against a codeswitching interpretation, and no compelling evidence in favor of it.

4.2. Koineization defined

While the use of verb morphology in Jakarta speech does not seem to be consistent with a codeswitching interpretation, it does appear to be very similar to one possible outcome of dialect contact, namely koineization. A succinct definition is found in Siegel (1985, pp. 375–376):

Koineization is the process which leads to mixing of linguistic subsystems, that is, of language varieties which either are mutually intelligible or share the same

---

34 Apparent exceptions to this claim can usually be explained as instances of borrowing, where the root has been adapted phonologically and morphologically to the language of the â€œ. Some actual exceptions have been reported, in data from di ering areas in Africa (Forson, 1979; Scotton, 1988). The details of these exceptions are, however, quite different from the type of mixing found in Jakarta Indonesian. Forson (1979) has described a case of morpheme-level codeswitching between Akan and English, in which an entire system of morphological marking from one language replaces that of the other language. These substitutions were regular and across the board, not fluctuating, as in Jakarta Indonesian, and involved the avoidance of complex morphosyntactic subsystems replete with irregular forms. Scotton (1988) describes a type of fusion or amalgamation between an international language such as English and individual local East African languages on the part of educated bilinguals that produces ‘hybrid forms’ (Scotton ibid., p. 158) consisting of e.g. an English root with Swahili morphology. These amalgamations appear to be restricted to combinations of one international and one local language, however, which is not the case for Jakarta Indonesian, and from the examples given by Scotton it appears that it is a case of incorporating roots of the international language into the morphology of the local language, and not vice versa.

35 Although technically Betawi and Indonesian are dialects of Malay, in Indonesian folk linguistics they are generally identified as separate languages. It is possible that Jakarta residents might claim not to be able to speak Betawi due to its low social standing, when they actually do. I do not believe this is the case with the participants in this study however. They were recruited through my own social network or through the social networks of my research assistants, and thus claims about their linguistic background could be verified through personal knowledge.
genetically related superposed language. It occurs in the context of increased interaction or integration among speakers of these varieties. A koine is the stabilized composite variety that results from this process. Formally, a koine is characterized by a mixture of features from the contributing varieties, and at an early stage of development, it is often reduced or simplified in comparison to any of these varieties. Functionally, a koine serves as a lingua franca among speakers of different varieties. It also may become the primary language of amalgamated communities of these speakers.

Koineization is then a process through which the features of two or more different linguistic subsystems are combined, giving rise to a new, compromise dialect, a koine. A koine may be a regional koine, which evolves to accommodate contact between different dialects in a single region, as was the case for the original Greek Koine, or it may be an immigrant koine, which develops when population movement brings together speakers of related dialects in a new location (Siegel, 1985).

Koineization has been described as a combination of three processes: dialect mixing, dialect leveling, and simplification (Trudgill, 1986). Dialect mixing refers to the combining of forms from different dialects in a single system. As part of the process of development of a koine, there will be an early phase during which the variant forms from all varieties occur in the speech of most members of the speech community, who can then be considered as speaking an intermediate variety; such a situation has been found in Burträsk, Sweden (Thelander, 1976).

Dialect leveling is the process by which certain distinctive forms from the source dialects disappear as the koine stabilizes. These might be part of the lexical or morphological inventory, or regularization and decreased markedness could be involved (Trudgill, 1986). No explicit model predicting which forms will be removed through the leveling process exists, though Trudgill (1986, p. 143) suggests that "forms which occur in the majority of the contributing dialects win out and survive in the emerging focused dialect..." While Siegel (1993) argues that extralinguistic (demographic, political, cultural) factors such as the number and status of speakers from particular source dialects are likely to be more significant.

While in many cases variant reduction takes place through leveling and simplification, it is also possible for variant reallocation to occur instead (Trudgill 1986). In variant reallocation, divergent forms do not disappear; they are redeployed in restricted environments. Regional variants from different source dialects may become stylistic variants, utilized by all speakers but associated with different degrees of formality. Or they may become redistributed socially, each one coming to be associated primarily with speakers from a particular socioeconomic background. They may become redistributed geographically, so that variants from different source dialects are found in different geographical areas within the region in which the koineized variety is spoken. Finally, phonological variants may be redistributed as allophonic variants, coming to occur in different phonological environments.
4.3. A koineization analysis of Jakarta Indonesian

The sociohistorical background of JI would make it, in effect, both a regional and an immigrant koine, though differing slightly from each in that it is an amalgam of one indigenous and one superposed variety. As in many other koineization situations, social processes of migration have led to increased contact between two closely related varieties with a high degree of mutual intelligibility and a shared rhetoric of national and linguistic unity. The migration in this case is the continuing influx of second language Indonesian speaking immigrants from the rest of Indonesia to the national capital. However, immigrant koines characteristically develop in an environment where all of the input varieties have been relocated. In the Jakarta case, Betawi is not the language of relatively recent immigrants, but that of the indigenous population. And it is not the case that contact between the two varieties did not exist prior to the immigration, as SI has been present in Jakarta for decades prior the proclamation of Indonesian independence. Thus the situation in which JI developed is more similar to that of a regional lingua franca; however, the process was accelerated by large-scale migration to Jakarta over the past 50 years. JI has been the lingua franca for speakers of di erent dialects in Jakarta, as well as among immigrant native speakers of di erent languages who have learned Indonesian as a second language. It is also the primary language of the children of these immigrants, and as they, and their descendants, increase in number over time, it is likely that JI will become the first language of the majority of the city’s population.

The speech used in Jakarta shows clear signs of dialect mixing. Just as in Burträsk (Thelander, 1976), it shows, as I have extensively documented, the use of morphological, lexical, and phonological features of the two source varieties. This is true within the system of verb morphology focused on in this study, but also, of course, for many other areas beyond the scope of this article.

Now what of Trudgill’s three processes of dialect mixing, dialect leveling, and reallocation, with respect to Jakarta Indonesian? Jakarta Indonesian shows a substantial amount of reallocation. For example, all the aÁes other than be- are present, but would appear to have undergone reallocation as stylistic variants, with the Betawi forms more frequent in colloquial speech, and the SI ones in more formal speech. This is the expected directionality – Betawi is the non-standard variety, its forms thus come to mark informal speech; the SI forms come to mark formal speech.

In addition to stylistic reallocation, there has been some di erentiation of function, as detailed above, which can be seen as another type of reallocation in addition to the ones discussed by Trudgill (1986). The morphological variant of the preÁessless verb, which in Betawi indicated an aspectual distinction, is used in JI to indicate a distinction in transitive clauses between highly individuated patients and less individuated patients. I am not aware of any studies of koineization which describe such a change in function of a grammatical morpheme, but such reanalyses are common in syntactic change within a single variety (Hopper and
Traugott, 1993 and references therein), and can also be part of the process of pidginization and creolization (Holm, 1988). It seems quite reasonable to me that this type of reanalysis could accompany the koineization process, and it would appear to be completely parallel to the reanalysis of phonological variants as allophonic variation, which can also be considered a differentiation of function.

On the other hand, the data do not indicate a great deal of leveling or simplification, although there would appear to be some. Leveling involves the loss of certain variants from one variety in favor of variants from other varieties. In JI, an example would be the loss of the Betawi prex be- and retention of the SI ber-. This example also illustrates simplification. As already noted, in SI ber- is obligatory, while in Betawi, be- is not, as it may be dropped before verbal, but not nominal, roots. In Jakarta Indonesian, however, not only does the SI form ber-take on the non-obligatory feature of the Betawi be-, it also drops the Betawi distinction between verbal and nominal roots, with omission possible with both.

While there is only limited evidence of leveling or simplification in the present study, it may be that studies of other domains would yield more instances. Furthermore, Siegel (1985) points out that in particular the degree of simplification varies between koines depending on the specific conditions under which they developed, and that therefore simplification should not be considered a necessary component of the process of koineization.

In conclusion, then, JI is a compromise dialect that has developed at least partly through interaction between two closely related dialects, Betawi used by Betawi speakers and SI used mainly by non-native speakers of Indonesian in restricted circumstances. This compromise dialect contains elements from both source dialects. There is limited evidence of leveling or simplification, but a significant amount of reallocation has taken place. This dialect is the first language of a new generation of children of immigrants, such that JI can be considered a nativized koine (Siegel, 1985).
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Appendix A
A.0.1. Transcription conventions

The transcriptions used in this paper use the following format: each line of JI text is accompanied by a roughly morpheme-by-morpheme gloss directly beneath that line. JI verbal aÁxes are not given glosses, but rather are repeated in the gloss. An idiomatic English translation of each section follows the glossed transcription.

Punctuation reÁects intonational patterns, not syntactic structures. A period represents falling intonation, a comma represents a slight fall, and a question mark represents a rise. A colon following a letter indicates that the sound represented was lengthened. Spelling generally follows SI orthography. However, when there is more than one pronunciation of a word in colloquial speech, the spelling reÁects the pronunciation used. Pauses between words or syllables are represented within parentheses, by the length of the pause, which is measured in conversational beats, e.g. (.25) for a quarter of a beat. A conversational beat is derived by counting one-one thousand, two-one thousand etc. during a pause, in time to the rhythm of the conversation, four-one thousand being one beat.

Overlapping speech is shown by aligning the overlapping segments of the two speakers and placing them between slashes, as follows:

A: don't you think /so/
B: /well/ I don't know

In this made-up example, the 'well' of speaker B is spoken at the same time as the 'so' of speaker A.
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