SOCIAL CORRELATES OF SOME PHONOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES IN JAKARTA MALAY

Stephen Wallace

0. INTRODUCTION

0.1. In this paper I am presenting a summary of my findings* concerning certain points of phonological difference and their social correlates in the Malay of Jakarta which have not received prior notice or analysis. The central thesis is that, within the area of Jakarta studied, geographical factors involved in phonological differences are minimal. Instead, a host of other factors must be evoked to describe such differences: primarily, ethnicity and age; secondarily, socio-economic status, milieu, and native language.

Further, we can distinguish several layers of Jakarta Malay speech. The fundamental distinction I have discovered is that between a disappearing traditional pattern, now heard 'only among a restricted group of older speakers, and a spreading modern pattern, common especially among the young. A secondary distinction divides speakers following the modern pattern into two groups: a conservative one which closely resembles the traditional pattern, and an innovative one which diverges from it. There are aspects of the social structure and recent history of the city which are seen to have contributed to the present distribution of linguistic differences.

0.2. Jakarta Malay in one variety or the other is the native language of the indigenous inhabitants of Jakarta, the capital of the Republic of Indonesia and a metropolis of over five million people, and of the countryside immediately surrounding the city. It is further widely spoken as a second language by the large numbers of migrants who come to the city from throughout Indonesia.

Jakarta Malay is an enclave of Malay speech in an area where two genetically related but still quite distinct languages are spoken: Sundanese to the south, and Javanese to the east and west (the northern border of the city being the Java Sea). The dialect-geographical situation is thus quite different from that of other large cities such as London, Tokyo, Moscow, Peking, New York, or Mexico City, in whose extensive surrounding territory the metropolitan language, albeit in a variety of dialects, prevails.

Historically, Jakarta Malay is a form of spoken Malay which has undergone great influence—phonological, morphological, syntactical, lexical, and semantic—from the languages of the earliest Indonesian migrants to the city: the Balinese, the Sundanese, and the Javanese. Jakarta Malay differs in many respects from Indonesian, the national language of Indonesia, which is based on literary Malay and which is used in Jakarta as throughout Indonesia as the official language for governmental, educational, technical, commercial, and literary purposes.

The linguistic situation in Jakarta thus resembles the 'diglossia' found by Ferguson in many areas of the world (Ferguson 1959), with the important qualification that in actual fact in Jakarta there exists an almost continuous range of speech from Jakarta Malay, the 'dialect', to Indonesian, the 'standard language', so that the term 'diglossic continuum' would be an apter description of linguistic reality in the city (cf. Soepomo 1970: 9-10).

Most persons in Jakarta are familiar with at least the basic features of Indonesian, which they learn in school, from the communications media, or from occupational experience.

0.3. The data on which my conclusions are based are tape-recordings of ordinary, everyday conversations in Jakarta Malay discreetly recorded by my fourteen native-speaker and near native-speaker assistants in the contexts of family, neighborhood, and peer-group. Under my close supervision, they transcribed these tape recordings and provided me with information concerning the speakers and contexts involved. I also elicited phonetic data from them.

Concentration was on the central urban area where the most prestigious form of Jakarta Malay—that which has -s corresponding to Indonesian -a—is spoken. The three neighborhoods I devoted the most attention to are in the areas of Menteng Atas, Manggarai, and Rawasari, areas differing greatly in their ethnic and socio-economic composition. In addition, I have samples from several other areas as well as samples of 'dialect' broadcasts from radio and television.

Before presenting my findings, I will give some necessary social background information on Jakarta.

1. THE CITY OF JAKARTA

1.1. Macroperspective.

1.11. Jakarta is a multi-ethnic city. While space does not allow a detailed presentation of this aspect here, I would at least like to give approximate figures: for the ethnic composition of present-day Jakarta. The reader is advised to consult Castles (1967) for further information.

The four largest ethnic groups in Jakarta are the Sundanese (+35%), Javanese (+30%), Betawi (+15%), and Chinese (+10%). The Sundanese and Javanese hail from Jakarta's hinterland on the island of Java. The Betawi, considered by themselves and others to be the original inhabitants of the city, are thought to be mostly descendants of Balinese slaves brought by the Dutch to the city in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Chinese of Jakarta are mostly what is locally termed peranakan 'of mixed ancestry'; while culturally assimilated in many respects to local ways, including language, they still maintain a separate identity.

The remainder of the population comes from Indonesia's 'outer islands', or those other than Java. Numerically and socially, the most prominent groups are the Minangkabau (western Sumatra), the Batak (northern Sumatra), the Madurese (northern Celebes), and the Ambonese (Moluccas).

Jakarta's ethnic composition has changed greatly in the last few decades because of large-scale in-migration. The percentage of Betawi in what is now the metropolitan area has fallen from around 55% before World War II to 15% or maybe even less today.

1.12. Jakarta is a city of migrants. The census of 1971 showed that 41% of Jakarta's total population was born outside the city; of the population over age 20, 66% were born outside (Speare 1975:2).

The migrants leave rural areas, especially on Java, because of high rates of unemployment, and go to the city with the hope of finding at least marginal jobs by using their connections with friends and relatives (Temple 1974: Foreword).
1.13. Jakarta is a city of youth. In 1973, 64.5\% of the population was age 24 and below (Jakarta Dalam Angka 1974:14). For recent information on youth, its culture, and its problems in Jakarta and Indonesia, see e.g. Ennemerson (1973) and Taufik Abdullah (1974), and the references contained therein.

1.14. Jakarta is a rapidly-growing city. Because of a relatively high birth rate (around 2.5\% annually) and continued in-migration, its population has grown from 2.9 million in 1961 to 5.2 million in 1974, and is estimated to reach 12 million by the end of the century.

1.15. Jakarta is socio-economically a very diverse city. Practically all occupations, levels of income, degrees of education, and life-styles are represented. For our purposes, it is worth pointing out that most Betawi have lower-status occupations (drivers, construction workers, gardeners, etc.), and that they have traditionally been at the bottom of the social pecking order. The other groups fall in the whole range: the president and vice-president of the Republic of Indonesia are Javanese, but so are most pedicab drivers; the governor of Jakarta is a Sundanese, but so are many coolies; many Chinese are storekeepers, but there are also Chinese jinay drivers.

1.2. Methodology. Looking at the three neighborhoods studied in terms of the above features typical of Jakarta as a whole, we find the following characteristics which, as we shall see later, are important for describing linguistic differences.

1.21. In Menteng Atas. Practically all working-class (carpenters, drivers, domestic servants, small vendors, etc.). Heads of families: 42\% Sundanese, 36\% Javanese, 22\% Betawi.


2. THE PHONOLOGY OF JAKARTA MALAY

2.0. General remarks. It is a feature of Malay and other languages of western Indonesia that interlanguage and inter-dialect differences often lie at the ends of words: using standard Indonesian as a reference, especially the correspondences in these languages and dialects to Indonesian -g, and the distributions of the final 'laryngeal' consonants -h and -? and their relationships to other final consonants and to final zero consonant; and the effect of the final -j on a preceding vowel.

For Jakarta Malay it is also the case that these are chief points of difference from other forms of Malay and from Indonesian, and that these are the ways in which varieties of Jakarta Malay differ from each other.

I will first give a very brief outline of the 'autonomous' segmental phonological inventory of Jakarta Malay, based on the speech of my informants from the three neighborhoods mentioned above and from other areas. My analysis differs somewhat from that presented by the other investigators who have studied the overall phonology of Jakarta Malay (Muhsdjir 1964 and 1972, Kühler 1966, and Ilkernag 1975), possibly because informants from different milieus were used. A detailed presentation and defence of the present analysis will be given in my forthcoming dissertation. The problem lies with the vowels, as the consonantal contrasts pose no difficulty.

The Indonesian spoken by my informants has the same sound system as their Jakarta Malay, at least in terms of inventory, so the symbols used for Jakarta Malay will be used for Indonesian also.

I will not in this paper be focusing on the important topic of language-internal patterns of morphophonemic alternation, many of which involve -g, -h, and -?, or what underlying forms and rules can be posited to account for actually pronounced forms. I am rather seeking to characterize some of the (surface) differences heard in vernacular Jakarta Malay speech in terms of their distributions through the speech community. Many, if not all, of my statements can be translated into rules, constraints on rules, exceptions, sub-dialectal variants, and so forth, which apply to underlying forms of the type given in Ilkernag (1975:section 9). Differences between her data and mine will not be treated in this paper.

2.1. Consonants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>laryngeals: h, ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Vowels.

- **Tense**
  - **Front**
    - **High**
      - lax: i
    - **Mid**
      - lax: a
    - **Low**
      - lax: o

(We use the terms 'tense' and 'lax' instead of 'higher' and 'lower' to avoid confusion with the terms 'high' and 'low.')

2.21. The high vowel pairs i/\ i and u/\ u are almost in complementary distribution, it generally being the case that the tense ones occur in open, the lax ones in closed syllables. But:

2.211. Before \ h, \ r, \ an intervocalic glottal, I always hear the lax high vowels: bruh 'blue', bruh 'confused', huruh 'bird', punut 'to pick up', pu?un 'tree', spai\ (man's name).

2.212. When a suffix is added to a form like koci 'small', the \ i remains as in the stem: koci 'smaller', koci 'to make small'. Likewise: masuk 'to enter', komasukan 'to be possessed', masukum 'to put in'.

2.213. There is a pattern of CV reduplication for forming disyllabic forms of monosyllabic nicknames. When the monosyllabic vocative forms din (from kasdir) and dun (from apdu) are reduplicated, the resulting non-vocative forms are ddin and dudun, respectively, with the lax high vowels in open syllables.

2.214. The quality of high vowels before the final glottal is not statable by rule. This will be treated below in section 6.
2.22. Mid vowels.
2.221. There is a clear contrast among the mid vowels in monosyllables: ye 'the jack (in cards)', ye 'yes'; lo 'you', no 'there (distant)'. Either a tense mid sequence or a lax mid sequence can occur in the frame VCVC#: bole 'to be allowed', bole 'ball'; lele (kind of fish), mele (woman's name); tokoko 'store', sando 'there (distant)'.
2.222. It is generally the case that only the lax mid vowels occur in closed syllables and in closed sequences of mid vowels (VCVC#): cet 'paint', bokom 'bomb', bo resp. 'in order', boko 'to buy in quantity', bokok 'tomorrow'. Only lax mid vowels occur in medial open syllables before a following non-mid vowel: pili 'motor oil', ede (man's name), lanang 'indeed', akan 'person'.
2.223. Before the final glotal, both tense and lax mid vowels are found. See section 6.

3. TRADITIONAL JAKARTA MALAY AND MODERN JAKARTA MALAY

3.0. It is a hitherto unnoticed fact that there are two varieties of Jakarta Malay definable in terms of their correspondences to Indonesian -a.

The first is the 'real', 'pure' Jakarta dialect which regularly has -e for Indonesian -a. This variety I will term Traditional Jakarta Malay (TJM). Presently, it is spoken only by members of the Betawi ethnic group, and only by older and more conservative Betawi speakers at that.

The second, which I will call Modern Jakarta Malay (MJM), has the Betawi -e only in the functors (personal pronouns, interrogatives, and several particles), but -a? in the contentives (nouns and verbs). It is spoken by young people in general, including the younger Betawi, and by many older non-Betawi (e.g. Javanese, Sundanese, and Chinese).

The regular pattern of correspondence is illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indonesian</th>
<th>TJM</th>
<th>MJM</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taña</td>
<td>tan</td>
<td>taña?</td>
<td>to ask a question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bala</td>
<td>bol</td>
<td>bala?</td>
<td>a ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apa</td>
<td>ape</td>
<td>apa?</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dia</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>dia?</td>
<td>he, she, it, they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saja</td>
<td>nji</td>
<td>saja?</td>
<td>just, only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1. Details.

3.11. TJM also has -e = Indonesian -ah: rumah 'house', susah 'difficult'. MJM usually has -ah as in Indonesian. See section 4.

3.12. The following frequently-occurring forms with -a in Indonesian never have -e in my data, but -a? in both TJM and MJM: bawa 'to bring', bisa 'is able', buka 'to open', coba 'to try; please', juga 'also', minta 'to request', suka 'to like; be apt to'.

3.13. Even the most conservative Betawi speakers hesitate between -e and -a? in the numerals du or dua? 'two', tiga or tiga? 'three', lima or lima? 'five'. MJM has the latter forms always.

3.14. A few forms never have -e in MJM: TJM supay 'so that', sara 'all', but MJM supaya, sara.

3.15. Foreign words and formal Indonesian words do not have -e, but speakers of both TJM and MJM hesitate between, for instance, amerika and amerika?, parakara and parakara? incident'.

3.16. The functors which have -e in MJM are:

3.161. Personal pronouns: gue, kita, sae, ane, 'I, we'; ents 'you'; die 'he, she, it, they'; he 'his, her, its, their'.

3.162. Interrogatives: apa 'what', bari 'how much/many', kana 'why', mane 'where; which', pajang 'how', sapa 'who'.

3.163. Particles: ade 'to be; have', aj 'just, only', ame 'with, and, by, to', daripade 'instead of', liv 'yes', kate 'say' (quotative marker), pade 'all', sans 'there (distant)'. There are further ude (h) 'already' and de(b) (exhortative, assertive particle) whose Indonesian forms are sudah and dah. For the -h, see section 4.

3.17. There are a few other forms in MJM which have -e. For example, the Betawi kin term baba 'father' is often used familiarly and humorously by the youth of Jakarta in phrases such as baba gue 'my old man'.

3.2. Regularity and variation.

3.21. The speech of the Betawi.

3.211. In Menteng Atas, an almost exclusively working-class area, the older Betawi (40 years and above) still speak fairly 'pure' TJM. Persons younger than that hesitate in the contentives between the TJM -e and the MJM -a? and children younger than 10 or so speak regular MJM.

3.212. In Rawaasari, a much more diverse and cosmopolitan area closer to the center of Jakarta, the older Betawi almost always use the MJM -a? in the contentives, with only very rare 'slips' into the TJM -e; the younger Betawi there speak regular MJM.

3.213. The fact that much Betawi speech shows variation in the direction of MJM is to me a reflection of their marginal and uncertain social position in present-day Jakarta. The Betawi almost all have lower-status occupations; and they are an ever-shrinking minority in a city dominated politically, economically, socially, and culturally by other groups. They seem to have little interest in preserving their own traditions, which are often looked down on and ridiculed by the majority, and so they imitate others. Linguistically, this amounts to imitating MJM, the present prevailing norm, to the point that some—the young—speak complete MJM.

3.22. The speech of the non-Betawi. Lest anyone think that MJM and I have defined it as an unstable and transitory form of speech, I would like to mention that I have numerous recordings of speakers whose casual MJM follows the patterns outlined in 3.0 and 3.1 above in every utterance, subject of course to a few alternations which are not being treated here.

But there are many speakers whose MJM, even when they are speaking in the most casual and relaxed circumstances, is not so regular. They hesitate between -e and -a? in the functors, and the -? of the contentives is sometimes absent when we expect it. We find this variation in the speech of first-generation migrants who speak MJM as a second language or dialect; in the speech of just about everyone, Jakarta-born and—raised or otherwise, in the area of Manggarai studied; and in the speech of many persons of the middle class. The linguistic and social factors involved here are many and complex. I would at least like to say here that there are certain patterns to the variation found in the speech of these persons; that their Jakarta Malay seems to be influenced in this respect by Indonesian; and that they have the general status of 'outsiders' with respect to the MJM tradition which is found in its most regular
form among the non-Betawi lower-status native Jakartans in areas which still have significant numbers of Betawi.

Compare this also with the distribution of the final glottal after vowels other than a for these speakers, section 5 below.

3.3. Evaluation. The use of the -e indicates an intimate style of speech, suitable for use with one's family, with one's neighbors, and with one's good friends. When one speaks with the -e, one is really speaking like a Jakartan. One must not, however, use the -e too much: my young informants, Betawi and otherwise, told me that to say words such as tabe 'to ask' and boly 'ball' instead of tana? and bila? was kuno 'old-fashioned', soperti pran tua 'like old people', or betawi barbar 'really Betawi'. The tape recordings bear out their judgments on this matter.

3.4. Origin. Where, when, how, and in what group TJM and MJM became differentiated is not known. The lack of previous studies on the speech of anyone except the Betawi, the poorly-known dialect situation both within the Jakarta Malay speech area and in the neighboring Javanese and Sundanese areas, and the complex social situation obtaining in Jakarta since its founding render hypotheses at this time highly tentative.

4. THE RE-EMERGENCE OF -h. ANOTHER MODERN FEATURE

4.0. There are indications from several sources that Jakarta Malay at one time underwent a general loss of -h.

One, the existence of forms such as TJM rume 'house' (Indonesian rumah) can be explained historically most satisfactorily by positing a loss of -h before the shift of -a to -e. Two, the Jakarta Malay described by von Dewall in 1909 generally shows no -h. Three, the more recent works of Muhadjir, Kéhler, and Ikramegara, along with my own data, show that -h is often absent in urban Jakarta Malay speech. Cf. also the special study of h in Jakarta Malay by Lukman Hakim (1969).

4.1. My data indicate that -h is, as it were, reappearing in Jakarta Malay.

4.11. The TJM spoken in Menteng Atas very frequently has zero corresponding to Indonesian -h.

4.12. The MJM spoken in Rawasari and Manggarai regularly has -h = Indonesian -h, except that a few frequent forms such as boly 'to be allowed', tuju 'seven', and udé 'already' lack -h in Rawasari.

4.13. The MJM of Menteng Atas has a great deal of fluctuation between the -h-less TJM and -h-ful Indonesian patterns.

4.2. Whatever the origin of the new -h— influence from Indonesian or possibly from Javanese and Sundanese— it is clearly a part of MJM, at least in its most prestigious form, and is another difference between TJM and MJM.

5. THE FINAL GLOTTAL. CONSERVATIVE AND INNOVATIVE JAKARTA MALAY

5.0. A striking feature of Jakarta Malay is the frequent occurrence of a final glottal in forms which in other Malay dialects and in Indonesian have zero final consonant. Furthermore, within the central urban area of the city, we often hear variant forms such as sade, gade?, sade? 'big', pagi?, pagi?, pagi? 'morning', ribu, raba?, raba? 'Wednesday', ribu, ribu?, ribu? 'thousand'.

In this section I would like to point out that there are important social correlates for the use of the final glottal.

The basic contrast is that the Betawi and those non-Betawi closely associated with them have relatively few forms with final glottals; other speakers, relatively more.

We will here be dealing with forms which in their Indonesian versions end in vowels other than a and a. Forms in -a are only a very few foreign words. The Jakarta Malay correspondences to Indonesian -a have been given above in section 3.

Before describing the differences in usage after other (non-central) vowels, I will first outline those forms in Jakarta Malay which have a fixed final glottal. These must be discounted, so to speak, from any text of Jakarta Malay prior to dealing with other glottals found.

5.1. Fixed final glottals. There is a fairly large number of forms which have a non-varying final glottal in all varieties of everyday Jakarta Malay that I have investigated. Many of these forms fall into semantic categories.

5.11. Kinship terms which can potentially be used in direct address. This applies to terms of whatever origin, e.g. the terms for 'older sister' in common use in Jakarta: Indonesian kaka?, Betawi mpa?, Javanese ma?i, Sundanese a?. Chinese dei?. Terms which are never used in direct address, such as laki 'husband', bini 'wife', and manu 'child's spouse', occur with and without the glottal. Several terms which do not have -? in Indonesian have regularly in Jakarta Malay: b?u 'mother', c?ucu 'grandchild'.

5.12. Negatives. The Jakarta Malay negatives nga? and kaga? (the difference in meaning being something like 'not' vs. 'not at all') always have -?, as do their Indonesian analogues tida?, short form ta?, and the colloquial pada?.

5.13. Certain particles: k? (amazement, surprise) and k? (indifference). The former is probably to be considered colloquial Indonesian, but the latter has no Indonesian equivalent.

This category and the two above were pointed out by Ikramegara (1975: section 9), who discusses the vocative/expressive nature of the glottal in these instances. Besides these three, there are several other categories in my data.

5.14. Forms indicating aversion, filth, and bad smells.

5.141. Aversion: baer? 'to hate', gali 'disgusted, repelled', jabol? 'to provoke one's lower lip (as a sign of dislike)', jiri? 'thoroughly disgusted, repelled', malu? 'embarrassed, ashamed, shy; unwilling to get involved in a potentially embarrassing situation'. But always without the glottal: gali 'tickled, to find something funny'.

5.142. Filth: tait? 'excrement' dakt? 'bodily dirt'.

5.143. Bad smells: bas? 'spoiled, smelling sour (of rice)', bau? 'to smell bad, to stink', banu? 'stale (of air)', lanu? 'smelling rotten', sapt? 'smelling burned, stinging'. But without the glottal is bau wan? 'to smell fragrant'.

5.144. All these forms lack the glottal in Indonesian except jabol? and jiri?.

5.15. Two forms indicating deviant or confused behavior: gagu? 'dumb, unable to speak', naco? 'to talk nonsense, to have confused thoughts'. The latter is a derivative of kaco 'confused, in disarray'.

5.16. Interjections. The interjection yo? or yu? 'come on; good-bye' regularly has the glottal in my data. The long form occurs with or without the glottal: yo? (Indonesian ayo or ayo). The interjection-like form tau? 'I don't know' regularly has -?; in the meaning 'to know', there is a great deal of fluctuation between tau and tau? (Indonesian ta(h)u). There is further the interjection-like particle masa? (disbelief).
5.17. There is a fairly large number of miscellaneous forms which always have -2 in my data. Examples: buli? 'albinho', cipik? 'girl', cewek? 'boy', roka? 'cigarette', taj? (kind of lizard). These forms have -2 in Indonesian as well, insofar as they occur in that language.

5.18. Jakarta Malay -2 for Indonesian -h. Jakarta Malay has tar? 'to put, place' (Indonesian tarib, tarub; colloquial tarb, tarub). Corresponding to the colloquial Indonesian particle sb (topicalization), the most frequently-occurring form in Jakarta Malay is ar?. Some speakers have only that; others hesitate between ar? and aj: practically nobody in my texts says sb.

5.19. The particle meaning 'like, as' which in colloquial (Jakartan) Indonesian is kaya (?) is regularly kay in TJM. MJM has either ka? or ke?, or sometimes kaya?.

5.2. A note on nicknames. There are a variety of naming patterns in use in Jakarta, differing according to religion, ethnic group, and social class. Most personal names are not of Indonesian origin, but of Arabic, Sanskrit (in both Javanese and Sundanese guise), Chinese, or European provenience. Many names, in their official forms anyway, have sounds and arrangements of sounds which are foreign to Jakarta Malay and to the other languages of Indonesia as well. There is generally a feeling that one's 'real' name is too formal, too long, and too hard to pronounce for everyday use, and so a familiar nickname, derived by certain patterns of diminutivization, is used instead. The reason is not the negative one of taboo, but the positive one of endearment.

One of the features of many familiar names is the addition of -2 if the 'real' name ends in vowel. While this -2 might have originally had only a vocative use, it is now used in all environments, so that it has become an integral part of many familiar names used by people of all kinds in Jakarta.

Examples: Betawi male ramlil, nickname lit?: Javanese female ari, nickname ci?: Sundanese male subrata, nickname ta?: Chinese female susana (sus), nickname uci?: Menadonese female tinaka, nickname tina?.

I will not here go into the problem of the lack of -2 in some familiar names.

5.3. Different use of -2. When we listen to Jakarta Malay speech, we hear other final glottals, and we hear variation between the final glottal and zero. For the sake of convenience, I will refer to that final glottal after non-central vowels (thus all except a and i) in Jakarta Malay corresponding to Indonesian final zero, and not occurring in any of the above categories mentioned in sections 5.1 and 5.2 above, as the extra glottal.

In most general terms, the fewest extra glottals occur in the speech of speakers of TJM and what we will term conservative speakers of MJM, especially persons of lower social status, persons living in areas where there are relatively many Betawi, and persons who speak MJM as a native language. Other speakers of MJM—persons of higher social status, persons living in areas where there are few or no Betawi, and migrants to the city who have acquired MJM as a second variety of speech—use more extra glottals; we will call these persons innovative speakers of MJM.

Furthermore, speakers in the first category—TJM and conservative MJM—have the extra glottal fairly regularly in certain forms; but those of the second category—innovative MJM—hesitate in its use. The general impression given is regularity, consistency, and certainty on the one hand; irregularity, inconsistency, and uncertainty on the other.

These differences are summarized in the following table, which is meant only to show the basic linguistic and social contrasts involved in a very complex situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>innovative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>linguistic:</td>
<td>fewer extra 2</td>
<td>more extra 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regularity</td>
<td>irregularity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TJM, some MJM)</td>
<td>(other MJM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social: Betawi</td>
<td>lower-status</td>
<td>higher-status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Betawi</td>
<td>non-Betawi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betawi area</td>
<td>non-Betawi area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natives</td>
<td>migrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.31. TJM and conservative MJM (CMJM) generally share the occurrence of the extra final glottal in the following forms, rarely in others:


The forms kali 'river' and kali 'time, occurrence' have no extra glottal. One hears both kali and kali? 'to buy' and a few other such pairs.

5.312. Corresponding to Indonesian -u: dulu? 'first; a moment', manu? or mo? 'to want to, be going to', satu? or satu? 'one'. But dulu 'formerly' has no extra glottal. Both malulu and malulu? 'nothing but' are found.

5.313. Indonesian orthographic -au (pronounced aw, oy, or, usually in Jakarta, aj) 'cap', 'tired', pakai? 'to use, wear, don; with, by means on', (s)ampai? 'until, up to, as far as', salampe? 'handkerchief'. In the meaning 'arrive', both ampai and sampai? are common.

5.314. Indonesian orthographic -au (pronounced aw, oy, or, usually in Jakarta, aj) 'kap? (kind of bird), kali? 'when; if, as for'.

5.315. Among speakers of TJM/CMJM, there are some small differences in the use of the glottal in the forms listed in 5.311 to 5.314 above. The gist of this is that speakers in Menteng Atas, which we have seen is a linguistically conservative area, hesitate between what is evidently an older pattern with slightly fewer extra glottals and a new pattern, common in Rawasari, with slightly more. E.g., kali? 'when' is the usual form in Rawasari, but both kali and kali? are heard in Menteng Atas. Cf. the study of von Dewall (1909), which shows that fewer extra glottals were used in Betawi speech than today.

5.32. For innovative speakers of MJM, it is almost the case that anything goes. These speakers usually, but not always, have the extra glottal as in the above, but practically any other form can and often does receive it as well: goek?, gode? 'big', sore? 'evening', toko? 'store', kali? 'river', baku?, baku? 'book', feke? 'VV, Volkswagen', and many others, which speakers of TJM/CMJM consistently, and speakers of DMJM sometimes, pronounce as goke, sore, toko, kali, baku, iwe.

No speakers have -2 in certain proclitic particles such as di in 'in, at, on', si (personal article), hari 'form'; in other particles such as lagi 'again; be in the process of'; in the deictics; or in the pronouns.

5.33. The linguistic and social explanation of this phenomenon of relatively extensive but irregular glottalization is by no means a clear-cut matter.

Many migrants to the central area of Jakarta, especially native speakers of rural Jakarta Malay (RJM), Sundanese,
and possibly some Javanese dialects, speak languages in which a form whose stem ends in a vowel receives a glottal in phrase-final position. I have recordings of such people now living in the central urban area speaking Jakarta Malay, and their Jakarta Malay indeed shows many extra glottals, but the use is not consistent. Possibly they have been influenced by urban Jakarta Malay or Indonesian patterns. In view of our lack of detailed knowledge of glottalization in these languages of migrants, and in view of the many languages and dialects involved, it is not possible at this time to go further into this problem.

But the relatively frequent extra glottal is also found in the speech of persons who are 1) native speakers of urban Jakarta Malay, and 2) migrants to the city whose native languages (e.g. Sumatran Malay and the Javanese of Yogakarta) do not show the phrase-final glottalization typical of rural Jakarta Malay and Sundanese.

Linguistically, there are two explanations, not mutually exclusive, for the behavior of the latter two groups.

First, there is borrowing. It could be that these speakers hear native speakers of BMJ and Sundanese using Jakarta Malay in the city, and since, for instance, BMJ/Sundanese sere? is different from Indonesian sare, take the former to be the Jakarta form. In view of the fairly large number of migrants to the city from the BMJ and Sundanese speech areas, this is not at all unlikely.

Second, there is analogy. It could be that, on the basis of such frequently-occurring forms as cerry? 'to look for', dulud? 'first; a moment', and pake? 'to use', whose Indonesian forms have no -?-, speakers analogically extend the glottal to other forms as well in an attempt to speak in what they think is the Jakarta way.

Socially, it is important to notice that the fewest extra glottals and the most regular use are heard in TMJ and CMJMJ: the speech of the urban Betawi and lower-status Jakarta-born and -raised non-Betawi who live in areas where there are still relatively many Betawi. Evidently the CMJMJ speakers are following the conservative tradition of glottalization of their TMJ speaking neighbors and ancestors; but the 'outsiders'--the migrants, the middle class, and those who live where they would rarely hear Betawi speech--innovate by carrying over external habits, by borrowing pronunciations, or by analogical extension.

All things considered, the general trend is increased final glottalization. More glottals are heard now than formerly in TMJ speech; the CMJMJ heard in the more prestigious and cosmopolitan area Rawassari has slightly more than the TMJ and CMJMJ heard in the less prestigious working-class area of Menteng Atas; migrants have more than natives; and a preliminary analysis of my data shows that the young have more than the old. We might refer also in this regard to the regular glottalization of a in MJM in the contentives, where TMJ has -? with no glottal.

Speakers’ evaluation of glottal usage is a complicated matter which I will not treat here.

6. PRE-GLOTTAL VOCALS. FURTHER INNOVATION

6.0. As mentioned above in section 2.2, it is usually the case that in closed syllables only the lax vowels i, u, e, and æ occur, and not the tense ones i, u, e, and ə. Before a final glottal, however, we find both tense and lax vowels.

6.1. The presence of the tense set before final glottals is common for all speakers in the following instances:

6.11. The forms ayo? or yay? 'come on; good-bye', kal? 'if, if? 'to want to'.

6.12. Some names whose formal (Indonesian) version ends in -i when given the -? typical of nicknames, end in -?.

6.2. Aside from these categories, there are important differences in vocalic distribution before the final glottal, and these differences fall into the same division made above in the discussion of the extra glottal between TMJ and conservative MJMJ on one hand, innovative MJM on the other.

It will be seen from section 5.31 that TMJ/CMJMJ has the lax set before the extra glottal: cerry? 'to look for', dulud? 'first; a moment', pake? 'to use', bana? (kind of bird), etc.

Innovative speakers of MJM also usually have the lax set in these forms, which historically seem to represent an earlier level of glottalized forms which have now gained wide currency. But in forms with the extra glottal where TMJ/CMJMJ has no extra glottal (later glottalization), speakers of MJM have both tense and lax vowels, as in the examples in sections 5.0 and 5.32. And the speaker will sometimes hesitate between, for instance, gade? and gade? 'big'. When the stem has two mid vowels, however, the glottalized variant almost always has the lax vowels: sore, sere? 'evening', toku, toku? 'store'.

6.3. The interpretation of pre-glottal vocalic distribution involves the same complex of linguistic and social factors as with the extra glottal, and will be treated in my dissertation.

6.4. In terms of a traditional ("autonomous") phonemic analysis, I find that the 10-vowel system given in section 2.2 is necessary. Whether or not this number could feasibly be reduced with a more 'abstract' approach, given the vocalic distribution, alternation, and variation in my data, is a moot point which I will not go into here. Cf. Ikraneegra (1975: section 9) for the treatment of vowels in her data.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

7.1. Using overall phonological features, we have distinguished three major layers of urban Jakarta Malay speech:

7.11. Traditional Jakarta Malay: -e = Indonesian -a; zero = Indonesian -i; fewer extra glottals; regular glottalization; lax vowels before final glottal.

7.12. Modern Jakarta Malay: -a in contentives = Indonesian -a; -i = Indonesian -i.

7.13. Conservative Modern Jakarta Malay: fewer extra glottals; regular glottalization; lax vowels before final glottal.

7.122. Innovative Modern Jakarta Malay: more extra glottals; less regular glottalization; lax and tense vowels before final glottal.

7.2. We have further shown how the above linguistic features are distributed through the speech community. Our point is that it is not possible to draw lines on a map of Jakarta--at least not in the central urban area--to show these features; that other factors such as ethnic group, age, socio-economic status and milieu, and native language are their extra-linguistic correlates.

7.3. The data I have allow the following generalizations about where Jakarta Malay is now and where it is heading.

7.31. Traditional Jakarta Malay, the language of the Betawi, is a moribund from of speech. It is presently spoken only by the older Betawi, and only in less prestigious areas
(Menteng Atas). The Betawi living in more prestigious areas (Rawasari), and young Betawi in general, follow the Modern Jakarta Malay of the non-Betawi. Traditional Jakarta Malay, or, as we might call it, Betawi Malay, is thus going the way of other specifically Betawi traditions whose demise or imminent demise has been pointed out by ethnographers (see for instance Taufik Effendi Muluk 1973).

7.32. Modern Jakarta Malay, whatever its origin might have been, has almost become the Jakarta dialect. Especially among the young, who form a relatively large portion of the population, MJM has become a widely-spoken dialect with connotations of being with-it, jazzy, up-to-date, urbane, and metropolitan. In the neighborhoods I studied, MJM is the native, most natural form of speech of all the children, whether their parents be Betawi, Sundanese, Javanese, or Chinese; carpenters or school-teachers, bus drivers or bureaucrats, domestic servants or secretaries. MJM is also the peer-group language of youth in general in Jakarta, a mark of youthful solidarity against the old-fashioned (traditional Betawi), provincial (Javanese, Sundanese, etc.), or stuffy (standard Indonesian) linguistic ways of parents, teachers, and employers.

MJM is furthermore that form of speech which many first-generation migrants acquire, or attempt to acquire, upon arrival in the city. Younger migrants and those of lower socio-economic status—the vast majority—show no compunction whatever in imitating MJM ways; in fact, they are forced by peer-group pressure to conform. Older migrants of higher status resist MJM ways, especially the —€ . Some say that they are just not used to speaking that way, others say that it is ugly and 'bad Indonesian'. But they are far in the minority.

Looking at the population of the city in overall statistical terms—only around 15% Betawi; 65% age 24 and below; 40% born outside the metropolitan area; 3% annual increase in population from in-migration; 2.5% annual increase in population from births—MJM is the wave of the present and will be the deluge of the future.

7.33. But Modern Jakarta Malay is by no means a phonologically uniform variety of speech. We have seen that there are significant differences in the distribution of the final glottal and of vowels before the final glottal among its speakers. It appears that as the migrants, the middle class, and possibly the young favor glottalization, it will spread even further. Interference from Indonesian, which has no such feature of glottal addition, will likely cause a continued state of variable glottalization.

There is also possible influence from Indonesian in the variation in correspondences to Indonesian —a found in the speech of some persons. But whereas —€ has an upper bound of use in MJM, the glottal does not. Both will bear close watching in the future.

7.4. We might here summarize certain aspects of the social structure and culture of Jakarta and the great changes which it has undergone since Indonesia became independent which have clearly affected language in the city. Migration from outside has given it a more cosmopolitan character and radically changed its former ethnic composition. Migrants have brought with them non-Malay speech habits (especially glottalization) which have possibly influenced Jakarta Malay. The age structure of Jakarta's population, coupled with the existence of a variety of beliefs, attitudes, feelings, desires, ways of life, and preferences subsumed in the term 'youth culture', has meant that the young are aware of themselves as a group and often desire to set the trend rather than follow the pace. Economic and political changes have led to the emergence of a not insubstantial middle class, whose members are torn between regional and national, traditional and modern ways. Widespread mass education, the development of mass communications media, and frequent intergroup contact have familiarized just about everyone with at least the basic features of the Indonesian language.

7.5. In all the mixture that is Jakarta—mixed ethnic composition, mixed marriages, mixed neighborhoods, mixed economy, mixed cultural values—we see a leveling out in one important aspect of life: language. Modern Jakarta Malay, whose origin possibly lies in some kind of mixture and evening out of different phonological traits, has become, to be sure with some internal variation, the cosmopolitan vernacular style of probably most people in the city. Just as the Indonesian language has become widely known, used, and respected throughout Indonesia's diverse archipelago as the means of formal and official communication, so Modern Jakarta Malay has become the means of informal, everyday communication throughout Jakarta, the microcosm of Indonesia.

Cornell University

FOOTNOTES

* The research on which this paper is based was done in Jakarta from November, 1974, until December, 1975, with a Foreign Area Fellowship of the Social Science Research Council of New York City. Complete results will be included in my dissertation provisionally titled "Language and Society in Jakarta", which I hope to complete in 1976, at Cornell University under the direction of Profs. C. F. Hockett, F. van Coetsen, and J. U. Wolff. My Indonesian sponsors were the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) and the National Center for Language Development. My thanks go to Dr. Amran Halim, director of the latter institution, for inviting me to submit this paper and for his advice and encouragement while I was in Indonesia. I have further profited greatly from talks with Dr. Kay Glassburner Ikranegara, Mr. Muhadjir, and Mr. Abdul Chaer, linguists in Jakarta who have dealt with Jakarta Malay. Of course, I alone am responsible for the contents of this paper and any errors which might have inadvertently been included.
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Introduction

In a recent article, Unlenbeck (1975) presents some very interesting data with regard to the division of Javanese sentences into intonation marked segments. He points out that sentences can consist of as many as four such segments and that their order with reference to each other is flexible, different orders emphasizing different elements. However, although he stresses the importance of intonation in marking these segments, he does not describe the intonation contours involved. He also mentions the importance of topicalization in Javanese, but does not describe the mechanisms for identifying topics.

I think, too, that the division of Javanese sentences into what are generally called topic and comment on the one hand and into intonation marked sentence segments on the other are both important. I also think, however, that the interaction between these two kinds of structures needs to be described and that is what I propose to do here. The phenomena in question lend themselves to description in terms established by Halliday (1967-69). Since his terminology is not yet in universal use among linguists, it perhaps needs to be reviewed first.

In place of "topic" and "comment" which he says tend to be used ambiguously, Halliday proposes theme and rheme. The theme is what we are talking about. The rheme is what we are saying about it. In English theme always comes first, rheme follows. In the neutral instance the theme is equivalent to the subject, and the rheme is the same as the predicate. Thus in the sentence

Tom lives in Middleburg.

Tom is the theme (as well as the subject), and lives in

Middleburg is the rheme (as well as the predicate). The theme, however, can be some other element, such as a locative or time reference:

On Saturdays, Mary goes to town.
In America, people don't eat bread every day.

On Saturdays is the theme of the first sentence, while Mary goes to town is the rheme. In America is the theme of the second sentence while people don't eat bread every day is the rheme. In English, rarely, a verb can be theme as in the second clause below:

(He said he would run, and) run he did.

In this clause run is theme, he did rheme. In colloquial speech we sometimes find as theme a noun whose only syntactic relation to the rest of the sentence is a genitive one to the subject:

(Now) Tom, his house is in Middleburg.

Here Tom is theme, his house is in Middleburg is rheme. In addition to thematic structure, speech has an information structure. Information structure has to do with the way segments of language function as components of a message. Halliday notes that when we speak in English we break our speech into information units, marked by intonation contours. One information unit may correspond to one sentence:

Mary goes to town on Saturdays.
Tom lives in Middleburg.

Or a sentence may be broken into two or more information