Author/s:
Adelaar, A

Title:
Javanese -aké and -akə n: A short history

Date:
2011-12-01

Citation:
Adelaar, A. (2011). Javanese -aké and -akə n: A short history. Oceanic Linguistics, 50 (2), pp.338-350. https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2011.0024.

Persistent Link:
https://hdl.handle.net/11343/122871

Javanese *-aké* and *-akən*: A Short History

Alexander Adelaar

UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

Evidence from various Javanese dialects is presented to show that the standard Javanese transitive suffixes *-aké* and *-akən* have only recently become part of the Javanese morpheme inventory. They have replaced an earlier transitive suffix *-(ʔ)ən, which is still reflected in Tengger Javanese and in marginal positions in standard Javanese.

The acquisition of *-aké* and *-akən* in standard Javanese happened independently of the acquisition of *-akən* in Old Javanese. This allows a different perspective on the position of Old Javanese in the classification of Javanese dialects: it is most likely not a direct predecessor of standard Javanese.

The spread of *-akən* to Javanese and other languages is an areal feature. The replacement of *-(ʔ)ən by *-akən* may have been motivated by a need to reduce the high functional load of *-(ʔ)ən. The form *-aké* is tentatively explained as a low register back-formation from *-akən*.

1. INTRODUCTION. In this paper, I present evidence from various Javanese dialects to show that the standard Javanese suffixes *-aké* and *-akən* have only recently become part of the Javanese morpheme inventory and have replaced an earlier Javanese transitive suffix *-(ʔ)ən.[1] They were not part of Proto-Javanese morphology. This puts the position of Old Javanese among Javanese dialects into a different perspective: this historical variety is not a direct predecessor of standard Javanese, but more like an "older sister" dialect.

My investigation is based on a comparison of the following Javanese dialects: standard Javanese (Uhlenbeck 1978, Ogloblin 2005), Tengger Javanese (Smith-Hefner 1983, 1988; Conners 2008), East Javanese (Smith-Hefner 1983, 1988), Cirebon Javanese (Ewing 2005), Banten Javanese (Munadi Patmadiwiria 1977), Old Javanese (Zoetmulder 1983a), and field data from Purwokerto, Gombong, Banyumas (Central Java), and Blitar and Tulung Agung (East Java).[2]

"Standard Javanese" is the variety of Javanese that developed at the courts of Yogyakarta and Surakarta (Central Java). It provided the basis for modern written Javanese and is considered a standard in other parts of Java. It has various speech levels marked for

1. I would like to thank Novi Djenar (University of Sydney), Michael Ewing (University of Melbourne), Waruno Mahdi (Max Planck Institute, Berlin), Sasha Ogloblin (University of St. Petersburg), John Wolff (Cornell University), and two anonymous referees for their valuable feedback on earlier versions of this paper. They are not responsible for any mistakes left in the present version.

2. These field data were collected as part of a research project "Dialect variation in Javanese: an integrated historical-linguistic and typological analysis," which was supported with a grant (No. DP0663938) from the Australian Research Council.

politeness, including a low speech level (called "ngoko" or low Javanese), which uses the suffix *-aké*, and a high speech level ("karma" or high Javanese),[3] using *-akən*. Other dialects do not have significant speech level contrasts or try to emulate the high speech levels of standard Javanese. Tengger Javanese is spoken around Mount Bromo in East Java. Cirebon Javanese is the dialect of northwest Java, east of Jakarta on the border between the Javanese and Sundanese speech areas. Banten Javanese is an isolate dialect spoken west of Jakarta in the extreme northwest of the island of Java. Old Javanese is defined as a basically Central Javanese historical dialect that underwent East Javanese influence and appears in inscriptions and manuscripts from the ninth to the fifteenth century in Java, as well as in more recent manuscripts in Bali (cf. Ogloblin 2005:590).

All these dialects have the transitive suffix *-i*, which is usually called a "locative suffix" because its core function is to add a locative orientation to the base it is attached to. They also have suffixes that are functionally more or less equivalent to standard Javanese *-aké* (/*-akən*), although they may be different in shape or even historically unrelated. The functions of *-aké*/*-akən* and equivalent suffixes are wider in scope and more complex than those of *-i*, and they tend to differ slightly across dialects. Furthermore, although *-akən* is marked for (high) register in standard Javanese, it is often not marked as such in other dialects, including Old Javanese and Banten Javanese. It is, in fact, register-neutral in comparative-historical hindsight. However, what *-aké*/*-akən* and these equivalent suffixes do have in common is that they can make the host verb transitive or change its valency. They can add an instrumental, comitative, and benefactive orientation to the verb, and they form causative verbs as well as verbs meaning 'consider as [base]'. In some cases, they change the meaning of the host verb rather than its valency, or they indicate that there is an implied third argument or a complement (Uhlenbeck 1978:117–26). For want of a more accurate term, in what follows I will call them "general transitive suffixes."

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives the different histories of general transitive suffixes in Old Javanese and standard Javanese. Section 3 discusses the general transitive suffixes in other Javanese dialects, which are often formally different from *-aké* and *-akən*. One of these suffixes, Tengger *-(ʔ)ən*, has cognates occurring in marginal position in standard Javanese. It must be inherited from Proto-Javanese, the hypothetical stock language ancestral to all Javanese dialects. Section 4 is an attempt to explain the formal differences between *-aké* and *-akən*. Section 5 gives a possible explanation of the origin of *-akən* and the conditions that led to the replacement of *-(ʔ)ən. Section 6 presents the conclusion.

2. STANDARD JAVANESE *-aké* AND *-akən* ARE NOT INHERITED FROM OLD JAVANESE. There is a significant difference between the morphophonemic processes involved in the suffixation of *-akən* in Old Javanese and those of *-aké* and *-akən* in standard Javanese in cases where these suffixes are attached to a root with a final vowel. This is clearly demonstrated in Zoetmulder's examples (1983a:42–47). In Old Javanese, vowel reduction and contraction apply: the final *a* of a root merges in a long *ā* with the initial *a* of *-akən*; root-final *i* is shortened to *y*, and root-final *u* and *ŏ* to *w*. Compare:

3. For the sake of simplicity, the characterization of Javanese speech levels is kept at an elementary level in this paper. In reality, the structure of Javanese speech levels is more complex.

(1) kawaśa ‘dominated’ kumawaśākən ‘to have power over; to subdue’
dadi ‘to become’ aŋdadyakən ‘to bring into existence, generate, cause’
parahu ‘boat’ (m)amarahwakən ‘to ship, transport by boat’
-rəŋö ‘to hear’ aŋrəŋwakən ‘to listen to’

In standard Javanese, a glottal stop (written *k* in standard spelling) emerges between final vowels and *-aké*/*-akən*. Furthermore *i* and *é* are lowered to *è*, and *u* is lowered to *ò*. Compare the following low Javanese word pairs:

(2) kuwasa[4] ‘power; powerful’ ŋuwasaʔaké ‘to give power/authority to’
dadi ‘become’ ndadèʔaké ‘to make into’
prau ‘ship’ mraòʔaké ‘to transport by ship’
ruŋu ‘to hear’ ŋruŋòʔaké ‘to listen to’
səpélé ‘of no importance; very little’ ñəpèlèʔaké ‘to consider of no importance’

Note that in the spoken Javanese of Yogyakarta and Surakarta, the first vowel in *-aké* is as a rule not pronounced (yielding the pronunciations [ŋuwasaʔke], [ndadɛʔke], [mraoʔke] and so on in the above cases).

Compare also the following high Javanese word pairs exhibiting the same changes:

(3) ŋəndika ‘to talk’ ŋəndikaʔakən ‘to talk about’
mantu ‘child-in-law’ mantòʔakən ‘to hold a wedding for (one’s child)’
jagi ‘to guard’ njagèʔakən ‘to look after, take care of’
supé ‘to forget’ dipunsupèʔakən ‘to be made to forget’
prayogi ‘sensible deliberation; fit, suitable’ dipunprayogèʔakən ‘to be approved, passed; recommended, considered appropriate’

Old Javanese has retained the Proto-Austronesian (PAN) final diphthongs *-ay and *-aw, and roots ending in one of these have *-akən* suffixed to them without (apparent) complications. Standard Javanese, however, has reduced these diphthongs to mid-vowels *-é* and *-o*, respectively. Suffixation of *-aké* and *-akən* after roots ending in these mid-vowels requires the insertion of a glottal stop and brings about vowel lowering from *é* [e] to *è* [ɛ] and from *o* [o] to *ò* [ɔ]. These morphophonemic adaptations are demonstrated on the basis of reflexes of Proto–Malayo-Polynesian *gaway ‘ceremonial or ritual activity, work’, which became Old Javanese (OJ) *gaway* ‘work, task, occupation; work, product; feast, celebration’, and standard Javanese (SJ) *gawé* ‘work, task’. Compare:

(4) OJ gaway aŋgawayakən ‘to make (something)’
SJ gawé ŋgawèʔaké ‘to make on behalf of (someone)’

Zoetmulder (1983a) also mentions semantic differences between Old Javanese *-akən* and standard Javanese *-aké*/*-akən*. The latter are often recipient-oriented. Old Javanese *-akən* forms, on the other hand, can only be recipient-oriented if they also have (*N*-)*pa-* prefixed. The contrast was already apparent in the above example of *ŋgawèʔaké* vs. *aŋgawayakən*. Compare also:

4. Note that in standard Javanese pronunciation, word-final *a* is rounded to [ɔ], and so is any *a* in an open syllable directly preceding a word-final rounded *a*; hence *purwa* ‘ancient’ is pronounced [purwɔ], and *kuwasa* becomes [kuwɔsɔ].

(5)	(gaway) aŋgawayakən 'to make'	magawayakən 'to make on behalf of' [N-pa-gaway-akən]
	carita 'to tell'	macaritākən 'to tell on behalf of ' [N-pa-carita-akən]
	ajar 'communication; teaching'	pinājarakən 'to discuss on behalf of' [p<in>a-ajar-akən]

These dialectal differences between Old and standard Javanese (especially the morphophonemic ones) tell us two important things. First, the standard Javanese adaptations involving the insertion of a glottal stop are very different from the vowel reduction phenomena in Old Javanese, and it is phonetically very unlikely that they are a continuation of the latter. Rather, it seems that the acquisition of general transitive suffixes in both dialects is the result of two separate historical events. If so, these events can only have happened *after* these dialects had become separate entities. In other words, on the basis of these differences, it is unlikely that *-aké* and *-akən* already existed in Proto-Javanese. If the standard Javanese adaptations were derived from the Old Javanese ones, the expected outcome would at least involve some form of rationalization, but this is not the case. On the contrary: the suffixation of *-akən* to roots ending in a vowel is much less disruptive to the overall word structure of Old Javanese than the suffixation of *-aké* and *-akən* is to the overall word structure of standard Javanese, in that (a) it does not involve a glottal stop in intervocalic position; (b) it keeps to a minimum the length of derivations (adding only one syllable to them); and (c) it involves sandhi rules that conform to those applying to suffixes that are verifiably inherited from Proto–Malayo-Polynesian (such as *-ən* and *-an*).[5]

In standard Javanese and other dialects, however, suffixation of *-aké* and *-akən* to roots ending in a vowel (a) involves the introduction of glottal stop in intervocalic position (which breaches the phonotactic structure of inherited Javanese words); (b) creates awkwardly long derivations (adding two syllables to the root); and (c) involves a set of adaptation rules that do not apply to the suffixation of inherited affixes. It is, therefore, extremely unlikely that the morphophonemic adaptations in standard Javanese are derived from those in Old Javanese.

Second, historically, the standard Javanese dialect is unlikely to be the direct continuation of Old Javanese; that is, it cannot have developed from it in a gradual and regular way. While this observation is based on morphophonemic evidence, it may not come as a total surprise in light of what is already known from historical linguistics about the indirect nature of genetic linguistic relations in parallel cases: it is well known, for example, that modern Romance languages have not directly evolved from literary Latin, Sanskrit is not ancestral to Hindi or Punjabi, and Old English did not generate Middle English. Nevertheless, it is important to make the observation once again in the context of a historical study of Javanese, because it is often assumed (implicitly or explicitly) that standard Javanese did evolve directly from Old Javanese (cf. Ras 1970, Nothofer 1980, Sirk 1996, Poedjosoedarmo 2002:320). Sirk (1996:193, footnote 4) writes "the morphophonological rules of adding *-akən* to bases have changed since the Old Javanese period." This somehow presupposes that there is only one language, which has been subject to

5. For the sake of completeness, a third morphophonemic change involving vowel-initial suffixes is *-n*-epenthesis, which happens in both Old and standard Javanese when transitive *-i* is suffixed.

rules that have changed over time. But in fact, there are two language varieties, each with its own rules to suffix *-akən* and *-aké* (whether or not these rules were introduced at different points in time).

In very general terms, the notion that present-day (standard) Javanese is not just a gradual continuation from Old Javanese is not new. Zoetmulder (1983b:24–36) already argued this in relation to Old, Middle, and modern Javanese.[6] However, he was primarily referring to the historical periods to which these varieties pertain as literary languages. These periods show a considerable overlap, to the point that in the sixteenth century all three languages were used at the same time in Javanese literature. Zoetmulder was particularly concerned with the difficulty in defining the Middle Javanese period between that of Old and modern Javanese. At one point, he speculated that Middle Javanese and modern Javanese might in fact "represent two separate and divergent branches of one and the same language [Old Javanese]" (Zoetmulder 1983b:31), but he concluded that this could not have been the case because of the occurrence of linguistic commonalities that are shared between Middle and modern Javanese but missing in Old Javanese. As an example of the latter, he presented one word, which is found with divergent meanings in modern and Middle Javanese and has no cognate in Old Javanese.[7] Zoetmulder only obliquely addressed the issue of the historical relationship between modern (standard) Javanese and Old Javanese as linguistic organisms, and the evidence he presented to demonstrate that this relationship was not a direct one is not significant.

3. GENERAL TRANSITIVE SUFFIXES ACROSS JAVANESE DIALECTS AND PROTO-JAVANESE *-(ʔ)ən. General transitive suffixes in Javanese dialects are not always cognates of *-aké* or *-akən*. Tengger Javanese has a corresponding *-ən* (which becomes *-ʔən* after vowels).[8] The dialects of Purwokerto, Banyumas, and Gombong (in the southwestern part of Central Java) have *-na* (*-ʔ(ə)na* after vowels), those of Blitar and Tulung Agung (in the southwestern part of East Java) have *-né* (*ʔné* postvocalically), and the Surabaya dialect of East Java has *-no* (postvocalic *-ʔno*). The *-no* (/*-ʔno*) suffix has the same origin as *-na* (*-ʔna*), and in what follows I will refer to both as *-(ʔ)na. Cirebon Javanese has the competing forms *-(ʔ,k)(ə)naŋ* and *-(ʔ,k)akən*, with no apparent difference in meaning or distribution. While there are more verbs with *-(ʔ,k)(ə)naŋ* than with *-(ʔ,k)akən*, both in terms of types and tokens, each of these suffixes has variant forms with or without *k*, *ʔ*, and *ə* (Ewing 2005:48). The Banten dialect in far Northwest Java does have *-(k)akən*, but its suffixation involves different morphophonemic rules from the ones applying to Old Javanese *-akən*.[9] These various general transitive suffixes are subsidiary evidence that *-aké* and *-akən* did not yet occur in Proto-Javanese.

6. Middle Javanese is a literary language used from the fourteenth to the late seventeenth century, and is more or less intermediate between Old and modern Javanese. It was generally used in Bali for the production of Kidung poetry, and hence shows very little influence from Islam; however, these are no absolute criteria for its definition (Ogloblin 2008).
7. The word in question is *andika*, which means 'command, order' in Middle Javanese, and refers to the speech of a person of high social status addressing a person of lower status (Zoetmulder 1983b:32).
8. Somewhat confusingly, the glottal stop in *-ʔən* and *-ʔna* is written with a *k* in Smith-Hefner (1983), but with an apostrophe in Smith-Hefner (1988).

Tengger Javanese *-(ʔ)ən* is of particular historical interest.[10] It occurs with active and passive verbs in the indicative mood, as shown in the following examples involving *ŋ-gawè-ʔən* 'to make (for someone)' (< *gawé* 'work') and *di-silih-ən* 'be lent to' (< *-silih* '[act of] borrowing'):[11]

(6) a. Dèwèʔné ŋ-gawè-ʔən səga mboʔ.
3 ACT-work-TR rice mother
'He makes/made rice for mother.' (Smith-Hefner 1988:209)

b. Arit-é di-silih-ən naŋ Sukir.
sickle-DEF PASS-borrow-TR to Sukir
'The sickle is/was loaned to Sukir.' (Smith-Hefner 1988:209)

This general transitive suffix is maintained in active imperative constructions; compare *ŋ-ətər-ən* in the following sentence:

(7) ŋ-ətər-ən torun!
ACT-accompany-TR contribution
'Deliver this gift/contribution!' (Smith-Hefner 1988:210)

However, it is substituted with *-ʔna* in passive imperative constructions, as seen in *tukò-ʔna* in the following example, which derives from *tuku* 'to buy' (apparently via a form ?*nukò-ʔən* 'to buy on behalf of'):[12]

(8) Tukò-ʔna rujak!
buy-GNRL.TR+ PASS+IMP k.o.spicy.fruit.salad
'Buy (him/her) *rujak*!'

To confuse the matter, note that an identical—or, at least, homonymous—suffix also appears with imperative passive verbs that would normally not receive the general transitive suffix. This *-(ʔ)ən* also emerges in standard Javanese imperative passive constructions; compare the verb *-jajal* '(act of) trying', which appears as *jajal-ən* in the following imperative passive construction (which is presented simultaneously as a Tengger and standard Javanese sample sentence by Smith-Hefner);

(9) Klambi iki, jajal-ən!
shirt this try-PASS+IMP
'Try (on) this shirt!' (Smith-Hefner 1988:208)

In standard Javanese verbs in the indicative mood, *-aké* and *-akən* generally combine with affixes expressing voice. However, in nonindicative moods, they are replaced by other suffixes: imperative forms take *-na* (*-ʔna* after vowels), and propositional 1st person forms take *taʔ-* + *-né* (*-ʔné* after vowels). (As stated above, *-(ʔ)ən* also appears in the imper-

9. The data in Munadi Patmadiwiria (1977) show that, in Banten Javanese, *-akən* appears after consonants and *-kakən* after vowels; preceding final high vowels are not lowered, hence *dadi* 'to become' and *tuku* 'to buy' yield *ŋə-dadi-kakən* 'to make, cause to become' and *tuku-kakən* 'to buy on behalf of someone', respectively. This source does not clarify whether the first *k* in *-kakən* is realized as [k] or [ʔ].
10. Thomas Conners (2008:209–10) notes that this suffix is in the process of being replaced by its East Javanese equivalent *-na*.
11. Abbreviations not found in the Leipzig Rules are ACT, active; GNRL, general.
12. While the existence of such a derivation logically follows from Smith-Hefner's (1988) argumentation, the derivation itself is actually missing in both her (1983) and (1988) publications.

ative, but only in passive forms of verbs that normally have no general transitive suffix. Note also that the imperative mood is not used in high Javanese.) The various derivations are shown below on the basis of the root *jupuk* 'to take' (taken from Ogloblin 2005:600):

(10)	indicative verb without *-aké*	n-jupuk 'to take'
	imperative passive of verb without *-aké*	jupuk-ən! 'take it!'
	active verb with *-aké*	n-jupuk-aké 'to fetch (for s.o. else)'
	passive verb with *-aké*	di-jupuk-aké 'to fetch (for s.o. else)'
	imperative of verb with *-aké*	jupuk-na! 'fetch it (for s.o. else)!'
	propositional of verb with *-aké*	taʔ-jupuk-né 'let me fetch it (for s.o. else)'

Given that neither *-aké* nor *-akən* can be attributed to Proto-Javanese, they should be discarded as foreign bodies concealing the early history of Javanese transitive suffixation. On the other hand, there is good reason to consider standard Javanese *-(ʔ)ən*, *-na*, and *-né* as residual forms from an earlier stage. Comparison of *-na* and *-né* suffixes with the evidence from Tengger Javanese indicates that they historically consist of a transitive suffix *-(ʔ)ən followed by one of the irrealis suffixes *-e or *a. Originally, the morpheme structure of *-na* and *-né* must have been as follows:

(11)	jupuk-na	<	*jupuk-ən-a ROOT-GNRL.TR-IRR
	taʔ-jupuk-né	<	*taʔ-jupuk-ən-ay 1-ROOT-GNRL.TR-PASS.IRR

The loss of schwa in *-(ʔ)ən-*a* and *-(ʔ)ən-*é* is clearly the result of vowel reduction. While such reduction is to be expected (especially in long derivations), it has not happened in the passive imperative marker *-(ʔ)ən attached to simple verbs. This is no doubt because many verb bases end in a consonant, and the maintenance of schwa is essential to avoid word-final consonant clusters (for example, **jupuk-n*), which are unacceptable in the word structure of Javanese.

On the basis of standard Javanese and Old Javanese evidence only, Wolff traces the standard Javanese passive imperative *-(ʔ)ən* from the PAN object focus suffix *-ən (Wolff 1973:76), and the propositional (Wolff's "hortative") suffix *-né* from the PAN irrealis passive suffix *-ay preceded by an epenthetic *-n-* (Wolff 1973:91). This agrees in principle with my analysis, although I would derive *-né* from a combination of PAN *-ən + *-ay, rather than from *-ay preceded by an epenthetic *-n-*.

Other authors hold that Tengger *-(ʔ)ən* and other dialects *-(ʔ)na are reflexes of, respectively, *-akən and *-akən-a. Smith-Hefner (1988:209) proposes that Tengger *-(ʔ)ən* derives from *-akən, arguing that "reduced or shortened lexical forms in Javanese are characteristically the result of a loss occurring in an initial rather than a second and/or final syllable. The Tengger *-ən* [my *-(ʔ)ən*] form in this case would seem to be etymologically related to the Old Javanese form *-akən,* which has the same meaning and which is, interestingly, retained in the kròmò [krama], polite level, of the standard. Loss of the first syllable of the Old Javanese form would leave the form *-ən*."

Sirk (1996:195, footnote 7) traces *-(ʔ)na to *-akən + *-a. He postulates an underlying *-[*a*][*k*]*na* that appears in the imperative in standard Javanese, and in the imperative and indicative in dialects: "[*a*] symbolises the sandhial change taking place in case the base

ends in a vowel: after consonant-final bases this [*a*] leaves no trace. [*k*] is similarly lost after a consonant, but if the base ends in a vowel, [*k*] is usually represented by a glottal stop." Sirk believes that "undoubtedly the suffix *-[a][k]na* goes back to the combination of *-akən* with the irrealis marker *-a*."

Nothofer (1975:171–74) and Conners (2008:239) reason along similar lines, tracing the standard Javanese imperative and irrealis suffix *-(ʔə)na* to *-akən + irrealis *-a. Conners also traces Tengger *-(ʔ)ən* to Old Javanese *-akən*.

These authors aprioristically take standard and literary forms as a historical reference point and attach too much value to the historicity of Old Javanese and high Javanese *-akən*, whereas vernacular and low register forms are generally no less likely to be historical. Some of them may also misinterpret the *k* written for a glottal stop on morpheme boundaries between a verbal base and the following general transitive suffix, identifying it as a reflex of *k instead of *ʔ. It is easy to see how they might have come to this identification. Both in the current official roman spelling of Javanese[13] and in traditional Javanese script, there is no distinct glottal stop sign, and the glottal stop heard before *-aké*/*-akən* is written as a *k* (for example, *ndadèʔaké*, mentioned in section 2, is spelled *ndadèkaké*, and so on). Furthermore, in some dialects, the historical glottal stop on morpheme boundaries even ended up being pronounced as [k]. As already mentioned above, Cirebon Javanese has the competing forms *-(ə)naŋ, -ʔ(ə)naŋ*, and *-k(ə)naŋ*, as well as *-akən*, *-ʔakən*, and *-kakən* (Ewing 2005). Compare furthermore the following examples from Banyumas and Purwokerto, in which the general transitive suffix *-na* has an allomorph *-k(ə)na* appearing after vowels:

(12) nulis 'to write' nulisna 'to write (on behalf of s.o.)'
ñilih 'to borrow' ñilihna 'to lend'
ana 'to be' ŋanakəna 'to organize'
dadi 'to become' ndadèkəna 'to make into; cause'

Nevertheless, given their formal differences, it is somewhat contrived to derive *-(ʔ)na historically from *-akən. The vowel loss may be easy to explain, but what about the change from historical *k to glottal stop, and the emergence of an additional final *a? It makes more sense to diagnose the postvocalic *ʔ* or *k* emerging before reflexes of both *-(ʔ)na and *-aké/*-akən as epenthetic stops, which are not part of the basic shape of their host suffix. If we would derive them from a historical *k, we should also consider as historical the *k* written in standard Javanese, such as in *ndadèkaké*, *ŋəndikakakən*, and *mantòkakən*. This would not make much sense: we would end up with a diagnostic suffix *-kakən, and would have to assume that it loses initial *k after a final consonant. We would also have to explain why its initial *k became a glottal stop in standard Javanese pronunciation, and why it does not show up in Old Javanese *-akən* (or, for that matter, in Indonesian *akan*, Madurese *-aghi*, and cognate forms in other Austronesian languages). The formal variety in Cirebon Javanese is noteworthy in this respect, because it shows the free alternation of *k* and *ʔ* as epenthetic consonants in both *-(ʔ,k)(ə)naŋ* and *-(ʔ,k)akən* forms.

The analogy with reduced lexical forms made by Smith-Hefner in her attempt to trace *-(ʔ)ən* to *-akən is ad hoc. In a case like *tukò-ʔna*, there may seem to be an argument for an original *-*akən,* because the distinction between *k and *ʔ is neutralized to *ʔ* if these consonants immediately precede another consonant. However, this argument does not

13. However, earlier roman spellings of Javanese do distinguish a glottal stop in this position.

hold in *ŋ-gawè-ʔən*: according to Smith-Hefner, the *ʔ* in this form is supposed to reflect an intervocalic *k, but there is no precedent for an intervocalic *k becoming *ʔ* in Javanese phonological history (cf. Nothofer 1975). In Sirk's underlying -[*a*][*k*]*na* form, the [*a*] should explain the standard Javanese lowering of *i*, *é*, and *u* before suffixation of *-aké* and *-akən*; the [*k*] stands for the insertion of a glottal stop after vowels. However, this conditioned vowel lowering and inserted glottal stop are better explained by the suffix combination *-(ʔ)ən + *-a as proposed by me. Nothofer's *-(ʔ)(ə)na* also agrees much better with *-(ʔ)ən + *-a than with the more cumbersome *-akən + *-a combination.

Regarding Cirebon Javanese *-(ʔ,k)(ə)naŋ*, Ewing cautiously mentions that "this suffix is reminiscent of *-(k)na* [my *-(ʔ)na*] in standard Central Javanese," and that "Standard Central Javanese speakers to whom I have mentioned the Cirebon suffix *-nang* have assumed it is equivalent to *-(k)na*" (Ewing 2005:48). It is quite possible that *-(ʔ,k)(ə)naŋ* is related to *-(ʔ)na* (and hence is derived from *-ʔən-a). However, as already noted by Nothofer (1980:1974), this leaves unexplained the final velar nasal.

I persist in my claim that *-akən* is not related to *-(ʔ)ən* and *-(ʔ)na, and that *-akən* is a relatively recent suffix that has replaced an original *-(ʔ)ən. As seen above, the latter was generally maintained in Tengger Javanese, and it was maintained in other Javanese dialects in certain specific positions. In contrast, *-akən* and *-aké* have little historical foundation in (at least) standard Javanese (see section 2).

The form *-(ʔ)na must be derived from *-(ʔ)ən + *-a, and *-né* /*ʔné* must be derived from *-(ʔ)ən + *-ay, although it remains unclear what motivated these derivations, since *-a and *-ay were nonindicative modal suffixes. The same derivation also applies to the Cirebon Javanese forms *-(ə)naŋ*, *-ʔ(ə)naŋ*, and *-k(ə)naŋ*. These are no doubt more original than their competing forms *-akən*, *-ʔakən*, and *-kakən*, which must be borrowed from standard Javanese.

Old Javanese *-akna* can be analyzed as *-akən + *-a. It is somewhat similar in structure to *-(ʔ)na*, which probably added to the fact that it has often been taken for the ancestral form of this suffix. Of the Javanese dialects under discussion, Old Javanese appears to be the only one with *-a* directly suffixed to *-akən*.

4. POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS FOR THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STANDARD JAVANESE *-aké* AND *-akən*. There are several ways to approach the problem of two general transitive suffixes in standard Javanese.

From the perspective of language levels, many krama words originated as transformations of ngoko forms. If this is taken as a guideline, *-akən* should be a transformation of an original *-aké*, especially since krama transformations tend to end in consonants where their ngoko counterparts do not. However, a closer look shows that the *-aké*/*-akən* opposition does not really fall into any of the regular patterns along which krama words are formed. The pattern that comes closest, CVCV > CV*nt*V*n*, involves an intervocalic nasal + *t* cluster, which is missing in *-akən*; compare (ngoko) *dina* > (krama) *dintən* 'day', or (ngoko) *kira* > (krama) *kintən* 'thought, imagination' (cf. Uhlenbeck 1978:209).

From the perspective of Javanese history, it is clear that both suffixes are recent, now that it appears that they replaced an earlier (Proto-Javanese) *-(ʔ)ən, and that *-ʔna* and *-ʔné* are not derived from *-akən. Nevertheless, *-akən* seems to be more original and "older"

than *-aké*, because it is the only general transitive suffix in Old Javanese, as well as in various regional dialects. Therefore, whereas in standard Javanese the neutral ngoko forms (including *-aké*) are generally less marked than their krama counterparts, from a historical and cross-dialectal perspective, *-akən* is the default variant.

As indicated above, there is a tendency in Javanese to associate vocalic endings with low register, and nasal endings with high register. Instead of explaining *-akən* as a krama transformation of *-aké*, it may be more fruitful to explain *-aké* as a low Javanese back-formation of *-akən*: once the latter became grammaticalized, its word structure was felt as too krama-like, causing the creation of *-aké*. Such a development may sound unlikely, given the fact that, in the historical processes leading to the formation of standard Javanese registers, ngoko words were usually adapted to create krama words, and not the other way around. However, it becomes more conceivable if *-akən* were introduced from another language, as I propose in section 5.

Parallel cases where low Javanese has developed ngoko forms with final *-é* where possible original forms end in a nasal are *gəḍé* 'big', matching Malayic *gədAŋ (same meaning),[14] and *ko(w)é*, a 2nd person pronoun, matching *koən* with the same meaning in the Javanese vernaculars of Brebes/Tegal (Central Java's north coast; Nothofer 1981, map 31) and Probolinggo, Malang, and Surabaya (East Java; Soedjito et al. 1981).[15] That *gəḍé* must be derived from Malayic *gədAŋ is supported by the fact that it has a retroflex *ḍ,* which in Javanese is often evidence for borrowing. The evidence presented here is insufficient, and the case is presently not strong, but hopefully other pairs parallel to *gəḍé*/*gədAŋ and *ko(w)é*/*koən* will be found in the Javanese lexicon and can be added to the list.

When lined up, the evidence gives the following picture:

(13)

		Standard Ngoko Javanese
(Malayic) *gədAŋ	>	gəḍé
koən (dialectal)	>	ko(w)é
(high Javanese) -akən	>	-aké

Sirk (1996) tries to analyze *-aké*, *-akən*, *-(ʔ)ən, and other general transitive suffixes in Western Malayo-Polynesian languages by segmenting them and by looking for common core parts. Such an approach may generally be appropriate to trace the pathways of grammaticalization of linguistic elements. However, in the case of Javanese *-aké* and *-akən*, it strikes me as unduly speculative, because cross-dialectal evidence makes it sufficiently clear that they had not yet become suffixes in Proto-Javanese.

5. POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS FOR THE ORIGIN OF *-akən* AND THE REPLACEMENT OF *-(ʔ)ən. Suffixes corresponding in form and meaning to *-akən* are found in many languages in and around Java and Sumatra, including Malayic and Batak languages, Sundanese, Lampung, and Madurese. They are also found elsewhere in the Austronesian region, including Sulawesi. Javanese and Malay are the two languages for which we have fairly good insight into their regional and historical varieties. Interestingly, both agree in having reflexes of *akən with relatively short histories, as *akən can be reconstructed for neither Proto-Malayic nor Proto-Javanese. Fur-

14. Proto-Malayic *A stands for a vowel that was either *a or *ə.

15. Both *ko(w)é* and *koən* derive from *ko '2nd person pronoun'; cf. Nothofer (1980:171).

thermore, Malay still has a preposition *akan* alongside the transitive suffix *-kan*. In Old Malay and in regional variants such as Banjar Malay, *akən did become the suffix *-akan* but was not reduced to *-kan*, as happened in most other forms of Malayic. Some Malayic varieties never adopted *akən but obtained other suffixes or kept the reflex of an earlier transitive suffix *-An (in which *A is ambiguous for *a and *ə). The latter is the case with Minangkabau (West Sumatra) *-an* and Kanayatn (Kandayan, in West Borneo) *-atn* (Adelaar 1992). It is quite likely that this *-An was one of the original transitive suffixes in Proto-Malayic, making the Malayic and Javanese cases even more similar. Old Malay records from the late seventh century AD already exhibit *-akan*, which provides us with a date *ante quem* for the use of *aken as a bound form in Malayic.

One can only speculate about the origin of Javanese *-akən*, but given the various reflexes of *akən in the aforementioned languages of Indonesia, its spread in Sumatra, Java, and other Austronesian regions is most likely an areal feature. It is not clear where it ultimately came from. Both Malay and Javanese have a long history as hegemonic languages in western Indonesia and Malaysia (if not in insular South East Asia and Malaysia in general), and they have been influencing one another for more than a millennium. However, the fact that Malay has the oldest recorded history in the region, and the fact that it still has a reflex of *akən as a free form, makes this language a somewhat more likely direct source than Javanese. Starosta, Pawley, and Reid (2009) reconstruct a PAN preposition *akən, arguing that it became a transitive suffix in Proto–Malayo-Polynesian if it had not already become one in PAN. However, irrespective of the question as to whether or not *akən goes back that far, its history in Javanese and Malayic clearly shows that it had not yet become a suffix in the early histories of these languages. Furthermore, another problem with PAN *akən as proposed by Starosta, Pawley, and Reid is that one of its key reflexes, Proto-Oceanic *-akin, does not match, as PAN schwa should have become Proto-Oceanic *o, not *i (cf. Adelaar 1984:419, footnote 10).

The Banten Javanese dialect developed in relative isolation from other Javanese dialects and is the language of Javanese who migrated from Demak and Cirebon to Banten's north coast in the early sixteenth century (Munadi 1977, Sartono 1966). It must already have acquired its reflex of *akən before it became an isolate, which is not long ago in historical linguistic terms.[16]

A final question is why *akən replaced the earlier transitive marker *-(ʔ)ən. Again, one can only speculate, but a possible explanation is that *-(ʔ)ən had too many functions, and the adoption of another suffix as a general transitive marker would have helped to reduce the functional load of this suffix and avoid ambiguity. (In standard Javanese, *-(ʔ)ən is used to derive stative verbs, passive imperative verbs, and nouns, and it is also part of several circumfixes.) In Malayic varieties, a similar functional overload may have favored the adoption of *-akən: *-an* (< *-An) as a verbal suffix already expresses plurality of subject, diffuse action, and reciprocality; as a nominalizing suffix, it expresses the goal or place of an action;

16. In the less likely case that it had not yet acquired it by then, it could also have done so independently after it became isolated, given that the spread of *akən as an areal feature was not limited to contiguous Javanese varieties but also affected many other languages in the Java and Sumatra region. Being situated on Java's north coast puts the Banten area within reach of cosmopolitan influences.

and reflexes of *-An are also part of several circumfixes. In Malayic varieties, the ambiguity is further exacerbated by the merger of the original PAN suffixes *-ən and *-an as *-an*.

6. CONCLUSION. Comparison of Javanese dialects (including Old Javanese) clearly shows that the suffixes *-aké* and *-akən* are relative newcomers in the Javanese affix inventory, and that their origins cannot be attributed to Proto-Javanese. They appear to have replaced Proto-Javanese *-(ʔ)ən, which is still extant as the default general transitive suffix in Tengger Javanese but has all but disappeared from standard Javanese and Old Javanese. This has important consequences for the history of Javanese and for comparative Austronesian linguistics in general.

The different morphophonemic adaptations involved in the suffixation of *-akən* and *-aké* in Old Javanese and standard Javanese show that the former dialect is not a direct historical (or "genetic") predecessor of the latter.

The history of Javanese *-aké* and *-akən* is also relevant to PAN morphosyntax. Starosta, Pawley, and Reid (1982) assumed that PAN *akən (basically a preposition making noncore arguments definite and raising them to direct objects) had already become a suffix in Proto–Malayo-Polynesian. Javanese evidence does not support this, because in early Javanese history *-aké* and *-akən* had not yet become suffixes. At any rate, if there is a connection at all between PAN *akən and Javanese *-aké*/*-akən*, it cannot simply be qualified as the result of a gradual process in which a PAN preposition on the verge of becoming a suffix became fully grammaticalized as a suffix in Javanese.

Proto-Javanese *-(ʔ)ən is rather similar in form and function to the Proto-Malayic general transitive suffix *-An, which was replaced by *-kan* and other signifiers in all mainstream Malayic varieties. Both Proto-Javanese *-(ʔ)ən and Proto-Malayic *-An must be cognate and eventually derive from the PAN undergoer suffix *-*ən*.

REFERENCES

Adelaar, Alexander. 1984. Some Proto-Malayic affixes. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 140(4):402–21.

———. 1992. *Proto-Malayic: A reconstruction of its phonology and part of its morphology and lexicon.* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Conners, Thomas J. 2008. Tengger Javanese. PhD diss., Yale University.

Ewing, Michael C. 2005. *Grammar and inference in conversation. Identifying clause structure in spoken Javanese.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Munadi Patmadiwiria. 1977. *Dialek Jawa Banten — Banten.* Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.

Nothofer, Bernd. 1975. *The reconstruction of Proto–Malayo-Javanic.* Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 73. The Hague: Nijhoff.

———. 1980. *Dialektgeographische Untersuchungen in West-Java und im westlichen Zentral-Java. Teil 1:Text.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

———. 1981. *Dialektatlas von Zentral-Java.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Ogloblin, Alexander K. 2005. Javanese. In *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar,* ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 590–624. London: Routledge.

———. 2008, In search of Middle Javanese. In *Language and text in the Austronesian world. Studies in Honour of Ülo Sirk*, ed. by Yuri A. Lander and Alexander K. Ogloblin, 31–45. LINCOM Studies in Austronesian Linguistics 06. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Poedjosoedarmo, Gloria R. 2002. Changes in word order and noun phrase marking from Old to modern Javanese: implications for understanding developments in western Austronesian 'focus' systems. In *The history and typology of Western Austronesian voice systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 311–30. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Ras, J. J. 1970. Lange consonanten in enige Indonesische talen II. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 126(4):429–47.

Ross, Malcolm D. 1995. Some current issues in Austronesian linguistics. In *Comparative Austronesian dictionary: An introduction to Austronesian studies*, ed. by Darrell T. Tryon, vol. 1, 45–120. Trends in Linguistics Documentation 10. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sartono Kartodirdjo. 1966. The peasants' revolt of Banten in 1888. Its conditions, course and sequel. A case study of social movements in Indonesia. PhD diss., University of Amsterdam.

Sirk, Ülo. 1996. On the history of transitive verb suffixes in the languages of western Indonesia. In *Papers in Austronesian linguistics No. 3*, ed. by Hein Steinhauer, 191–205. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Smith-Hefner, Nancy J. 1983. *Language and social identity: Speaking Javanese in Tengger.* PhD diss., University of Michigan. University Microfilms International 8324289.

———. 1988. Cara Tengger: Notes on a non-standard dialect of Javanese. In *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*, ed. by Richard McGinn, 203–33. Monographs in International Studies Southeast Asia Series, Number 76. Athens (Ohio): Ohio Center for International Studies, Center for Southeast Asia Studies.

Soedjito, Abdul Syukur Ibrahim, I. L. Marsoedi Oetama, and Imam Hanafi. 1981. *Sistem morfologi kata kerja bahasa Jawa dialek Jawa Timur.* Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.

Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley, and Lawrence A. Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, vol. 2: *Tracking the travellers*, ed. by Amran Halim, Lois Carrington, and S. A. Wurm, 201–16. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Uhlenbeck, E. M. 1978. *Studies in Javanese morphology.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection in Proto-Austronesian. In *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez*, ed. by A. B. Gonzalez, 71–91, Quezon City: Philippine Journal of Linguistics (Special Monograph 4).

Zoetmulder, P. J. 1983a*, De taal van het Adiparwa. Een grammaticale studie van het Oudjavaans.* Dordrecht (Netherlands)/Cinnaminson (New Jersey): Foris Publications.

———. 1983b. *Kalangwan: Sastra Jawa Kuno, Selayang Pandang.* Jakarta: Penerbit Djembatan.

karlaa@unimelb.edu.au