LITERA
Vol. 24 No. 1, March 2025
https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/litera/issue/view/2859
DOI: https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v24i1.76728

The phonological changes of Surinamese Javanese: A language contact perspective

Zainur Rofiq*
Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: zainurrofiq@uin-malang.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This article aims at discussing the phonological variation of Surinamese Javanese in language contact with Dutch and Sranantongo. It has been conducted to scrutinize the specific differences regarding the phonology in Surinamese Javanese in comparison to its counterpart in Indonesia. The study involved the recordings of 16 native speakers of Surinamese Javanese and the recordings of 7 native speakers of Indonesian Javanese, all narrating a picture-story in Javanese Ngoko. The results disclose five phonological alternations: palatal plosive to voiceless and voiced alveolo-palatal affricates, vowel shift from central close-mid to front close, nasal-stop combinations, retroflex to non-retroflex plosive changes, and the change of alveolar nasal to velar nasal in suffixes. These suggest influences from Dutch and Sranan as well as independent developments in Surinamese Javanese. The general finding of the study is that language contact in the multilingual environment of Suriname significantly impacted the phonology of Surinamese Javanese, giving it a dynamic nature of language change under these circumstances.

Keywords: Surinamese Javanese, phonological variations, language contact, multilingual environment

Article history

Submitted:	Accepted:	Published:
3 August 2024	26 November 2024	31 March 2025

Citation (APA Style):
Rofiq, Z. (2025). The phonological changes of Surinamese Javanese: A language contact perspective. *LITERA, 24*(1), 52-60. https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v24i1.76728

INTRODUCTION

Javanese language is part of the Austronesian language family and originates from Java (*Jawa*), the most populous Island in Indonesia. It is spoken by approximately 70 million people worldwide (Ewing, 2005), who primarily reside in Central Java, Yogyakarta, East Java, and other parts of the Indonesian archipelago, primarily due to migration and inter-ethnic marriage. However, the language is also spoken in other parts of the world, such as Suriname, South America. The Javanese language was introduced into Suriname through a multifaceted historical migratory process.

Between 1890 and 1939, approximately 33,000 Javanese were transported to Suriname as indentured laborers, primarily to work on the sugar plantations. The laborers were imported from the Dutch East Indies, now known as Indonesia, to compensate for the deficit that had arisen following the official abolition of slavery in 1863 (Darmoko, 2017). The census reveals that Javanese speakers make up 15% of the total Surinamese population in 2004 (Yakpo & Muysken, 2014), and are the descendants of 32,000 contracted laborers from different cities in Java during the Dutch colonial period in the 1800s. Around 8500 labors had returned to Indonesia until 1954 (Borges, 2014; Villerius, 2017), while some others lived there or moved to the Netherlands and that is the reason why most of them are bi/multilingual speakers with proficiency in Dutch and Sranan Tongo, a creole language and lingua franca of Suriname (Yakpo & Muysken, 2014).

Currently, the linguistic structure of the Surinamese Javanese community is transforming, as the majority of speakers have acquired fluency in at least two additional languages: Dutch and Sranantongo. Dutch is a school language and is increasingly used at home as the primary language for daily conversation, often replacing Javanese. Sranantongo, due to its informal acquisition, is primarily used in socialization. The decline of Javanese is one reason; another cause lies in the association of language and culture with backward rural life and underdevelopment (Villerius, 2018b). Dutch, which is associated with being more educated and a higher society, many people tend to prefer it compared to Javanese, which is sometimes viewed as an embarrassment. Children often develop an inferiority complex when speaking Javanese in school, as they may be ridiculed. A widely held perception in

Suriname is that the use of Javanese at home may hinder children's ability to learn Dutch, the language of school and social mobility.

Consequently, in many families, Dutch is more prevalent at home, and Javanese has even less chance of being passed on to the next generation. While many regard this view as accurate, it has been slowly rebutted by scholars and has even become a subject of discussion among Surinamese authorities. However, this view remained dominant, especially among the less educated and rural populations. Several members of the youth attribute their limited command of Javanese to this language shift in their families (Villerius, 2018a).

Indeed, the multilingual nature of the Suriname community provides a greater possibility for the aspect(s) of the Javanese language to undergo any changes, including its grammatical markers (Villerius et al., 2017). Therefore, it might be fair to expect that Surinamese Javanese diverges phonologically from Indonesian Javanese as a result of language contact in the multilingual environment of Suriname.

The phonological system of the Javanese language is complex and possesses unique features and diversities. Researchers have identified the distinct characteristics of this language through its phonology, sound shifts, phonotactics, and phonological processes. Yannuar et al. (2022) explore the phonological structure of Malangan Javanese through Basa Walikan Malangan, an inverted language. The researchers found word-final stops, consonant clusters, and vowel lowering processes adhere to the phonological patterns of Malangan Javanese. This article underscores the fluidity of the vowel phonemes, in particular the development of the /ɔ/ as a new separate phoneme, earlier thought to be a variant of /a/. Furthermore, the morphologically motivated Phonological Readjustment theory stems from research conducted by Ekarina (2023), which focuses on the infixation process of -um- in Javanese. The research explains that infixation triggers phonological changes, thereby creating a general target for the process of phonology.

In addition, Al Haris (2017) also investigated the suffix /-i/ in Javanese and found that this suffix affects the word's phonology through the process of the creation of /n/ consonants and also weakens the vowel. Moreover, this suffix also functions to mark passive verbs and the iterative. Owing to its position as a dominant language in Indonesia, an archipelagic country, the phonology of Javanese is really influenced by regional dialects and language contacts. Such relations give birth to variations and alternations in its phonological patterns.

One such study, by Kartikasari and Laksono (2022), indicated distinct vocabularies and pronunciations in different regions of East Java, with five principal dialects and two sub-dialects. Along these same lines, the investigation by Zen and Starr (2021) examined how the Indonesian language has influenced the phonology of Javanese in bilingual children. This pointed to a two-way shift in coronal stops, motivated by Indonesian phonology. The change in the difference was suggested to be due to variation and, therefore, was language-dependent, both socially and geographically. Senowarsito and Ardini (2019) conducted research into the influence of Javanese phonology systems on English pronunciation. They identified the common issues that take place in the pronunciation of Vowels and Consonants among the Javanese EFL learners, which are the results of phonological fossilization. This review has shown that Javanese phonology is complicated and dynamically changing, guided by elaborate phonological processes, regional variation, and the influence of language contact.

The Surinamese linguistic landscape reflects a long and troubled history of colonization, migrations, and cultural interaction. Studies on contact dynamics between the languages spoken in Suriname have shown the influence it has, for example, on language use, identity, and linguistic change. In terms of linguistic diversity and language use, Suriname is home to a remarkable variety of languages due to its historical migration patterns. Carlin (2006) argues that even with a population of less than 500,000, Surinamese speak 19 different languages, which are Amerindian, Creole, and Eurasian. The official language is Dutch, while the lingua franca is Sranantongo. This can be traced back to historical migration and the integration of different ethnic groups. Furthermore, A school survey conducted by Carlin et al. (2014) identified multilingualism as a norm among Surinamese schoolchildren. The research showed that, in everyday communication, children use at least two, in most cases even more, languages. Children in Suriname have developed a positive attitude towards multilingualism; therefore, they wish to learn and use both local and international languages.

Language contact and change have been significantly influential in the formation of Sranan Tongo, among other Surinamese Creoles. The research by Essegbey et al. (2013) sheds light on the role of Gbe languages and substratum influence due to language contact in the formation of Surinamese Creoles as paramount examples of how important linguistic and cultural interactions are in the evolution

of these languages. In the same vein, Yakpo and Muysken (2014) conducted other research on Sarnami: the Surinamese Hindustani language. They could identify profound changes that contact had engendered in the lexicon and grammar of Sarnami under the influences of Sranan Tongo and Dutch. These changes included the emergence of the SVO word order alongside the usual SOV order, pointing to the deep impacts that multilingualism has on the structure of language. Besides, in another study, Yakpo et al. (2015), elucidated that Suriname's linguistic diversity in practice is not static; it is dynamic in interaction. They consider languages in Suriname to be in a condition of dynamic interaction that facilitates the emergence of convergence and other instances of linguistic integration. This comes out clearly through the dynamism inherent in the way linguistic practices among various ethnic groupings shift and change over time.

All in all, Suriname is a multilingual lively entity crafted by history, migrations, colonial legacies, and continuing multilingual contact. Until now, language contact in Suriname has meant numerous linguistic changes, the process of Creole formation, and the dynamic interrelation between language and identity.

For the purpose of the present article, the author looked at four consonants and one vowel variable that occur in three phonological contexts: the initial, medial, and final positions. The Surinamese Javanese speakers demonstrate important phonological differences in those variables from the speakers living in the mainland of Java at present.

METHOD

The present study adopted a comparative phonological approach, as it aims to find the differences between Surinamese and Indonesian Javanese on spoken narratives produced by native speakers from each of these dialects. For this research, data were elicited with the participation of 16 native speakers of Surinamese Javanese and seven native Indonesian Javanese speakers who are all fluent in Javanese *Ngoko*—the informal level of Javanese speech. Participants were selected on the basis of their use of Javanese in everyday communication in order to ensure their dialectal competence.

Audio recordings of spontaneous narratives based on a picture book entitled *The Frog Story* serve as the primary data source, given that this has been one of the most widely recognized methods of eliciting naturalistic and spontaneous speech. This procedure should serve effectively in eliciting authentic patterns of speech, a requirement for capturing the genuine phonological variations in the speech analysis (Berman & Slobin, 2013). The recording was done with high-quality equipment to ensure that the phonetic details were clear, with all sessions being conducted in quiet rooms to avoid backgrounds that could interfere with the recording process. Afterwards, these recordings were transcribed for phonetic and phonological variation documentation between Surinamese and Indonesian Javanese speakers. Transcription was therefore done with extra caution to ensure that correct phonological variants were documented and compared between the two groups of speakers.

In an attempt to guarantee the validity of the study, a dual approach was employed. The audio recordings and their transcriptions were cross-checked by both me and a team of linguists (as mentioned in the acknowledgement) to limit errors or misinterpretations. This iterative process was used to address the fact that the phonetic features identified in the transcriptions were identical or as near identical to the original sound recordings. Furthermore, the phonological variants observed from the transcription were cross-checked with previous linguistic research on Javanese phonology to verify the validity of the findings. By so doing, it was deemed able to ensure the analysis represents the valid sound changes occurring due to language contact. Besides, the frequency distributions of the sound patterns were also taken into account. For example, how often the affricate [t͡ɕ] occurs as a variant of plosive [c] and the tables on the distribution of the other sound patterns for Surinamese and Indonesian Javanese speakers to provide numerical proof of variation and therefore serve to support further the claim that multilingual contact is responsible for these phonological changes.

In the present study, the analysis was conducted in the following steps. First, a phonetic comparison that involves prosodic features of vowel quality and consonant articulation is measured across the two dialects. For instance, the palatal plosive /c/, retroflex and non-retroflex plosives, and nasal-stop combinations were investigated in detail. Second, the occurrence of specific phonological variants in both dialects was quantified. Then, the frequencies were presented in tables to outline the differences between Surinamese and Indonesian Javanese. Next, the theoretical interpretation of the detected phonological differences was based on the relevant linguistic theories, especially those

concerning language contact and phonological variation. At this stage, findings were discussed within the context of previous studies on Javanese phonology and language change due to multilingualism. Finally, the comparison was presented in phonetic transcription and frequency distributions that enable a more systematic and clearer presentation of the differences between the two dialects, with some supporting evidence for the claim of language contact-induced phonological changes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

From the transcription and by listening to the recordings, the author examined five words that phonologically varied between Surinamese Javanese and Indonesian Javanese. Those words are *bocah* 'little kid', *weruh* 'to see', *mlayu* 'to run', *kodhok* 'frog', and *bolongan* 'hole'.

Bocah

In Javanese, the word *bocah* 'little kid' is often shortened to *cah* without any meaning changes. Based on the data, there were some phonological variations of the sound **c** in the medial position of the word *bocah* and that in the initial position of the word *cah* in Surinamese Javanese and Indonesian Javanese. The palatal plosive sound **c** varies with the voiceless alveolo-palatal affricate **t͡ɕ** and voiced alveolo-palatal affricate **d͡ʑ.** The author distinguishes these sounds by writing them orthographically different. The sound **c** is written in *c*, the sound **t͡ɕ** is written in *ty* (following Surinamese Javanese spelling), and the sound **d͡ʑ** is written in *j*.

Table 1. The phonological contexts of *cah,tyah, jah,* and *bocah, botyah, bojah*

No.	Variables	Initial	Medial	Final
1.	c (palatal plosive)	***c**ah*	*bo**c**ah*	
2.	t͡ɕ (voiceless alveolo-palatal affricate)	***ty**ah*	*bo**ty**ah*	
3.	d͡ʑ (voiced alveolo-palatal affricate)	***j**ah*	*bo**j**ah*	

The author quantified the occurrences of those three different sounds from the data, and the results can be illustrated in the table as follows:

Table 2. The frequency distribution of *bocah, cah, botyah, tyah, bojah, jah* variables

No.	Speakers	*bo**c**ah*	***c**ah*	*bo**ty**ah*	***ty**ah*	*bo**j**ah*	***j**ah*
1.	Surinamese Javanese	64	0	67	176	19	19
2.	Indonesian Javanese	18	29	0	0	0	0

From the data, Indonesian Javanese speakers produced the palatal plosive sound **c** for both initial (29 occurrences) and medial position (18 occurrences), but there was no sound variation found for this word. On the contrary, Surinamese Javanese speakers only produced the palatal plosive sound **c** for medial position (64 occurrences), but there was zero occurrence of this sound in the initial position. The rest of them produced voiceless alveolo-palatal affricate **t͡ɕ** with 176 occurrences in the initial position and 67 occurrences in the medial position and voiced alveolo-palatal affricate **d͡ʑ** with 19 occurrences for each medial and initial position.

Weruh

The word *weruh* is derived from the word *wruh, which means 'to know' (Conners, 2008), but there was a meaning shift from 'to know' to* 'to see'. The author suspected that this was due to the same Krama (the highest level of speech in Javanese) word *pirsa* for *ndelok* 'to see' and *wruh* 'to know'. In this sense, *wruh* has shifted into 'to see'. From this genealogy, *wruh* is generally pronounced as *weruh* with the central close-mid vowel sound **ə**. In the data, the author found a variant of this sound in the front close **i** sound in the word *wiruh.*

Table 3. The phonological contexts of *weruh* and *wiruh*

No.	Variables	Initial	Medial	Final
1.	ə (central close-mid)		*w**e**ruh*	
2.	i (front close)		*w**i**ruh*	

From the data, the author found 31 occurrences of the sound **ə** in the word *weruh* from Surinamese Javanese speakers and one occurrence of the same sound from the Indonesian Javanese variant. There was zero occurrence of the sound **i** from Indonesian Javanese speakers, but there were 20 occurrences of this sound from Surinamese Javanese speakers.

Table 4. The frequency distribution of *bocah, cah, botyah, tyah, bojah, jah* variables

No.	Speakers	*W**e**ruh*	*W**i**ruh*
1.	Surinamese Javanese	31	20
2.	Indonesian Javanese	1	0

Mlayu

The bilabial nasal sound **m** in the word *mlayu* occurs in the initial position. In the data, there is a variant of this sound that combines the bilabial nasal **m** with the bilabial plosive **b**, resulting in a heavy, nasalized **mb** sound in the word *mblayu.* In Javanese, this heavy nasalized consonant occurs frequently for words initiated by the bilabial plosive **b** sound, such as *mbakar* 'to burn', deriving from the stem *bakar* or *mbangun* 'to build', deriving from the stem *bangun.* It may also occur with the lateral sound **l** in the medial position as in *do**mbl**o* 'chubby in the cheeks', but there is no explanation for the combination of heavy nasalized consonant **mb** and lateral **l** in the initial position as found in the data.

Table 5. The phonological contexts of *mlayu* and *mblayu*

No.	Variables	Initial	Medial	Final
1.	m (bilabial nasal)	***ml**ayu*		
2.	mb (bilabial nasal + bilabial plosive)	***mbl**ayu*		

There were 23 occurrences of the bilabial nasal **m** and 21 occurrences of heavy nasalized **mb** of the word *mlayu* spoken by Surinamese Javanese speakers. Indonesian Javanese speakers produced nine occurrences of bilabial nasal **m** and one occurrence of heavy nasalized **mb** for the same word.

Table 6. The frequency distribution of *mlayu* and *mblayu*

No.	Speakers	***ml**ayu*	***mb**layu*
1.	Surinamese Javanese	23	21
2.	Indonesian Javanese	9	1

Kodhok

In Javanese, there are two sound variations of **d,** those are the retroflex-plosive **ɖ** and the alveolar-plosive **d.** These sounds are distinguished by the orthographic symbols of **dh** for the retroflex-plosive **ɖ** and **d** for the alveolar-plosive **d**. For example, the word *dhuwur* 'tall' is pronounced with the retroflex-plosive **ɖ**, while the word *dudu* 'not' is pronounced with the alveolar-plosive **d.** The word *kodhok* 'frog' is supposed to be pronounced with the retroflex-plosive **ɖ** in the medial position but the author found from the data that it is also pronounced with alveolar-plosive **d** (as illustrated in Table 7)**.**

Table 7. The phonological contexts of *kodhok* and *kodok*

No.	Variables	Initial	Medial	Final
1.	ɖ (retroflex-plosive)		*ko**dh**ok*	
2.	d (alveolar-plosive)		*ko**d**ok*	

There were 103 occurrences of alveolar-plosive **d** and 209 occurrences of retroflex-plosive **ɖ** in the word *kodhok* spoken by Surinamese Javanese speakers. There were 120 occurrences of the retroflex plosive **ɖ** and zero occurrences of alveolar-plosive **d** by the Indonesian Javanese speakers for the same word.

Table 8. The frequency distribution of *kodok* and *kodhok*

No.	Speakers	*Ko**d**ok*	*Ko**dh**ok*
1.	Surinamese Javanese	103	209
2.	Indonesian Javanese	0	120

Bolongan

The word *bolongan* 'hole' is derived from the stem *bolong* added by the suffix –an, which in Javanese functions as a substantivizer. In the data, the author found that the alveolar nasal **n** in the final position of this suffix varies with the velar nasal **ŋ** (as illustrated in Table 9 below)**.**

Table 9. The phonological contexts of *bolongan* and *bolongang*

No.	Variables	Initial	Medial	Final
1.	n (alveolar nasal)			*bolonga**n***
2.	ŋ (velar nasal)			*bolonga**ng***

Based on Table 10, there were 9 occurrences of the sound **n** and 1 occurrence of the sound **ŋ** in the word *bolongan* spoken by Surinamese Javanese speakers. There were 6 occurrences of the sound **n** and zero occurrences of the sound **ŋ** in the word *bolongan* spoken by Indonesian Javanese speakers.

Table 10. The frequency distribution of *bolongan* and *bolongang*

No.	Speakers	*Bolongan*	*Bolongang*
1.	Surinamese Javanese	9	17
2.	Indonesian Javanese	6	0

The author also found some more occurrences of the velar nasal sound **ŋ** in other words having suffix –an; such as in the word *gunungang* 'mountain' (3 occurrences), *wit-witang* 'trees' (8 occurrences), *gambarang* 'picture' (25 occurrences), and *growongang* 'hole in the ground' (4 occurrences). There were some occurrences of this sound in words without suffix; such as *tawong* 'bee' (1 occurrence) that is supposed to be pronounced as *tawon* and *kebablaseng* 'to pass through something that is not intended to' (1 occurrence) that is supposed to be pronounced as *kebablasen.* All of these **ŋ** variants were spoken by Surinamese Javanese speakers.

Discussion

Gussenhoven and Jacobs (2011) emphasized that "different languages have different phonologies. One of the clearest illustrations of this fact is provided by the adaptation of loanwords to the phonology of the borrowing language. In this process, speakers will interpret the pronunciation of the words of the foreign language in terms of the phonological elements of their own." (p.45). In the case of Surinamese Javanese and Indonesian Javanese, they both have the same language: Javanese. However, Surinamese Javanese is influenced by different languages compared to Indonesian Javanese. The author suspected that the phonological variation in Surinamese Javanese is either influenced by the languages in contact, such as Dutch and Sranan, or developed by itself.

The author would like to argue that the sound **t͡ɕ** in *bocah* and *cah* as a variation from the sound **c** influenced by Dutch phonology. In Dutch, there are allomorphs like *–tje* and *–etje* as in *strootje* 'straw', deriving from the stem *stro* and allomorph *-tje*, and *ringetje* 'ring', deriving from the stem *ring* and allomorph *-etje* (Booij, 1995). The sound of these allomorphs is best pertained to the voiceless alveolo-palatal affricate **t͡ɕ** rather than the palatal plosive **c.** In Dutch, to produce the sound, the tongue touches the dental arch, whereas in Javanese the front part of the tongue touches the area in between the dental arch and the upper teeth; the tip of tongue very slightly touches the inside of the upper teeth (Arps et al., 2000). The author found that some of the Surinamese Javanese speakers produced this same sound as in Dutch, which is in line with the hypothesis that the occurrence of sound t͡ɕ in Surinamese Javanese is influenced by Dutch.

Another variant the author found is that the words *bocah* and *cah* are pronounced with the voiced alveolo-palatal affricate **d͡ʑ.** It is considered that this variant is derived from the voiceless alveolo-palatal affricate **t͡ɕ**, not from the palatal plosive **c.** The facts that such variant does not exist in Indonesian Javanese, that there is no possible scenario of Dutch or Sranan's influence to the occurrence of this sound, and that compared to **t͡ɕ,** this **d͡ʑ** sound only differs in terms of voicing lead us to an argument that **d͡ʑ** sound develops as a variant of **t͡ɕ** within Surinamese Javanese speakers themselves, not by the influence of other languages in contact.

The author also found a phonological vowel variation of the word *weruh.* As mentioned previously, *wruh* is generally pronounced as *weruh* with the central close-mid vowel sound **ə**. However,

in Surinamese Javanese, there is a variation of the front close **i** sound in the word *wiruh.* This variant is also acknowledged in the Surinamese Javanese - Dutch dictionary (Vruggink, 2001). Conversely, compared to the Indonesian Javanese-Dutch dictionary (van Albada & Pigeaud, 1994), such a variant does not exist. The author was unable to find any scenarios in other languages that might influence the occurrence of this variation. This alternation is regarded as an independent variation, in a way that it is developed within the Surinamese Javanese language itself.

Further, another important phonological variable to argue as a contact-induced change is that the bilabial nasal **m** in the word ***m****layu* tends to have a combination of nasal-stop consonant **mb** (hence ***mb****layu*) in many instances of Surinamese Javanese data. To the best of the author's sense, such a combination and vowel insertion into a stem (e.g., *banter* 'fast' becomes *b**ua**nter* 'really fast' and *mlayu* becomes ***mb****layu*) do exist in the Indonesian Javanese. However, they only occur under certain circumstances, such as exaggerative, exclamatory, and dramatic expressions. From the data, it is found that only one occurrence of mb in Indonesian Javanese is an exaggerative expression. Meanwhile in Surinamese Javanese this sound occurred in regular expressions as evident from the numerous occurrences in the data (see table. 4). One of the explanations of the commonality of nasal-stop in Surinamese Javanese data might be due to what Smith (2008, p. 106) called as 'marked sound of African languages.' Pertaining to this, he elucidates that initial nasal-voiced stop combinations are characterized as the feature found in two other languages in Suriname, such as ***mb****alu* 'woodchips' in Saramaccan and ***mb****ukóko* 'Flamingo' in Ndyuka (Ibid.: 109-10). Another evidence perhaps can be observed from the fact that Sranan possesses similar variation that occurs in medial position of the word, such as *me**m**re* 'member' that has an alternative *me**mb**re* and *e**m**re* 'bucket/pail' that has a variant *e**mb**re*. These kinds of variation are quite common in Sranan, either there is "insertion of intrusive stop or deletion of the organic one" (Norval Smith, personal communication). Equally, both Dutch and Sranantongo languages form the loanwords of Surinamese Javanese and Sarnami. Additionally, Sranantongo also allows some features for Dutch. This complex behavior, however, becomes more apparent for the younger age group. Many actually shift between languages—both in formal gatherings and casual conversations (Villerius, 2020)

Another interesting phonological phenomenon is the occurrence of non-retroflex **d** as a variation to the retroflex **ɖ.** Referring to the native speakers, words containing retroflex **ɖ** are never pronounced with non-retroflex **d** in Indonesian Javanese (unless for people with articulatory impairments). It is interesting to find that in Surinamese Javanese, the occurrence of non-retroflex **d** as a variant of the retroflex **ɖ** is quite common, as it can be seen in Table 7. The author tried to examine the mean age of the Surinamese Javanese speakers for both sounds to see whether there is a significant mean age difference for non-retroflex **d** speakers and retroflex **ɖ** speakers. It is found that non-retroflex **d** is produced by mostly the younger generation with a mean age of M=35.86, while the retroflex ɖ sound is produced by the older generation with a mean age of *M*=64.11. From this finding, it is argued that the retroflex **ɖ** is gradually degrading into the non-retroflex **d** for young Surinamese Javanese speakers. Vruggink (2001) emphasizes that the distinction between retroflex **ɖ** and non-retroflex **d** is fading, and this underlies the reason why the orthography committee in Surinamese Javanese probably does not spell this difference in the standard spelling. However, the author could not identify any plausible reasons for the cause of this degrading process in relation to the contact-induced change scenario within the multilingual environment of Suriname.

The author further argues that the sound **ŋ** instead of **n** that occurs finally as a feature affected by Sranan. Pronunciations with a final [ŋ] are common since modern Sranan does not allow a word-final nasal **m** and **n**, except in very recent loans (Norval Smith, personal communication). Pée et al. (1954) demonstrate that the combination sound of 'vowels alveolar nasal N' in Sranan tends to end up in velar nasal **ŋ** sound, such as in the word *wan 'one'* which is pronounced as wa**ŋ**. Additionally, it is also confirmed by the findings in the words other than *bolonga**ŋ*** in the data, such as the E+N final combination of *kebablas**eŋ*** 'to pass through something that is not intended to' and O+N final combination in taw**oŋ** 'bee'.

Eventually, the findings of the present study have demonstrated that the Surinamese Javanese phonological variation of voiceless alveolo-palatal affricate **t͡ɕ** in the words *bo**ty**ah* and ***ty****ah* may be deemed as features borrowed from or affected by Dutch, while the final velar nasal **ŋ** in the word *bolonga**ŋ*** and the initial nasal-stop combination **mb** in the word ***mb****layu* may receive influence from Sranan or from other creoles that possess *African marked sound system* (Smith, 2008), such as Ndyuka

and Saramaccan. Further, the voiced alveolo-palatal affricate **d͡ʒ** in the words *bo**j**ah* and ***j**ah,* the front close **i** in the word *w**i**ruh,* and the non-retroflex alveolar plosive **d** in the word *ko**d**ok* may be argued as the variations that independently develop in Surinamese Javanese, as the author does not find any corresponding features in the languages involved in the contact scenario in Suriname.

CONCLUSION

The phonological differences between Surinamese Javanese and Indonesian Javanese are more revealing in how language changes in different social and linguistic conditions. This may be considered the influence of contact languages, especially Dutch and Sranan, which have affected Surinamese Javanese with unique phonetic shifts not observed in the Indonesian form. It is, in fact, these processes that include changes in the palatal plosives, changes in the vowel sounds, changes in the nasal-stop consonants, and loss of retroflex sounds that give evidence to the fact that language is dynamic and phonological changes are highly influenced by external factors. It is, in fact, suggested that though both varieties of the languages were from one and the same origin, the unique evolutions were decided by the unique landscapes in which they came to be spoken. Such differences outline wider implications of language contact and the continuous adaptability of language to new cultural and communicative contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank the late Prof. Pieter Muysken, who provided initial feedback on this article while at Radboud University Nijmegen. The author is also grateful to Irene Ossi Wydiastuti for her insights and availability to critically discuss some aspects of this article. Additionally, the author would like to express his gratitude to Sophie Villerius, Kofi Yakpo, and Riski Lestiono, who collected the Surinamese Javanese and Indonesian Javanese recordings and made them available for use in this article.

REFERENCES

Al Haris, U. N. (2017). *The phonological process of the suffix/-i/in the Javanese language: A generative phonology approach* (Doctoral dissertation, Diponegoro University)

Arps, B. (2000). *Hedendaags Javaans: En leerboek*. Opleiding talen en culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië, Universiteit Leiden

Berman, R. A., & Slobin, D. I. (Eds.). (2013). *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Psychology Press

Booij, G. E. (1995). *The phonology of Dutch*. Clarendon Press

Borges, R. D. (2014). The life of language dynamics of language contact in Suriname. *PhD Dissertation,* Radboud University Nijmegen

Carlin, E. B. (2006). *Language Situation*

Carlin, E., Léglise, I., Migge, B., & Tjon Sie Fat, P. (2014). Looking at language, identity, and mobility in Suriname. *Carlin, EB, Leglise, I., Migge, B. and Tjon Sie Fat, PB (eds.). In and out of Suriname: Language, mobility and identity*

Conners, T. J. (2008). *Tengger Javanese*. Yale University dissertation. (Chapter 4)

Darmoko, B. J. D. D. (2016). Tinjauan pada masyarakat Jawa di Suriname. *Jurnal*, *5*(12)

Ekarina, N. F. N. (2023). A morphophonological analysis of -um- in Javanese. *Linguistik Indonesia, 41*(1), 21-32

Essegbey, J., Migge, B., & Winford, D. (2013). Cross-linguistic influence in language creation: Assessing the role of the Gbe languages in the formation of the Creoles of Suriname. *Lingua*, *129*, 1-8

Ewing, M. C. (2005). *Grammar and Inference in Conversation: Identifying clause structure in spoken Javanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Jacobs, H., & Gussenhoven, C. (2011). *Understanding phonology*. Hodder Education

Kartikasari, E., & Laksono, K. (2022). Lexical and phonological differences in Javanese in East Java, Indonesia. *Dialectologia*, (28), 143-155

Nickel, M., Wilner, J., & Pet, W. (1984). *Papers on Sranan Tongo*. Paramaribo, Suriname, South America: Instituut voor Taalwetenschap (Summer Institute of Linguistics)

Pée, W., Hellinga, W. Gs. & Donicie, P. A. (1954). Voorstellen tot een nieuIsystematische spelling van het Surinaams (Neger-Engels) op Linguistische grondslag. In Donicie, A., & Campagne, W. (eds.), *De Creolentaal van Suriname. Spraakkunst. Door A. Donicie ... met medewerking van W. Campagne [and others], etc*. Radhaksihun & Co

Senowarsito, S., & Ardini, S. N. (2019). Phonological fossilisation of EFL learners: The interference of phonological and orthographic system of L1 Javanese. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *25*(2)

Smith, N. S. H. (2008). Creole phonology. In Kouwenberg, S., & Singler, J. V. (Eds.). *The handbook of Pidgin and Creole studies*. Wiley-Blackwell Pub

van Albada, R., Pigeaud, T.G., (1994). *Javaans-nederlands woordenboek*. KITLV Uitgeverij

Villerius, S. (2017). Developments in Surinamese Javanese. *Boundaries and Bridges: Language Contact in Multilingual Ecologies*, *14*, 151

Villerius, S. (2018a). The expression of location and space in Surinamese and Indonesian Javanese. *Wacana*, *19*(1), 191-218

Villerius, S. (2018b). Voice and information structure in Surinamese Javanese. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, *35*(1), 139-153

Villerius, S., Narrog, H., Hengeveld, K., & Olbertz, H. (2017). Modality and aspect marking in Surinamese Javanese: Grammaticalization and contact-induced change. *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality, and evidentiality*, 111-132

Vruggink, H. & Sarmo, J. (2001). *Surinaams-Javaans-Nederlands woordenboek*. KITLV

Yakpo, K. & Muysken, P. (2014). Language change in a multiple contact setting: The case of Sarnami (Suriname). In Isabelle Buchstaller, Anders Holmberg & Mohammad Almoaily (eds.), *Pidgins and Creoles beyond Africa-Europe encounters*, 101–140

Yakpo, K., Berg, M., & Borges, R. (2015). On the linguistic consequences of language contact in Suriname: The case of convergence, 164-195

Yannuar, N., Hoogervorst, T., & Klamer, M. (2022). Examining Javanese phonology through word-reversal practices. *Oceanic Linguistics*, *61*(1), 560-588

Zen, E., & Starr, R. (2021). Variation and contact-induced change in Javanese phonology among multilingual children in Indonesia. *Asia-Pacific Language Variation*