The expression of location and space in Surinamese and Indonesian Javanese

Sophie Villerius
University of Amsterdam, sophievillerius@gmail.com

The expression of location and space in Surinamese and Indonesian Javanese

SOPHIE VILLERIUS

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the influence of language contact and multilingualism on the expression of location and space in the heritage variety of Javanese spoken in Suriname. Alongside Javanese, this community also speaks Sranantongo and Dutch. It is found that Surinamese speakers tend to use simple locative constructions more frequently than baseline speakers, at the expense of complex constructions. It is shown that the individual speaker variables age, generation, place of residence, and network play a role in explaining the usage of simple versus complex locative constructions in Surinamese Javanese: the more language contact speakers experience, the more they will use simple constructions at the cost of complex ones.

KEYWORDS

Javanese; Sranantongo; language contact; cross-linguistic influence; locative.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper studies the use of locative expressions in Surinamese Javanese, one of the heritage languages spoken in Suriname. Through its history of colonialism and labour migration, Suriname harbours one of the most fascinating multilingual ecologies in the world. It has been described as a "laboratory of language contact" (Yakpo and Muysken 2014: 102), with 89 percent of inhabitants claiming to speak more than one language regularly, and 40 percent even more than two (Taalonderzoek 2011 in Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges 2015: 165). One of the communities in which multilingualism is the norm is that of the descendants of Javanese contract labourers, who have been present in Suriname since the end of the nineteenth century. The

SOPHIE VILLERIUS graduated from the Research Master Linguistics at the University of Amsterdam. She is currently working on her PhD dissertation on Surinamese Javanese, an Austronesian immigrant language spoken in South America. Her research aims at retracing the history of Surinamese Javanese and identifying the changes this language has undergone. One of her publications is "Developments in Surinamese Javanese" in: Kofi Yakpo and Pieter Muysken (eds), *Boundaries and bridges; Multilingual ecologies in the Guianas*, pp. 151–178 (Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2017). Sophie Villerius may be reached at: sophievillerius@gmail.com.

variety of Javanese which is spoken in this community has diverged from the homeland (also called baseline) variety as spoken in Indonesia in a number of aspects, as a consequence of various processes (Lestiono 2012; Hermawan 2017; Villerius 2017a, b, c):

- convergence to the dominant languages Dutch and Sranantongo
- incomplete acquisition
- simplification
- ordinary language change

This paper compares the two varieties of Javanese in a thus far unexplored domain: the expression of location or spatial reference.

The question of how languages around the world express location, that is, the relationship between an object or person and the ground to which it is related, has been a widely studied topic. This area of grammar is of interest in the study of language contact, because we know from previous studies that the expression of location in heritage or bilingual speakers is susceptible to change, especially in a situation of variation in which two or more possible constructions compete (see, for example, Şahin 2015), as is the case with locative constructions. In cases like these, bilingual speakers will be more likely to select that construction in their heritage language which is also present in the dominant language (Silva-Corvalán 1994, 2008; see "The vulnerability hypothesis" in Prada Pérez 2015; "The alternation hypothesis" in Jansen, Lalleman, and Muysken 1981).

This has been shown to be the case in Suriname: Sranantongo, the lingua franca of Suriname, and an English-lexifier creole, originally allowed the use of both post- and prepositions in locative constructions, but modern-day Sranantongo speakers show a high preference for prepositions, following the construction found in Dutch (Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges 2015). Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges (2015: 165) analyse this as a case of convergence, which in a broad sense can be defined as the increase in "(partial) similarities at the expense of differences between the languages in contact" (Weinreich 1954 in Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges 2015: 165). The narrower definition of linguistic convergence, which they apply in their analysis, is "the adaptation of an element in language A to match the scope and distribution of an element of language B that is perceived to be its functional equivalent". This phenomenon, in which bilinguals copy the frequency from one language to the other, has also been referred to as "frequential copying" (Johanson 2002). This frequential copying usually entails overgeneralization of a minor pattern in the affected language ("an element in language A"), to imitate the distribution of a similar construction ("functional equivalent") in the dominant language. This "overgeneralization", together with the process of "simplification", has been pointed out as an important processes among bilingual speakers, arising from the need for "lightning the cognitive load of having to remember and use two different linguistic systems" (Silva-Corvalán 1994: 3–6).

   In the Surinamese Javanese speech community, the three languages Javanese, Dutch, and Sranantongo, are in constant interaction on the community level (multilingual language use and language attitudes) as well as the individual level (code-switching and borrowing). The situation in Suriname has been characterized as a case of language shift (Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges 2015: 166), in which Dutch and Sranantongo are becoming increasingly dominant. Heritage speakers, such as the Surinamese Javanese, form a unique population to study the influence of factors such as the nature of linguistic input, incomplete acquisition, universal principles, and cross-linguistic transfer. Synchronically, language contact is visible through the presence of loan translations, code-switching, and borrowings. Diachronically, changes can occur in the grammatical system of the heritage language, including for example re-analysis, consolidation, overgeneralization, reduction/loss or simplification of linguistic structures (Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges 2015).

   This paper addresses the question of what differences, if any, there are between the heritage and homeland variety in terms of spatial reference, and how on the one hand these are related to direct influence from Dutch or Sranantongo, and on the other hand to individual speaker factors such as age, generation, network, and place of residence. By separating these different factors, this study contributes to distinguishing the influence of incomplete acquisition from that of direct cross-linguistic transfer.

   I shall examine spatial reference in heritage Javanese as spoken in Suriname, and compare it to the strategies employed in baseline Javanese as spoken in Indonesia. In section 2, I shall describe the background of the Surinamese Javanese speech community and its position in the heritage language field. Section 3 will cover the typology of locative expressions in general, as well as the possible constructions found in the three languages involved. Section 4 will describe the methodology employed, and Section 5 will report on the results. This is followed by a Discussion in Section 6 and the Conclusions in Section 7.

2. Background

2.1 Javanese in Suriname

Suriname, as a former colony of The Netherlands, hosts a large variety of ethnic groups, brought together throughout the period of Dutch colonial rule. One of these groups is the Javanese who immigrated to Suriname as indentured labourers. Between 1890 and 1939, a total of 32,956 Javanese were brought to Suriname (Hoefte 1987: 3). At the end of their five-year contract, most of these immigrants remained in Suriname, which has led to a community of approximately 70,000 Javanese in Suriname nowadays (ABS 2012).

   The first generation spoke predominantly Javanese, but was probably to some extent bilingual in Sranantongo, an English-lexifier creole, since this was the language of communication on the plantations on which they worked. Later generations show more and more multilingualism in both Dutch and

Sranantongo (Villerius 2017b). One of the factors contributing to this was the independence of Suriname in 1975, after which there were large migrations of Surinamese to the Netherlands. This migration has created a "transnational social space", since relatives still maintain close bonds between Surinamese and the Netherlands in the form of sending mail and packages, keeping contact through e-mail and telephone, and physical visits (Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges 2015: 172). Taking the opposite view, this might have caused a reinforcement of Dutch in Suriname, as well as contributing to the vitality of Sranantongo in the Netherlands, thereby promoting multilingualism in Surinamese Javanese speakers.

In terms of scenarios (following Thomason and Kaufman 1991), the Surinamese Javanese are shifting from a situation of language maintenance in the earlier days of labour migration, towards a situation of language shift in the present era (in which younger generations become more and more dominant in Dutch and Sranantongo at the expense of Javanese). This multilingualism and consequent language shift have led to the unique character of Surinamese Javanese, as a variety which has developed mostly independently of Indonesian Javanese.

The speakers of Javanese in Suriname can be defined as heritage speakers. Heritage speakers are speakers who have been exposed to a minority language from early childhood, mostly with their parents or grandparents, and who usually switch to the dominant language of the country around the age they enter school (compare Van Deusen-Scholl 2003: 222). In order to exclude possible participants from the research beforehand, I define heritage speakers in a very broad sense here, hence also including speakers who do not use the language actively on a daily basis. This makes sense in the Surinamese context, since the degree of competence varies greatly.

What they all do have in common is a reduced usage of the heritage language, with Dutch and Sranantongo becoming more and more dominant. A typical outcome of heritage language contact, especially in cases of reduced usage and imminent language shift, is simplification of linguistic structures (Thomason 2001: 12; Silva-Corvalán 2008; Hickey 2010: 214).

2.2 THE TYPOLOGY OF SPATIAL REFERENCE

Spatial reference has been a widely studied topic in languages throughout the world, and there are several features within this domain which are universal. The most influential typology is that by Talmy (1985), who has classified both events in which the location is stationary and those in which movement is present under the broad category of "motion events", composed of the same basic elements (Talmy 1985: 61).

The main elements within these motion events are the "Figure" and the "Ground". The Figure is the object or being which moves or is located, whereas the Ground is the point of reference, with respect to which the Figure moves or is located. The relationship between the two is expressed by the "Path", in English usually conveyed by means of a preposition. Examples of these

three elements for motion events in English are given in (1) for a stationary location, and (2) shows an event involving movement.

(1)	Figure		Path	Ground	
	The pencil	*lay*	*on*	*the table*	(Talmy 1985: 61)

(2)	Figure		Path	Ground	
	The pencil	*rolled*	*off*	*the table*	(Talmy 1985: 61)

Another (optional) element of the locative construction is the Region or Search Domain, a notion first introduced by Hawkins (1981, in Langacker 1987: 286). This element narrows down the location of the Figure (or trajectory, as Langacker calls it), as in (3), in which the element *the bottom of* narrows down the location of the mouse vis-à-vis *the tree*.

(3)	Figure		Path	Search Domain	Ground
	The mouse	*is*	*sitting*	*at*	*the bottom of*	*the tree*

In the following section, I give a more detailed account of these constructions in the different languages under discussion.

3 LOCATIVE EXPRESSIONS IN JAVANESE, DUTCH, AND SRANANTONGO

The following section discusses the main options for expressing location in the languages under study here: Javanese, Dutch, and Sranantongo. This paper focuses specifically on the part of the locative construction which expresses the Path, that is the relationship between the Figure and the Ground. The description will be limited to the types of spatial expressions elicited by the stimuli (see Section 4.2) and, if no reference is provided, examples are taken from the data which were collected for this study. The section on Javanese is based on data from both Surinamese and Indonesian Javanese; relevant similarities and differences between the varieties will be discussed in Section 5.

3.1 JAVANESE

3.1.1 COMPLEX AND SIMPLE CONSTRUCTIONS

A locative construction in Javanese typically contains the following elements: the Figure in the first position, followed by general locative preposition *nang* or a variant,[1] an optional element specifying the Region or Search Domain (a noun such as "top", "bottom", "side" etcetera) and finally the Ground. The element specifying the Region or Search Domain has been called a locative noun (Sneddon et al. 2010: 195) or a prepositional noun (Klamer 1998: 123) in Austronesian languages. For the sake of convenience and comparability,

---

[1]   This general locative preposition can be realized as either *nang*, *nèng* or *ning*. These variants differ only in their pronunciation according to region/dialect, although *nèng* is sometimes regarded as "more colloquial" (Hermawan 2017: 47).

I refer to this element by the abbreviation PrepN (from Prepositional Noun), and to the general locative preposition by the abbreviation GenPrep (General Preposition). The GenPrep and PrepN together with the Ground form a complex PP. This is schematically represented in (4).

(4)   Figure – $[[\text{GenPrep– (PrepN)}]_{\text{Path}}$ – Ground$]_{\text{PP}}$

An example of a locative construction with a prepositional noun is given in (5), to be contrasted with (6), in which the PrepN is absent.

(5)

Figure	GenPrep	PrepN	Ground
kayu	*ning*	*nduwur*	*méja*
wood	LOC	top	table

'The piece of wood [is] on top of the table.'

(6)

Figure	GenPrep	Ground
<u>*tiki*</u>	*nang*	*méja*[2]
stick	LOC	table

'A stick on the table.'

Since the latter construction in (6) requires the expression of fewer elements and is also less variable in the sense that there is no lexical variation in the locative preposition, I label this the "simple" construction. This construction can be considered structurally simpler than the construction in (5), which is labelled the "complex" construction. Here, the PP is more complex since it consists of more elements (GenPrep + PrepN + Ground).

Another optional element in these constructions is the existential verb. If it is present, it is usually in sentence-initial position, directly preceding the Figure, which is then always indefinite, as in (7). In these cases it is still optional, since a construction as in (5), with no existential verb, is also possible. However, in cases in which the word order is reversed, that is, the Ground precedes the Figure as in (8), the existential verb is not optional but is obligatory to introduce the Figure.

(7)

	Figure	GenPrep	PrepN	Ground
ana	*kayu*	*ning*	*nduwur*	*meja*
EXIST	wood	LOC	top	table

'There is a piece of wood on top of the table.'

---

[2]   Note on borrowings in transcription: Dutch borrowings are underlined, Sranantongo borrowings are double underlined..

(8)   GenPrep   Ground   Figure
      nang   *méja*   *ènèk*   *tiki*
      LOC   table   EXIST   stick
      'On the table there is a stick.'

3.1.2 CONSTRUCTIONS WITH "PLACE"

Another possible construction involves *nggon* 'place' in the position in which the PrepN would normally go, following *ning* as in (9).

(9)   GenPrep   Ground   Figure
      ning   *nggon*   *baskita*   *ènèk*   *sopi*
      LOC   place   basket   EXIST   liquor
      'At the place of the basket there is (a bottle of) liquor.'

At first sight, one might think that this is a similar construction to the complex construction in the previous paragraph, with *nggon* functioning as the PrepN. However, I propose to categorize this as a separate construction since *nggon* does not have the same status as the PrepN in example (5). This is because, first of all, it does not specify anything about the Search Domain, but only makes explicit that the following element (usually a noun) should be interpreted as a Ground. Secondly, the use of *nggon* is not mutually exclusive to the use of a PrepN such as *dhuwur* 'top' or *jero* 'inside' as in (10) (see also Hermawan 2017), showing that it does not have the same status.

(10)   *terus*   *guwak*   *nèng*   *nggon*   *jero*   *ton*
       then   throw   LOC   place   inside   barrel
       'Then he throws it inside the barrel.'

3.1.3 CONSTRUCTIONS WITH POSTPOSED PATH

In some cases, the element(s) encoding the Path do(es) not precede the Ground, but follow it:

(11)   Ground   GenPrep   PrepN   Figure
       iki   *ènèk*   *baskita*   *ing*   *jero-né*   *botol*
       this   EXIST   basket   LOC   inside-DEF   bottle
       'Here there is a basket, on the inside a bottle.'

3.1.4 OTHER CONSTRUCTIONS

In the Javanese corpus, there were several locative constructions which did not fit into the above categories. Since these were only marginally used, I shall categorize them as other, except for the construction in (12), which uses only the PrepN without the GenPrep. In these cases, the PrepN is usually

marked with the nasal prefix.[3] I call this the PrepN construction. The other constructions employed a verb instead of a preposition to encode the Path, with the Ground bare as in (13), pre-nasalized as in (14) or with an existential verb expressing the Path as in (15).

(12) Figure   PrepN   Ground
      Botol   *di-dèkèk*   *n-dukur-é*   *méja*
      bottle   UV-put   N-top-DEF   table
      'The bottle is put on top of the table.'

(13)   Figure   Ground
      Onok   *wong*   *ng-gawa*   *botol*   *di-dèkèk* *méja*
      EXIST   person   AV-carry   bottle   UV-put   table
      'There is a person who puts a bottle on the table.'

(14)   Figure   Ground
      ng-gawa   *andha,*   *di-dèlèhké*   *ng-uwit*
      AV-carry   ladder   UV-put-APPL   N-tree
      'Carry a ladder, it is put at the tree.'

(15)   Figure   Path   Ground
      bapak-bapak   *ng-gawa*   *andha*   *di-sèndhèk-ké*   *ana*   *uwit*
      father~RED   AV-carry   ladder   UV-put-APPL   EXIST   tree
      'There is a man who carries a ladder and puts it at the tree.'

3.2 DUTCH

In Dutch, locative constructions usually consist of a positional verb in combination with a specific locative preposition, in a position following the Figure and preceding the Ground, as in Javanese. Examples of different prepositions are given in (16) and (17).

(16) Figure   Positional verb   Path   Ground
      Het kopje   *staat*   *op*   *de tafel*
      DEFcup   stands   on   DEFtable
      'The cup is on the table.'   (Van Staden, Bowerman, and Verhelst 2006: 486)

---

[3]   The insertion of the homorganic nasal on the noun expressing the Ground is common when it has initial plosive or vowel (Arps et al. 2000: 204). This is not the same nasal prefix as that indicating actor voice, which is why it is glossed differently (simply as N).

(17) Figure   Positional verb Path Ground
      Het gat   *zit*   *in*   *mijn linkermouw*
      DEFhole   sits   in   myleft.sleeve
      'The hole is in my left sleeve.' (Van Staden, Bowerman, and Verhelst 2006: 486)

The choice of the preposition depends on the relationship between Figure and Ground: contact with the upper surface is *op*, Figure being inside the Ground is *in*, etcetera. As mentioned before, the verb in this construction is not a copula but a Positional Verb, the choice of which ("to sit", "to lay", "to stand") depends on the posture of the Figure as well as its relation to the Ground. There is the possibility of emphasizing the Search Domain by adding a PrepN to the preposition: *bovenop* 'up at the top', *onderin* 'in at the bottom', *binnenin* 'in the inside' etcetera.

3.3 SRANANTONGO

Sranantongo locative constructions can consist of the following elements: the existential verb *de* 'to be', a general locative preposition *na*, and a nominal element which specifies the Search Domain, such as *ini* 'inside', *tapu* 'top', *ondro* 'under/bottom'. There are no positional verbs as there are in Dutch. Speakers are quite flexible about which elements they can include, and hence different combinations are possible, as shown by the examples in (18)-(20) below.

(18) Figure   EXIST   GenPrep   PrepN   Ground
      a buku   *de*   *(na)*   *ondro*   *a tafra*
      DEFbook   be   LOC   bottom   DEFtable
      'The book is under the table.'   (Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges 2015: 184)

(19) Figure   EXIST   PrepN   Ground
      wan tiki *de*   *tap'*   *a tafra*
      INDF stick be   top   DEFtable
      'The stick is on top of the table.'

(20)   Figure
      wan   *frow*   *e*   *pot'* *wan*   *la_*   *wan*   *trapu*
      INDF   woman   PROG   put   INDF   HES   INDF   ladder
      GenPrep   Ground
      na   *a*   *bon*
      LOC   DEF   tree
      'A woman is putting a ladder at [against] a tree.'

In older Sranantongo, these latter nominal elements (the PrepN) could both follow and precede the Ground. However, Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges

(2015) found that modern-day Sranantongo almost exclusively allows these elements to precede the Ground, a change which they claim is because of convergence to Dutch word order.

3.4 CONTACT-INDUCED CHANGE

Contact-induced change in grammatical domains such as these is often expressed as a change in preference or frequency, in which the use of the option which is shared by the two languages in contact is usually increased (Moro 2016). This has been shown to be the case for locative constructions: modern-day Sranantongo almost exclusively expresses the Search Domain in a position preceding the Figure, because of influence from Dutch (Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges 2015). In a similar study, Hermawan (2017) found that Surinamese Javanese speakers have a different preference for locative constructions than homeland speakers, and that they prefer "simple" constructions.

4. THE STUDY

4.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This paper addresses, the following questions: 1) How do locative constructions in heritage Javanese differ from those used in homeland Javanese? 2) Can these divergences be explained by the influence of language contact and, if so, does the effect come from Dutch, Sranantongo, or both? 3) What is the influence of the individual speaker factors of age, generation, and place of residence, and can these be brought together to distinguish different types of speakers?

4.2 STIMULI

The stimuli were part of a larger set of videos and pictures.[4] The four stimuli chosen for further study in this article were those which consistently elicited locative constructions; with a clear Figure and Ground. An overview is given below.

STIMULUS	NAME	DESCRIPTION
1	StickOnTable_Still	A stick is lying on top of a table (no movement)
2	Bottle_Table	Someone (not visible) places a bottle standing on top of a table (movement)
3	BottleInBasket_Still	A (wine) bottle is lying inside a basket (no movement).
4	Ladder_Tree_Lean	A woman carries a ladder and puts it against a tree, then leaves the scene (movement)

Table 1. Overview of the stimuli.

[4] This collection of video clips and pictures was assembled as a standard elicitation kit for the Traces of Contact research group (2009-2013, ERC Project #230310), whose aim is to establish criteria by which results from language contact studies can be used to strengthen the field of historical linguistics, online URL http://www.ru.nl/linc/projects/erc-traces-contact/ (last accessed 22 August 2017).

4.3 PARTICIPANTS

In order to compare a speaker from Suriname with a speaker from Indonesia (Java), I interviewed speakers from two main groups: the heritage/ experimental group (Suriname) and the baseline/control group (Indonesia). The baseline group consisted of forty-one participants, who were matched as much as possible to the heritage group in terms of age and gender (see the description of heritage group below). Table 2 below gives an overview of the participants in the baseline group.

PLACE OF RESIDENCE OF SPEAKERS	NUMBER OF SPEAKERS		AGE GROUP		
	MALE	FEMALE	>60	40-60	<40
Central-Java	11	12	6	7	10
East-Java	5	13	6	4	8
Total	16	25	12	11	18

Table 2. Overview of participants in the baseline group.

The heritage group consisted of forty-one speakers, of whom an overview is given in Table 3.

PLACE OF RESIDENCE OF SPEAKERS	NUMBER OF SPEAKERS		AGE GROUP			GENERATION				NETWORK		
	MALE	FEMALE	>60	40-60	>40	2	3	4	5	JV	MIX	NON-JV
City	5	2	5	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	7	0
District	7	27	6	8	20	3	12	14	5	7	19	8
Total	12	29	11	10	20	5	14	14	5	7	26	8

Table 3. Overview of participants in the heritage group.

In order to study within-group variation, I divided the heritage on the basis of the variables place of residence, age, network, and generation. These factors are relevant to determining to what extent direct cross-linguistic transfer has played a role, and in distinguishing between the effect of Dutch and Sranantongo. The main distinction in place of residence is between speakers who live in the capital (Paramaribo, more mixed, and therefore more language contact), and those who live outside in the "districts" (smaller, less mixed communities, and more language maintenance). It is assumed that these latter speakers will be closer to the homeland variety.

The motivation for the ranges of the age groups (>60; 41-60; <40) is as follows: speakers above sixty were born before the commencement of the great flow to the urban areas in the 1950s, which led to more contact with people outside of the Javanese community, and therefore to more language

contact. This contact is expected to have affected speakers below sixty more than those above sixty. Speakers below forty are expected to show even more signs of language contact, since they have been born since Suriname became independent of the Netherlands in 1975, after which Dutch has become increasingly important for maintaining contact with family overseas.

I have made a distinction of network on the basis of the participants' description of how often and with whom they spoke Javanese: if this was to only one person (mostly a parent or grandparent), and they also indicated their preferred language other than Javanese, I classified their network as "mostly non-Javanese". If the participants indicated that their preferred and most frequently used language is Javanese, and they speak it with the majority of their network, I have classified their network as "mostly Javanese". Participants who said that they usually spoke a mix of language to everyone, or different languages to all their interlocutors, were classified as having a "mixed" network.

I split up the participants according to their generation, that is, how many generations ago their family came to Suriname. The immigrants themselves are called Generation 1, their children Generation 2, grandchildren Generation 3, etcetera. It is expected that later generations will show more divergence from the homeland variety because of increasing language shift.

For the division in the two main groups, I gave all the participants a score for each factor of the variables as specified in Table 4. Then, I summed up the scores. Speakers with a score 3 or less were classified as "conservative" (C, 16 speakers) and speakers with a score of 4 or higher were "innovative" (I, 19 speakers).

VARIABLE	SCORING			
	0	1	2	3
Generation	2	3	4	5
Age	>60	60-40	<40	-
Place of residence	district	city	-	-
Network	Javanese	mix	non-Javanese	-

Table 4. The scoring table of the variables.

In order to confirm whether the expectations of Dutch and Sranantongo locative constructions laid out in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 were justified, I also elicited some additional data in these two languages for some of the participants. Of the speakers given in Table 3, there were two participants also interviewed in Dutch and three in Sranantongo. I shall briefly discuss their answers in Section 5 below at the point at which the respective stimuli are analysed.

5. Results

5.1 Excluded responses

Responses which did not show any explicit expression of a relationship between the Figure and Ground were excluded. Examples of these responses are given in (21) and (22), which simply juxtapose the Figure and Ground without any Path.

(21)   Ground   Figure

       ènèk   *méja*   *lan*   *kayu*

       EXIST   table   and   wood

       'There is a table and wood.'

(22) Ground   Figure

       Bak   *sampah*   *ana*   *gendul-é*

       basket   waste   EXIST   bottle-DEF

       'In the waste basket, there is a bottle.'

In some cases, a speaker would use multiple constructions in one utterance, mostly because of self-repair. Consider the following example, in which a speaker first utters a "simple" locative construction (including some signs of hesitation), which is then followed directly by a specification of the location by means of PrepN *dhuwur* 'top'. Because of their ambiguity, these constructions were also excluded from the analysis.

(23) *eh*   *ènèk*   <u>*tiki*</u>   *nèng*   *eh*   *méja-né,*   *n-dhuwur*   *méja*

       HES   EXIST   stick   LOC   HES   table-DEF   N-top   table

       'Eh there is a stick on eh the table, top of the table.'

5.2 Overview of stimuli and possible constructions

This section gives an overview of the results in the included responses. I shall first give an overall overview of the different constructions, and then split up the responses according to the extra-linguistic factors (age, generation, network, and place of residence) and per stimulus.

5.2.1 Overall results

The overall frequency of the different constructions in all groups is given in Table 5.

CONSTRUCTION TYPE	INDONESIAN JAVANESE	SURINAMESE JAVANESE	
		GROUP C	GROUP I
Simple construction	20 15.9%	34 66.7%	57 83.8%
Complex construction	75 59.5%	9 17.6%	4 5.9%
PrepN-construction	9 7.1%	1 2.0%	
Construction with "place"	7 5.6%	3 5.9%	5 7.4%
Postposed Path	10 7.9%	4 7.8%	2 2.9%
Other	5 4.0%		
TOTAL	126	51 = 119	68

Table 5. Overview of constructions according to the group (C = conservative, I = inovative).

Comparing the homeland and the heritage group, we see a striking difference in the most frequently used construction: while both of the heritage groups prefer the simple construction; the homeland speakers use the complex construction in the majority of cases. This preference is even stronger in the "innovative" group than in the "conservative" group. Since the other constructions are substantively more marginal and very small in terms of absolute numbers, I shall not discuss them further, since it is hard to draw firm conclusions from this small data set.

In order to see whether the factors of age, generation, network, and place of residence on which I based the division of the two groups of Surinamese speakers do indeed play the role we assumed, I shall split out the frequencies of the constructions according to these factors in the following paragraphs.

5.2.2 SPEAKER VARIABLES

Generation

CONSTRUCTION TYPE	SURINAMESE JAVANESE			
	Generation 2	Generation 3	Generation 4	Generation 5
Simple construction	11 68.8%	36 75%	31 77.5%	13 86.7%
Complex construction	3 18.8%	7 14.6%	1 2.5%	2 13.3%
Construction with "place"	1 5.6%	1 2.1%	6 15%	
Postposed Path	1 5.6%	3 6.3%	2 5.0%	
PrepN construction		1 2.1%		
TOTAL	16	48	40	15

Table 6. Overview of constructions according to the generation of participants.

In Table 6, I split up the responses of the participants according to their generation. This table shows that the frequency of simple locative constructions rises the further the generations are away from the first generation of immigrants. The frequency of the complex construction is mostly reduced in every subsequent generation. Generations 4 and 5 show a somewhat deviant behaviour, since Generation 5 has a higher frequency than 4, but it must be remarked that these numbers are very small.

Age

In Table 7, I present the age groups of the participants of the usage of constructions, as it is assumed that younger speakers are increasingly dominant in Dutch and Sranantongo because of language shift, and are likely to diverge further from the homeland variety.

CONSTRUCTION TYPE	>60	40-60	<40
Simple construction	19 63.30%	19 73.10%	53 84.10%
Complex construction	5 16.70%	3 11.50%	5 7.90%
Construction with "place"	2 6.70%	4 15.40%	2 3.20%

CONSTRUCTION TYPE	>60	40-60	<40
PrepN construction			1 1.60%
Postposed Path	4 13.30%		2 3.20%
TOTAL	30		63

Table 7. Overview of constructions according to age groups of participants.

The fact that the simple locative construction is very common becomes quite clear here: it is the dominant construction in all age groups. There does appear to be a clear relationship to age: the frequency of the construction does rise as the age of the participants drops. On the other hand, the usage of the complex construction is highest in the oldest age group, and lowest for the youngest speakers, while the middle ones are in between.

Place of residence

CONSTRUCTION TYPE	DISTRICT	CITY
Simple construction	78 75.70%	13 81.30%
Complex construction	12 11.70%	1 6.30%
Construction with "place"	7 6.80%	1 6.30%
PrepN construction	1 1.00%	
Postposed Path	4 3.90%	1 6.30%
TOTAL	103	16

Table 8. Overview of constructions according to place of residence.

Table 8 presents the responses of the participants classified by their place of residence. As predicted, the district speakers have a slightly higher preference for complex constructions and a lower preference for simple locative constructions than the speakers in the urban area, although it must be noted that the number of utterances in the "urban" group is very low.

Network

Table 9 gives the responses according to the network classification of the participants.

	MOSTLY JAVANESE	MIXED	MOSTLY NON-JAVANESE
Simple construction	14 58.30%	55 78.60%	22 88%
Complex construction	6 25%	6 8.60%	1 4%
Construction with "place"	1 4.20%	5 7.10%	2 8%
PrepN construction	1 4.20%		
Postposed Path	2 8.30%	4 5.70%	
Total	24	70	25

Table 9. Overview of constructions according to the interaction network.

In Table 9, the participants with the "mostly Javanese" network show the highest frequency of the use of the complex construction of all groups, while the participants with the mostly non-Javanese network show the opposite: they have the highest frequency of simple constructions and the lowest for the complex construction. The "mixed" network participants are in between these frequencies for both constructions.

Results per stimulus

In this section I discuss the results of every individual stimulus, and explore possible differences. I concentrate mainly on the ratio of the simple locative construction compared to the complex construction within and between each group, since these have been shown to be the main constructions which also show most divergence, whereas the other constructions are more marginal.

Stimulus 1: StickOnTable_Still

In this stimulus, the homeland group has a clear preference for the complex construction, in which the PrepN indicates the position of the stick as being on the "top" of the table (*(n)dhuwur(é)/(n)dukur(é)* 'high/top'). The simple construction of GenPrep-Ground is not very frequent in the baseline group (see Table 10), but it is the preferred construction in the heritage group.

Construction type	Indonesian Javanese	Surinamese Javanese	
		Group C	Group I
Simple construction	2 7.1%	10 76.9%	14 93.3%
Complex construction	23 82.1%	3 23.1%	
Construction with "place"			1 6.7%
PrepN construction	3 10.7%		
Total	28	13	15
		28	

Table 10. Constructions per group elicited by Stimulus 1.

Other, more marginal constructions are of the type PrepN-Ground as in (24). There is one construction with *(ng)gon* 'place' in (25).

(24)   *ana*   *juthik*   *n-dukur-é*   *méja*
       EXIST   stick   N-top-DEF   table
       'There is a stick on top of the table.'

(25)   *nang*   *nggon*   *méjané*   *ènèng*   *eh*   *anu*   *ti_*   <u>*tiki*</u>
       LOC   place   table-DEF   EXIST   HES   thing   HES   stick
       'At the table there is eh, a thing, a stick.'

In the Sranantongo utterances, there was one occurrence with only a PrepN (*tap'* 'top'), one with an existential verb and PrepN (*de tap'* 'to be (on) top'), and finally one with an existential verb and two PrepNs (*de in' tap'* 'to be in top').

In their Dutch utterances, both of the speakers used a construction which did not fit the canonical pattern described in Section 3.2, with a positional verb. The speakers used an existential construction without a positional verb, as in (26) below.[5]

(26)   EXIST   Figure   Path   Ground
       Er   *is*   *een stok*   *op*   *tafel*
       there   is   INDF stick   on   table
       'There is a stick on the table.'

---

[5]   This might be the result of earlier influence from Sranantongo on Surinamese Dutch, although further research is necessary to assess this idea.

Stimulus 2: Bottle_Table

Construction type	Indonesian Javanese	Surinamese Javanese	
		Group C	Group I
Simple construction	4	12	17
	10.8%	92.3%	89.5%
Complex construction	28	1	1
	75.7%	7.7%	5.3%
Construction with "place"	1		1
	2.7%		5.3%
PrepN construction	3		
	8.1%		
Other	1		
	2.7%		
Total	37	13	19
		32	

Table 11. Constructions per group elicited by Stimulus 2.

In this stimulus, the homeland speakers again have a clear preference for the complex construction (see Table 11), although it is less clearly pronounced than in Stimulus 1. Rather surprisingly, the two groups of heritage speakers behave almost the same in their preference for the simple construction, with the supposedly "conservative" group even showing a slightly higher frequency. The use of the complex construction is still relatively more frequent in Group C, although both groups only have a frequency of 1. Group I also has one case of construction with "place", like the homeland group. This latter group shows some more variation in the usage of constructions without any locative preposition ("top [table]") or even PrepN ("[table]"). There is one example, rendered below, of a speaker who only expresses the Figure and Ground, connected by a verb of placement (classified as "other").

(27)   Figure   Ground
      onok   *wong*   *ng-gawa*   *botol*   *di-dèkèk*   *méja*
      EXIST   person   AV-carry   bottle   UV-put   table
      'Someone carries a bottle (and) puts it on the table.'

All three Sranantongo speakers expressed the Path simply with PrepN *tap'* 'top'. In their Dutch utterances, one used preposition *op* 'on', while the other one was a juxtaposition of Figure and Ground ("a table with a bottle").

Stimulus 3: BottleInBasket_Still

CONSTRUCTION TYPE	INDONESIAN JAVANESE	SURINAMESE JAVANESE	
		Group C	Group I
Simple construction	4 10.8%	3 21.4%	10 62.5%
Complex construction	20 51.4%	5 35.7%	3 18.8%
Construction with "place"		2 14.3%	1 6.3%
Postposed Path	10 27.0%	4 28.6%	2 12.5%
PrepN construction	3 8.1%		
Total	37	14 30	16

Table 12. Constructions per group elicited by Stimulus 3.

For this stimulus, the homeland group again showed a preference for the complex construction over the simple construction (see Table 12). In the heritage group, the picture is largely similar to Stimulus 1, with a preference for the simple locative construction in the "innovative" group. However, in the "conservative" group, the preference is a bit different: among them the complex construction is more frequent than the simple construction. Other possible constructions are the postposed Path, and the construction with "place" ((*ng*)*gon*) as in (28).

(28)   *ning*   *nggon*   *n-jeron*   *kranjang*   *botol-é*
        LOC   place   N-inside   basket   bottle-DEF
        'At the inside of a basket is the bottle.'

Two of the Srananatongo speakers used a construction consisting of the existential verb in combination with the PrepN *in'* (*de in'* 'to be inside'), while the other one used only a PrepN:

(29)   Figure   PrepN   Ground
       wan   *fles*   *wijn*   *in'*   *wan*   *mandje*
       INDF   bottle   wine   in   INDF   basket
       'A bottle of wine in a basket.'

Both of the Dutch speakers used a juxtaposition construction ("basket with wine").

Stimulus 4: Ladder_Tree_Lean

CONSTRUCTION TYPE	INDONESIAN JAVANESE	SURINAMESE JAVANESE	
		Group C	Group I
Simple construction	10 41.7%	9 81.8%	16 88.9%
Complex construction	5 20.8%		
Construction with "place"	6 25%	1 9.1%	2 11.1%
PrepN construction		1 9.1%	
Other	3 12.5%		
Total	24	11	18
		29	

Table 13. Constructions per group elicited by Stimulus 4.

For this stimulus, all groups, including the homeland speakers, have a preference for the simple locative construction, although this preference is visibly higher in the heritage groups (see Table 13). As for the complex constructions, there is quite a bit of variation in the PrepN: I find *cidèké* 'nearness', *ngisor* 'under', as well as *jèjèr* 'side'.

(30)

				Figure	GenPrep	PrepN	Ground
onok	*wong*	*wédok*	*ng-gawa*	*andha*	*nang*	*cidèk-é*	*pohon*
EXIST	person	female	AV-carry	ladder	LOC	nearby-DEF	tree

'There is a woman who carries a ladder towards the tree.'

(31)

				Figure	GenPrep	PrepN	Ground
ana	*wong*	*wédok*	*nye-èlèh-ké*	*andha*	*ning*	*ng-isor*	*uwit*
EXIST	person	female	AV-put-APPL	ladder	LOC	N-bottom	tree

'There is a woman who puts a ladder at the bottom of the tree.'

(32)

			Figure	GenPrep	PrepN	Ground
wong	*wadon*	*iki*	*n-dèkèk*	*andha*	*ning*	*jèjèr*	*wit*
person	female	this	AV-put	ladder	LOC	side	tree

'This woman puts a ladder next to the tree.'

There is also one case of construction with only a PrepN, in which the simple

locative preposition is left out:

(33)				Figure		PrepN	Ground
	wong	*wédok*	*n-dèkèk*	*andha*	*s_*	*jèjèr*	*wit*
	person	female	AV-put	ladder	HES	side	tree
	'A woman puts a ladder next to the tree.'						

A possible analysis of this utterance would be that *jèjèr* here is used similarly to the Dutch preposition *naast* 'next to', thus being re-analysed as a preposition instead of a noun.

Two of the Sranantongo speakers express the Path by means of a PrepN (*sei* 'side' and *tap'* 'on/top' respectively), while the other one use only the general locative preposition *na* (*na a bon* 'at the tree'). The Dutch speakers make use of specific locative prepositions (*onder* 'under' and *voor* 'in front of').

5.3 SUMMARY

All four stimuli, heritage speakers have a preference for the simple locative construction of the type Figure-GenPrep-Ground overall, in which GenPrep refers to the general locative preposition *nang* or a variant. Homeland speakers prefer the complex construction, Figure-GenPrep-PrepN-Ground, in which they specify the position by means of a nominal element referring to the exact position (for example *dhuwur* 'top' in Stimuli 1 and 2 or *jero* 'inside' in Stimulus 3).

This difference in preference between the homeland and heritage group is especially strong in cases in which the position of the object is on top of something else (in this case a table); the stick in Stimulus 1 and the bottle in Stimulus 2. This might be because the position of the Figure (on top) in these cases is more canonical or prototypical in reference to a table as Ground.

In Stimulus 3, picturing a bottle inside a basket, the preference of the Surinamese speakers for the simple construction is also present. However, the difference between homeland and heritage speakers is less striking than for Stimuli 1 and 2. This could be because a position of a Figure inside the Ground is less canonical than the Figure being on top of the Ground, as in 1 and 2.

As for Stimulus 4, in which a ladder is being put against a tree, the Indonesian group also has a rather high frequency for the simple locative construction. This might be explained by the fact that the position of the ladder in relation to the tree here is not entirely clear; it is leaning against it, so could be described as being at the bottom of the tree, next to it, or just in its proximity. This is shown by the larger variety in constructions elicited by this stimulus, also in Dutch (*voor* 'in front of' and *under* 'under') and Sranantongo (*sei* 'next to', *tap'* 'on', *na* LOC).

Overall, the Surinamese speakers seemed to generalize the (simpler) construction with the locative preposition *nang* to all types of situations, whereas the Indonesian speakers mostly prefered to specify the position by means of a PrepN, which differs depending on the exact Path.

6. DISCUSSION

As we have seen in the previous sections, Surinamese Javanese shows a higher preference for the use of general or "simple" locative constructions compared to Indonesian Javanese. I first discuss the general tendencies found in the whole data set, before examining the separate stimuli and differences found between them.

Factors which play a role in the overall preference for simple constructions are the speakers' age, generation, place of residence, and network. All of these factors are associated with a position further along the cline of language shift, towards the dominant languages Sranantongo and Dutch. The increased preference for simple constructions is mostly at the expense of the complex construction, in which the location is specified by means of a prepositional noun. This observation fits well within the expected tendency of "simplification" among heritage speakers (Thomason 2001: 12; Silva-Corvalán 2008; Hickey 2010: 214). But how does this simplification arise exactly? Furthermore, why does it occur specifically in the locative construction? Below, I give a more detailed account of how this change could have come about.

When a speaker of Surinamese Javanese is describing one of these stimuli, he/she first selects the order in which the elements of Figure, Path, and Ground will appear. The fact that the order [Figure-Path-Ground] is most frequent is probably favoured by universal tendencies as well as the fact that both Dutch and Sranantongo have this as their canonical linear order for locative constructions.

When it comes to the selection of which elements to include in the expression of the Path, multiple factors are at play. The multilingual speaker first selects the general locative preposition *nang*, a choice which I suggest is favoured by three factors: first of all, the fact that *nang*, as a general locative preposition, is so widely applicable (in static as well as dynamic motion events), and therefore requires a little cognitive load. The second factor favouring *nang* might be its functional and phonological equivalence to Sranantongo *na*. Finally, the functional category of *nang*, as a preposition rather than a noun, plays a role. To understand why this is the case, let me first look at Dutch and Sranantongo more closely.

As discussed in Section 3.2, in Dutch, locative constructions are usually encoded by means of either an existential or posture verb and a locative preposition, for example *in* 'in' or *op* '*on*'. In Sranantongo, a locative construction consists of optional *de* 'to be at' which combines with either *na* (LOC) or with a locative nominal element (PrepN), or with both. One of these locative elements is *ini*, literally 'inside'. According to Yakpo, Van den Berg, and Borges (2015: 186), *ini* is grammaticalizing towards a prototypical preposition, under the influence of Dutch syntactic structure and its phonological similarity to Dutch *in* 'in'. As evidence to support this assumption, they take the fact that na is frequently absent in sentences with *ini*. However, if we look at the small corpus of Sranantongo locative constructions collected for this study, we actually see a similar development in the case of *tapu* 'top' (see the examples

in 5.2.3 for Stimulus 1 and Stimulus 2). Here, *tapu* is also most frequently used on its own, without *na*. Another argument suggesting the grammaticalization of *tapu* towards a more preposition-like element is the fact that it is commonly phonologically reduced to *tap'*, which is one of the signs of grammaticalization (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 17). This could then lead to the speakers perceiving *tapu* and *ini* as belonging to a preposition-like category, similar to Dutch prepositions, and consequently being more prone to selecting a prepositional element in Javanese as well.

After the relatively straightforward selection of *nang*, the selection of PrepN is a bit more complicated. This can be explained by two reasons; first, every situation/position requires its own type of PrepN, so the speaker has to be very aware of the exact relationship of the Figure to the Ground and, of course, also needs a wider vocabulary to select the correct PrepN. Secondly, most of these PrepNs do not have an exact equivalent in Dutch and/or Srananutongo. This becomes clearer when we look at the example of the stick on the table: this relationship (the Figure is on top of the Ground) would be encoded by means of the PrepN *dhuwur*, which means 'high' (adjective) as well as 'top' (noun) in Javanese. However, this association with the adjectival meaning 'high/tall' does not exist in Dutch *op* 'on' or Srananutongo *tapu* 'top'. Therefore this word does not have an exact semantic equivalent in either Srananutongo or Dutch locative constructions. Srananutongo *tapu* means only 'top', whereas Dutch *op* is a specific locative preposition expressing a relationship of the Figure being on top of the Ground. Also, the word *dhuwur* is not very specific about whether or not there is direct surface contact between the Figure and the Ground, which means that it can also be used in the meaning of the Figure "being somewhere above" the Ground. All of these semantic differences could make the selection of this PrepN more complex for the speaker and, since it is only preferred in baseline Javanese and not strictly required, the most natural possibility for these multilingual speakers is to leave out the PrepN altogether. This would also explain the decreased usage of the complex construction; two developments which go hand in hand.

There were also some differences in preferences between the stimuli: in Stimuli 2 (bottle-table) as well as Stimuli 4 (ladder-tree), the two groups of heritage speakers behave very similarly, quite differently to the way they behaved towards the other two stimuli. One of the possible explanations for this, as set out in Section 5.3, is the canonicity of the position, and whether or not the interpretation of the GenPrep was logically predictable. However, this only explains the divergences found in Stimulus 4, since the position of the ladder vis-à-vis the tree is not entirely clear, but in Stimulus 2, the position of the bottle vis-à-vis the table (on top of it) is not very marked. Therefore I would like to propose another factor: the presence of motion. In both Stimuli 2 and 4, the Figure is being moved (by a human agent) towards the Ground and then placed in a position relative to it. In order to use a PrepN here, a speaker would have to be able to predict the final position of the Figure vis-à-vis the Ground, which is not always obvious, especially for Stimulus 4. This

also explains why in this particular Stimulus, even the baseline group uses the simple locative construction frequently.

In the case of individual speaker factors, it was found that use of the simple locative construction generally increased at the expense of the complex construction if speakers were younger, of a later generation, living in the urban area, or with a less Javanese-speaking network. This confirmed the expectations as formulated in Section 4, and suggests that this is indeed a change (partially) caused by language contact and increasing language shift.

However, the difference between heritage and homeland is already visible in the "conservative" group, suggesting that this divergence might have already been taking place over a longer time. This in turn could suggest that it might have initially been caused by language contact with Sranantongo, which has been in contact with Javanese ever since the beginning of the labour migration. Assigning this main role to Sranantongo is further supported by the similarity of Javanese preposition *nang* to Sranantongo *na*, whereas we find no such equivalence in Dutch. In fact, Dutch canonical locative constructions with a positional verb do not even occur in the corpus, and therefore do not seem to play a role in the formation of locative construction for the heritage speakers.

7. Conclusions

This paper has looked at locative construction in heritage Surinamese Javanese. My research questions were threefold: (i) How do locative constructions in heritage Javanese differ from those used in homeland Javanese? (ii) Can these divergences be explained by the influence of language contact, and if so, does the effect come from Dutch, Sranantongo, or both? (iii) What is the influence of the individual speaker factors age, generation and place of residence, and can these be brought together to distinguish different types of speakers?

The answer to question (i) would be that the difference between heritage and homeland Javanese lies mainly in usage frequencies. While the homeland speakers prefer complex constructions, including a PrepN, heritage speakers most frequently use a simple construction with only a GenPrep. The answers to questions (ii) and (iii) are related: there is indeed evidence to suggest that this divergence is caused by language contact, since factors which are associated with increased language contact (younger age, later generation, place of residence, and type of network) are all related to an increased usage of the simple construction and a decrease in the complex construction. On the basis of this evidence, we cannot exclude the influence of one of the two contact languages. Nevertheless, I assume that Sranantongo might have played a bigger role, since it has been in contact with Javanese for a longer period of time and because of the similarity between Sranantongo *na* and Javanese *nang*.

ABBREVIATIONS

AV	actor voice
APPL	applicative
DEF	definite
EXIST	existential verb
GenPrep	general locative preposition
HES	hesitation
INDF	indefinite
LOC	locative
N	nasal
PrepN	prepositional noun
PP	prepositional phrase
PROG	progressive
RED	reduplication
UV	undergoer voice

REFERENCES

ABS (Algemeen Bureau voor de Statistiek). 2012. *Censusstatistieken 2012; Districten naar ressort en etnische groep census 8*. Paramaribo: Algemeen Bureau voor de Statistiek, Censuskantoor.

Arps, Ben, et al. 2000. *Hedendaags Javaans*. Leiden: Leiden University, Opleiding Talen en Culturen van Zuid-Oost Azië en Oceanië. [Semaian 20.]

Deusen-Scholl, Nelleke van. 2003. "Toward a definition of heritage language; Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations", *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 2(3): 211–230. [DOI:10.1207/S15327701JLIE0203.]

Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hermawan, Yeremiah. 2017. "The locative constructions in frog story narratives; A comparative study between Surinamese Javanese and Java Javanese". MA thesis, Radboud University Nijmegen.

Hickey, Raymond. 2010. *The handbook of language contact*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell. [DOI:10.1002/9781444318159.]

Hoefte, Rosemarijn. 1987. "Het politiek bewustzijn van Hindostaanse en Javaanse contractarbeiders, 1910-1940", *Oso* 6(1): 25–34.

Jansen, Bert, Josien Lalleman, and Pieter Muysken. 1981. "The alternation hypothesis; Acquisition of Dutch word order by Turkish and Moroccan foreign workers", *Language Learning* 31(2): 315–336.

Johanson, Lars. 2002. "Contact-induced change in a code-copying framework", in: Jones, Mari C. and Edith Esch (eds), *Language change; The interplay of internal, external, and extra-linguistic factors*, pp. 285–314. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. [Contributions to the sociology of language 86.]

Klamer, Marian. 1998. *A grammar of Kambera*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar; Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford, California, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lestiono, Riski. 2012. "Spatial relations in frog story narratives; A comparative study between Surinamese Javanese and Java Javanese". MA thesis, Radboud University Nijmegen.

Moro, Francesca. 2016. *Dynamics of Ambon Malay; Comparing Ambon and The Netherlands*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.

Prada Pérez, Ana de. 2015. "Spanish-Catalan bilingual subject pronoun production and the vulnerability hypothesis". [Paper, Bilingualism in the Hispanic and Lusophone World Conference, Leiden, 14-16 January.]

Şahin, Hülya. 2015. *Cross-linguistic influences; Dutch in contact with Papiamento and Turkish*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Language contact and change; Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 2008. "The limits of convergence in language contact", *Journal of Language Contact* 2: 213–224.

Sneddon, James Neil, et al. 2010. *Indonesian reference grammar*. Crows Nest: Allen and Unwin.

Staden, Miriam van, Melissa Bowerman, and Magriet Verhelst. 2006. "Some properties of spatial description in Dutch", in: Levinson, Stephen C. and David P. Wilkins (eds), *Grammars of space; Explorations in cognitive diversity*, pp. 475–511. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511486753.014.]

Talmy, Leonard. 1985. "Lexicalization patterns; Semantic structure in lexical forms", in: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic descriptions, vol. 3; Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, pp. 57–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. [DOI: 10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/03032-1.]

Thomason, Sarah G. and Terrence Kaufman. 1991. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Villerius, Sophie. 2017a. "Developments in Surinamese Javanese", in: Yakpo, Kofi and Pieter Muysken (eds), *Boundaries and bridges; Multilingual ecologies in the Guianas*, pp. 151–178. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. [DOI: 10.1515/9781614514886-006.]

Villerius, Sophie. 2017b. "Modality and aspect marking in Surinamese Javanese; Grammaticalization and contact-induced change", in: Heiko Narrog, Kees Hengeveld, and Hella Olbertz (eds), *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality, and evidentiality*, pp. 111–132. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Villerius, Sophie. 2017c. "Het Surinaams-Javaans anno 2016", *Oso* 36(1): 274–290.

Yakpo, Kofi, Margot van den Berg, and Robert Borges. 2015. "On the linguistic consequences of language contact in Suriname; The case of convergence", in: Eithne B. Carlin, et al. (eds), *In and out of Suriname; Language, mobility, and identity*, pp. 154–195. Leiden: Brill. [DOI: 10.1163/9789004280120_009.]

Yakpo, Kofi and Pieter Muysken. 2014. "Language change in a multiple contact setting; The case of Sarnami (Suriname)", in: Buchstaller, Isabelle, Anders Holmberg, and Mohammad Almoaily (eds), *Pidgins and creoles beyond Africa-Europe encounters*, pp. 101–140. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.