Journal of Language and Literature
Vol. 23 No. 1, April 2023, pp. 56 - 66
DOI: 10.24071/joll.v23i1.5198
Available at https://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/JOLL/index



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Locative Imperatives in Javanese

Suhandano
suhandano@ugm.ac.id
Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, INDONESIA

Abstract

Javanese is a member of the Western Austronesian language, a sub-family of the Austronesian language family. Languages in this sub-family are known in linguistic literature as having an exceptional feature in their voice system among the world's languages and continue to be exciting issues in the theory of syntax. This paper investigates the voice system in Javanese and focuses on the locative imperative clauses' voice system. Data are collected from the Javanese spoken in Yogyakarta at the ngoko level. This study demonstrates that Javanese has five variants of locative imperative clauses: intransitive locative imperatives, active locative imperatives, passive locative imperatives, locative imperatives with actor focus, and locative imperatives with locative focus. The five variants of imperatives reflect the voice system of the clauses. There are two voice systems of locative imperatives in Javanese: a two-voice system and a multiple-voice system. Intransitive locative imperatives, active locative imperatives, and passive locative imperatives are imperatives within the two-voice or active-passive voice systems. The other two variants of locative imperatives, the locative imperatives with actor focus and the locative imperatives with locative focus, are types of locatives imperatives within the multiple voice system. The existence of the two voice systems in Javanese indicates that this language is in the process of changing from a multiple-voice language to a two-voice language.

Article information

Received: 27 September 2022

Revised: 21 December 2022

Accepted: 26 December 2022

***Keywords**: Javanese, imperative, locative, voice system*

Introduction

Imperative clauses can be found in all languages, so this type of clause is universal. Indeed, the universality of the imperative is still debatable. Zhang (1990) distinguishes two types of imperatives, strong and weak, and says that strong imperatives are not universal. There are also reports that there is no imperative clause in some languages, such as Rapanui, Lango, and Maori. A closer scrutiny of these languages, however, shows that they have imperative clauses that stand clearly apart from other clauses, such as declarative and interrogative clauses (Alcázar and Mario Saltarelli, 2014).

Journal of Language and Literature
ISSN: 1410-5691 (print); 2580-5878 (online)

Imperative clauses have their grammatical properties, differ from the grammatical properties of the other two moods of clauses, and differ from one language to another. In some languages, imperatives appear simple in their forms, but in others, they can also be dauntingly complex (Aikhenvald, 2017). In English, the verb of imperative clauses appears in the bare form, without any affixes. Aikhenvald (2016) reported that the verb of imperatives in Manambu, a Ndu language from the East Sepik Province of Papua New Guinea, has a complex form and consists of a stem and some affixes. In Korowai, a Papuan language, imperative verbs consist of a stem and a person-number suffix which can be first person, second person, and third person, both singular and plural (Vries, 2017). In Karawari, transitive imperative verbs consist of a stem, an imperative suffix, followed by a suffix marking a transitive object (Telban, 2017).

This paper discusses imperative clauses in Javanese, a member of the Austronesian language family in the Western Austronesian sub-family. In the linguistic literature, languages in this group are known as having an exceptional feature in their voice system among the world's languages. Their voice system has become an interesting issue and a matter of debate in the study of syntactic theories (Himmelmann, 2002; Naes, 2013; Chen & McDonnell, 2019). The discussion of the Javanese voice system in this paper focuses on the voice system of locative imperatives (LI), a type of imperative clause that consists of a verb and two core arguments, an actor and a locative.

Austronesian languages exhibit varieties of voice systems that can roughly be divided into two types: Philippine and Indonesian (Himmelmann, 2002). Arka & Ross (2005) make more details in classifying Austronesian languages. The Indonesian type or the two-voice type language is further classified into two types: a two-voice type with morphological markers on the verb and a two-voice type without morphological markers on the verb. They also add another type of language with no voice system. So, according to Arka & Ross (2005), there are four types of Austronesian languages in terms of their voice system. Javanese is included in the Indonesian type, i.e., the sub-type of the two-voice type with morphological markers on the verb.

Studies of voice systems in Austronesian languages are generally carried out in declarative clauses, but as Blust (2013:499) said, voice systems can also be found in imperative clauses, as indicated by the existence of multiple forms of imperative marking. To illustrate, consider the two LI clauses in (1) and (2).

1) Para-ni kantor-e!
   come-APL office-DEF
   Come to the office!'
2) Para-nana kantor-e!
   come-LF office-DEF
   Come to the office!'

The two clauses in (1) and (2) express the same meaning 'Come to the office!'. The two clauses have a structure: the verb comes at the beginning of the clause, followed by the locative argument that is expressed in a noun phrase (NP). The verb of the two clauses has the same root or stem *para*, but they take a different suffix. In (1) the verb appears with the suffix *-i,* and the verb in (2) takes the suffix *-nana*. The suffix *-i* is an applicative suffix (APL) and the suffix *-nana* indicates a locative focus (LF). The difference of suffixes on the verb marks the difference in voice system of the clauses. The LI clause in (1) is an LI clause in the active voice, while the LI clause in (2) is an LI clause in the actor focus (AF) voice.

This paper addresses two questions: what are the variants of LI clauses in Javanese? and why does Javanese have variants of LI clauses. The first question will be answered by describing the types of LI clauses in Javanese. It will be showed that there are five types of LI clauses in Javanese. The second question will be answered by explaining that the existence of imperative clause variants in Javanese is related to the voice system of the clauses. There are two voice systems of LI clauses in Javanese: a two-voice system and a multiple voice system.

The relationship between affixes on verbs and the voice system in Javanese has been described by Poedjosoedarmo (2002). She identified affixes on Javanese verbs that mark voice/focus system in declarative, imperative, and desiderative modes. She found that in

active declarative clauses the affix *N-* marks a patient focus, the affix *N-ake* marks a benefactive focus, and the affix *N-i* marks a locative focus. In passive declarative clauses the prefix *di-* marks a patient focus, the affix *di--ake* marks a benefactive focus, and the affix *di--i* marks a locative focus. In imperative clauses the suffix *-a, -en, -(k)na, -ana* respectively marks an actor focus, a patient focus, a benefactive focus, and a locative focus. In Javanese desiderative clauses a patient focus is marked by the affix *dak--e*, a benefactive focus is marked by the affix *dak--(k)ne*, and a locative focus is marked by the affix *dak--ane*. So, four arguments may be the focus of a clause in Javanese: an actor, a patient, a benefactive, and a locative. In this paper, I elaborate on one of them, that is a locative focus in imperative clauses.

Suhandano (2021a) discussed the benefactive and instrumental focus of the imperative clauses in Javanese. He found that benefactive and instrumental arguments of Javanese imperative clauses can be present as elements of clauses that are focused or unfocused. The benefactive and instrumental arguments are expressed in prepositional phrases (PP) when they are not focused. When they are focused, the two arguments are expressed in noun phrases (NP), and the clauses' verb appears with the suffix *–(k)na*. Their position in the clause structure also differs when they are focused and when they are not. This evidence leads him to conclude that there are two voice systems in Javanese imperatives with benefactive and instrumental arguments: a two-voice system active-passive and a multiple-voice system. The existence of the two voice systems in Javanese indicates that this language is changing from a multiple-voice type language to a two-voice type language.

Suhandano (2021b) discussed the similarities and differences between imperative clauses with actor and patient arguments in Javanese and Indonesian and found that Javanese has more variants of imperatives than those of Indonesian. In Indonesia, there are two types of imperatives: active and passive. In addition to these two types of imperatives, Javanese has two other imperatives: imperatives with actor focus and imperatives with patient focus. He argued that Indonesian and Javanese have different number of imperative clause variants because their voice systems are different. Indeed, Indonesian and Javanese voice systems are derived from the same voice system, the multiple voice system of the proto-Austronesian. The multiple voice system of proto-Austronesian has developed into a two-voice, active-passive system in Indonesian. The voice system in Javanese also changes from the multiple voice system of proto-Austronesian to a two-voice system, but the change is not yet completely finished, at least in the imperative clauses. Javanese still maintains the multiple voice system of its ancestor language so that the imperative clauses of the Javanese language apply two voice systems. That is why Javanese has many variants of imperative clauses with actor and patient arguments than those of Indonesian. This paper further explores the findings by looking at the voice system of LI clauses or imperatives with actor and locative arguments. The results of exploring the voice system in LI clauses reinforce the previous finding that there are two voice systems in Javanese imperative clauses, that is the multiple voice system and the two-voice system. This also strengthens the hypothesis that Javanese is being changing from the language type of multiple voice system to the two-voice system.

Methodology

Javanese is the largest Austronesian language in terms of the number of native speakers. It is also spoken in a wide area, in the island of Java, in some parts of Indonesia where Javanese speakers migrate, even outside of Indonesia, such as in Suriname and New Caledonia. Therefore, Javanese has many geographical dialects such as the Javanese dialects of Tegal, Banyumas, Yogyakarta, Surabaya, Malang, Osing, etc. In addition to the geographical dialects, there are also social dialects of Javanese that can roughly be divided into two variants: the *ngoko* variant/ordinary or low variant and the *krama* variants/respect or high variant. The data of the discussion in this paper are collected from the Javanese dialect of Yogyakarta, the standard dialect of Javanese, in the *ngoko* variant.

The data are in the form of spoken Javanese and collected through the observation method. The researcher observed the use of Javanese in

everyday conversations by its speakers. From these observations, the researcher obtained a number of imperative clauses. Not all imperative clauses, however, become data in this study. The data of this study are locative imperative clauses. Therefore, the imperative clauses found from observation must be identified to select the locative imperatives. An imperative clause will be identified as a locative imperative when it contains a locative as a core argument.

The data are analysed from two approaches, the synchronic approach and the diachronic approach. The LI clauses in Javanese are described synchronically to find out their structural characteristics. For this purpose, two methods are employed, they are the immediate constituent analysis method and the distributional method. Using the immediate constituent analysis method, the elements of LI clauses are identified. There are at least three elements of LI clauses: the verb, the locative argument, and the actor. The actor, however, does not always appear explicitly in the clause structure. The three elements, then, are analyzed in their positions in the clause structure by applying the distributional method. The three elements are permuted in the clause structure so that it is known which order is possible and which is not possible or which strings which are grammatical and ungrammatical. Each element of the clause is further analyzed by looking at their marker. The marker found on the locative arguments is a preposition, and the markers found on the verbs are affixes. From the results of synchronic analysis, then, the variants of LI clauses in Javanese are described. The analysis with the synchronic approach was carried out to answer the first question, what are the variants of LI clauses in Javanese.

The diachronic approach is carried out by comparing the results of the synchronic analysis to the voice system of Proto-Austronesian as proposed by Wolff (Blust, 2013, p. 438). The comparison focuses on the affixes on the verbs that mark the argument focused on the clause. In addition, the diachronic analysis was also carried out by comparing the results of the synchronic analysis with the typology voice system of Austronesian languages proposed by Arka and Ross (2005). From this comparison, the development of the Javanese language is interpreted. Javanese is changing from a multiple voice type language to a two-voice type language so that this language has variants of imperative clauses. The diachronic analysis is intended to answer the second question, why does Javanese have variants of LI clauses.

Results and Discussion

There are five variants of LI clauses in Javanese: intransitive LI, active LI, passive LI, LI with actor focus, and LI with locative focus. The existence of these five variants is related to the two types of voice systems of Javanese imperative clauses: the two-voice system and the multiple voice systems. The first three variants are variants in the two-voice system, and the other two variants are variants in the multiple voice system. These findings answer the two research questions above. Before the variants of LI clauses are described and discussed in terms of the voice system of Javanese imperatives, to facilitate the understanding of discussion, it is needed to give a brief overview of the structure of Javanese LI clauses.

The Structure of Locative Imperatives

Javanese LI clauses consist of a verb with two arguments, an actor and a locative. Among the three elements, the actor of LI clauses tends to be optional. The actor may present explicitly in the clause, but it may be absent in the clause. For example, in LI clause (3) below, the actor is absent, and in (4), the actor *kowe* appears explicitly in the clause

3) Lungguh-a ing kursi iku!
sit-AF on chair that
'Sit on that chair!'
4) Kowe lungguh-a ing kursi iku!
you sit-AF on chair that
'Sit on that chair!'

The actor's optionality in the Javanese LI clauses is not an exception. It is prevalent that the actor (the subject or the addressee) of imperatives in the majority of languages of the world is not expressed explicitly as Alcázar and Mario Saltarelli (2014) said, the subject of an imperative seems to be optional, even in languages that ordinarily need to express it. In

canonical imperative, the actor or the addressee of imperatives is always a second person (Aikhenvald, 2010). Zanuttini (2008) calls imperatives with null subjects in English as core imperatives and they are generally accepted cross-linguistically. The addressee of the two LI clauses in (3) and (4) is a second person *kowe* 'you'. Therefore, the two LI clauses can be categorized as canonical imperatives.

LI clauses in Javanese have a structure: the verb comes at the beginning of the clauses, followed by the locative argument. For some LI clauses, the locative argument may come at the beginning of the clause. For example, the locative argument of LI clauses in (5) can be moved at the initial position of the clause as in (6), and both LI clause in (5) and (6) are grammatical.

5) Lungguh-ana kursi iku!
sit-LF chair that
'Sit on that chair!'
6) Kursi iku lungguh-ana!
chair that sit-LF
'Sit on that chair!'

The two LI clauses above express the same command and consist of the same elements, but their structure differs. The verb of the two clauses also takes the same suffix, *-ana* indicates a locative focus (LF). This means that the verb and the locative argument is not in a fixed order in the clause structure. The verb may come in the initial position of the clause, followed by the locative argument (Verb + Locative), or the locative argument comes in the initial position of the clause, followed by the verb (Locative + Verb).

Morphologically the verb of LI clauses may take different affixes that indicate the types of LI clauses. In example (1) above, the verb takes the suffix *-ni*. In (2), the verb takes the suffix *-nana*. In (3) and (4), the verb takes the suffix *-a*, and in (5) and (6), the verb takes the suffix *-ana*. Based on the affixes that attach to the verb, the LI clauses in Javanese can be classified into five types. The five types or variants of LI clauses in Javanese are (a) intransitive LI clauses, (b) active LI clauses, (c) passive LI clauses, (d) LI clauses with AF, and (e) LI clauses with LF. In addition to the difference of affixes on the verb, the locative arguments are also expressed in two different categories, in an NP or a PP. The variants of LI clauses are described below.

Intransitive Locative Imperatives

Intransitive LI clauses in Javanese consist of an intransitive verb followed by a locative argument in the forms of prepositional phrases. The verb may be in a stem form (without affixes), as in (7), or a verb prefixed *N-* as in (8).

7) Lungguh ing kursi iku!
sit on chair that
'Sit on that chair!'
8) M-(p)ara menyang kantor-e!
ACT-come to office-DEF
'Come to the office!'

The verb *lungguh* in (7) is an intransitive verb, it consists of a single morpheme or a monomorphemic word. The verb *mara* in (8) is an intransitive verb that consists of two morphemes, the prefix *N-* which indicates an active verb (ACT) and the stem *para*. The verb *mara* is a complex word or a polymorphemic word.

In the intransitive LI clause (7) the locative argument is expressed in the PP *ing kursi iku* which consists of the preposition *ing* and the NP *kursi iku*. In the intransitive LI clause (8) the locative argument is expressed in the PP *menyang kantore* which consists of the preposition *menyang* and the NP *kantore*. The choice of the preposition to mark the locative argument depends on the semantic characteristics of the verb.

The locative argument in intransitive LI clauses bears grammatical relations as an oblique, not an object (for discussion of grammatical relations in Javanese, see Suhandano, 2015). Since the verbs such as *lungguh* and *mara* are followed by locative arguments bearing grammatical relation of an oblique, they are categorized as intransitive verbs. Therefore, LI clauses with such verbs are called intransitive LI clauses.

Based on intransitive LI clauses as exemplified in (7) – (8), it can be said that intransitive LI clauses in Javanese have two characteristics. First, the locative arguments

are expressed in prepositional phrases, take the preposition *menyang* or *ing*, and they bear grammatical relations as obliques. Second, morphologically the verb can be monomorphemic words (stem verbs) or polymorphemic words (complex words). When the verbs are complex words, they consist of the prefix *N-* and a stem. The verb of intransitive LI clauses has no suffix.

Active Locative Imperatives

In Javanese, intransitive LI clauses can be changed into active LI clauses through the syntactic operation of applicative. When it occurs, the preposition marked the locative argument is deleted and the verb takes the applicative (APL) suffix *-i/-ni*. The two intransitive LI clauses in (7) and (8), for examples, can be changed into active LI clauses in (9) and (10) respectively.

9) Lungguh-i kursi -ne!
Sit-APL chair-DEF
'Sit on the chair!'
10) Para-ni kantor-e!
come-APL office-DEF
'Come to the office!'

In the active LI clauses (9) and (10) the verb takes the suffix *-i/-ni.* The suffix *-i* appears when the stem of the verb ends in consonants as in (9) and the suffix *-ni* appears when the stem of the verb ends in vowels as in (10). The suffix -i/-ni, an applicative suffix, indicates a grammatical relation changing from an oblique relation to an object relation (Suhandano, 2015). The locative arguments in (9) and (10) are not expressed in a PP as in (7) and (8), but they are expressed in an NP, which bears a grammatical relation to object.

The LI clauses such as in (9) and (10) are called active LI clauses. The active LI clauses have similarities with active clauses in declarative moods. Compare the LI clauses in (9) and (10) with their active declarative counterparts, respectively, in (11) and (12) below.

11) Ali ng-lungguh-i kursi-ne.
Ali ACT-sit-APL chair-DEF
'Ali sat on the chair'
12) Ali m-(p)ara-ni kantor-e.
Ali ACT-come -APL office-DEF
'Ali came to the office'

In both the active LI clauses and their active declarative counterparts, the verb takes the suffix -i/-ni and the locative argument is expressed in an NP. The differences are that the subject of the active declarative clauses does not appear in the active LI clauses and the prefix N- on the verb of active declarative clauses is deleted in the active LI clauses.

So, it can be concluded that the active LI clauses have two characteristics. First, the verb of active LI clauses takes the suffix -i/-ni and without any prefix. Secondly, the locative argument is expressed in an NP, not in a PP as in the intransitive LI clauses.

Passive Locative Imperatives

Javanese active LI clauses have their counterparts in their passive forms. The active LI in (9) and (10), for example, can be expressed in their passive forms in (13) and (14) respectively.

13) Kursi -ne di-lungguh-i!
chair-DEF PAS-sit-APL
'Sit on the chair!'
14) Kantor-e di-para-ni!
office-DEF PAS-come-APL
'Come to the office!'

Javanese passive LI clauses have characteristics: the verb take the passive prefix *di-* and the suffix *-i/-ni*. The locative argument may come in front of the clause or before the verb as in (13) and (14); and it may come in after the verb as in (15) and (16).

15) Di-lungguh-i kursi-ne!
PAS-sit-APL chair-DEF
'Sit on the chair!'
16) Di-para-ni kantor-e!
PAS-come-APL office-DEF
'Come to the office!'

The actor argument of passive LI clauses cannot be expressed explicitly. Trying to express explicitly the actor of the LI clause in (15), for example, will produce the ungrammatical clause in (17).

17) *Kowedi-lungguh-i kursi-ne!
you PAS-sit-APL chair-DEF
'Sit on the chair!'

The ungrammaticality of (17) can be explained as follow. In declarative passives, the prefix *di-* appears on the verbs when the actor is a third person. When the actor is a first person, the verb takes the prefix *tak-*; and when the actor is a second person, the verb takes the prefix *kok-*. Consider the passive declarative clauses below.

18) Kursi-ne di-lungguh-i Ali.
chair-DEF PAS-sit-APL Ali
The chair was sat/occupied by Ali.
19) Kursi-ne tak-lungguh-i.
chair-DEF I-sit -APL
The chair was sat/occupied by me.
20) Kursi-ne kok-lungguh-i.
chair-DEF you-sit-APL
The chair was sat/occupied by you.

In the passive declarative (18), the actor is *Ali*, a third person NP, and the verb takes the prefix *di-*. In the passive declarative (20), the actor is a second person and the verb takes the prefix *kok-*. In the passive LI clause (17), the verb takes the prefix *di-*, so the actor must be a third person. That is why the LI clause (17) is ungrammatical. But why a passive with third person actor is used in imperative clauses. The use of a third person actor or subject in imperative clauses is also found in other languages; imperative of this type is called a non-canonical imperative (Aikhenvald, 2010). Therefore, passive LI clauses in Javanese can be categorized as a non-canonical imperative.

Locative Imperatives with Actor Focus

Another variant of the LI clauses in Javanese is the LI clause with actor focus (LI with AF). This type of LI characteristic is that the verb takes the suffix *-a*. Consider the LI clause in (21) and (22) below.

21) Lungguh-a ing kursi iku!
Sit-AF on chair that
'Sit on that chair!'
22) M-(p)ara-a menyang kantor-e!
ACT-come to office-DEF
'Come to the office!'

The verb of the LI with AF in (21) and (22) consist of the stem and the suffix *-a*. In (21) there is no prefix on the verb and in (22) the verb takes the prefix *N-*. The verb will take the prefix *N-* if in its declarative counterpart the verb appears with the prefix *N-*, but if in its declarative counterpart the verb does not appear with the prefix *N-*, the verb does not take the prefix N-. Therefore, the morphology of the verbs in LI with AF clauses is the same as those in their declarative counterparts except the presence of the suffix *-a*. This differs from active LI clauses in which the prefix *N-* on the verb of their declarative counterparts is deleted in the imperative mode.

LI clauses consist of two arguments, an actor and a locative. Both the actor argument and the locative argument can be focused on. When the actor is focused, the verb will take the suffix *-a*. So, the suffix *-a* marks the actor focus. It is the argument, not the locative argument, that focused in the LI clauses in (21) and (22). When the locative argument focuses, the verb will take a different suffix described in the next section below.

As described above, the locative argument of LI clauses can be expressed in a PP and an NP. The locative argument is expressed in a PP in the intransitive LI clauses; and it is expressed in an NP in the active LI clauses and passive LI clauses. The locative argument in the LI with AF clauses is expressed in a PP as in the intransitive LI clauses. The locative argument in (21) *ing kursi iku* is a PP which consists of the preposition *ing* and the NP *kursi iku*. Likewise, the locative argument in (22) *menyang kantore* is also a PP which consists of the preposition *menyang* and the NP *kantore*.

It is worth to bear in mind that the actor argument presents in all types of imperative clauses, not only in LI clauses, although it tends to appear implicitly. Therefore, the actor focus can be found in all types of imperative clauses. There is no a locative argument in the following imperative clauses, all of the imperatives focused on the actor, marked by the suffix *-a* on the verb.

23) Meneng-a!
quite-AF
'Be quite!'

Journal of Language and Literature
ISSN: 1410-5691 (print); 2580-5878 (online)

24) Tuku-a kue iku!
buy-AF cake that
'Buy that cake!'
25) Ng-gawa-a kue iku nggo Ali!
ACT-bring-AF cake that for Ali
'Bring that cake for Ali!'

Locative Imperatives with Locative Focus

Javanese LI with locative focus (LF) clauses are marked by the verb's suffix -ana or -nana. The verb will take the suffix *-ana* when it ends in consonants (26). When the verb ends in vowels, it will take the suffix *-nana* as in (27).

26) Lungguh-ana kursi iku!
sit-LF chair that
'Sit on that chair!'
27) Para-nana kantor-e!
come -LF office-DEF
'Come to the office!'

Morphologically, the verb of LI with LF only takes the suffix *-ana/-nana*, it does not take any prefixes. Note that the verbs in the two clauses above appear without the prefix *N-*. The verb *para* that takes the prefix *N-* in LI with AF as in (22) appears without the prefix *N-* in (27). The absence of the prefix N- on the verb of LI with LF is similar to the verb of active LI clauses.

As the locative argument of active LI clauses, the locative argument of LI with LF clauses is also expressed in an NP. It differs from the locative arguments of intransitive LI clauses and LI with AF clauses in which the locative argument is expressed in a PP. The locative argument *kursi iku* in (26) and *kantore* in (27) are NPs and are not preceded by prepositions.

Since the locative argument in (26) and (27) is focused, it can be put in the initial position of the clause as in (28) and (29).

28) Kursi iku lungguh-ana!
chair that sit-LF
'Sit on that chair!'
29) Kantor-e para-nana!
office-DEF come -LF
'Come to the office!'

So, the LI with LF clauses have characteristics: (i) the verb takes the suffix -ana/-nana without the prefix N-, (ii) the locative argument is expressed in an NP, and (iii) the structure can be: the verb comes in the initial position of the clause and followed by the locative argument, or vice versa, the locative argument comes in the initial position of the clause followed by the verb.

Locative Imperatives and the Voice System

The description of LI clauses above shows that there are five variants of LI clauses in Javanese. Different affixes mark each variant on the verb and the locative argument may be expressed in an NP or a PP. The characteristic of each variant of LI are summarised in the table 01 below.

Table 1. The characteristics of variants of LI clauses

Type of LI	Affixes of verbs	Category of the locative
Intransitive LI	N-/Ø	PP
Active LI	-i/-ni	NP
Passive LI	di--i/-ni	NP
LI with AF	N-/Ø--a	PP
LI with LF	-ana/-nana	NP

The intransitive LI has characteristics: the verb may take the prefix *N-* or may have no affixes, and the locative argument is expressed in a PP. The active LI has characteristics: the verb takes the suffix *-i/-ni,* and the locative argument is expressed in an NP. The passive LI has characteristics: the verb takes the prefix *di-* and the suffix *-i/-ni*, the locative argument is expressed in an NP. The LI with AF has characteristics: the verb takes the suffix *-a* and the locative argument is expressed in a PP. The LI with LF has characteristics: the verb takes the suffix *-ana/-nana,* and the locative argument is expressed in an NP.

The five variants of LI clauses can be classified into two types: the first type includes three variants: the intransitive LI, the active LI, and the passive LI; and the second type includes the LI with AF and the LI with LF.

Compared with their declarative counterparts, the LI clauses of the first type are similar to their declarative counterparts. The intransitive LI clauses are similar to their intransitive declarative counterparts. The verbs in intransitive LI and intransitive declarative appear in the same forms, some verbs take the prefix *N-* and some other verbs appear without any affixes. The locative arguments in the two moods of clauses are also expressed in the same category in a PP. The difference of intransitive LI clauses and intransitive declarative clauses lies on their intonation when they are spoken. The intransitive LI clauses end in a raising tone, meanwhile, the intransitive declarative clauses end in a falling tone.

The active LI clauses are similar to their active declarative counterparts. In LI clauses and their active declarative counterparts, the verb takes the suffix *-i/-ni* . But, the prefix *N-* in the verb of active declaratives is deleted in the active LI clauses. Likewise, the passive LI clauses are similar to their passive declarative counterparts in which the verb of the two moods of clauses takes the prefix *di-* and the suffix *-i/-ni*. The similarity of LI clauses and their declarative counterparts in terms of their affixes on the verbs and their categories of the locative arguments can be seen in table 2 below.

Table 2. The affix on verbs and their category of locatives in locative declarative and locative imperative

Type	Declarative		Imperative	
	affix	Loc	affix	Loc
intransitive	N-/Ø	PP	N-/Ø	PP
active	N--i/ni	NP	-i/-ni	NP
passive	di--i/ni	NP	di--i/ni	NP

Indeed, the LI clauses of the first type differ to their declarative counterparts in the case of the presence/absence of the subject. The subject presents explicitly in the declarative clauses, but it absents in the LI clauses. The absence of subject is not specific for the LI clauses, but it is a general phenomenon of imperatives (Alcázar and Mario Saltarelli, 2014). Therefore, based on the similarities of the LI clauses of the first type to their declarative counterparts, it seems that the voice system of the LI clauses of the first type are the same as those of their declarative counterparts the two-voice system: active voice and passive voice. In other words, the existence of the intransitive LI, the active LI, and the passive LI is reflection of the two-voice system in Javanese clauses. It agrees with the classification of Austronesian languages proposed by Arka and Ross (2005) in which Javanese is in the group of Indonesian or two-voice types.

How about the LI with AF and the LI with LF? The existence of the LI with AF and the LI with LF clauses in Javanese indicates another type of voice system in Javanese. Actors, and locatives are arguments of clauses. If these arguments can be the focus of imperative clauses, or be focused, is it possible to focus other arguments such as patients, benefactives, or instrumentals. The answer is that, in addition to the actor and locative arguments described above, the other arguments can be focused in the Javanese LI clauses. Suhandano (2021) shows that the patient argument can be focused in the LI clauses. The LI with PF (patient focus) are marked by the suffix *-en/-nen* on the verb as in (30) below.

30) Waca-nen buku-ne!
read-PF book -DEF
'Read the book!'

Benefactive and instrumental arguments can also focus on LI clauses in Javanese. The LI clause in (31) and the LI clause in (32) are examples of the LI with BF (benefactive focus) and LI with IF (instrumental focus), respectively.

31) Gawa-kna ibu-mu kue-ne!
bring-BF mother-your cake-DEF
'Bring the cake for your mother!'

32) Gebug-na tongkat-mu nyang ula-ne!
hit-IF stick-your to snake-DEF
'Hit the snake with your stick!'

The verb of the LI with BF in (31) takes the suffix *-kna* and the verb of the LI with IF in (32) takes the suffix *-na*. The suffix *-kna* and *-na* are allomorphs of the same suffix; *-kna* appears when it attaches to a word ends in vowels as in

Journal of Language and Literature
ISSN: 1410-5691 (print); 2580-5878 (online)

(31) and *-na* appears when the suffix attaches to a word ends in consonants as in (32). The LI with BF and the LI with IF are marked by the same suffix, the suffix *-na/-kna*. The same affix marks that benefactive and instrumental voices is not only found in Javanese, but it is also found in Formosan and Philippine languages as reported by Wolff (Blust, 2013).

It is clear that locative, actor, patient, benefactive, and instrumental arguments can be the focus of imperatives clauses in Javanese. This suggests that Javanese is a type of the multiple voice system or the Philippine type of Austronesian languages.

Therefore, there are two voice systems in Javanese imperative clauses: the two-voice system and the multiple-voice system. The five types of LI clauses discussed in this paper come from the two voice systems. The intransitive LI, active LI, and passive LI clauses are imperatives in the two-voice system and the LI with AF and LI with LF clauses are imperatives in the multiple-voice system. The two voice systems underline variants of imperative clauses in Javanese.

It seems that the existence of two different voice systems in Javanese indicates that this language is in the process of changing from the multiple voice system to the two-voice system. As it is widely accepted, the multiple voice system is the original voice system of the Austronesian languages or the voice system of proto-Austronesian. Donohue (2008) says that the change in the presence and nature of voice systems follows the migration path of the Austronesians, moving the highly marked diathesis to a more 'normal' diathesis. It seems that Javanese follows this path.

This conclusion, however, needs to be confirmed using other evidence, such as evidence from the voice system in declarative clauses. To ensure that the existence of five variants of the LI clauses in Javanese is the result of the development of the multiple voice system in proto-Austronesian, it is also necessary to compare the affixes of verbs in the Javanese LI clauses with the affixes of voice system markers in the proto-Austronesian. In addition, it is also necessary to compare the case markers of the arguments in the Javanese LI clauses with the case markers in the proto-Austronesian as reconstructed by Blust (2015).

Conclusion

There are five variants of LI clauses in Javanese: the intransitive LI, active LI, passive LI, LI with AF, and LI with LF. The five variants have the same structure, the verb comes in the initial position of the clause, followed by the locative argument; although it is also possible to place the locative argument in the initial position of the clause. As generally found in other languages, the subject or the addressee of Javanese LI clauses tends to be absent in the clause structure. The locative argument s expressed in two categories: a PP and an NP. The verb of the clause has different affixes in the five variants of Javanese imperatives, the affixes mark the different variants of LI clauses.

The five variants of LI clauses in Javanese come from two different voice systems, the multiple voice system, and the two-voice system. The multiple voice system is the voice system of the proto-Austronesian. It seems that Javanese is in the process of changing from the multiple-voice system to the two-voice system.

This finding reinforces the statement that affixes on Javanese verbs are related to the voice system/focus system of the language (Poedjosoedarmo, 2002). In addition, The findings also strengtens the hypotesis that there are two voice systems in the Javanese imperative clauses and the existence of the two voice systems indicates that Javanese is in the process of changing from a multiple voice language to a two-voice language (Suhandano, 2021a,b).

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2010). *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2016). Imperatives and commands in Manambu. *Oceanic Linguistics*, *55* (2), pp. 634-668.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R. M. W. Dixon. (2017). *Commands: Across Linguistic Typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alcazar, Asier and Mario Saltarelli. (2014). *The Syntax of Imperative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arka, I Wayan & Malcolm Ross. (2005). Introduction. In *The many Faces of Austronesian Voice Systems: Some New Empirical Studies*. I Wayan Arka and Malcom Ross eds.: pp. 1-15. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Blust, Robert. (2013). *The Austronesian languages*. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics, The Australian National University.

_____. (2015). The Case-markers of proto-Austronesian. *Oceanic Linguistics 54 (2)*:436-491

Chen, Victoria and Bradley McDonnell. (2019). Western Austronesian voice. *Annual Review of Linguistics 5*, 18.1- 18.23.

Donohue, Mark. (2008). Malay as a mirror of Austronesian: Voice development and voice variation. *Lingua*, *118,* pp. 1470-1499.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (2002). Voice in western Austronesian: an update. In *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking*. Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross eds.: pp. 7-16. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Næss, Åshild. (2013). From Austronesian voice to Oceanic transitivity: Äiwoo as the "missing link". *Oceanic Linguistics 52*(1), pp. 106-124.

Poedjosoedarmo, Gloria. (2002). Changes in word order and noun phrase marking from old to modern Javanese: Implications for understanding developments in Western Austronesian focus sytems. In *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking.* Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross eds.: pp. 311-330. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics

Suhandano. (2015). *Grammatical Relations in Javanese*. Munchen: LINCOM GmbH

_____. (2021a). Fokus imperative dan instrumental dalam kalimat imperative bahasa Jawa. *Widyaparwa 49*(1), pp. 40-30.

_____. (2021b). Actor and patient in Javanese and Indonesian imperative clauses. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 622*, 99-106

Telban, Borut. (2017) Commands as a form of intimacy among the Karawari. In *Commands: Across linguistic Typology*. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon eds: 226-282. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vries, Laurens de. (2017). The imperative paradigm of Korowai, a greater Awyu language of West Papua. In *Commands: Across linguistic Typology*. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon eds: 250-265. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wouk, Fay, and Malcom Ross. eds. (2002). *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Zhang, Shi. (1990). *The Status of Imperatives in Theories of Grammar*. (Doctoral Dissertation). The University of Arizona.

Zanuttini, Raffaella. (2008). Encoding the addressee in the syntax: evidence from English imperative subjects. *Nat Lang Linguist Theory 26*, pp. 185-218.