



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Bahasa doeloe: Indies Dutch in folk linguistic perspective**

Reintjens, Merel

### **Citation**

Reintjens, M. (2023). *Bahasa doeloe: Indies Dutch in folk linguistic perspective*.

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master Thesis, 2023](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3629911>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# *Bahasa doeloe*

---

## Indies Dutch in folk linguistic perspective

**MA thesis linguistics**

M.E. Reintjens

30-05-2023

**Supervisor:**

dr. A.T.P.G. van Engelenhoven

This thesis builds on van Engelenhoven's (2014) observation that 'speaking' Indies Dutch language varieties in the Netherlands no longer arises from multilingual competence, but rather from linguistic folklore. It takes into account the effect of postcolonial memory-making (Pattynama, 2013) and colonial power dynamics on Indo-Dutch heritage (van Leeuwen, 2008) and explores to what extent these forces have affected Indies Dutch linguistic folklore. Semi-structured interviews with six second generation Indo-Dutch respondents revealed that Indies Dutch linguistic folklore consists of a holistic set of linguistic, paralinguistic and cultural markers that arise primarily from one's familial and cultural background.

*Dedicated to JR, JB, CS, FS, IK and MS,  
without whom this thesis could not have been completed.*

*A special thanks to dr. van Engelenhoven,  
for his patience, stimulating discussions and continuous support.*

*Terima kasih semua.*

## Table of contents

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| 1. Introduction.....  | 4     |
| 2. Research question.....   | 4     |
| 3. Theoretical frame.....   | 4-10  |
| 3.1 Terminology.....  | 5     |
| 3.2 Historical background: colonial power dynamics.....                           | 5-7   |
| 3.2.1 Cross-demographic contact.....  | 5-6   |
| 3.2.2 Becoming Dutch: changes in the colony.....                                  | 6     |
| 3.2.3 The ghost of the colony: the Indo-Dutch in the Netherlands.....             | 7     |
| 3.3 The making of postcolonial heritage.....                                      | 8     |
| 3.4 Indo-Dutch linguistic heritage: linguistic folklore and folk linguistics..... | 8-10  |
| 3.4.1 Indies Dutch: a broad contact variety.....                                  | 8-9   |
| 3.4.2 Indies Dutch or Petjoh? Confusion and construction.....                     | 9-10  |
| 4. Methodology.....   | 10-12 |
| 4.1 The folk linguistic method.....   | 11    |
| 4.2 Respondents.....  | 11    |
| 4.3 Interview structure and stimuli fragments.....                                | 11-12 |
| 4.4 Free, prior and informed consent.....   | 12    |
| 4.5 Recordings and transcripts.....   | 12    |
| 5. Stimuli analysis.....  | 13-21 |
| 5.1 Transcript fragment 1.....  | 13    |
| 5.1.1 Phonology.....  | 13-14 |
| 5.1.1.1 Consonants.....   | 13-14 |
| 5.1.1.2 Vowels.....   | 14    |
| 5.1.1.3 Suprasegmentals.....  | 14    |
| 5.1.2 Lexicon.....  | 14-15 |
| 5.1.3 Morphology.....   | 15    |
| 5.1.4 Syntactical features.....   | 15-17 |
| 5.2 Transcript fragment 2.....  | 17    |
| 5.2.1 Phonology.....  | 17-18 |
| 5.2.1.1 Consonants.....   | 17    |
| 5.2.1.2 Suprasegmentals.....  | 18    |
| 5.2.2 Lexicon.....  | 18    |
| 5.2.3 Syntactical features.....   | 18-20 |
| 5.3 Transcript fragment 3.....  | 20    |
| 5.3.1 Lexicon.....  | 20    |
| 5.3.2 Syntactical features.....   | 21    |
| 6. Indies Dutch in folk linguistic perspective.....                               | 21-29 |
| 6.1. Linguistic profiles.....   | 21-22 |
| 6.2 Indies Dutch vs. Petjoh.....  | 22    |
| 6.3 Folk phonology.....   | 22-23 |
| 6.3.1 Pre-fragments.....  | 22-23 |
| 6.3.2 Post-fragments.....   | 23    |
| 6.4 Folk syntax.....  | 23-26 |
| 6.4.1 Pre-fragments.....  | 23-25 |
| 6.4.2 Post-fragments.....   | 26    |
| 6.5 Folk lexicon.....   | 26-27 |
| 6.5.1 Pre-fragments.....  | 26-27 |
| 6.5.2 Post-fragments.....   | 27    |
| 6.6 Language use.....   | 28-29 |
| 7. Conclusion.....  | 29-31 |
| References.....   | 32-33 |
| Appendices.....   | 34-48 |

## Transcription conventions

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| ::          | Lengthening (Gumperz and Berenz, 1993, p. 121; Niedzielski and Preston, 2000, p. xviii) |
| ..          | Short pause (Du Bois et al, 1993, p. 88)  |
| ..(N)       | Longer pause (Du Bois et al., 1993, p. 88)  |
| .           | Final intonation (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 88)   |
| ,           | Continuing intonation (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 88)                                      |
| [ ]         | Speech overlap (Du Bois et al, 1993, p. 88; Niedzielski and Preston, 2000, p. xviii)    |
| ?           | Rising intonation/question tone (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000, p. xviii)               |
| (* *)       | Standardization (Gumperz and Berenz, 1993, p. 121)                                      |
| (H)         | Inhalation (Du Bois et al., 1993, p. 89)  |
| @           | Laughter (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)   |
| <@ @>       | Laugh quality (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)  |
| <Q Q>       | Quotation quality (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)  |
| <SM SM>     | Smile quality (modelled on Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 69)                                  |
| <WH WH>     | Whisper quality (Du Bois et al., 1993, p. 69)   |
| <SARC SARC> | Sarcastic quality (modelled on Du Bois et al., 1993, p. 69)                             |
| <L2 L2>     | Code switch (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)  |
| CAPS        | Emphasis (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000, p. xviii)                                      |
| !           | Animated talk (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000, p. xix)                                   |
| ()          | Vocal noise (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)  |
| (( ))       | Researcher's comment (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)                                       |
| (/ /)       | Phonetic transcription (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)                                     |
| <X X>       | Uncertain hearing (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)  |
| X           | Indecipherable syllable (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)                                    |
| \$          | Non transcription line (Du Bois et al. 1993, p. 89)                                     |
| { }         | Redacted content  |
| -           | False start   |

## *Bahasa doeloe*

### Indies Dutch in folk linguistic perspective

#### 1. Introduction

While widespread multilingualism among the Indo-Dutch population prompted the development of a number of contact varieties during the Dutch colonial occupation of Indonesia (Salverda, 2014; van der Sijs, 2014), discussion of this linguistic component of Indo-Dutch heritage is generally restricted to linguistic literature<sup>1</sup>. Where anthropological works are concerned, the varieties are touched upon briefly within the larger framework of Indo-Dutch cultural heritage (M. de Vries, 2009; van Leeuwen, 2008), if at all<sup>2</sup>.

This thesis aims to make the first stride in bridging the gap between works on Indo-Dutch cultural heritage and Indo-Dutch linguistic heritage by arguing that the same forces that determined the shaping and perception of Indo-Dutch cultural heritage can be said to apply to Indo-Dutch linguistic heritage. It builds on van Engelenhoven's (2014) observation that 'speaking' Indies Dutch language varieties in the Netherlands no longer arises from multilingual competence, but rather from linguistic folklore: assumptions, memories and associations related to the varieties. That constructed memories are central to Indo-Dutch heritage as a whole will be demonstrated in Chapter 3 through an examination of lingering colonial power dynamics (van Leeuwen, 2008) and the concept of postcolonial memory-making (Pattynama, 2013).

While linguistic folklore may apply to any aspect of language, this thesis restricts itself to the investigation of folk phonology, folk syntax, folk lexicon and language use among second generation Indo-Dutch people. To this end, six members of this generation were interviewed using an altered version of the folk linguistic method (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000). The interviews included three stimuli fragments which contained Indies Dutch. Chapter 5 will compare linguistic features found in these fragments to features described in the literature in order to familiarise the reader with Indies Dutch/Petjoh. It should be noted that this chapter will not provide an exhaustive review of linguistic features found in Indies Dutch/Petjoh. Chapter 6 will provide an analysis of the interviews, after which Chapter 7 will close with a conclusion and notes for additional research. Citation is done according to APA citation rules<sup>3</sup>

#### 2. Research question

The central question to the thesis is the following:

*How do second generation Indo-Dutch people construct Indies Dutch within the framework of linguistic folklore?*

#### 3. Theoretical frame

This chapter will open with an extended note on terminology, followed by a historical overview highlighting the societal dynamics that led to the development of Indies Dutch and Petjoh during the colonial period. It is not the aim of this thesis to provide the reader with a full overview of historical events relevant to the Indo-Dutch community.

---

<sup>1</sup> See for instance Bulan, 2018; J.W. de Vries 1994a, 1994b, 1996, 2005; Riyanto, 1996; van Rheeden, 1994, 1995; Salverda, 2014; van der Sijs, 2014.

<sup>2</sup> See for instance Captain, 2014; Pattynama, 2013; Steijlen, 2015.

<sup>3</sup> With the exception of dictionary entries. In order to preserve readability, in-text references to dictionary entries are put in footnotes and cited according to the rules for the reference list so readers may instantly access the source. Since all dictionary entries are from the same online dictionary, the dictionary is cited once and in its entirety in the reference list.

### 3.1 Terminology

This thesis focusses on the linguistic folklore surrounding contact varieties arisen among people of mixed Indonesian and European descent during the Dutch colonial occupation of Indonesia. After Indonesian independence, an estimated 200.000 members of this demographic migrated to the Netherlands (Jones, 2013). Historically, members of this demographic were known as Indo-Europeans (Captain, 2014). This term, however, became obsolete after the Second World War (M. de Vries, 2009) and yields immediate problems in a linguistic context.

The shortened form *Indos* (singular *Indo*), by which this group is often known in Dutch, seems a logical alternative. It is indeed used by a number of authors, both in linguistic (van Engelenhoven, 2014; van Rheeden, 1995) and anthropological works (van Leeuwen, 2008). In many cases, it is done to distinguish European/Indonesian mixed race individuals from white Dutch colonials, who are often referred to with the term *totoks* (M. de Vries, 2009; Pattinama, 2013; van Leeuwen, 2008; van Rheeden, 1995). However, in colonial times, the term *Indo* was typically used to refer poorer, lower-class members of the mixed race demographic and swiftly acquired negative overtones in the strongly racialized society of the Dutch East Indies (M. de Vries, 2009; van Rheeden, 1995). After migration to the Netherlands, the term has been reclaimed by some members of the community (van Leeuwen, 2008; van Rheeden, 1995), but not by all (M. de Vries, 2009).

A final option is the term *Indische Nederlanders* ‘Indo-Dutch’. While this term is also found in the literature (M. de Vries, 2009; Jones, 2013; Pattinama, 2013; Salverda, 2014), it is not without problems. Firstly, it is a contemporary invention (Captain, 2014) that at times may refer to all postcolonial migrants from the former Dutch East Indies, both the white colonials and those of mixed European and Indonesian descent (van Leeuwen, 2008). Secondly, in the work of van Rheeden (1995) and van Leeuwen (2008), *Indische Nederlanders* is attached to the European-oriented ‘upper-class’ of this latter group, thereby failing to include all its mixed race members. Both authors, whose work focuses on respectively the linguistic and cultural heritage of the demographic at large, use the term *Indo* for this reason.

Between epithets rooted in colonial power dynamics and a somewhat obscuring umbrella term, this thesis nonetheless opts for the latter. Indo-Dutch as used from here on follows Jones (2013) and M. de Vries (2009, p. 16) and refers only to postcolonial migrants and their descendants of mixed European and Indonesian ancestry. While M. de Vries (2009) adds the additional criterion of European legal status and Dutch citizenship, the definition of Indo-Dutch as used in this thesis encompasses all postcolonial mixed race migrants and their descendants, regardless of their legal status in the former Dutch East Indies.

### 3.2 Historical background: colonial power dynamics

#### 3.2.1 Cross-demographic contact

Despite the longstanding presence of the Dutch in Indonesia – roughly spanning three and a half centuries – the events that were of particular importance to the emergence of colonial contact varieties did not occur until the final 150 years of colonial occupation (van der Sijs, 2014).

One reason for this relative late development was the pre-existence of Malay as the area’s lingua franca, long before the arrival of the first European colonists (Salverda, 2014; van Rheeden, 1995; van Engelenhoven, 2014). Coupled with a comparatively low number of Dutch colonists until the 19<sup>th</sup> century (van der Sijs, 2014) and initial policies aimed at restricting the Dutch language to the Dutch ruling class (Salverda, 2014), this pre-existing linguistic situation ensured Malay’s hegemony as the language of everyday cross-demographic communication (Salverda, 2014; van Engelenhoven, 2014).

That Dutch was contained within the colonial elite and numerically rather insignificant, did not entail a lack of contact between different demographic groups (Salverda, 2014), as one of the main avenues of cross-demographic contact since the 17<sup>th</sup> century involved sexual relations between European colonists and Indonesian women (Baay, 2008; van Leeuwen, 2008; van Rheeden, 1995). The children born of these unions were usually raised by their mothers and/or domestic servants, who spoke varieties of Malay or an indigenous Indonesian language as their L1 (van Rheeden, 1995;

1994)<sup>4</sup>. As a consequence, Indo-Dutch children grew up with an L1 other than European Dutch and would only be exposed to the language of their fathers at a later age (van Rheeden, 1995), if at all (J.W. de Vries, 1996).

The legal status of children born of mixed unions hinged on legitimisation by their European fathers. If they were not legitimised, they were considered ‘natives’ i.e. Indonesians and therefore Dutch subjects (Jones 2013; van Leeuwen, 2008; van Rheeden, 1995). Those who were legitimised were legally considered Europeans (van Leeuwen, 2008) and therefore Dutch citizens (Jones, 2013; van Rheeden, 1995). Despite the fact that Dutch citizenship put Indo-Dutch of European legal status in the same legal category as the white ruling class, social, political and economic power remained concentrated in the hands of the Dutch colonial elite (Jones, 2013).

The legal separation of the colony’s population in discrete ethnic groups is an example of the racial stratification that was endemic to colonial society in the former Dutch East Indies (Jones, 2013). Within the colony’s racial hierarchy, Dutch colonists were positioned at the top, while Indonesians were positioned at the bottom. The Indo-Dutch, meanwhile, occupied an uneasy position between them. On the one hand their European ancestry – and more importantly their European legal status – afforded them some proximity to colonial power, while on the other hand their Indonesian roots made them targets of the colonial elite’s racialized anxieties (van Leeuwen, 2008). Socioeconomic problems that affected the Indo-Dutch but were not rooted in multiracial ancestry were consistently evaluated in ways that reflected fears over miscegenation and racial degradation (van Leeuwen, 2008). Such fears resulted in rampant negative stereotyping of the Indo-Dutch in colonial literature (van Leeuwen, 2008), that targeted their character, intelligence and speech (Baay, 2008; Salverda, 2014).

### 3.2.2 *Becoming Dutch: changes in the colony*

During the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, state-controlled businesses in the Dutch East Indies were denationalised, which drew a new cohort of Dutch migrants to the colony. Other than their predecessors, who generally settled in the colony permanently and sired children on Indonesian women, the new colonists brought their Dutch families – including their Dutch wives – with them. In addition, the majority of these new migrants returned to the Netherlands once their term at an Indies firm was over (J.W. de Vries, 1994b; van Rheeden, 1995). Due to being white, native speakers of Dutch, the new colonists automatically became part of the colonial ruling class (van Rheeden, 1995).

The expansion of the colonial elite led to a decrease in contact between different demographic groups and further exacerbated the pre-existing racial stratification in the colony (van Rheeden, 1995). Despite the fact that Malay remained the colony’s lingua franca, command of Dutch increasingly became necessary to advance one’s socioeconomic position (Salverda, 2014; van Rheeden, 1995). Access to the Dutch language became available through increased educational opportunities under the so-called *Ethische Politiek*<sup>5</sup> (van Rheeden, 1995), but stringent adherence to a European Dutch linguistic standard ensured that the Indo-Dutch faced intense pressure for their speech to resemble that of a native Dutch speaker, as well as socioeconomic marginalization when their Dutch inevitably showed interference from their L1 (Salverda, 2014).

The imposition of the Dutch standard was not restricted to language but permeated all aspects of life (Captain, 2014). As a consequence, the Indo-Dutch population became divided in those who were able to emulate the Dutch, and those who were not (Captain, 2014, van Rheeden, 1995). Linguistically, emulation of the Dutch standard expressed itself as a type of superstandard Dutch (Salverda, 2014; van den Toorn, 1957).

---

<sup>4</sup> If Dutch was spoken in the home, it was as a second language with extensive influence from speakers’ respective first language(s) (J.W. de Vries, 1996).

<sup>5</sup> A set of government policies inspired by the Enlightenment. Targeting all sectors of society, the goal of the *Ethische Politiek* was to recreate Indonesia in the likeness of an industrialized, Western European country (van Rheeden, 1995).



### 3.2.3 *The ghost of the colony: the Indo-Dutch in the Netherlands*

The collapse of the colonial system after Indonesian independence and the subsequent migration to the Netherlands did not undo centuries of colonial attitudes. In line with prior racial anxieties, the Dutch government considered the Indo-Dutch ‘Other’ (Captain, 2014) and unfit for life in the Netherlands (Jones, 2013). White Dutch colonials, by contrast, were exempt from similar assessment (Captain, 2014). Indo-Dutch Otherness was based on a supposed “Eastern orientation” – cultural and domestic customs in which they differed from the Dutch and Dutch society – (Captain, 2014; Jones, 2013, p. 38). This ascribed Otherness became grounds for discriminatory policies aimed at preventing the Indo-Dutch from settling in the Netherlands (Captain, 2014; Jones, 2013), despite the fact that many held Dutch citizenship (Jones, 2013). When this position proved untenable, the Dutch government instead assumed a policy geared towards full assimilation within the Netherlands (Jones, 2013).

While the push for assimilation is in part explained by the government’s focus on reconstruction following the Second World War (Pattynama, 2013), the centralised efforts to undo any supposed Eastern orientation of the newly arrived Indo-Dutch migrants (Captain, 2014) can be seen as the continuation of a colonial dynamic wherein the native Dutch norm is imposed and maintained through the threat of social and economic marginalization (van Leeuwen, 2008). As in colonial times, many Indo-Dutch people oriented themselves towards this standard (Pattynama, 2013), which profoundly affected the way in which Indo-Dutch cultural heritage would be transmitted to the next generation:

To achieve the goal of assimilation and integration, the first generation of Indo-European migrants had to emphasize their Dutch descent and to forget about their Indonesian heritage. The claim of assimilation and integration was so strong that many of the first generation Indo-Europeans passed this message on to their children, most of whom were born in the Netherlands (Captain, 2014, pp. 57-58).

The demand for assimilation and a focus on European hardships during the Second World War caused the experiences of the Indo-Dutch to remain outside the sphere of public awareness (Pattynama, 2013). In the absence of meaningful postcolonial discourse, a facsimile of postcolonial reflection arose whose primary tenet was a nostalgic longing for the former colony (van Leeuwen, 2008). The central focus on nostalgia as opposed to critical engagement with the colonial past was exemplary of Dutch postcolonial discourse until the 1980s and led to a cultural output with a heavy reliance on orientalist imagery and colonial stereotypes (Pattynama, 2013; van Leeuwen, 2008).

In accordance with old power dynamics, many contributors to these nostalgia-driven narratives were part of the former colonial elite. The fact that widespread nostalgia had furthermore made the fantasy of the former Dutch East Indies accessible to a Dutch audience allowed native Dutch artists to contribute to the shaping of the Indies’ postcolonial legacy (van Leeuwen, 2008). For the Indo-Dutch, the distorted memory of the colony worked as a conductor to safely channel feelings of displacement and disappointment after migration and assimilation. As such, it was not rare to find strong commitment to the fantasy image of the former colony among this group (van Leeuwen, 2008).

At the same time, some Indo-Dutch migrants did try to maintain their mixed identity, whether in the private sphere (Pattynama, 2013) or in the public eye (Captain, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2008). Most relevant from a linguistic point of view in this respect is Indo-Dutch writer and journalist Jan Boon – better known by his pseudonym Tjalie Robinson. Robinson strove for Indo-Dutch emancipation by emphasising the unique aspects of their bicultural heritage (van Leeuwen, 2008), which included Indies Dutch language varieties, and Petjoh in particular (J.W. de Vries, 1996, 2005; Salverda, 2014; van Rheeden, 1995). Despite the fact that Robinson and his next of kin were highly successful in establishing an enduring Indo-Dutch presence in the Dutch cultural circuit (Captain, 2014; Steijlen, 2015; van Leeuwen, 2008), his central message of bicultural identity and linguistic pride proved disorienting to a majority of the Indo-Dutch who had committed themselves to assimilating into Dutch society (van Leeuwen, 2008). After Robinson’s death in 1974, a situation arose where narratives crafted by the Dutch (whether native Dutch or ex-colonial) determined the wider public perception of both the postcolonial legacy of the former East Indies and the Indo-Dutch themselves (van Leeuwen, 2008).

### 3.3 *The making of postcolonial heritage*

The continuation of colonial dynamics post-migration and a strong focus on nostalgia as opposed to critical engagement with the colonial past caused Indo-Dutch cultural heritage and identity to become synonymous with a largely imaged ‘Indies’ cultural heritage devoid of painful baggage (van Leeuwen, 2008). In this configuration, Indo-Dutch/Indies culture could be integrated into Dutch national culture, much in the same way as the Indo-Dutch themselves integrated into Dutch society (van Leeuwen, 2008). As assimilation undid their prior ascribed Otherness (M. de Vries, 2009), both the Indo-Dutch and their cultural heritage became a “foreign yet familiar” (van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 17, translation M.R.) supplement to the Dutch nation (Captain, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2008).

Engagement with and distortion of the colonial past in order to serve a specific function in the present is part of what Pattynama (2013, p. 175) calls postcolonial memory-making. The collection of individual and collective memories that arise from memory-making yield a cultural memory that plays an essential role in a given community’s sense of identity, which is maintained through repeated reference to the memories at play (Pattynama, 2013).

Memory-making with regards to the Indo-Dutch and broader Indies community<sup>6</sup> is seen in the construction of the former colony as a land of harmless fantasy (van Leeuwen, 2008), in subsequent generations’ renewed interest in their families’ Indonesian roots (Captain, 2014; Pattynama, 2013; van Leeuwen, 2008), in increasing attention to the negative aspects of Dutch colonial occupation (Pattynama, 2013) and ongoing discussion of and reflection on the exact nature of Indo-Dutch cultural heritage and identity (Captain, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2008). Which voices and narratives were amplified during the early stages of postcolonial memory-making occurred along the axis of old power dynamics, thereby creating porous boundaries between Indo-Dutch and Dutch cultural memory (Pattynama, 2013). Such porous boundaries also affected the Indo-Dutch’ perception of their own cultural heritage and identity, as contemporary Indo-Dutch identity as defined by Indo-Dutch people themselves is often composed of highly stereotypical identity markers (Captain, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2008), or reduced to an elusive feeling (M. de Vries, 2009). Nevertheless, continuous engagement with the postcolonial legacy of the former Dutch East Indies ensures that the former colony and its associated narratives remain relevant as identity markers for Indo/Indies-Dutch migrants and their descendants (Pattynama, 2013).

### 3.4 *Indo-Dutch linguistic heritage: linguistic folklore and folk linguistics*

Since postcolonial memory-making is central to the construction and maintenance of Indo-Dutch cultural memory and identity, the question arises whether similar forces are at work with regards to Indo-Dutch linguistic heritage. This chapter will explore Indies Dutch and various issues associated with research on this variety in more depth and introduce the angle of folk linguistics (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000) as an alternative way to conduct research on Indies Dutch.

#### 3.4.1 *Indies Dutch: a broad contact variety*

Indies Dutch as used in this thesis follows Salverda (2014, p. 802-804) and refers to a linguistic continuum with origins in the former Dutch East Indies. One end of this continuum consists of a superstandard European Dutch, while the other end consists of heavily Malay-influenced Dutch. Between these two poles lie various ‘shadings’ of Indies Dutch, sometimes more and sometimes less admixed with Malay, depending partly on immutable characteristics such as one’s socioeconomic background, and partly on mutable characteristics such as conversational and/or social context, as well as individual preferences (Salverda, 2014).

While Petjoh is not strictly speaking part of the continuum by virtue of being a mixed language rather than a variety of Dutch (Salverda, 2014; van Rheeden, 1994; 1995, but see van Engelenhoven, 2014, for an alternative analysis), Salverda (2014) nonetheless includes it in his

---

<sup>6</sup> Here meaning all migrants from the former Dutch East Indies.

discussion of Indies Dutch contact varieties, likely due to its similar function as a marker of Indo-Dutch identity (van Rheeden, 1995). Furthermore, while Petjoh and Indies Dutch show theoretical differences, their difference in practice is not always apparent (see section 3.4.2). For this reason and for the purposes of this thesis, Petjoh is considered part of the Indies Dutch spectrum.

Due to concurrent societal pressure to speak and behave as Dutch as possible, Indies Dutch and Petjoh held notoriously low prestige throughout the colonial period (Salverda, 2014; van Rheeden, 1995)<sup>7</sup>. Even so, the Indies Dutch continuum was an integral part of the sociolinguistic environment of the former Dutch East Indies. While neither Indies Dutch nor Petjoh ever had a primarily communicative function and Dutch held overt prestige (Salverda, 2014), strategic movement along the continuum enabled speakers to highlight *or* downplay their Indo-Dutch identity across different social contexts (Salverda, 2014; van Rheeden, 1995). In addition to being used by multilingual Indo-Dutch speakers, it was not uncommon to find reproductions of Indies Dutch and/or Petjoh in racially charged satirical works (Salverda, 2014) or colonial novels depicting Indo-Dutch characters (Baay, 2008; van den Toorn, 1957; van Leeuwen, 2008).

With migration to the Netherlands, the circumstances that had facilitated the development and use of Indies Dutch and Petjoh changed abruptly (Bulan, 2018). Internalized negative attitudes towards the varieties (Riyanto, 1996; Bulan, 2018) as well as pressure to assimilate into a monolingual Dutch society resulted in a mass-shift to Dutch (Salverda, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2008), a process that was accelerated by the fact that many first generation Indo-Dutch migrants had (L2) command of Dutch (Salverda, 2014).

### 3.4.2 Indies Dutch or Petjoh? Confusion and construction

Indies Dutch and Petjoh's shared substrate presents difficulties in determining the point at which heavily admixed Indies Dutch morphs into Petjoh and vice versa<sup>8</sup>, as the varieties are phonologically similar enough to act as each other's substitutes in linguistic analysis (van Rheeden, 1995, p.14, p. 59; but see J.W. de Vries, 2005, for minor phonological differences).

To complicate matters, van Rheeden (1995) deems Indies Dutch a type of Indies-speech that arose post-migration, rather than in the former colony. This post-migration Indies Dutch is occasionally called Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995). Van Engelenhoven (2014) elaborates on this point by stating that Petjoh, as spoken by Indo-Dutch people in the Netherlands is in fact "(... ) more likely to concern imitations of something that in linguistic folklore was considered Petjoh." (p. 13, translation M.R.). According to van Engelenhoven (2014), such linguistic folklore extends to post-migration material often used in linguistic analysis.

For van Engelenhoven (2014), performativity and exaggeration are key features of post-migration Petjoh – and by extension post-migration Indies Dutch – in their function as linguistic markers of Indo-Dutch identity. The main component of this type of identity marking is a special emphasis on linguistic difference vis á vis Standard Dutch in order to highlight one's similarly distinct Indo-Dutchness. While Indies Dutch and Petjoh thus maintain their original function as markers of Indo-Dutch identity, the linguistic competence of its speakers has changed. Where pre-migration speakers were at least bilingual in Malay and Dutch and spoke the varieties according to this bilingual competence (Salverda, 2014), post-migration speakers are typically monolingual in Dutch and speak either variety according to memories of relatives' speech, rather than active, bilingual competence in Malay and Dutch (van Engelenhoven, 2014).

Since linguistic folklore refers to "(...) orally transmitted beliefs about a language that circulate in a community" (van Engelenhoven, 2014, p. 12, translation M.R.), the parallel with Pattynama's (2013) postcolonial cultural memory seems apparent. In the same manner in which the

---

<sup>7</sup> In colonial times, these varieties were assigned the general moniker *pecok* or *pecuk*, denoting the supposedly 'crooked' quality of the language (van Engelenhoven, 2014). Over time, the term *pecok* narrowed in scope to denote only the Malay-based mixed language from Batavia, nowadays known as Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1994; van Engelenhoven, 2014).

<sup>8</sup> van Leeuwen (2008, p. 78), for instance, considers a set of fairy tale retellings by Johan Fabricius rare recordings of post-migration Petjoh, while van Rheeden (1995, p. 14) considers the same recordings a blend of Indies Dutch and another type of *pecok* than Robinson's Betawi Petjoh.

colonial past remains a cornerstone of Indo-Dutch identity through the construction and redistribution of memories relating to the former colony, so are Indies Dutch language varieties kept relevant to Indo-Dutch identity by reference to a language that one does not speak (van Engelenhoven, 2014). The identity-affirming aspect of ‘speaking’ Indies Dutch is illustrated by the following quote from M. de Vries’ (2009) study:

In gezelschap van andere Indische mensen wordt het soms opeens heel Indisch! Indische stopwoordjes, en van die dingen die mijn moeder ook deed: een bepaalde gezichtsuitdrukking, een bepaalde manier van snoepen en zelfs van hikken. Het is heel moeilijk te benoemen, maar we voelen ons er hárstikke lekker bij. Het duurt even, en daarna zijn we weer gewoon. (p. 148)

*In the company of other Indo-Dutch people things sometimes get very Indies! Indies Dutch fillers, and one of those things my mother used to do: a certain facial expression, a certain way of eating snacks and even hiccupping. It is very difficult to define, but we feel extremely good while doing it. It lasts a while, and afterwards we’re normal again. (p. 148, translation M.R.)*

Here, Indies Dutch – or what is thought to be Indies Dutch – is ‘spoken’ among Indo-Dutch people as a way of establishing and commemorating a collective Indo-Dutch identity. The language itself is characterised as consisting of a broad range of paralinguistic features (facial expressions, ways of eating and hiccupping) in addition to linguistic ones (fillers), triggered in an in-group environment. In addition, the switch to Indies Dutch is temporary and positioned opposite the speakers’ regular mode of speech and behaviour.

The continuation of aforementioned colonial power dynamics within the Netherlands can be argued to have had a similar effect on Indies Dutch linguistic folklore as on Indo-Dutch cultural memory. As mentioned the previous section, Indies Dutch has long been used for satirical or humorous purposes, often with racist overtones (Salverda, 2014, van Leeuwen, 2008). After migration to the Netherlands, this trend was continued in the television programme *The Late Late Lien Show*, where actress Wieteke van Dort played an Indo-Dutch ‘auntie’ who entertained her audience with comedic sketches and songs in the spirit of Indies nostalgia (van Leeuwen, 2008)<sup>9</sup>. Both the television show and Tante Lien herself were well-received by Dutch and more European-minded Indo-Dutch audiences, yet her character consisted of an amalgam of colonial stereotypes concerning the more ‘Eastern’ subset of the Indo-Dutch population, including associated language use and speech patterns (Salverda, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2008). Since van Dort herself had belonged to the upper echelon of colonial society, her impersonation of stereotypically ‘Eastern’ Indo-Dutch people generated considerable backlash among Robinson’s next of kin (van Leeuwen, 2008). Despite such criticism, van Dort’s Tante Lien and her "( ... ) childish fantasy language that had little to do with Petjoh.” (van Leeuwen, 2008, pp.134-135, translation M.R). long remained the face and voice of the Indo-Dutch, both among the general Dutch public (van Leeuwen, 2008) and among the Indo-Dutch themselves (Salverda, 2014).

#### 4. Methodology

The complicating factors of performativity, memory-making and a loss of active competence in Malay from the second generation onwards make Indies Dutch and Petjoh uniquely suited for folk linguistic research. Other than conventional linguistics, folk linguistics concerns itself not with language per se, but with the opinions, beliefs and assumptions laypeople hold about a given language variety (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000).

---

<sup>9</sup> Though she also addressed political issues that affected the Indo-Dutch community (van Leeuwen, 2008).

#### 4.1 The folk linguistic method

The folk linguistic method as employed by Niedzielski and Preston (2000) makes use of semi-structured interviews between respondent(s) and researcher(s)<sup>10</sup>. Domains selected for this thesis were phonology, syntax, and semantics, taken from the language variation list in Preston (1986, p. 35) and Niedzielski and Preston (2000)<sup>11</sup>. An additional topic, *Language use* was added for the purposes of this thesis. Niedzielski and Preston's (2000) use of personal anecdotes or other conversation starters to introduce interview topics to respondents was retained.

The interviews were held in Dutch. To assuage respondents' possible linguistic insecurities regarding Indies Dutch, participants were informed of the research topic in advance. Since folk linguistics is concerned with opinions and beliefs about language, respondent knowledge of the research topic does not notably affect research results (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000).

#### 4.2 Respondents

Two respondents were contacted through the researcher's own network; the remaining four were contacted through the network of one of the respondents. All respondents were second generation Indo-Dutch people living in the Netherlands; no other criteria (gender, age, education, etc.) were required beyond being of Indo-Dutch descent. First generation Indo-Dutch migrants were purposefully excluded on account of widespread multilingualism in this group (Salverda, 2014).

Respondent age ranged from mid- to late-sixties. Gender was divided along a 2:4 male:female ratio. Three respondents were born in Indonesia, while the remaining three were born in the Netherlands. Those born in Indonesia arrived in the Netherlands between their early infancy and three years of age. At least two of these respondents made it clear that they considered themselves members of the second generation rather than the first, as their lived experiences align with those of second generation Indo-Dutch people. For this reason, this thesis considers all its respondents, whether born in the Netherlands or Indonesia, members of the second generation. Prior to the interviews, contact with the respondents occurred through e-mail and WhatsApp.

#### 4.3 Interview structure and stimuli fragments

Each interview was held according to an interview outline divided into seven sections (see Appendix II). Sections I to III contained questions relating to respondents' backgrounds and experiences with Indo-Dutch culture and were designed as conversation starters. They were modelled on questions in M. de Vries (2009, pp. 377-382).

Sections IV to VIII covered the domains folk phonology (what do people think Indies Dutch sounds like?), folk syntax (what do people think the sentences look like?), folk lexicon (what words/phrases do people think belong to Indies Dutch?) and language use (when and how do people think Indies Dutch is used?). Since folk linguistic research is less affected by direct questioning than conventional linguistic research, a number of interview questions are direct inquiries into respondents' beliefs, opinions or associations.

The order in which sections appeared within the interview was left relatively free as to approach natural conversation. The only fixed components of each interview were the opening question and the moment at which stimuli fragments were presented<sup>12</sup>. The fragments were always

---

<sup>10</sup> While Niedzielski and Preston (2000) made use of the network model (Bortoni-Ricardo 1985, Burton, 1978; Labov, 1984, p.31, Milroy, 1980, in Niedzielski and Preston, 2000) in which researchers become members of respondents' pre-existing networks, the nature of folklinguistic research does not necessitate this type of relation between respondent and researcher (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000). For this reason, it was deemed safe to interview respondents without having become part of their network.

<sup>11</sup> Dubbed folk phonology, folk lexicon and folk syntax in this thesis.

<sup>12</sup> It should be noted that the *Tante Lien* video-fragment was left out of the interview with JR due to JR's overfamiliarity with the presented material. Due to unexpected technical difficulties, the interview with FS lacks discussion of the audio and video-fragment altogether.

presented after respondents had been asked their initial opinions on Indies Dutch phonology, syntax and lexicon as to avoid priming effects. Additional questioning on these domains occurred after respondents had been exposed to the fragments.

The audio fragment consisted of the first 1:10 minutes of the skit *De Tennistournooi* [sic] ‘The Tennis Tournament’, narrated by Wal Neyndorff and uploaded to Youtube by the channel J Poppe (2012). The video fragment consisted of the first 1:40 minutes of an early episode of Wieteke van Dort’s *Late Late Lien Show*, uploaded to Youtube by the channel mdfrasher (2018). The written fragment was taken from the second volume of Tjalie Robinson’s storybook *Piekerans van een straatslijper* ‘Ruminations of an idler’. All fragments were selected for phonological, syntactical and lexical features commonly found in Indies Dutch/Petjoh. Chapter 5 will discuss these fragments in more detail.

#### 4.4 Free, Prior and Informed Consent

All respondents were given an information sheet detailing the nature of the interview, data processing, data retention as well as FPIC (see Appendix VI) prior to the interview. After reading the information sheet, respondents had the opportunity to ask additional questions. The FPIC form was divided into two parts: one temporary and one definite. The temporary form was offered prior to recording and gave respondents the opportunity to withdraw their participation during or immediately after the interview. The definite form was offered after completion of the interview and finalised the respondents’ participation. The split FPIC forms allowed respondents a way out of participation in the study should they regret any content they presented during the interview.

Respondents were offered 10 euros as compensation for their time and participation in the study.

#### 4.5 Recordings and transcripts

Interviews took place at a location familiar to the interviewee in order to facilitate naturalistic conversation. In practice, this included work spaces and people’s homes. All interviews were recorded on a ZOOM H1n Handy Recorder. The *Tennistournooi* and *Tante Lien* fragments were played to the interviewees through the YouTube app on a Fairphone 2.

Each interview was transcribed<sup>13</sup> according to the guidelines for discourse transcription in Du Bois et al. (1993) and Gumperz and Berenz (1993), supplemented by the transcription conventions used in Niedzielski and Preston (2000). This thesis follows the enumeration convention in Niedzielski and Preston (2000), where each numbered line corresponds to one speaker turn, rather than to a single intonation contour (Du Bois et al., 1993). Since this thesis only uses the format of discourse analysis in order to conduct a folk linguistic analysis, transcription of paralinguistic phenomena central to much of discourse analysis is left out for readability. To protect respondents’ privacy, they were assigned a pseudonym consisting of two capital letters. References to identifiable locations, dates and persons within a transcript are redacted and enclosed in curly brackets. Where identifiable information pertains the names of other respondents, their pseudonyms as used in this thesis are retained.

---

<sup>13</sup> To protect respondents’ privacy, the full transcripts are not publicly available.

## 5. Stimuli analysis<sup>14</sup>

For English translations of the stimuli fragments, see Appendix I.

### 5.1 Transcript fragment 1

*Gado Gado Wal Neyndorff De Tennistournooi, 0:00-1:10* (J Poppe, 2012)

Op een dag, wij, de Indo-gang, besluiten aan deze grote *pukulan*partij mee te doen. Onze tennisclub, hij is van groot formaat. En Wim *Blekok* is de penningmeester. Eindelijk, de grote dag is gekomen en uitgelaten gaan de vrouwen van de tennissers mee en nemen al kwetterend plaats op een van de bezoekersbanken. Si Pim en Loe in hun witte *celana pendek* staan stoer als *klapper*<sup>15</sup>boom op de rooie *kerikil*. De umpire, hij zegt: ‘Ayo, heren! Geef de bal een lel!’

Pim, hij servet eerst: ‘*Nyang* hard!’

Maar zijn eerste bal, *kena* in de net.

‘Geeft nèks,’ zegt Loe.

De tweede bal, listig en zacht, ook tegen de net.

‘Geeft weer nèks,’ zegt Loe.

De tegenpartij, ze lachen fijntjes want die twee Indo’s blijken *telor godok* voor hun te zijn.

Toen, plotsklaps, de vrouw van Pim, Si Lies, zij zegt: ‘Ayo, Pim! Gisternavond al *tak pijit* jouw *otot* en jij direct naar bed zonder wat-wat en nu je speel als een slappe *dodol*.’

#### 5.1.1 Phonological features

##### 5.1.1.1 Consonants

The above fragment features phonological markers found in both Petjoh and Indies Dutch. These are a strongly rhotic realisation of /r/ (J.W. de Vries, 2005; ; van den Toorn, 1957; van Rheedeen, 1995), the devoicing of Standard Dutch fricatives (van Engelenhoven, 2014, J.W. de Vries, 2005, van Rheedeen, 1995) and the aspirated and strongly realised /d<sup>h</sup>/ (J.W. de Vries, 2005; van Rheedeen, 1995, p. 60). realisation of Standard Dutch /d/ as /d<sup>h</sup>/ originates in Javanese rather than Malay, but has come to be associated with the Indies Dutch accent (J.W. de Vries, 2005). Both the rhotic /r/ and strongly aspirated /d<sup>h</sup>/ were salient enough to have been orthographically produced in colonial literature (J.W. de Vries, 2005).

The Standard Dutch phonemes /h/ and /x/ are collapsed into a single allophone in both Indies Dutch (J.W. de Vries, 2005; van den Toorn, 1957) and Petjoh (van Rheedeen, 1995). According to van Engelenhoven (2014), this allophonic variation is representative of the performative language use of post-migration Petjoh (and by extension Indies Dutch), a fact that is also noted by van Rheedeen (1995, p. 68).

<sup>14</sup> Literature on Indies Dutch written in Dutch as well as non-academic works on Indies Dutch typically make use of a pre-standardised spelling fitted to Dutch spelling conventions as opposed to contemporary Indonesian spelling (but see van Engelenhoven, 2014, for an exception). This thesis approaches the issue as follows: material taken from the literature in pre-standardised spelling will not be altered to reflect the current spelling, but data gathered for this thesis will be transcribed according to Indonesian spelling rules. The main orthographic differences between colonial spelling and contemporary spelling are given below (based on van Engelenhoven, 2014, p. 5):

| Old spelling | New spelling | Phoneme |
|--------------|--------------|---------|
| <oe>         | <u>          | /u/     |
| <tj>         | <c>          | /c/     |
| <j>          | <y>          | /j/     |
| <dj>         | <j>          | /ʒ/     |

<sup>15</sup> Refers to kelapa ‘coconut palm tree, coconut’ (ke.la.pa. (2016). In Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, *KBBI Daring*. Retrieved October 28, 2022, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/kelapa>)

This allophonic variation between [x/h] is also found in the fragment, as demonstrated by the differing realisations of *zegt* [sext] ‘says’ in (1):

- (1) *De umpire hij zegt* [seht]  
 ‘Geeft weer nèks,’ *zegt* [sext] *Loe*.

The reverse, where /h/ is realised as [x] – a phenomenon found in Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995) – does not occur.

An phonological feature that the fragment does share with Petjoh is the realisation of final /k/ as [ʔ] (van Rheeden, 1995), represented in the pronunciation of *Blekok* and *tak* as [bləkʔ] and [tʔ]. At the same time, the feature is not realized consistently, as *godok* is pronounced [gɔdɔk].

Deletion of the final dental in consonant clusters (van Rheeden, 1995; van den Toorn, 1957) occurs only in the inflected verb *je speel* ‘you play’, as inclusion of the final dental would yield Standard Dutch *je speelt* ‘you play’. Whether this single instance of dental deletion is driven by phonological constraints is debatable, as it may equally likely be a demonstration of the lack of verbal inflection commonly found in Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995).

### 5.1.1.2 Vowels

The close front vowel in Standard Dutch <niks> [niks] is lowered to an open mid front vowel in the fragment, which appears to go against the general tendency of Indies Dutch and Petjoh to raise Dutch vowels (Salverda, 2014; van Rheeden, 1995). In addition, the vowel is excessively lengthened, producing the realisation [nɛ:ks] <nèks>.

Van Engelenhoven (2014) provides an analysis where Petjoh shows high allophonic variation in its vowels. While monosyllabic words would be exempt from this variation (van Engelenhoven, 2014), the performative nature of the fragment may nonetheless have extended this tendency to monosyllabic words. Without additional research into the precise phonology of Petjoh and Indies Dutch (van Engelenhoven, 2014, van der Sijs, 2014), a conclusive answer to this particular realisation of /ɪ/ as [ɛ:] cannot be given.

### 5.1.1.3 Suprasegmentals

Since both Indies Dutch and Petjoh are “Malay-accented” (Salverda, 2014, p.811), they share the majority of their phonology and suprasegmentals with Malay (van Rheeden, 1995).

As in Malay, stress in the fragment falls on the penultimate syllable in words of three or more syllables, and on the final syllable in disyllabic words (van Rheeden, 1995). On the sentence-level, stress is located on the final word in an utterance, again in line with Petjoh’s – and thus Malay’s – stress pattern (van Rheeden, 1995). Pauses between words contribute to what J.W. de Vries (2005) and van den Toorn (1957) describe as a lack of phonological assimilation in Indies Dutch. At the same time, the fragment lacks the stereotypical final rising intonation (J.W. de Vries, 2005; van Rheeden, 1995) except in the utterance *en nu je speel als een slappe dodol*.

### 5.1.2 Lexicon

The fragment includes a number of Malay lexical items. Among these are the interjection *ayo* (J.W. de Vries, 2005), the Malay form of address *Si* found in Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995), verb *pijit*<sup>16</sup> ‘to massage’, as well as NPs. Except for *Blekok* and *telor godok* all NPs are compounds consisting of a Malay noun and a Dutch noun, or mixed NPs consisting of Dutch modifiers and a Malay noun. The lexical domains covered by these NPs are those immediately relevant to the subject of the skit, as well as more stereotypical Indies Dutch lexical domains such as food (*telor godok*, *dodol*), botany

<sup>16</sup> pi.jit. (2016). In Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, *KBBI Daring*. Retrieved April 17, 2023, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/pijit>



(*klapperboom*), animals (*blekok*<sup>17</sup>) and the human body (*otot*) (van den Toorn, 1957; J.W. de Vries, 2005). Along with interjections, they are typical of the generally restricted Indies Dutch lexicon (J.W. de Vries, 2005, van den Toorn, 1957). Another lexical domain common to Indies Dutch, that of onomatopoeia (J.W. de Vries, 2005), is not found in the fragment.

### 5.1.3 Morphology

As mentioned in the previous section, most Malay nouns are paired with Dutch nouns and modifiers to form compounds or mixed NPs. Compounds such as *pukulanpartij* ‘hitting<sup>18</sup> match’ and *klapperboom* ‘coconut palm’ are right-headed, while mixed NPs such as *de rooie kerikil* ‘the red gravel<sup>19</sup>’ as well as the possessive construction *hun witte celana pendek* ‘their white shorts<sup>20</sup>’, show Dutch adjective and determiner placement. This demonstrates that both types of NP are formed according to Dutch morphological rules (J.W. de Vries, 2005, Salverda, 2014). Verbs in the fragment are generally inflected for tense and person as is common in Indies Dutch<sup>22</sup> (J.W. de Vries, 2005; van den Toorn, 1957), except in the case of *jij speel*, where person marking is absent. Since this constitutes the only verb with incomplete verbal inflection, its occurrence may be due to stylistic reasons rather than syntactical ones.

### 5.1.4 Syntactical features

The fragment shows one instance of reduplication, namely the calque *wat-wat* ‘anything<sup>23</sup>’. Reduplication is not mentioned as a feature of Indies Dutch, though it is common in Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995). Gender incongruence and subsequent overapplication of the gendered definite article *de* (J.W. de Vries, 2005; van den Toorn, 1957) is found in the NP *de net* ‘the netting’. In Standard Dutch, *net* is a neuter noun and takes the corresponding neuter definite article *het*. Incongruence in number occurs in (2):

- (2) *Si Pim en Loe staan stoer als klapperboom op de rooie kerikil.*  
 ‘Si Pim and Loe stand proud like coconut tree on the red gravel.’

Here, there is no congruence between the plural subject *Si Pim and Loe* and the singular *klapperboom*. Number incongruence, or rather the absence of pluralization, is not recorded for Indies Dutch but may occur in Petjoh (van Engelenhoven, 2014).

Further syntactical features sourced from Malay include the use of the relative pronoun *nyang* in the construction *nyang hard!* For contact varieties of the former Dutch East Indies, use of this relative

<sup>17</sup> ble.kok. (2016). In Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, *KBBI Daring*. Retrieved October 27, 2022, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/blekok>

<sup>18</sup> pukul<sup>1</sup> >> pu.kul.an. (2016). In Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, *KBBI Daring*. Retrieved April 7, 2023, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/pukulan>

<sup>19</sup> ke.ri.kil. (2016). In Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, *KBBI Daring*. Retrieved April 7, 2023, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/kerikil>

<sup>20</sup> ce.la.na. (2016). In Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, *KBBI Daring*. Retrieved April 7, 2023, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/celana>

<sup>21</sup> pen.dek. (2016). In Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, *KBBI Daring*. Retrieved April 7, 2023, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/pendek>

<sup>22</sup> Though tense in Indies Dutch is nonetheless often realised in a non-standard manner. See J.W. de Vries (2005, p. 73).

<sup>23</sup> apa<sup>1</sup> >> a.pa-a.pa. (2016). In Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, *KBBI Daring*. Retrieved April 7, 2023, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/apa-apa>

marker is only recorded in Petjoh, as *nyang* is the Betawi Malay realisation of Standard Malay *yang* (van Rheedeen, 1995). Also interesting in this respect is the use of *tak*, as seen in (3):

- (3) *Gisternavond al tak pijit jouw otot ( ... )*  
 ‘Yesterday evening I massaged your muscles ( ... )’.

*Tak* is derived from a Javanese verbal prefix denoting a first person singular actor. It was borrowed into Betawi Malay and subsequently incorporated into Petjoh, where it functions as a first person singular pronoun (J.W. de Vries, 1994a, p. 11). The inclusion of Dutch *al* ‘already’ furthermore denotes a past action, likely due to a lack of tense inflection on the Malay verb *pijit*. Using Dutch temporal markers in lieu of verbal tense inflection is a common strategy in Petjoh, which usually shows no tense marking on verbs (van Rheedeen, 1995).

Use of topicalisation strategies followed by a resumptive pronoun is recorded in both Indies Dutch (J.W. de Vries, 2005; Salverda, 2014) and Petjoh (van Rheedeen, 1995) and occurs often in the fragment. In (4-8), the topicalized subject is indicated with TOP, while the resumptive pronoun is indicated with ResPRO:

- (4) [Onze tennisclub], [hij] is van groot formaat  
 [TOP] [ResPRO]  
 ‘Our tennisclub, he is big in size’
- (5) [De umpire], [hij] zegt  
 [TOP] [ResPRO]  
 ‘The umpire, he says’
- (6) [Pim], [hij] servet eerst  
 [TOP] [ResPRO]  
 ‘Pim, he serves first’
- (7) [De tegenpartij], [ze] lachen fijntjes  
 [TOP] [ResPRO]  
 ‘The opposing team, they smile affably’
- (8) [Si Lies], [zij] zegt  
 [TOP] [ResPRO]  
 ‘Si Lies, she says’

In all cases except (7) and (8), the resumptive pronoun is the third person masculine singular *hij* ‘he’. In van Rheedeen’s (1995) description of Petjoh, no other resumptive pronouns occur. This is likely due to the fact that *hij* can be used as a general pronoun to cover referents that are feminine, neuter or plural in Petjoh (van Rheedeen, 1995). Examples in J.W. de Vries (2005) and Salverda (2014) likewise only contain instances of *hij* as a resumptive pronoun, even if the antecedent is feminine, as is demonstrated in (9):

- (9) *Mijn sus, hij so pienter, want zijn rapport so mooi.* (J.W. de Vries, 2005, p. 73)

Examples (7) and (8), however, show that the resumptive pronoun can also match its referents in gender and number. In (7) the resumptive pronoun *ze* ‘they’ matches its plural antecedent and in (8), the resumptive pronoun *zij* ‘she’ shows no gender incongruence with its singular feminine antecedent. Whether this constitutes an expansion of the original rule (i.e., the resumptive pronoun can be any pronoun) or whether it is a strategy to diminish ungrammaticality in an already non-standard sentence structure, cannot be determined from this fragment alone.

On the sentence level, the fragment shows retention of Malay's SVO word order (10-11) where Standard Dutch would employ a Verb Second construction (Broekhuis and Corver, 2020b, 2020c; Salverda, 2014), as demonstrated in (12) and (13). Such retention is common in both Indies Dutch (J.W. de Vries, 2005) and Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995).

- (10) *Op een dag, [wij, de Indo-gang], [besluiten] aan deze grote pukulanpartij mee te doen*  
[S] [V]  
'One day, we, the Indo-gang, decide to partake in this big pukulanmatch.'
- (11) *Eindelijk, [de grote dag] [is] gekomen*  
[S] [V]  
'Finally, the big day has come.'
- (12) *Op een dag, [besluiten] [wij, de Indo-gang], aan deze grote pukulanpartij mee te doen*  
[V] [S]  
'One day, we, the Indo-gang, decide to partake in this big pukulanmatch.'
- (13) *Eindelijk [is] [de grote dag] gekomen.*  
[V] [S]  
Finally, the big day has come.'

## 5.2 Transcript fragment 2

*The Late Late Lien Show 1979 (mdftrasher, 2018)*

Tante Lien: Oeh! Oh ja! Een beetje kritiek. Even een handvol pinda's in mijn waffel stoppen ja. Dat noemen wij *kacang*, Leo. Hé weet je lui. Niet erg toch? Kritiek-kritiek en *krupuks* horen ook bij de rijsttafel. En waardering ja. Niet alleen hoog kijkcijfers ook weet je. Als ik had gehad op de *Genta Kali* meisjes-HBS zulke hoge cijfers, ik was nou allang geweest doctoranda Lien van Dommenlah zeg! Menskundige en *totokoloog*. Nee, maar tante had nooit hoge cijfers weet je. Tante moest hard werken en veel afkijken. Bij spieken haantje de voorste. Over haan gesproken heb je gezien de nieuwe act van de Para haan?

Audience: Nee hoe dan, hoe dan, heeft ie nieuwe?

Tante Lien: Ja! Zo toch, hij loopt altijd zo. Choe kloek, choe kloek, choe kloek. Met zo'n lellebel ja. De Para is gewoon Indisch. *Duta* ook. En weet je wat nog meer. Choe kloek, choe kloek. De Para, van de hulle lach. De Para van de *rujak manis* met *dideh* en *pisangblad*. Nee maar. Ik ben zo blij weet je dat de Para nog van tante's diensten gebruik kan maken ondanks mijn leeftijd ja. En ze zijn zo Indisch-minded, weet je de Para. Ik krijg onkostenvergoeding voor mijn show! En daarvan laat ik het hele huis opknappen. Alles een beetje verzakt toch. Net als bij tante.

### 5.2.1 Phonology

#### 5.2.1.1 Consonants

Van Dort is fairly consistent in her use of a strongly rhotic /r/, which occurs in all positions and is often lengthened with regards to the Standard Dutch pronunciation. Like Neyndorff, she tends to unvoice Standard Dutch voiced fricatives.

As in the previous fragment, Standard Dutch /x/ may be substituted for a barely audible [h]. This is especially common in final position: *erg* [er:ə(h)], *zeg* [seh], *toch* [təh] and *krijg* [krɛi(h)], but also occurs in the utterance *De Para, van de hulle lach*. In this case, the Standard Dutch realisation [xʌlə] <gulle> 'generous' is pronounced [hʌlə] (van Engelenhoven, personal communication, April 12, 2023), likely for comedic effect (van Engelenhoven, 2014).

Other than Neyndorff, van Dort does employ the [p] for /v/ substitution found in Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995). In van Dort's case, this substitution only affects the initial [v] in in the word /para/, pronounced /vara/ in Standard Dutch. Other instances of [v] are devoiced to /f/. Van Dort does not delete her final dentals, nor does she realise final /k/ as [ʔ].

### 5.2.1.2 Suprasegmentals

As in the previous fragment, stress is located on the final syllable in disyllabic words and on the penultimate syllable in words of three or more syllables. In contrast to Neyndorff, stress on the sentence level does not reliably occur on the final word. The rising intonation pattern deemed typical for Indies Dutch and Petjoh (J.W. de Vries, 2005; van Rheeden, 1995) only occurs in the utterance *Ik ben zo blij weet je dat de Para nog van tante's diensten gebruik kan maken ondanks mijn leeftijd ja*.

### 5.2.2 Lexicon

The lexical domains referenced by van Dort pertain to food and dishes (*kacang, krupuks, dideh*<sup>24</sup>, *pisangblad*) or colonial-specific terminology (van den Toorn, 1957; J.W. de Vries, 2005) such as the neologism *tokokoloog*. Making use of these two rather stereotypical domains would likely have reinforced the nostalgic element so central to van Dort's show. Like the previous fragment, van Dort uses both fully Malay NPs and blended NPs such as the compound *pisangblad* 'banana leaf' consisting of the Malay noun *pisang* 'banana' and the Dutch noun *blad* 'leaf'. Onomatopoeic word use is evident in van Dort's use of *choe-kloek* to imitate a rooster's clucking. Interjections include *toch* (J.W. de Vries, 2005) and *zeg*.

### 5.2.3 Syntactical features

Syntactical features sourced from Malay include the reduplication of the Dutch noun *kritiek* 'criticism' to *kritiek-kritiek* and the use of the emphatic suffix *-lah*<sup>25</sup> in the utterance *ik was nou allang geweest doctoranda Lien van Dommelah zeg!*, where the inclusion of the suffix creates a pun on Tante Lien's surname *van Dommelen*<sup>26</sup> (*The Late Late Lien Show*, n.d.). Otherwise, Dutch morphological rules are consistently applied to Malay roots, such as in the pluralized *krupuks* and the neologism *totokoloog*.

All pronouns in van Dort's skit are sourced from Dutch, whereas the Neyndorff fragment featured a single occurrence of the Betawi Malay pronoun *tak*. Other than what is reported in van den Toorn (1957) and J.W. de Vries (2005), van Dort does not exclusively use the full forms of pronouns deemed typical for Indies Dutch.

Other than Neyndorff, van Dort does make liberal use of the stereotypical Indies Dutch tag *ja* 'yes' at the end of otherwise declarative clauses (Salverda, 2014):

- (14) *Even een handvol pinda's in mijn waffel stoppen ja.*  
'Let me stuff my face with a handful of peanuts eh.'
- (15) *En waardering ja.*  
'And appreciation eh.'
- (16) *Met zo'n lellebel ja.*  
'With one such a wattle eh.'
- (17) *Maar ik ben zo blij weet je dat de Para nog van tante's diensten gebruik kan maken ondanks mijn leeftijd ja.*

<sup>24</sup> van Engelenhoven, personal communication, April 12, 2023.

<sup>25</sup> lah<sup>1</sup>. (2016). In Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, *KBBI Daring*. Retrieved April 7, 2023, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/lah>

‘But I’m so happy you know that the Para can still make use of auntie’s services despite my age eh.’

Since these clauses show no deviation from Standard Dutch grammatical rules, the insertion of *ja* appears a stylistic choice to infuse an otherwise Dutch utterance with a whiff of Indies-ness. In addition, the tag does not occur in more syntactically Malay clauses (see below).

Subject/object drop, which is common in Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995), occurs twice in the fragment. Subject drop is shown in (18), whereas object drop is shown in (19):

(18) *Bij spieken haantje de voorste.*  
‘When it came to cheating on tests, first in line.’

(19) *Heeft ie nieuwe?*  
Does he have new?

In (18), the prior subject *tante* is retained and thus omitted. Additionally, the clause lacks a copula, a feature found in both Indies Dutch (J.W. de Vries, 2005) and Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995). Omitting either the subject or the copula is not possible in Standard Dutch, where a clause must contain both in order to be grammatical:

(20) *Bij spieken [was] [tante/ik] haantje de voorste.*  
[COP] [S]  
‘When it came to cheating on tests, auntie/I was first in line’

In the case of (19), the prior object *de Para haan* is retained and omitted. Note however that in spoken Dutch, the utterance is not ungrammatical if it carries an indefinite article: *heeft ie een nieuwe?* ‘Does he have a new one?’

On a sentence level, syntactical influence from Malay is found in the following clauses. In (21), the plural noun *kijkcijfers* ‘ratings’ is modified by the singular adjective *hoog*:

(21) *Niet alleen hoog kijkcijfers ook weet je*  
‘Not only high ratings too you know’

This might again be a case of number incongruence as found in (2). While non-standard adjective formation is reported for Indies Dutch with heavier syntactical admixture from Malay, its cause is rooted in non-standard gender declension (J.W. de Vries, 2005; van den Toorn, 1957) rather than non-standard number declension. The occurrence of number incongruence in both fragments might therefore be the inclusion of a feature found in Petjoh (Rheeden, 1995) or a stylistic choice on the part of the performers. Since van Dort does not display number incongruence in other utterances, its single occurrence in the fragment is likely to be stylistic.

Van Dort also shows retention of Indies Dutch/Petjoh’s SVO word order, as well as non-standard tense inflection, as seen in (22-23):

(22) *Als [ik] [had] gehad op de Genta Kali meisjes-HBS [zulke hoge cijfers]*  
[S] [V] [O]  
‘If I would have had on the Genta Kali girls’ HBS such high grades

(23) *[ik] [was] nou allang geweest doctoranda Lien van Dommenlah zeg!*  
[S] [V]  
‘I would long have been doctoranda Lien van Dommenlah eh!’

In Standard Dutch, objects in hypothetical or conditional clauses typically precede the finite verb (Broekhuis & Corver, 2020b), whereas in (22) it occurs directly after both the finite verb and the past participle *gehad*. Strict retention of SV(O) word order in Indies Dutch is also seen in (23), where the subject *ik* precedes the finite verb *was*, whereas in Standard Dutch subject and verb would be inversed (Salverda, 2014), yielding (24):

- (24) [was] [ik] *nou allang doctoranda Lien van Dommenlah (geweest) zeg!*  
 [V] [S]  
 ‘I would long have been doctoranda Lien van Dommenlah eh!’

(23) also shows that the inclusion of the past participle *geweest* is optional in Standard Dutch (Broekhuis & Corver, 2020a). The realization of past participles where none are warranted is another feature deemed typical of Indies Dutch (J.W. de Vries, 2005, p.73; van den Toorn, 1957) that, while not outright ungrammatical, does constitute a non-standard realisation of tense.

An exception to Indies Dutch’ tendency to retain an SVO word order is seen in (25), where the subject and finite verb are inversed to comply with Dutch question syntax (Broekhuis & Corver, 2020d):

- (25) *Over haan gesproken [heb] [je] gezien de nieuwe act van de Para haan?*  
 [V] [S]  
 ‘Speaking of rooster did you see the new act of the Para rooster?’

The object however, again occurs in a non-standard position, namely at the very end of the clause rather than between the finite verb and the past participle. Such partial adherence to Dutch syntax is found in van den Toorn’s description of Indies Dutch (1957).

### 5.3 Transcript fragment 3

*Piekerans van een straatslijper II* (Robinson, 1954, p. 18-19)

The following fragment is a dialogue between Tjalie Robinson’s eponymous character and his mother. Spelling and punctuation of the original text is retained. The mother opens the dialogue:

- „Wie is dat ?”  
 „Tikoes – eh – Herman.”  
 „Hoe weet je dat hij het is ?” Iedereen kan toch zo fluiten ?”  
 „Niet. Alleen Tikoes fluit als deze.”  
 „Waarom heet hij Tikoes ?”  
 „Zijn kop een beetje botak.”  
 „Wat is dat nou ?”  
 „Ha-a, haar-nja ken niet groeien een beetje hier een beetje daar.”  
 „Maar waarom dan Tikoes ? ... O, als een schurftige rat zeker. Fris !”  
 „Niet, niet korèng ! Al eenmaal zo zijn kop, si !”

#### 5.3.1 Lexicon

Robinson himself provides lexical glosses at the end of each chapter. *Tikoes* is glossed as ‘mouse’. *Botak* means ‘bald’ and *koreng* ‘scabies’. In addition, the dialogue shows the use of *si* as a standalone form of address (van Rheeden, 1995).

When compared to the previous fragments, there are no mixed NPs or Malay-Dutch compounds. The lexical domains are again restricted and include animals (*tikus*) and the human body (*botak*, *koreng*).

### 5.3.2 Syntactical features

The dialogue in the fragment shows a clear difference between the speakers, where the mother character uses exclusively Dutch syntax and lexical items, while the Tjalie character employs syntactical structures that show influence from Malay:

- (26) *Niet. Alleen Tikoës fluit als deze.*  
 ‘No. Only Tikoës whistles like he does.’

As is common in Petjoh, (24) shows the use of *niet* as a negative answer. *Niet* in this case is a calque of Malay *tidak*, which is used both for negative answers and verbal negation (van Reeden, 1995). Similarly, the Dutch determiner *deze* ‘this (one)’ functions as a personal pronoun rather than a demonstrative (van Rheeden, 1995).

Like the Tante Lien fragment, lack of a copula is seen in (27):

- (27) *Zijn kop [ ] een beetje botak.*  
 ‘His head [COP] somewhat bald’

The possessive construction *zijn kop* in (27) is formed according to Dutch syntactical rules. A Malay possessive construction is however entirely possible, as seen in (28):

- (28) *Ha-a, haar-nja ken niet groeien een beetje hier een beetje daar.*  
 ‘Ha-a, his hair can’t grow a little over here a little over there.’

While the clause largely adheres to Dutch syntactical rules, the construction *haar-nja* is formed with the Malay determiner *-nja*<sup>27</sup> on the Dutch root *haar* ‘hair’. Alternation between Dutch and Malay possessive constructions is not uncommon in Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995), but is not found in Indies Dutch, which only employs Dutch possessive constructions (van den Toorn, 1957).

Each fragment thus contains linguistic markers ascribed to both Petjoh and Indies Dutch. More stereotypical markers such as the rhotic /r/ and the *ja*-tag (Salverda, 2014) as well as Neyndorff’s resumptive pronoun constructions (J.W. de Vries, 2005, p. 74; Salverda, 2014, p. 812) are applied fairly consistently while others such as non-standard verbal inflection are performed more haphazardly. Since Indies Dutch features generally also show up in Petjoh but not vice versa, the inclusion of features specific to Petjoh in the Neyndorff and van Dort fragments, put both towards the heavier admixed end of the Indies Dutch spectrum. At the same time, van Dort’s fragment contains utterances that are only discernible from Standard Dutch by a non-standard pronunciation and the inclusion of aforementioned *ja*-tag (Salverda, 2014). Such variation within a single fragment shows that even post-migration, Indies Dutch continued to be altered to fit speakers, audience and situations (Salverda, 2014).

## 6. Indies Dutch in folk linguistic perspective<sup>28</sup>

### 6.1 Linguistic profiles

All respondents were raised to be monolingual speakers of Dutch, reflecting the pressure to assimilate into a monolingual Dutch society and conform to Dutch standards (van Leeuwen, 2008). At the same time, respondents reported instances of codeswitching to Malay among their parents and other first generation relatives under certain circumstances (see section 6.6). In line with the second generation’s reorientation towards the Indonesian component of their heritage (van Leeuwen, 2008), respondents

<sup>27</sup> Contemporary spelling *-nya*.

<sup>28</sup> For English translations of interview quotes, see Appendix III.

JR, CS, MS and JB followed Indonesian language courses as adults, resulting in varying degrees of L2 competence in Indonesian.

## 6.2 *Indies Dutch vs. Petjoh*

Due to the difficulties of drawing a stark demarcation line between Indies Dutch and Petjoh and the common interchangeability of the two in both the literature and popular thought, this thesis opted to use Salverda's (2014) spectrum variety Indies Dutch as an umbrella term for all Dutch/Malay contact varieties currently present in the Indo-Dutch community in the Netherlands. However, a number of respondents were familiar with Petjoh and/or Indies Dutch and supplied their own definitions of the difference between the two. JR, for instance, consistently spoke of Petjoh without mentioning Indies Dutch at all. Petjoh, in JR's view, was different from either Dutch, Indonesian or Malay and inexorably tied to van Dort and her performances (068-072 JR), reflecting an inherent degree of performativity. MS employed a phonological distinction between Indies Dutch and Petjoh (see section folk phonology), while CS echoes van Engelenhoven (2014) and van Rheeden (1995) in her assertion that the language "spoken here in the Indo-community" (402 CS) is in fact "not always Petjoh" (408 CS). In CS' definition, Indies Dutch is Dutch with occasional Indonesian lexical insertions, syntax or language use. Petjoh, by contrast, is strongly defined by accent and "faulty sentences" (1301 CS). Like JR, she associates Petjoh with Tante Lien (1299 CS) and employs the same prescriptivist distinction (1301-1303 CS) as described in Salverda (2014), where Petjoh is located at the less prestigious end of the spectrum while Indies Dutch is situated closer to the Dutch standard.

## 6.3 *Folk phonology*

### 6.3.1 *Pre-fragments*

To the respondents, the most salient phonological feature of Indies Dutch is the difference in suprasegmentals with regards to Standard Dutch. This difference was variously classified as a difference in intonation pattern (214 JB-218 JB), or accent (264 MS; 190 FS) or a more staccato rhythm (531 CS, 543 CS). One respondent deemed Indies Dutch "softer and rounder" (459 MS) as well as sounding "fuller" than Standard Dutch (272 MS), which contained "harsher" sounds by comparison (461 MS)<sup>29</sup>.

Respondents JR and CS mentioned the aspirated [d<sup>h</sup>] and the rhotic [r] as defining characteristics of the Indies Dutch "sound". The aspirated [d<sup>h</sup>] was labelled either "hard" (416 JR) or "thick" (CS, 533, 535), while the rhotic [r] was deemed "rolling" (416 JR). Substitution of /p/ for [f] as in Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995), allophonic variation of [h/x] (van Engelenhoven, 2014; J.W. de Vries, 2005) and devoicing of fricatives was not named as a feature of Indies Dutch by any of the respondents. In case of the latter, this is possibly due to the ongoing devoicing of fricatives in contemporary Standard Dutch (De Schryver et al., 2008). The reverse, where a "hard" /z/ was included as a phonological feature of Indies Dutch, did occur (098 FS).

For the respondents, a degree of overlap between phonology and other linguistic domains is apparent. CS, for instance, considered Indies Dutch' "staccato rhythm" to originate in its short sentence structure (543 CS) rather than in a lack of phonological assimilation (J.W. de Vries, 2005; van den Toorn, 1957). JR meanwhile considers "talking with sounds" a defining characteristic of Petjoh (230-231 JR), which he shortly after specifies as onomatopoeic word use (237 JR). While onomatopoeia occur frequently in Indies Dutch (J.W. de Vries, 2005) and Petjoh (van Rheeden, 1995), they are strictly speaking part of lexicon, but since they are sound imitations, it is perhaps not surprising that JR considers them part of the 'sound' of Indies Dutch/Petjoh. One respondent (MS) employed a phonology/lexicon dichotomy to distinguish Indies Dutch from Petjoh. According to her, Indies Dutch was defined only by a differing pronunciation with regards to Standard Dutch, whereas Petjoh also included an abundance of Malay words and stock phrases (264 MS, 324-326 MS). Speech that showed phonological divergence from Standard Dutch was especially common in first generation of Indo-Dutch migrants (260 MS).

<sup>29</sup> MS followed Indonesian language courses as an adult and frequently makes a comparison between 'Indonesian Dutch' and Standard Dutch.



The Indies Dutch ‘sound’ may also expand beyond purely linguistic markers, much in the same way as Indies Dutch is described in the earlier presented quote from M. de Vries (2009, p. 148). For CS, the sound of the variety includes frequent laughter, jokes, singing and making music as well as a certain degree of clamour in in-group settings (543 CS, 583 CS). These non-linguistic markers, in addition, are closely tied to Indies Dutch customs surrounding food and hospitality (577-583 CS). Two other respondents (018-020 IK, 048 MS) also considered song and music integral parts of Indies Dutch culture, but did not link them to the Indies Dutch ‘sound’.

### 6.3.2 *Post-fragments*

After having been shown the fragments, respondents reported recognition on the basis of accent, (126-132 IK, 204 IK) manner of articulation (531-533 MS; 142 IK) or the speech patterns of relatives (915 CS) and other Indo-Dutch people (375 JB). At the same time, respondents recognised the performative nature of the fragments, variously characterising the presented accents as “over the top” (789 CS; 606 MS) or “affected” (781 CS; 283 JB, 371 JB). According to the respondents, this was a consequence of the comedic nature of the performances (783 CS; 204-206 IK; 381-383 JB).

Despite recognising both the audio and video fragment as comedy skits meant to entertain an audience, respondents put forward the assertion that “some people did speak like that” (779 CS; 138 IK). This exclusively applied to members of the first generation (795 CS, 811 CS): in all other contexts, respondents deemed the occurrence of an Indies Dutch accent an act, whether those performing it were professional actors or subsequent generations of Indo-Dutch people (344-346 JR; 190-192 FS; 797-801 CS).

‘Speaking like that’, is not restricted solely to phonological markers, but also includes a non-standard word order (764 CS) and the inclusion of (287 JB, 293 JB) or added emphasis on (146 IK) Malay lexical items. The phonological markers of Indies Dutch can furthermore be forgone if these latter two linguistic markers are present (801 CS). This demonstrates that according to the folk beliefs of the respondents, the Indies Dutch accent is broader than its mere phonological markers.

While the Indies accent itself thus consists of syntactical and lexical markers in addition to phonological ones, respondents also put forward the notion that Dutch people were unable to replicate the accent (307 JR). This seemed a function of disinterest in Indo-Dutch humour (306 JR) or a lack of shared cultural background (834-836 CS) rather than a case of linguistic inability. In cases where Dutch people did have a connection to either Indonesia or Indo-Dutch culture, their performances of Indies Dutch are deemed accurate by the respondents (299-303 JR; 160-166 IK; 284-286 MS, 557-559 MS).

Some respondents judged the Neyndorff fragment a better approximation of the Indies accent than the van Dort fragment (375 JB, 381-383 JB; 610-612 MS, 636 MS, 640-648 MS) or vice versa (791 CS). MS, who judged van Dort’s performance to be inauthentic, did so on account of her previous characterisation of Indo-Dutch people as soft-spoken and demure. To her, van Dort’s character was “too frenzied in her movements” (610 MS) and overexaggerated her gesture (612 MS), yielding a discrepancy between MS’s personal perception of Indo-Dutch people and van Dort’s persona. In addition, MS perceived van Dort to be a “totok or a belanda who imitates Indonesian.” (636 MS), which in turn rendered her performance artificial (618 MS). Neyndorff’s performance, on the other hand, matched MS’s definition of Indies Dutch being “soft and round” (640 MS), whereas van Dort’s speech is “sharper and with harder sounds” (648 MS). CS, by contrast, deemed Neyndorff to perform the so-called Indies accent inconsistently (900 CS), whereas van Dort did not (791 CS).

## 6.4 *Folk syntax*

### 6.4.1 *Pre-fragments*

The syntactical feature most commonly identified by the respondents is a different word order (539 CS) vis à vis Standard Dutch, which is also defined as a difference in “sentence structure” (098 IK; 096 FS) and “changing the syntax. Using a different syntax” (214 JR), highlighting its salience even to a folk audience. Other syntactical features noted by respondents are a lack of tense inflection on “most verbs” (212, 214 JR), “the contamination of verbs and sayings” (218 JR) which is also mentioned in van den Toorn (1957), and a degree “conciseness” directly sourced from Indonesian (477 CS, 1097

CS). CS, who is a language teacher of Indonesian, states that the mixed character of Indies Dutch is partly due to the parallel use of Dutch and Malay/Indonesian lexical items (462 CS), but also to the adherence to an Indonesian word order, which is especially apparent in characters like Tante Lien and the more recent Ricky Risolles (467-469 CS). Adherence to an Indonesian word order includes the postposition of Dutch demonstratives (473 CS) and adjectives (475 CS).

The syntax of Indies Dutch is generally discussed in comparison to either Standard Dutch or Standard Indonesian, whether explicitly or implicitly. When the comparison is explicit, respondents will note that Indies Dutch is either non-standard (104 IK) or “lousy” Dutch (210 JR), or incorrect Indonesian (497 CS). When discussed implicitly, the assertion is put forward that Indies Dutch sentence structure is “kind of weird” (682 JB), demonstrating that respondents tend to operate under the constraints of their Dutch, L1 syntax.

As with phonology, respondents noted a distinction between non-standard word order as found in the first generation (464 CS) and as employed by “caricatures like Wieteke van Dort” (467 CS). If found among the first generation, the degree to which a Malay word order and lexical items are used is dependent upon one’s level of education (464 CS).

Syntactical and lexical mixing among the first generation occurs largely unconsciously and despite their own perceptions of speaking ‘correct’ Dutch. Furthermore, the mixed constructions cannot pass for ‘correct’ Indonesian either due to containing both Dutch and Indonesian lexical items:

- 491 CS: Zonder dat ze zich vaak bewust zijn dat dat dus zo is. Dat ze die Indonesische.. woordvolgorde eigenlijk aanhouden, omdat ze daarmee zijn opgegroeid.  
 492 MR: Hmhm.  
 493 CS: Dus vaak denken ze dan natuurlijk toch dat ze <@ g- goed Nederlands [spreken] @>,  
 494 MR: [Hmhm].  
 495 CS: alleen als je hier opgroeit met Nederlandse taal dan denk je van hè?.. Maar dat is helemaal niet correct in het Nederlands ofzo  
 496 MR: Hmhm.  
 497 CS: Maar het is ook weer niet correct Indonesisch, omdat het natuurlijk ook zo’n mix is met uh... ja met Nederlandse woorden en Indonesische woorden. Dat bedoel ik met mix.  
 498 MR: Ja.  
 499 CS: Dus woordvolgorde – of de grammatica van de ene taal maar de.. woorden of uitdrukkingen soms van de andere taal en soms dat ook weer.. door mekaar (\*elkaar\*) weet je wel.

Adherence to Indonesian syntax also causes Indies Dutch to have inherited Indonesian’s “telegraphic style” (477 CS). According to CS, exposure to this syntax through the speech of parents and grandparents allow Indo-Dutch people of subsequent generations to instantly understand sentences constructed in this way:

- 483 CS: uitgegeven en dan komt allemaal dialogen en dan één dialoog dat is moeder en dochter en die gaan naar Bali, en dan zegt die dochter van <Q nou mam wat zal ik meenemen, zal ik allemaal sieraden meenemen Q> zegt die moeder weer van <Q ja ik zou niet alles meenemen Q> maar dan zegt ze dus in het Indonesisch uh.. zoiets van <Q <L2ind kalau hilang. bagaimana:: L2ind> Q> weet je wel. En dan.. Nederlanders hebben daar moeite mee om dat te vertalen want die vertalen dat woord kalau, weet je wel, indien  
 484 MR: Hmhm.  
 485 CS: hilang, verdwenen of weg. Bagaimana, hoe. Maar als je dat zeg maar als Indo vertaalt, als verdwenen hoe, dan weet je al gelijk <Q oh. Ja als je het kwijtraakt, wat ga je dan doen? Hoe ga je daar mee om Q> weet je wel. Dus dan in het Nederlands moet je er een hele zin van maken

Respondents IK, FS and CS also note non-standard features in their own syntax. FS, for instance, professed to have struggled with Dutch syntax and the the placement of the Dutch particles *er* and *dus*. Non-standard use of *er* in Indies Dutch is described in van den Toorn (1957) and while it cannot be

proven that FS' syntactical difficulties are due to influence from Indies Dutch<sup>30</sup>, it is something that he himself connects to his Indies Dutch background:

- 096 FS: Uh.. Wat ik wel merk, uh.. en daar had ik op de middelbare school best wel veel last van, is dat de zinsbouw – zinsopbouw uh.. door uh.. Indische Nederlanders uh anders is.  
 097 MR: Hmhm.  
 098 FS: Uh buiten de uitspraak. Uite – of een – een harde z.  
 099 MR: Hmhm.  
 100 FS: Uh.. waar ik nog steeds last van heb, is ook de – de volgorde van uh van bijvoorbeeld het woordje er. Of het woordje dus.  
 101 MR: Hmhm.  
 102 FS: Is uh beduidend anders dan wat ik op de Ne – op de middelbare school moest leren.  
 103 MR: Ja.  
 104 FS: En uh. Uit – uit dat soort dingen kun je wel uh – wel merken dat uh.. ja toch iets anders Nederlands gesproken wordt dan uh dan – dan wat je misschien leert als je hier in Nederland o – van kinds af aan wel in – echt in Nederland [bent opgegroeid].  
 105 MR: [Hmhm].
- 111 MR: Ja. En – en waar bestond die last van uit [bij ui ]  
 112 FS: [Oh ja bij – ] dat had ik regelmatig in opstellen of in spreekbeurten uh.  
 113 MR: [Hmhm]  
 114 FS: [Hè] erop gewezen dat uh bepaalde zinsvolgorde uh niet uh niet klopte. Of dat ik bepaalde woorden (H) op een verkeerde plaats zette en uh oké ((RAISES AND THEN LOWERS HANDS ON KNEES)).  
 115 MR: Hmhm.  
 116 FS: Het zij zo. Dat is er nooit uitgegaan.

Like FS, IK reports instances of Indies Dutch sentence structure in her own speech, despite the fact that Dutch was spoken in the home:

- 098 IK: En dat je wel in het Nederlands – maar d'r (\*er\*) werd natuurlijk thuis ook Nederlands gesproken en ook met alle ooms en tantes en daar waren ze natuurlijk ook heel goed in. Het is soms ook in een bepaalde zinsopbouw. Dan maak ik een zin en dan zegt iemand <Q heb jij een Indische <@ achtergrond ofzo @> ? Q>

For both IK and CS, the effect becomes more pronounced in the company of other Indo-Dutch people. For CS, it primarily affects syntax (921-29 CS; 937-939 CS), while for IK her lexicon and phonology are also affected:

- 102 IK: Dat is heel grappig, dat dat toch – ik heb een Surinaamse uh vriend en die kan dat bijvoorbeeld ook. Dan zeggen in een keer <Q ach niet je vinger daar zetten Q>.  
 103 MR: Hmhm.  
 104 IK: En dan denk ik... <@ niet echt een goed Ne @> - een Nederlander zou dat nooit – nooit zo zeggen. En soms heb je in het Indisch, of je heb een bepaalde, iemand zegt iets en dat merk ik ook heel erg als ik in – als ik {MS} hier in de stoel heb, of ik heb {CS} in de stoel en ik luister, dat ik dan tussendoor opeens kan zeggen om het te bevestigen <Q huh-uh Q>  
 105 MR: Hmhm.  
 106 IK: Nou. Dat is zó Indisch {MR}.  
 107 MR: Hmhm.  
 108 IK: (H) <@ En dat is heel grappig @> dat ik dat in gesprekken niet met m'n.. gewoon

<sup>30</sup> FS spent part of his youth abroad, though he was raised in a Dutch-speaking community and attended a primary school where the language of instruction was Dutch.

Nederlandse of weet ik even niet zeg, en zodra we bij elkaar – schieten er woordjes tussenuit of bepaalde klanken of een bepaald iets dat je denkt.

#### 6.4.2 Post-fragments

Respondents did not alter their opinions on Indies Dutch syntax after having been shown the three fragments. Word order remained the most salient feature, and the only feature commented on after exposure to the fragments.

After reading the text fragment, CS, FS (219-221 FS) and MS noted a difference between the syntax of the mother-character and Robinson's character. According to CS the former "just spoke Dutch" (1287 CS) with a Dutch word order (1295 CS) while the other "speaks that Petjoh somewhat" (1291 CS). MS mentioned that the text attempted to establish a difference between Standard Dutch and "Indonesian Dutch" (831 MS). She recognised this so-called Indonesian Dutch due to its "different structure" (833 MS) where "words are sometimes turned around", a quality which she ascribes to Indonesian. She also notes that this happened in the audio and video fragment (835 MS).

### 6.5 Folk lexicon

#### 6.5.1 Pre-fragments

The folk semantics of Indies Dutch are at once a wide and at once a narrow field in the minds of the respondents. Wide, because words may have accumulated meaning throughout the decades that far exceed their original semantic load, and narrow because of the generally restricted domains found in Indies Dutch (J.W. de Vries, 2005). Lexical domains mentioned by the respondents include interjections (082 JR; 192 FS; 693 MS; 104 IK), food terms including the terms for dishes (084 FS; 082 IK; 178 MS), terms of address (450 CS, 708 CS), colony-specific vocabulary that has survived in Indies Dutch but not in Indonesian (416-422 CS), stock phrases (176-178 MS), spatial terms (136 JB, 138 JB) and words pertaining to the domestic sphere (126 JB, 128-132 JB). An additional domain not mentioned in the reviewed literature was that of swear words and taboo terms (066 IK; 104 JR).

Respondents reported having picked up Malay words and phrases from bilingual relatives (034-036 IK; 076 JR; 695 MS) or other first generation Indo-Dutch acquaintances (110 JB), even if the home language was Dutch (061-062 FS; 253 JR; 038 IK; 242 JB; 194 CS), though such inventories were small (178 MS; 104 JR).

In addition to overheard lexicon, FS and IK reserve an important role for "sensing" the meaning of Indies Dutch words (128 FS), with IK going as far as to assign it central focus in her experience with Indies Dutch:

060 IK: Ja. [Ja].

061 MR: [Oké]... Uh en we hadden het net al even over.. uh Indisch-Nederlands en dat familieleden soms Maleis met elkaar spraken als de kinderen het niet mochten horen. Uh maar als we het dan hebben over Indisch-Nederlands als. Taal, zeg maar. Zitten daar bepaalde kenmerken aan <X waar u aan denkt X>.

062 IK: Uh... Het is hel grappig dat je die vraag stelt want ik denk dat het.. die kenmerken zitten d'r (\*er\*), maar meer het onuitgesprokene.

063 MR: Hmhm.

064 IK: Dus niet in taal.

065 MR: Oke.

066 IK: Uh.. blikken en dingen dat je voelt als kind. Uh:... en wat de taal dan doet, bepaalde woorden wat je oppikt uh:: dan scheldwoorden of uh als iemand dom was dan werd er gezegd <Q oh wat een <L2msa tolol L2msa> (/tɔlɔl/) Q>

067 MR: Hmhm.

068 IK: Nou dan weet je op gegeven moment waar het dan bij hoort, dat pik je dan wel op. (H) Maar het grappige is dat het minder in woorden.. uh werd uitgedrukt. (H) Maar meer in – dat Indische toch meer in dat onuitgesprokene..

For IK, a core feature of Indies Dutch is a degree of implicit meaning, located outside of spoken language. It is linked to the stereotype of *Indisch zwijgen* ‘Indies silence’, yet communicated through paralinguistic features such as facial expressions, again similar to how the variety is defined in M. de Vries (2009, p. 148).

This again shows that the folk semantics of Indies Dutch words may exceed lexical meaning and may indeed include a number of personal and cultural associations (082 IK; 645-653 CS).

Nowhere is this extended meaning seen more clearly than in the Malay word *sudah*, which has accumulated a cultural meaning specific to the Indo-Dutch community and experience:

1149 CS: <X ne me X> ja <L2msa sudah L2msa> (/suda/). Al. Weet je wel.

1150 MR: Hmhm.

1151 CS: Ik bedoel dat geeft echt aan (H) – en dat was natuurlijk vanuit onze generatie juist ook soms het verwijt (H) naar de generatie voor ons van uh (H) want daarmee werd ook eigenlijk elke.. uh.. poging tot uh.. dialoog. Werd gelijk natuurlijk ondermijnd. Want als je al met je vader of moeder in een soort dialoog terecht wilde komen om effe (\*even\*) jouw kant van de zaak te laten zien over wat dan ook. (H) Maar zij zeiden dan <Q <L2msa sudah! L2msa> (/sudax/) Q> en dan was het ook meteen zo, klaar. Weet je wel. Dan was echt zo van oh maar IK was <@ nog niet klaar @>

1152 MR: @@.

1153 CS: of ik wil nog wel het een en ander uit – maar dat was echt zo’n – echt zo’n punt eronder weet je wel.

1154 MR: Hmhm.

1155 CS: Dat uh.. en en ook natuurlijk die hele generatie – of die hele groep Indische mensen die nu nog bezig zijn om – of nu nog – die in ereschulden of in backpay, weet je wel.

1156 MR: Hmhm.

1157 CS: Die dan ook zeggen van <Q ja want dat – de regering had natuurlijk ook, wat ook is, heeft daar natuurlijk zeventig jaar lang misbruik van gemaakt dat die generatie altijd zegt <Q ah <L2msa sudah L2msa> (/sudax/). Laat maar. Ja het is goed, gaan het er niet meer over hebben Q> verleden, bla bla bla. En <X ik X> denk is natuurlijk uh.. ook. Dat is ook wel iets Indonesisch natuurlijk. Dat komt wel daarvandaan.

1158 MR: Hmhm.

1159 CS: Maar Nederlanders hebben het uh.. niet. Die hebben het begrip niet. Ja hooguit zeggen ze ja punt erachter enzo.

1160 MR: Hmhm.

1161 CS: Misschien. Of punt uit. Punt uit zeggen ze <@ denk ik @>.

While it proved difficult for respondents to provide lexical items during the interview, some respondents reported that their Indies Dutch lexicon became more activated in the company of fellow Indo-Dutch people (108 IK; 998-1004 CS). JB, who was born in Indonesia, reported frequent activation of her Malay lexicon (122-124 JB), outside of in-group context and without discernible pattern (468-471 JB). In addition, she distanced herself from Indo-Dutch people who deliberately inserted Malay lexical items into their speech (234-240 JB, 286-302 JB).

### 6.5.2 Post fragments

The audio and video fragment largely consisted of the same lexical domains described in the reviewed literature. Some respondents showed instant recognition of more stereotypical terms such as *totok* (331 JB) and were able to expand upon them with their own lexicon (343 JB, 670 JB), while others expressed frustration at their inability to understand all words (505-509 MS). In some cases, unfamiliar words were amended to more stereotypical words. IK, for instance, amended *dodol* in the Neyndorff fragment to *totok* (146 IK), while FS linked the unfamiliar *koreng* in the text fragment to the food-related *goreng* ‘fried’ (215 FS).

IK also asserted that the performativity of the skits was located in the increased emphasis on lexical items sourced from Malay:

145 MR: En uh u zei net aangedikt [zou je XXXX]

146 IK: [Nou het lijkt wel of de nadruk] gewoon hier uh op bepaalde woorden dat het gewoon wat extra uh.: uh.. <Q Ayo.: Q> en <Q <L2msa totok L2msa> Q> weet je zo. Dat het dan extra de nadruk er op legt.

### 6.6 Language use

Respondents' aforementioned monolingual Dutch upbringing was motivated by parental concerns over assimilation (074 FS; 042 JR, 253 JR; 210-214 CS; 014 IK; 052-054 MS; 340 MS) as described by van Leeuwen (2008). Since respondents were raised as monolingual speakers of Dutch, it is not surprising that Indies Dutch is often contrasted to the 'normal' home language (242 JB; 194 CS; 014 IK; 253 JR). At the same time, this monolingual norm could be suspended under certain circumstances. Firstly, many respondents reported that their bilingual first generation relatives would speak Malay amongst each other as a way to prevent children from overhearing adult conversation (044-045 JR, 058 JR, 068 JR; 076- 078 FS, 164-168 FS). Secondly, when the goal was not private communication but rather bonding through humour, some respondents reported a shift to Indies Dutch/Petjoh among their family members (070 JR, 076 JR). In this latter case, the degree to which the monolingual Dutch norm could be eschewed seems to correlate with the degree to which the family oriented itself to the Dutch standard (332-338 JR).

The different motivations for suspension of the monolingual norm only show the old dichotomy between Malay as a medium of communication and Indies Dutch as a variety related to identity, but also that despite the external pressure to assimilate, Indies Dutch continued to be used among the in-group for nostalgic reasons (van den Toorn, 1957):

252 MR: Nee.. [Hmhm]

253 JR: [Dat] – Mijn ouders leerden ons altijd <Q Je moet Nederlands spreken ((BANGS FIST ON TABLE)), Nederlands spreken Q>. Petjoh deed je als andere Indische mensen d'rbij (\*erbij\*) waren. Dan konden ze een beetje eh...

254 MR: Ja.

255 JR: Een beetje geinen. Want want het werd wel een beetje gezien als.. leuk. Omdat – om die taal te spreken.

256 MR: Ja dus een soort – ja dus het werd een beetje gebruikt om.. onderling grapjes te maken of of?

257 JR: Ja. Ja. Ja.

258 MR: Oké.

259 JR: En ik denk ook uit een gevoel van nostalgie.

Bonding through the humorous use of Indies Dutch may also occur outside of the family, with other Indo-Dutch people. Such interactions may occur in person (613-625 CS), but also on social media (758-762 CS) or through texts and email (1117-1125 CS). Often, the switch to Indies Dutch is conscious and contains Indies Dutch stock phrases (1085-1095 CS) as well as significant alteration of respondents' typical syntax and/or phonology:

372 JR: Ik zou er meteen op afstappen. Ik zou zeggen van – < L2msa sebetar L2msa>! zeg ik dan.

373 MR: @. Ja@.

374 JR: < L2msa Aduh L2msa> jullie praten Petjoh.. hoe.: ken dese?

375 MR: @.

376 JR: Ik niet begrijpen. Weet je? Ik zou meteen daar in meegaan.

154 IK: het geeft een uh herkenning. En ik zou daar zeker gelijk ook naar kijken en contact maken. En dan ook zeggen <Q < L2msa adu L2msa> Indo jij Q> @@. Weet je. Dat – dat

155 MR: <@ Ja @>.

156 IK: is. Ja. Dat is een vorm van herkenning

While Indies Dutch is still primarily associated with humour and performance, its purpose is always to connect or commemorate, not to satirise:

- 803 CS: Weet je wel. Maar uh.. ik zal – ja of soms.. Indo's onder mekaar (\*elkaar\*).. doen het wel eens voor de grap. N- met dat neks weet je wel.  
 804 MR: Hmhm.  
 805 CS: Geeft neks! Weet je wel. Dan gaan we expres wel een beetje zo wel <Q ah geeft neks! Q>.  
 806 MR: Hmhm.  
 807 CS: En dan moeten we heel hard lachen enzo [om]  
 808 MR: [Ja].  
 809 CS: dat we gewoon <@ eigenlijk niet zo praten @>.  
 810 MR: Nee.  
 811 CS: En het dan – maar het het scheidt dan wel een band of f- het is toch misschien een soort van. Ja die generatie voor ons praatte zo en het is leuk om dat.. misschien in herinnering te brengen of dat nog even op te roepen ofzo  
 812 MR: Hmhm.  
 813 CS: Weet je wel.  
 814 CS: Het is niet bedoeld om dat echt belachelijk te maken.

For at least half the respondents, hearing Indies Dutch provides immediate points of recognition and kinship (375-379 JB, 690-704 JB; 816-818 CS, 834-838 CS; 154-156 IK; 392 JR-398). One respondent reported finding it easier to use Indies Dutch in an in-group environment as opposed to Standard Dutch (1097-1117 CS), and to have a negative reaction towards fellow Indo-Dutch people who did not respond to her linguistic bids for connection (1079-1081 CS). In a similar vein, one respondent reported having used Petjoh to admonish a younger Indo-Dutch colleague whom he perceived to be disconnected from her heritage. His sermon, which included cultural dress, is reminiscent of van Dort's sketches, though the intent is educational in addition to entertaining:

- 316 JR: Ik heb ook wel eens – we hebben afscheid genomen van een collega bij mij bij uh.. bij {workplace}. Die ging weg – Indisch meisje,  
 317 MR: Hmhm.  
 318 JR: maar die was helemaal – was een echte – <X t X>ja goed. Die had helemaal niets met Indonesië. Die had niets – die wist er ook niets van en zo. En die heb ik toen toegesproken, heb ik een sarongblouse aangetrokken en een sarongbroek aangetrokken en toen heb ik haar in het Petjoh toegesproken.  
 319 MR: Hmhm.  
 320 JR: En haar vermanend toegesproken om te zeggen dat ze dit maar eens moest gaan leren.

## 7. Conclusion

This thesis concerned itself with the linguistic folklore surrounding the spectrum variety Indies Dutch. Indies Dutch represents a continuum of Dutch with varying degrees of influence from Indonesian languages, and Malay in particular (Salverda, 2014). Due to similarities in functionality and a degree of interchangeability post-migration, this thesis considered the mixed language Petjoh (van Rheedem, 1994, 1995) to be part of the Indies Dutch continuum.

Once the Indo-Dutch migrated to the Netherlands, the conditions under which this continuum had arisen changed drastically (Bulan, 2018). From living in a multilingual society, the similarly multilingual Indo-Dutch migrated to a monolingual society that demanded their full and total assimilation (Captain, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2008). As a consequence, a rapid shift to monolingualism in Dutch occurred (Salverda, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2008). This entailed that subsequent generations lost the multilingualism that had characterised prior generations (Salverda, 2014). Despite this development, Indies Dutch and Petjoh remained in use to set Indo-Dutch identity apart from Dutch identity (van Engelenhoven, 2014).

The central question to this thesis was the following:

*How do second generation Indo-Dutch people construct Indies Dutch within the framework of linguistic folklore?*

Linguistic folklore refers to the beliefs, opinions and assumptions laypeople hold about a given language variety (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000). This thesis furthermore argued that contemporary Indies Dutch linguistic folklore has been influenced by the same colonial power dynamics and processes of postcolonial memory-making (Pattynama, 2013) that shaped the perception and remembrance of Indo-Dutch cultural heritage, both among a Dutch general public and the Indo-Dutch themselves (Captain, 2014). Such processes contributed to the strong performative component that has been present in the varieties from colonial time onwards (Salverda, 2014). Coupled with a loss of L1 competence in Malay in subsequent generations (Salverda, 2014, van Engelenhoven, 2014) makes both varieties uniquely suited for folk linguistic research.

In order to conduct folk linguistic research on Indies Dutch/Petjoh, this thesis interviewed six second generation Indo-Dutch people using an altered version of the folk linguistic method (Niedzielski and Preston, 2000). All respondents were raised as L1 speakers of Dutch, though at least four respondents had followed Indonesian language courses as adults. Interviews included post-migration audio, video and text fragments selected for the occurrence of linguistic features found in Indies Dutch and/or Petjoh.

While this thesis considered Petjoh part of the Indies Dutch continuum (Salverda, 2014), a number of respondents judged the varieties to differ from one another. In general, Indies Dutch was deemed less strongly admixed than Petjoh, which appeared to have a stronger performative component due to its association with Wieteke van Dort's Tante Lien.

Van Dort's in-character speech as well as the speech presented in the Neyndorff fragment prompted immediate recognition, yet was also unanimously judged to be over the top" (789 CS; 606 MS) or "affected" (781 CS; 283 JB, 371 JB), which was a function of the comedic nature of the fragments. At the same time, respondents held the opinion that "some people did speak like that" (779 CS; 138 IK). This exclusively applied to first generation Indo-Dutch migrants; in all other contexts the occurrence of Indies Dutch and/or Petjoh was deemed performative, whether the speaker was of Indo-Dutch descent or not.

'Speaking like that' was defined as employing a non-standard word order as well as inserting Malay lexical items into one's speech; the inclusion of phonological markers commonly found in both varieties appeared not to be a prerequisite.

Of these phonological markers, the difference in suprasegmentals with regards to Standard Dutch appeared most salient to respondents. A similar tendency is observed in Indies Dutch folk syntax, where respondents deemed one syntactical feature (non-standard word order) most salient and maintained this evaluation after exposure to the fragments. Discussion of this domain also elicited the most prescriptive comments from respondents: Indies Dutch was almost exclusively compared to either Standard Dutch or Standard Indonesian and judged to be an incorrect representation of both.

With regards to folk lexicon, respondents largely report the same restricted lexical domains as found in the reviewed literature. An additional domain not found in the literature – that of swear words and taboo terms – was also mentioned by respondents.

More interesting than the mere identification of linguistic markers is the ability of Indies Dutch to transcend its immediate domains. The folk perception of Indies Dutch phonology, for instance, may include syntactical, lexical and even cultural markers, while a considerable part of the Indies Dutch folk lexicon seems to consist of a unique set of paralinguistic features as well as personal and cultural meanings that may trump lexical meaning. Such a holistic perception of the variety is also seen in the assessment that 'speaking like that' primarily refers to syntactical and lexical features that need to occur in tandem for speech to be perceived as Indies Dutch.

Despite outward adherence to the Dutch monolingual norm, respondents revealed frequent instances of codeswitching among their first generation relatives. Such suspension of the Dutch norm occurred



under two conditions: to exclude children from adult conversation, or to facilitate family bonding. In case of the former, respondents' relatives would switch to Malay, while in the latter case, a switch was made to Indies Dutch/Petjoh. These different reasons for codeswitching duplicate the old dichotomy between Indies Dutch and Malay, where the former is used for purposes related to identity, and the latter for communication (Salverda, 2014). The degree to which suspension of the Dutch monolingual norm was possible seemed to correlate with the degree to which the family oriented itself to the Dutch standard, though more research is needed to ascertain if this is indeed the case.

Outside of the family environment, Indies Dutch is used to bond with fellow Indo-Dutch people and/or to commemorate the speech of first generation relatives. As within the family setting, bonding occurs mainly through humour, though it is devoid of satirical intent. Codeswitching to Indies Dutch may occur in person or in the digital sphere and typically involves the insertion of stereotypical Malay lexical items as well as extensive alteration of one's L1 syntax and/or phonology. A lack of L1 competence in Malay does not seem to impede codeswitching, as speakers seem to primarily rely on fossilized Indies Dutch stock phrases. Future research might want to focus on collecting data in Indo-Dutch in-group settings to determine the exact context, content, frequency and length of Indies Dutch codeswitches.

Despite the fact that codeswitching to Indies Dutch occurred consciously when used for social bonding, some respondents also noted increased activation of their Indies Dutch lexicon, syntax and phonology in in-group settings where conscious intent was absent. Such behaviour might point into the direction of respondents being heritage speakers of Malay rather than strictly L1 speakers of Dutch, or to the activation of respondents' L2 Indonesian, which they acquired in adulthood. Respondents' reports of overheard Malay lexicon in childhood favours the former explanation, though additional research that takes into account the historical multilingualism of this group is needed to determine whether members of the second generation (and onward) can be considered heritage speakers of Malay, or whether codeswitching to Indies Dutch is entirely driven by Indonesian second language acquisition and linguistic folklore.

The use of Indies Dutch in in-group settings affirms respondents' Indo-Dutch identity (van Engelenhoven, 2014) by reference to a shared (linguistic) heritage (Pattynama, 2013). Other than in the former colony, deliberate obscuring of one's Indo-Dutch identity through movement towards the Dutch end of the Indies Dutch spectrum (Salverda, 2014) seems irrelevant in a postcolonial context, as all respondents are native speakers of Dutch and the Indo-Dutch as a group have since fully integrated into Dutch society (M. de Vries, 2009). Post-migration Indies Dutch thus indeed appears to function solely as an *amplifier* of Indo-Dutch identity (van Engelenhoven, 2014).

While this thesis operated under the initial assumption that the perseverance of colonial power dynamics would have had the same impact on Indies Dutch linguistic folklore as on Indo-Dutch cultural memory (Pattynama, 2013), the image that emerges from respondents' recollections is more nuanced. While a performative aspect is always present, respondents' linguistic folklore was primarily modelled on the speech of relatives (van Engelenhoven, 2014) and personal conceptions of Indo-Dutch heritage rather than on post-migration performances. While such performances prompted immediate recognition, they were unanimously classified as overexaggerated representations of Indies Dutch speech.

Compared to pre-migration Indies Dutch, post-migration Indies Dutch consists of a severely reduced number of linguistic features when compared to the reviewed literature. For speech to be recognized as Indies Dutch, it must include at least non-standard word order and Malay lexical items; it appears that one cannot exist without the other. The inclusion of Malay suprasegmentals appears optional, even though it is a readily perceived feature of Indies Dutch. Furthermore, Indies Dutch is characterised by fluid boundaries between linguistic domains, as well as by the inclusion of domains outside of linguistics proper. This demonstrates that the linguistic folklore of Indies Dutch consists of a holistic set of linguistic, paralinguistic and cultural markers that together constitute the linguistic component of contemporary Indo-Dutch identity.

## References

- Baay, R. (2008). *De njai: Het concubinaat in Nederlands-Indië* [The njai: Concubinage in the Dutch East Indies]. Athenaeum-Polak & Van Gennep.
- Broekhuis, H., & Corver, N. (2020a, May 14). *Taalportaal* | *The uses of the perfect tenses*. Taalportaal. Retrieved April 12, 2023, from [https://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/link/syntax\\_Dutch\\_vp\\_V1\\_Characterization\\_and\\_classification\\_V1\\_Characterization\\_and\\_classification.1.5.4.2.xml](https://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/link/syntax_Dutch_vp_V1_Characterization_and_classification_V1_Characterization_and_classification.1.5.4.2.xml).
- Broekhuis, H., & Corver, N. (2020b, May 14). *Taalportaal* | *The clause-initial position*. Taalportaal. Retrieved April 12, 2023, from [https://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/link/syntax\\_Dutch\\_vp\\_V9\\_Word\\_order\\_introduction\\_V9\\_Word\\_order\\_introduction.9.3.xml](https://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/link/syntax_Dutch_vp_V9_Word_order_introduction_V9_Word_order_introduction.9.3.xml).
- Broekhuis, H., & Corver, N. (2020c, May 14). *Taalportaal* | *Placement of the finite verb*. Taalportaal. Retrieved April 11, 2023, from [https://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/link/syntax\\_Dutch\\_vp\\_V10\\_Verb\\_placement\\_V10\\_Verb\\_placement.10.1.xml](https://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/link/syntax_Dutch_vp_V10_Verb_placement_V10_Verb_placement.10.1.xml).
- Broekhuis, H., & Corver, N. (2020d, May 14). *Taalportaal* | *Yes/no questions*. Taalportaal. Retrieved April 12, 2023, from [https://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/link/syntax\\_Dutch\\_vp\\_V11\\_Word\\_order-Clause\\_initial\\_position\\_V11\\_Word\\_order-Clause\\_initial\\_position.11.2.1.xml](https://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/link/syntax_Dutch_vp_V11_Word_order-Clause_initial_position_V11_Word_order-Clause_initial_position.11.2.1.xml).
- Bulan, D. R. (2018). Indonesian Grammar in Petjo. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia (Online)*, 10(2), 301–312. <https://doi.org/10.21274/ls.2018.10.2.301-312>
- Captain, E. (2014). Harmless Identities: Representations of Racial Consciousness among Three Generations Indo-Europeans. In Ph. Essed & I. Hoving (Eds.), *Dutch Racism* (Vol. 27, pp. 53–70). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Editions Rodopi B.V. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401210096\\_004](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401210096_004)
- De Schryver, J., Neijt, A., Ghesquière, P., & Ernestus, M. (2008). Analogy, Frequency, and Sound Change. The Case of Dutch Devoicing. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*, 20(2), 159–195. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542708000056>
- de Vries, J.W. (1994a, August 22-27). *Verbal morphology in Javindo and Pecok* [Conference paper]. International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Leiden, The Netherlands.
- de Vries, J. W. (1994b). The language of the Indo-Dutch. *Studies in Netherlandic Culture and Literature*, 7, 213–223.
- de Vries, J. W. (1996). Mengtalen in de archipel: Nederlands in vreemde mond [Mixed languages in the archipelago: Dutch in foreign mouths]. In S. Darmojuwono, L. Suratminto, & K. Groeneboer (Eds.), *Duapuluh lima tahun studi Belanda di Indonesia / Vijfentwintig jaar studie Nederlands in Indonesië* (pp. 431–440). Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.
- de Vries, J. W. (2005). Indisch-Nederlands [Indies Dutch] [PDF]. In N. van der Sijs (Ed.), *Wereldnederlands: Oude en jonge variëteiten van het Nederlands* [Global Dutch: old and new varieties of Dutch] (pp. 59–77). Den Haag: SDU.
- de Vries, M. (2009). *'Indisch is een gevoel': De tweede en derde generatie Indische Nederlanders* ['Indies is a feeling': the second and third generation Indo-Dutch] [PDF]. Amsterdam University Press.
- Du Bois, J. W., Schuetze-Coburn, S., Cumming, S., & Paolino, D. (1993). Outline of Discourse Transcription. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking data: transcription and coding in discourse research* (pp. 45-90). New Jersey, United States of America: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- KBBI Daring. (2016). Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- Riyanto, S. (1996). Het ontstaan en de structuur van het Petjoek [The development and structure of Petjoek]. In S. Darmojuwono, L. Suratminto, & K. Groeneboer (Eds.), *Duapuluh lima tahun studi Belanda di Indonesia / vijfentwintig jaar studie Nederlands in Indonesië* (pp. 409–418). Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.
- Robinson, T. (1954). *Piekerans van een straatslijper II* [Ruminations of an idler II]. Bandung: N.V. Masa Baru.

- Gumperz, J. J., & Berenz, N. (1993). Transcribing Conversational Exchanges. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking data: transcription and coding in discourse research* (pp. 91–122). New Jersey, United States of America: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Jones, G. (2013). Dutch politicians, the Dutch nation and the dynamics of post-colonial citizenship. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-colonial immigrants and identity formations in the Netherlands* (pp. 27–48). Amsterdam University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9789048517312>
- Pattynama, P. (2013). Cultural Memory and Indo-Dutch Identity Formations. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-colonial Immigrants and Identity Formations in the Netherlands* (pp. 175-192). Amsterdam University Press. doi:10.1017/9789048517312.009
- J Poppe. (2012, November 6). *Gado Gado Wal Neyendorff De Tennis toernooi* [Video]. Youtube. Retrieved May 5, 2022, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ay-IVFSjo58>
- Preston, D. R. (1986). Fifty some-odd categories of language variation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 57(57), 9–48. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1986.57.9>
- mdfrasher. (2018, October 26). *De late late lien show 1979* [Video]. Youtube. Retrieved March 22, 2022, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ghsVHbMHTzg>
- Niedzielski, N. A., & Preston, D. R. (2000). *Folk Linguistics*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110803389>
- Salverda, R. (2014). Between Dutch and Indonesian: Colonial Dutch in time and space. In F. Hinskens & J. Taeldeman (Eds.), *Language and space: An international handbook of linguistic variation* (Vol. 3, pp. 800–821). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110261332.800>
- Steijlen, F. (2015). Indo-European Pasar Malam, Identity and Performance in the Netherlands. In Hatley, B. & Hough, B. (Eds.), *Performing Contemporary Indonesia* (Vol. 297, pp. 203–220). United States: BRILL. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004284937\\_012](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004284937_012)
- The Late Late Lien Show*. (n.d.). TV En Radio DataBase. Retrieved April 11, 2023, from <https://tvenradiodb.nl/index.php/5813/the-late-late-lien-show.html>
- van den Toorn, M. C. (1957). De taal van de Indische Nederlanders. *DBNL - Digitale Bibliotheek Voor De Nederlandse Letteren*. [https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/taa008195701\\_01/ta008195701\\_01\\_0059.php](https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/taa008195701_01/ta008195701_01_0059.php)
- van der Sijs, N. (2014). Systematisch onderzoek naar Nederlandse contactvariëteiten [Systematic research into Dutch contact varieties]. *Taal En Tongval*, 66(2), 117–142. <https://doi.org/10.5117/tet2014.2.sijs>
- van Engelenhoven, A. T. P. G. (2014). Petjoh: “Indisch” Nederlands of Nederlands Maleis: Feit of fictie? [Petjoh: “Indies” Dutch or Dutch Malay: Fact or fiction?]. *Praagse Perspectieven*, 9, 1–21. <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/27344>
- van Leeuwen, L. (2008). *Ons Indisch erfgoed: Zestig jaar strijd om cultuur en identiteit* [Our Indies heritage: sixty years of conflict over culture and identity]. Bert Bakker.
- van Rheedem, H. (1994). Het Petjo van Batavia: Een gemengde taal [Petjo of Batavia: A mixed language]. *Gramma/TTT – tijdschrift voor taalwetenschap*, 3(2), 89-101. [https://webdoc.ubn.ru.nl/tijd/g/gram/gramma\\_ttt/vol3\\_1994/petjvaba.pdf](https://webdoc.ubn.ru.nl/tijd/g/gram/gramma_ttt/vol3_1994/petjvaba.pdf)
- van Rheedem, H. (1995). *Het Petjo van Batavia: Ontstaan en structuur van de taal van de Indo's* [Petjo of Batavia: Development and structure of the language of the Indos]. Universiteit van Amsterdam Publicaties van het Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap.

## Appendix I: translations

*Fragment 1*

*Gado Gado Wal Neyndorff De Tennistournooi, 0:00-1:10 (J Poppe, 2012)*

One day, we, the Indo-gang, decide to partake in this big *pukulan* match. Our tennis club, he's big in size. And Wim *Blekok* is the treasurer. Finally, the big day has come and excitedly the wives of the tennis players come along and all the while chattering they take to one of the visitors' benches. *Si Pim* and *Loe* in their white shorts stand proud like coconut palms on the red gravel. The umpire he says:

'Ayo, gents! Give the ball a hit!'

Pim, he serves first: '*Nyang* hard!'

But his first ball: *kena* in the netting.

'No matter,' says *Loe*.

The second ball, wily and soft, also against the netting.

'Still no matter,' says *Loe*.

The opposing team, they smile affably because those two Indo's prove to be boiled eggs to them.

Then, suddenly, Pim's wife, *Si Lies*, she says: 'Ayo Pim! Yesterday evening I massaged your muscles and you were off to bed without anything and now you're playing like a floppy *dodol*.'

*Fragment 2*

*The Late Late Lien Show 1979 (mdfrasher, 2018)*

Tante Lien: Oeh! Oh yes! A little bit of criticism. Let me stuff my face with a handful of peanuts, eh. We call that *kacang*, Leo. Hey you know what folks. Not so bad right? Criticism-criticism and *krupuks* are also part of the rice table. And appreciation eh. Not only high ratings too you know. If I would have had on the Genta Kali girls' HBS such high grades, I would long have been doctoranda *Lien van Dommenlah* eh! People expert and *totokologist*. No but auntie never had high grades you know. Auntie had to work hard and cheat a lot. When it came to cheating on tests, first in line. Speaking of rooster, did you see the new act of the Para rooster?

Audience: No, how so, how so, does he have a new one?

Tante Lien: Yes! Like this right, he always walks like this. Choe kloek, choe kloek, choe kloek. With one such a wattle, eh. The Para is just Indies. *Duta* too. And you know what's more. Choe kloek, choe kloek. The Para, of generous laughter. The Para of the *rujak manis* with *dideh* and *pisangleaf*. No but. I am so happy you know that the Para can still make use of auntie's services despite my age eh. And they are so Indies-minded you know, the Para. I get reimbursement of expenses for my show! And I use that to renovate the entire house. Everything a little saggy right. Just like auntie.

*Fragment 3*

*Piekerans van een straatslijper II, p. 18-19*

"Who is that?"

"Tikoes – eh – Herman."

"How do you know it's him? Anyone can whistle like that, can't they?"

"No. Only Tikoes whistles like he does."

"Why is he called Tikoes?"

"His head's a little bald."

"What's that then?"

"Ha-a, his hair won't grow. a little over here a little over there."

"But why Tikoes?... O, like a rat with scabies surely. Neat!"

"No, not scabies! His head is just like that, ma."

## Appendix II: Interview questions/guidelines

### I. *General questions/conversation starters*

- Wanneer bent u geboren?
- Waar bent u geboren en opgegroeid?
- Waar zijn uw ouders geboren en opgegroeid?
- Wat voor werk deden zijn?

### II. *Culture and community*

- Zou u iets kunnen vertellen over hoe u bent opgegroeid?
- Heeft u veel contact (gehad) met andere Indische mensen? Nu nog?
- Wat zijn volgens u pijlers van de Indische cultuur? Anders geformuleerd: wat is volgens u echt Indisch?
- Wat maakt iemand Indisch?
- In hoeverre voelt u zich Indisch (in tegenstelling tot 'gewoon' Nederlands)?

### III. *Linguistic background*

- Welke talen of dialecten werden er bij u thuis gesproken?
- En in de bredere kring van uw familie?
- Is daar een reden voor geweest denkt u? Waarom denkt u dat uw ouders ervoor kozen wel/geen Maleis te spreken?
- Welke talen spreekt u nu?

### IV. *Folk linguistics: pre-fragments*

- Dit interview gaat eigenlijk over het Indisch-Nederlands. Kunt u daar een definitie van geven? Bijvoorbeeld: hoe klinkt het? Heeft het een bepaalde klank of bepaalde woorden en zinnen? Wordt het op bepaalde momenten gebruikt?
- Kunt u dat daar een voorbeeld van geven? Van een woord of een zin of een context waarin dat gebruikt wordt?
- Wat maakt Indisch Nederlands anders ten opzichte van 'gewoon' Nederlands?

### V. *Folk phonology: post-fragments*

- Ik ga u nu twee fragmenten laten horen. De eerste is alleen audio en de tweede is met beeld [Fragment Gado-Gado De Tennistournooi]
- kent u dit?
- wat vindt u hiervan? Grappig/niet grappig? Gepast/ongepast?
- Praten Indische mensen echt zo? *Als ontkennend antwoord:* Hoe denkt u dat Indische mensen praten?
- Wat vindt u ervan dat dit zo opgevoerd wordt?
- Stel, u komt iemand tegen en die persoon praat zo. Wat zou u daarvan vinden?
- Als die persoon Indisch is?
- Als die persoon Nederlands/totok is?

[Fragment Tante Lien]:

- kent u dit?
- wat vindt u hiervan? Grappig/niet grappig? Gepast/ongepast?
- Praten Indische mensen echt zo? *Als ontkennend antwoord:* Hoe denkt u dat Indische mensen praten?
- Zit er voor u een verschil tussen dit fragment en het vorige fragment? Zou u dat kunnen benoemen?

### VI. *Folk lexicon: post-fragments*

- Ik heb als kind maar 1 Maleis woord gehoord bij mij thuis: *pijet*. Hoe is dat bij u?
- Weet u nog hoe oud u ongeveer was toen u die woorden leerde?
- Zijn er voor u woorden of misschien wel zinnetjes die u echt bij het Indisch-Nederlands vindt horen? Waarom?
- U heeft net naar die fragmenten Indisch-Nederlands geluisterd en gekeken en daar hoorde u zowel Nederlands als Maleis. Wat maakt Indisch-Nederlands tot Indisch-Nederlands volgens u?

Als iemand geen Maleise woorden kent:

- Heeft u later nog Maleise woorden opgepikt? Van wie?
- Kent u mensen die Maleise woorden gebruiken? Wie zijn dat?
- In hoeverre is de Indische identiteit/Indisch zijn voor u verbonden aan het spreken of kennen van Indisch-Nederlands?

VII. *Language use:*

- Die woorden die u net noemde, gebruikt u die wel eens? → Als geïnterviewden het woord niet kennen, gaan onderstaande vragen op voor mensen in de omgeving van de geïnterviewden die het woord/de woorden wel kennen
- Wanneer?
- Hoe vaak?
- Met wie bent u dan?
- Kan iedereen dit zomaar zeggen?
- Hoe ziet volgens u de toekomst van het Indisch-Nederlands eruit?
- Wat vindt u ervan dat er minder en minder Maleis/Indisch-Nederlands wordt gesproken?

VIII. *Folk syntax: post-fragments*

- [Fragment 3]: Ik heb hier een boek van Tjalie Robinson. Zou u hier een stukje uit willen voorlezen?
- Herkent u hier iets van? Begrijpt u hier iets van?
- Zou u kunnen zeggen wat hier staat?
- Welke taal denkt u dat dit is? Waar leidt u dat uit af?
- U heeft net ook een stukje van Gado-Gado en Tante Lien gekeken: in hoeverre verschilt dit van hoe zij praatten/de taal die zij gebruiken?

## Appendix III: interview quotes translations

*p. 24*

491 CS: Without being aware that this is the case. That they retain that Indonesian.. word order as it were, because they were raised with it.

492 MR: Hmhm.

493 CS: So often they think of course that they <@ s- speak correct [Dutch] @>,

494 MR: [Hmhm].

495 CS: Only if you grow up here with the Dutch language you'll think what?.. But that doesn't make sense in Dutch or something like that

496 MR: Hmhm.

497 CS: But it's not correct Indonesian either, because it's a mixture of course of uh... of Dutch words and Indonesian words. That's what I mean with mixture.

498 MR: Yes.

499 CS: So word order – or the grammar of one language but the.. words or sayings sometimes of the other language and sometimes that gets.. mixed up you know.

*p. 24*

483 CS: published with all kinds of dialogues and then one dialogue is about a mother and a daughter and they go to Bali, and then the daughter is like <Q well mom what should I pack, shall I pack all kinds of jewellery Q> and then the mom says <Q yes well I wouldn't take everything Q> but then in Indonesian she says.. something like <Q <L2ind kalau hilang. bagaimana:: L2ind> Q> you know. And then.. Dutch people struggle with translating that because they translate that word, kalau, you know, if

484 MR: Hmhm.

485 CS: hilang, disappeared or gone. Bagaimana, how. But if you translate as an Indo-Dutch person, if gone how, then you immediately know <Q oh. yeah if you lose it, what will you do? How will you manage Q> you know. So Dutch requires an entire sentence.

*p. 24-25*

096 FS: Uh.. What I do notice, uh.. and I struggled with that in high school, is that sentence structure – sentence structure uh.. as used by uh.. Indo-Dutch people uh is different.

097 MR: Hmhm.

098 FS: Uh aside from pronunciation. Pronu – or a – a hard z.

099 MR: Hmhm.

100 FS: Uh.. what I still struggle with, is also the – the order of for instance the word er. Or the word dus.

101 MR: Hmhm.

102 FS: Is uh markedly different than what I – had to learn in high school.

103 MR: Yes.

104 FS: And uh. Through – through those things you'll uh – you'll notice uh.. yeah a different kind of Dutch speech than uh than – than what you might learn if you grow up here in the Netherlands o – from childhood onwards – were raised in the [Netherlands].

105 MR: [Hmhm].

*p.25*

111 MR: Yes. And – and what kind of trouble did [you have]

112 FS: [Oh well with – ] I used to have it in essays and presentations uh.

113 MR: [Hmhm]

114 FS: [Right] getting told that uh a certain sentence structure uh wasn't correct. Or that I put certain words (H) in the wrong spot and uh okay ((RAISES AND THEN LOWERS HANDS ON KNEES)).

115 MR: Hmhm.

116 FS: It is what it is. That never went away.

098 IK: And that you had to speak Dutch – but Dutch was spoken at home of course and also with all uncles and aunts and they were of course very good at that. It's a certain kind of sentence structure, sometimes too. Then I'll construct a sentence and someone will say <Q Do you have an Indo-Dutch <@ background or something @> ? Q>

*p.25*

102 IK: That is very curious, that that'll still – I have a Surinamese uh friend and they can also. Say suddenly <Q oh don't place your finger there Q>.

103 MR: Hmhm.

104 IK: And then I think... <@ not really a correct Dutch @> - a Dutch person would never – never say it like that. And sometimes in Indies Dutch you'll have, or you'll have a certain, someone will say something and I'll notice that especially if I'm in – if I've got {MS} in the chair, or I got {CS} in the chair and I listen, that I'll suddenly say as a confirmation <Q huh-uh Q>

105 MR: Hmhm.

106 IK: Well. That is so Indo-Dutch {MR}.

107 MR: Hmhm.

108 IK: (H) <@ And that is really funny @> That I won't.. I won't say that in conversation with my Dutch or I don't know really, and as soon as we're together – words or certain sounds slip out or a certain something that you think.

*p.26*

060 IK: Yes. [Yes].

061 MR: [Okay].... Uh and we just spoke about.. uh Indies Dutch and that family members would sometimes speak Malay with each other if children weren't supposed to overhear. Uh but if we consider Indies Dutch as. The language, as it were. Are there certain characteristics <X that spring to mind X>.

062 IK: Uh... It is curious that you ask that question because I think that it.. those characteristics are there, but more so in the unsaid.

063 MR: Hmhm.

064 IK: So not in language.

065 MR: Okay.

066 IK: Uh.. facial expressions en and things you feel as a child. Uh::.. and what the language does, certain words that you pick up uh:: swears then or uh if someone did something stupid then people said <Q oh what a <L2msa tolol L2msa> (/tɔlɔl/) Q>

067 MR: Hmhm.

068 IK: Well at a certain point you know what goes with what, you'll pick it up. (H) But the funny thing is that it was less expressed in.. uh words. (H) But more in – that Indies manner more in the unsaid..

*p.26-27*

1149 CS: <X ne me X> yes <L2msa sudah L2msa> (/suda/). Already. You know.

1150 MR: Hmhm.

1151 CS: I mean that is exemplary (H) – and that was our generation's issue with (H) with the generation above us (H) because it was used to.. uh.. every attempt at uh.. dialogue. Was immediately sabotaged. Because even if you wanted to engage your father and mother in a dialogue to explain your side of things. (H) But they would say <Q <L2msa sudah! L2msa> (/sudah/) Q> and then it was like that, done. You know. It would really be like oh but I <@ wasn't done yet @>

1152 MR: @@.

1153 CS: or I would like to discuss this or tha – but it was really a kind of – truly closing the chapter you know.

1154 MR: Hmhm.

1155 CS: That uh.. and and of course that entire generation – or that entire group of Indo-



Dutch people who are still involved in – or now even – in the backpay issue you know.

1156 MR: Hmhm.

1157 CS: Who will say <Q yeah because that – the government has, and that's true, has for seventy years abused the fact that that generation always says <Q ah <L2msa sudah L2msa> (/sudax/). Nevermind. Yes it's fine, we won't talk about it anymore Q> in the past, blah blah blah. And <X I X> think it's of course uh.. also. That's something Indonesian of course. That originates there.

1158 MR: Hmhm.

1159 CS: But Dutch people do not uh.. have it. They don't have that concept. Yeah maybe they'll say over and done or something.

1160 MR: Hmhm.

1161 CS: Maybe. Or period. They say period <@ I think @>.

*p.27*

145 MR: And uh you just said affected [would you XXXX]

146 IK: [Well it seems like the emphasis] here is uh on certain words that it just gets some extra uh:: uh.. <Q Ayo:: Q> and <Q <L2msa totok L2msa> Q> you know like that. That it receives extra emphasis.

*p.28*

252 MR: No.. [Hmhm]

253 JR: [That] – My parents always taught us <Q You have to speak Dutch ((BANGS FIST ON TABLE)), speak Dutch Q>. Petjoh you spoke in the presence of other Indo-Dutch people. Then they could eh...

254 MR: Yes.

255 JR: have some fun. Because because it was seen as kind of.. amusing. Because – to speak that language.

256 MR: Yeah so like some sort of – yeah so it was used somewhat to.. crack jokes amongst each other or or?

257 JR: Yes. Yes. Yes.

258 MR: Okay.

259 JR: And I also think out of nostalgia.

*p.28*

372 JR: I would approach them immediately. I would say like – <L2msa sebetar L2msa>! I would say.

373 MR: @. Ja@.

374 JR: <Q <L2msa Aduh L2msa> you speak Petjoh.. how:: is possible?

375 MR: @.

376 JR: I no understand Q>. You know? I would immediately follow suit.

*p.28*

154 IK: it shows uh recognition. And I would immediately turn my attention there and make contact. And say <Q <L2msa adu L2msa> you Indo Q> @@. You know. That – that

155 MR: <@ Yeah @>.

156 IK: is. Yeah. That is a kind of recognition.

*p.28*

803 CS: You know. But uh.. I will – yeah or sometimes.. Indos amongst each other.. sometimes do it for fun. N- with that no matter you know.

804 MR: Hmhm.

805 CS: No matter! You know. Then on purpose we'll say like <Q ah no matter! Q>.

806 MR: Hmhm.

807 CS: And then we're in stitches [because]

808 MR: [Yes].

809 CS: usually we <@ don't speak like that @>.

810 MR: No.

811 CS: And then it's – but at those times it fosters a bond or r- it may be some kind of. Yeah the generation before us spoke like that and it's nice to.. maybe commemorate that or bring it to mind or something.

812 MR: Hmhm.

813 CS: You know.

814 CS: It isn't really meant to make a mockery out of it.

*p.29*

316 JR: I had at some point – we said goodbye to a colleague of mine at u.. at{workplace}. She left – Indo-Dutch girl,

317 MR: Hmhm.

318 JR: but she was totally – really was a – <X t X> well anyway. She had no interest in Indonesia at all. she had nothing – she knew nothing of it and such. And I performed a speech for her, dressed myself in a sarong blouse and sarong trouser and then I made a speech to her in Petjoh.

319 MR: Hmhm.

320 JR: And spoke to her sternly to say that she had to learn this.

## Appendix IV: interview documents



Universiteit  
Leiden

## Informatieblad deelname interview MA-scriptie Indisch-Nederlands

Beste deelnemer,

Door middel van dit informatieblad krijgt u extra informatie over uw deelname aan een interview voor een MA-scriptie taalwetenschap. Mocht u na het lezen van dit informatieblad nog vragen hebben, voelt u zich dan vrij om deze te stellen.

### **Inhoud van het onderzoek**

Dit scriptieonderzoek focust op het Indisch-Nederlands en bestaat uit een interview tussen u en een MA student taalwetenschap aan de Universiteit Leiden. Vóór de opname en het interview starten, wordt u gevraagd een voorlopig toestemmingsformulier te tekenen waarin u toestemt met uw deelname, het opnemen en opslaan van het interview en de opslag en verwerking van uw gegevens voor taalkundig onderzoek. Na afloop van het interview zal u gevraagd worden om een definitief toestemmingsformulier te tekenen, waarmee u definitieve toestemming geeft voor bovengenoemde doelen.

Na het tekenen van het eerste toestemmingsformulier wordt u gevraagd schriftelijk wat algemene vragen te beantwoorden, zoals uw leeftijd, contactinformatie en dergelijke. Hierna start het interview. Tijdens het interview zal de student u vragen stellen over uw ervaringen met uw Indische achtergrond en het Indisch-Nederlands als taal. Ieder antwoord dat u geeft is goed, er kunnen geen fouten gemaakt worden in het interview.

Het interview wordt opgenomen door een spraakrecorder en naderhand uitgeschreven door de student. In dit transcript en de uiteindelijke scriptie zal een pseudoniem voor u gebruikt worden bestaande uit de eerste letter van uw voor- en achternaam. In de transcripties en de scriptie zult u niet nader te identificeren zijn dan uw pseudoniem, leeftijd, geslacht en opleidingsniveau. Deze vier geanonimiseerde gegevens vormen tezamen met het transcript en de interviewopname uw data. Van deze data zullen (delen van) het transcript en uw vier geanonimiseerde gegevens verwerkt worden in de scriptie. Deze scriptie is vervolgens voor iedereen openbaar toegankelijk in het scriptiearchief van de Universiteit Leiden. Uw interviewopname wordt **niet** opgenomen in dit openbare scriptiearchief.

U kunt ervoor kiezen restricties te stellen aan het gebruik van uw data voor toekomstig onderzoek. Ziet u hiervoor het blad 'Toekomstig onderzoek en databeheer', dat u tekent na het definitieve toestemmingsformulier.

### **Vergoeding**

Voor uw deelname aan dit onderzoek ontvangt u een vergoeding van €10,-.

### **Vrijwilligheid van deelname**

Deelname aan dit onderzoek is geheel vrijwillig en vrijblijvend. Dit betekent dat u te allen tijde, zonder opgaaf van reden en zolang het definitieve toestemmingsformulier nog niet getekend is, kunt besluiten om uw deelname aan het onderzoek te stoppen. Als u besluit te stoppen, heeft dit gevolgen voor de hoogte van de vergoeding; deze zal aangepast worden aan de daadwerkelijke duur van uw deelname.

### **Vertrouwelijkheid van informatie**

Alle informatie die in het kader van deze MA-scriptie wordt verzameld, wordt strikt vertrouwelijk behandeld. Al uw worden anoniem verwerkt en bewaard. Onbevoegden zullen geen inzage kunnen krijgen in uw gegevens en uw gegevens worden zo bewerkt dat ze niet terug te leiden zijn tot individuele personen.

### **Klachten en aanvullende informatie**

Indien u vindt dat u onjuist geïnformeerd bent over uw deelname aan de MA-scriptie of klachten hebt over de uitvoering of bejegening tijdens het interview, kunt u dit kenbaar maken aan de MA-student of diens supervisor. Onderaan dit informatieblad vindt u de contactgegevens van zowel de supervisor als de student. U kunt de student ook bereiken met aanvullende vragen of opmerkingen over het onderzoek, uw data of informatie die u naderhand nog te binnenschiet. Dit e-mailadres zal minstens zolang actief blijven als de scriptie duurt. Aanvullende data die u aanlevert via dit e-mailadres zal op dezelfde manier behandeld en verwerkt worden als uw data uit het interview en transcript.

### **Toestemmingsverklaringen**

Voor uw deelname aan het interview is uw toestemming nodig. Als u bereid bent om mee te doen, kunt u dit op het voorlopige en definitieve toestemmingsformulier aangeven.

### **Contactinformatie**

MA-student: M.E. Reintjens

E-mail: [redacted]

Supervisor: dr. A.T.P.G. van Engelenhoven

Telefoon: [redacted]

E-mail: [redacted]



Universiteit  
Leiden

## Voorlopig toestemmingsformulier interview MA-scriptie Indisch-Nederlands

Heeft u voldoende informatie ontvangen over uw deelname aan het onderzoek (aankruisen wat van toepassing is)?

- Ja
- Nee

Heeft u de mogelijk gekregen vragen te stellen over uw deelname en/of het onderzoek (aankruisen wat van toepassing is)?

- Ja
- Nee

Zijn al uw vragen naar tevredenheid beantwoord (aankruisen wat van toepassing is)?

- Ja
- Nee

Heeft u genoeg informatie gekregen om een vrije beslissing te kunnen maken over uw deelname (aankruisen wat van toepassing is)?

- Ja
- Nee

Begrijpt u dat u te allen tijde vrij bent om uw deelname in te trekken vóór het tekenen van het definitieve toestemmingsformulier na afloop van het interview zonder dat u hiervoor een reden hoeft op te geven (aankruisen wat van toepassing is)?

- Ja
- Nee

## **Ik geef hierbij mijn volledige en vrijwillige voorlopige toestemming voor mijn deelname aan het onderzoek voor de MA-scriptie Indisch-Nederlands**

Ik stem toe dat de MA-student die het interview afneemt dit opneemt, opslaat, uitschrijft en verwerkt in geanonimiseerde vorm. Ik begrijp dat mijn data gebruikt zal worden voor een MA-scriptie die voor iedereen toegankelijk zal zijn in het openbare scriptiearchief van de Universiteit Leiden.

Ik begrijp de aard en doelen van de procedures binnen het onderzoeksdeel (interview) waar ik deel aan neem. Dit is mij uitgelegd aan de hand van een informatieblad bij dit voorlopige toestemmingsformulier. Ik begrijp en onderschrijf dat ik meedoe aan wetenschappelijk onderzoek en dat mijn data uitsluitend gebruikt zal worden voor wetenschappelijke doeleinden. Ik begrijp dat als ik na afloop van het interview aanvullende data aanlever op het mailadres [redacted], dit onder dezelfde voorwaarden valt als beschreven in het informatieblad. Ik begrijp dat de MA-student die dit onderzoek uitvoert en eventuele andere onderzoekers mijn data kunnen gebruiken voor toekomstig onderzoek als ik hiervoor toestemming geef. Ik begrijp dat noch de MA-student noch de Universiteit Leiden controle heeft over de aard van eventueel toekomstig onderzoek.

Naam deelnemer: .....

Datum:.....

Plaats:.....

Handtekening deelnemer: .....



**Universiteit  
Leiden**

## Algemeen vragenformulier

deelnemer MA-scriptie Indisch-Nederlands

*Alle door u verstrekte informatie wordt anoniem verwerkt.*

**Naam:**.....

**Achternaam:**.....

**Woonplaats:**.....

**(E-mailadres\*):**.....

**Geslacht (aankruisen):**     Man         Vrouw         Anders, nl.:.....

**Leeftijd:**.....

**Opleidingsniveau:**.....

**Geboorteplaats:**.....

### Geboorteplaats ouders:

Moeder:.....

Vader:.....

### Werk/opleiding ouders:

Moeder:.....

Vader:.....



Universiteit  
Leiden

Definitief toestemmingsformulier  
MA-scriptie Indisch-Nederlands

**Ik geef hierbij mijn volledige en vrijwillige definitieve toestemming voor mijn deelname aan het onderzoek voor de MA-scriptie Indisch-Nederlands**

Ik stem toe dat de MA-student die het interview heeft afgenomen de door mij aangeleverde data opslaat, uitschrijft en verwerkt in geanonimiseerde vorm. Ik begrijp dat deze data slechts gebruikt zal worden voor de doeleinden beschreven in het informatieblad. Ik begrijp dat mijn data gebruikt zal worden voor een MA-scriptie die voor iedereen toegankelijk zal zijn in het openbare scriptiearchief van de Universiteit Leiden.

Ik begrijp de aard en doelen van de procedures binnen het onderzoeksdeel (interview) waar ik deel aan heb genomen. Dit is mij uitgelegd aan de hand van een informatieblad bij het voorlopige en definitieve toestemmingsformulier. Ik begrijp en onderschrijf dat ik meedoe aan wetenschappelijk onderzoek en dat mijn data uitsluitend gebruikt zal worden voor wetenschappelijke doeleinden. Ik begrijp dat als ik na afloop van het interview aanvullende data aanlever op het mailadres [redacted], dit onder dezelfde voorwaarden valt als beschreven in het informatieblad. Ik begrijp dat de MA-student die dit onderzoek uitvoert en eventuele andere onderzoekers mijn data kunnen gebruiken voor toekomstig onderzoek als ik hiervoor toestemming geef. Ik begrijp dat de MA-student, noch de Universiteit Leiden controle heeft over de aard van eventueel toekomstig onderzoek.

Naam deelnemer : .....

Datum:.....

Plaats:.....

Handtekening deelnemer: .....





Universiteit  
Leiden

## Toekomstig onderzoek en databeheer

Op dit formulier kunt u aangeven hoe u wilt dat u data beheerd wordt en wie uw data in de toekomst kosteloos mag gebruiken voor wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Ook hier geldt dat identificatie niet verder gaat dan pseudoniem, leeftijd, geslacht en opleidingsniveau. Uw gegevens zullen niet gebruikt worden voor commerciële doeleinden.

Na afloop van de scriptie wil ik dat mijn data (aankruisen wat van toepassing is):

- vernietigd wordt
- in zijn geheel bewaard wordt
- alleen als transcript bewaard wordt
- alleen als opname bewaard wordt

Na afloop van de scriptie wil ik dat mijn data bewaard wordt voor (aankruisen wat van toepassing is):

- Onbepaalde tijd
- Bepaalde tijd, namelijk:.....

Mijn (deels) bewaarde data mag gebruikt worden voor toekomstig onderzoek, door zowel M.E. Reintjens als andere onderzoekers (aankruisen wat van toepassing is):

- Ja
- Nee
- Alleen door M.E. Reintjens
- Alleen door andere onderzoekers

Ik wil graag via e-mail op de hoogte gesteld worden van de uitkomst van het onderzoek (aankruisen wat van toepassing is):

- Ja
- Nee
- Ander medium dan e-mail, namelijk:.....

M.E. Reintjens mag mij benaderen voor toekomstig onderzoek

- Ja
- Nee

Naam:.....

Datum:.....

Plaats:.....

Handtekening: