

The High and Low Speech Level Passive Voice in Javanese and Sundanese: A Comparative Study

Sry Satriya Tjatur Wisnu Sasangka

Research Center of Language, Literature, and Community, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Heksa Biopsi Puji Hastuti

Research Center of Language, Literature, and Community, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Jusmianti Garing*

Research Center of Language, Literature, and Community, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Wati Kurniawati

Research Center for Language and Literature Preservation, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Wiwin Erni Siti Nurlina

Research Center of Language, Literature, and Community, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Buha Aritonang

Research Center for Language and Literature Preservation, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Nontje Deisye Wewengkang

Research Center of Language, Literature, and Community, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Dharma Satrya HD

Research Center of Language, Literature, and Community, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Ery Agus Kurnianto

Research Center of Language, Literature, and Community, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

I Wayan Tama

Research Center for Language and Literature Preservation, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Siti Djuwarijah

Research Center of Language, Literature, and Community, BRIN, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract—This study investigates passive constructions in Javanese and Sundanese by addressing two central research questions: how passive forms in both languages are structurally and morphologically constructed across different speech levels, and how their passive markers function, particularly in expressing intentionality and unintentionality. Employing a descriptive–comparative qualitative approach supported by textual analysis and interviews with native speakers, this research identifies and compares the forms and types of passive voice in each language and examines the semantic roles of their passive markers. The findings show that Javanese exhibits five passive patterns, including verbs affixed with *di-*, *di- -i*, *di- -ake*; their *krama* counterparts *dipun-*, *dipun- -i*, *dipun- -aken*; verbs with *ke-* or *ke- -an*; personal-verb passives; verbs with the infix *-in-*; and verbs with *ka-*. Meanwhile, Sundanese presents only two passive types: verbs with *di-*, *di- -an*, or *di- -keun*, and verbs with *ka-* or *ka- -an*. A key distinction lies in the opposite semantic function of the *ka-* prefix: it signals intentionality in Javanese but unintentionality in Sundanese. These findings address the descriptive gap in the comparative study of Austronesian passive systems, clarify the influence of speech levels on morphosyntactic patterns, and provide insights relevant to the teaching of local languages.

Index Terms—Javanese, Sundanese, politeness hierarchy, passive voice, speech-level variation

I. INTRODUCTION

Studies on passive voice in Javanese and Sundanese have been widely discussed by scholars of both languages. Passives in Javanese, for instance, have been examined by several researchers. Poedjosoedarma (1979) analyzed passive verbs in

terms of their forms and meanings. Sudaryanto (1991) studied passive sentences from the perspective of syntactic roles or meanings. Sukesti (1998) investigated passive sentences in relation to active forms (active-passive diathesis) in narrative discourse. Wedhawati et al. (2001) addressed the forms of passive verbs in Javanese. Arifin (1999) discussed passive persona (personal passives). In addition to identifying the types of passive sentences, the authors also compared the structure of Javanese passive sentences with those in Indonesian (Sasangka, 2014). More recently, Sasangka (2018) described the morphological and syntactic aspects of Javanese passive constructions.

Meanwhile, passive sentences in Sundanese have been explored by scholars such as Ardiwinata (1984), Coolsma (1985), Djajasudarma (1994), and Kats and Soeriadiradja (1982), who mostly discussed passives from the perspective of affixal morphology. Hatikah (1988) examined passive verbs at morphemic, syntactic, and semantic levels, along with syntactic role structures and the functions of Sundanese passive sentences. Lyra (2024) investigated the comparative functions and meanings of the prefix *di-* and described the structure and meanings of Sundanese passive sentences. Her findings show that activity verbs in Sundanese passive constructions with *di--an* fall into four patterns, with inherent progressive, distributive, and resultative meanings, while constructions with *di-- keun* produce three patterns, with progressive and terminative meanings.

Although passive constructions in both languages have been extensively studied, comparative analyses between Javanese and Sundanese—particularly of passives in high-level speech (Javanese: *krama* and Sundanese: *lemes*) and low-level speech (Javanese: *ngoko* and Sundanese: *kasar*)—remain unexplored. Such a comparison allows a more comprehensive account of both shared and divergent patterns of passive constructions across speech levels.

For example, the sentence 'The novel *Robet Anak Suropati* I have already read' may be rendered as follows:

- (1) a. *Novel Robet Anak Surapati wis takwaca. (ngoko)*
b. *Novel Robet Anak Surapati sampun kula waos. (krama)* 'The novel *Robet Anak Suropati* **I have already read.**'
- (2) a. *Novel Robet Anak Suropati geus dibaca ku kuring. (kasar)*
b. *Novel Robet Anak Suropati parantos diwaos ku abdi. (lemes)* 'The novel *Robet Anak Suropati* **has already been read by me.**'

These examples clearly show structural differences in passive constructions. In Javanese, the passive is expressed as *wis takwaca (ngoko)* or *sampun kula waos (krama)*. In Sundanese, it is rendered as "*geus dibaca ku kuring*" (*kasar*) or "*parantos diwaos ku abdi*" (*lemes*). This evidence indicates that Javanese and Sundanese passives exhibit notable differences. A more thorough analysis of these differences would not only enrich the grammatical description of both languages but also contribute to the development of Indonesian grammar.

The study scope is limited to the structure of passive sentences in the two languages. Accordingly, the objectives are to (a) identify the features and forms of passives in Javanese and Sundanese, (b) describe the types of passive sentences found in both languages, and (c) examine the markers used to form passive constructions in each language. In response to the gaps outlined earlier, this research is directed by the following questions:

- 1) How are passive constructions in Javanese and Sundanese formed, and what types of passives appear across their speech levels?
- 2) How do passive markers in both languages function, especially in expressing intentionality and unintentionality, and how do these functions differ between them?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. *Speech Levels in Javanese and Sundanese*

Javanese and Sundanese are notable among Austronesian languages for their speech level systems, which are closely associated with social hierarchy and politeness. Javanese is commonly divided into *ngoko* and *krama*, with further refinements reflecting degrees of respect (Putri & Nugraheni, 2020; Quinn, 2011). Sundanese similarly distinguishes between *kasar* and *lemes*, although its system is generally considered less elaborate (Rusady & Munawarah, 2021).

These speech levels demonstrate how sociocultural values shape linguistic expression. Speakers select forms not only based on grammatical rules but also according to social relations, age, familiarity, and communicative context (Atmawati et al., 2024; Sudarwati et al., 2024). As a result, identical meanings can be conveyed through different lexical and morphological choices, depending on the register used.

This phenomenon is particularly relevant to passive constructions. Passives involve shifts in syntactic roles and pragmatic focus, and these shifts interact with speech level selection. In Javanese, passive clauses in *ngoko* and *krama* may differ in verb forms and pronoun usage, while in Sundanese, polite markers in *lemes* influence the stylistic realization of passives. Understanding these distinctions provides a necessary sociolinguistic framework for analyzing passive sentences in both languages.

B. *Passive Structures and Javanese Speech Level Variations*

The concept of passive structures in this study draws on the works of Alieva (1991), Purwo (1994), Ramlan (1981), Slametmuljana (1955), Sasangka (2016) and later scholars, who view passives as constructions shaped by grammatical, semantic, and functional factors. From a semantic perspective, passive clauses position the subject as the recipient of an action, while the agent is backgrounded or omitted (Bruening, 2019; Gotowski, 2019; Lee, 2019; Lee & Doherty, 2019; Sasangka, 2014).

Passive constructions involve at least three interrelated components: the verbal predicate, the redistribution of subject–object roles, and the morphological marking of the verb (Grosvald & Khwaileh, 2019; LeSourd, 2020; Moeliono et al., 2017; Murphy, 2021). These elements demonstrate that passives are not merely syntactic inversions, but rather complex structures shaped by argument structure and morphology.

In Javanese, the realization of passive structures is further influenced by speech levels. The Javanese *ngoko* typically signals informality and symmetrical social relations, whereas *krama* encodes politeness, social distance, and respect (Poedjosoedarma, 1979; Sasangka, 2019). Sociolinguistically, the choice between these levels depends on domain, addressee, and communicative purpose (Holmes, 1994; Wardhaugh, 2006; Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

The coexistence of low- and high-level speech reflects the close relationship between language and social values. Javanese speakers may alternate between levels within a single interaction in response to contextual shifts (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Giles & Coupland, 1991). This flexibility highlights that passive constructions in Javanese function not only as grammatical structures but also as resources for negotiating politeness and social relations.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study employs a qualitative descriptive–comparative design to analyze passive constructions in Javanese and Sundanese across low- and high-level speech varieties, utilizing written sources and semi-structured interviews. This approach identifies passive types, morphological markers, syntactic patterns, and cross-linguistic differences that reflect sociolinguistic factors, such as politeness and social hierarchy.

B. Data Sources

The data were obtained from oral and written sources. Oral data were collected through face-to-face interviews with purposively selected native speakers of Javanese and Sundanese representing both speech levels. Written data were drawn from Javanese and Sundanese texts, including literary works and media sources containing passive constructions.

C. Data Collection Techniques

Data were collected through documentation, semi-structured interviews, and observation. Documentation identified passive constructions in written texts, interviews elicited natural passive forms across speech levels, and observation captured passive use in everyday interactions.

D. Data Analysis Techniques

Data were analyzed using a descriptive–comparative qualitative approach (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The steps of analysis included: (1) grouping data based on morphological and syntactic categories; (2) classifying data based on speech levels; (3) comparing passive forms and functions across the two languages; and (4) interpreting the findings with attention to semantic aspects and social contexts.

E. Data Validity and Reliability

Data validity and reliability was ensured through source and methodological triangulation by comparing oral and written data, integrating documentation, interviews, and observations, with additional cross-checking by native speakers to confirm the accuracy and interpretation of passive constructions.

IV. RESULTS

Passive Voice in Javanese and Sundanese

Through data analysis and interviews with native speakers, this study identifies key passive voice forms that reflect the distinctive characteristics of Javanese and Sundanese.

TABLE 1
LOW-LEVEL AND HIGH-LEVEL SPEECH PASSIVE VOICE

No	<i>Ngoko</i>	<i>Kasar</i>	<i>Krama</i>	<i>Lemes</i>	Translation
1.	Mahasiswa keur dibingbing Pak Abdul Azis	Mahasiswa keur dibingbing Pak Abdul Azis	Mahasiswa nembe dipunbimbing Pak Abdul Azis	Mahasiswa nuju dibingbing Pak Abdul Azis	The students are being supervised by Mr. Abdul Azis
	Maneka warna flora lan fauna jero laut didelengi para turis	Rupa-rupa flora jeung fauna jero laut dititenan para turis	Maneka warni flora sarta fauna lebet laut dipuntingali para turis	Sagala rupi flora sareng fauna di laut dititenan turis	Various marine flora and fauna were observed by the tourists
	Bambang digawekake Dadang layangan	Bambang dipangnyieunkeun Dadang langlayangan.	Bambang dipundamelaken Dadang layangan	Bambang didamelkeun langlayangan ku Dadang	Bambang was made a kite by Dadang
	Biyen sikilku tau kejepit lawang sepur	Baheula suku urang pernah kajepit panto kareta	Rumiyyin suku kula nate kejepit lawang sepur	Kapungkur sampean abdi kantos kajepit panto kareta	My foot was once caught in the train door
2.	Tanggaku kerep kemalingan	Tatangga urang sering kamalingan	Tangga kula asring kapandangan	Tatangi abdi sering kapalingan	My neighbor has often been the victim of burglary
	Nalika isih cilik, aku tau ketiban andha	Keur leutik urang pernah katimpa taraje	Nalika tasih alit, kula nate kedhawahan andha	Nuju alit, abdi kantos katiban taraje	When I was a child, I was once struck by a falling ladder
	Klambi-klambi kang reged wis takkumbahi kabeh	Baju anu kotor geus diseuseuh kabeh ku urang	Rasukan-rasukan reged sampun kula kumbahi sedaya	Acuk anu kotor parantos diseuseuh ku abdi	All the dirty clothes have already been washed by me
3.	Suket ing buri omah wis koresiki?	Jukut di tukang geus dibersihkeun?	Rumput ing wingking griya sampun sampeyan resiki?	Jukut di pengkereun bumi parantos dibersihkeun ku anjeun?	Has the grass behind the house been cleaned by you?
	Iki gawean kang kudu ko(k)rampungake.	Pagawean ieu kudu dianggeuskeun ku maneh	Menika pakaryan ingkang kedah panjenengan rampungaken	Padamelan teu kedah direngsekeun ku anjeun	This is a task that must be completed by you
4.	Katresnan iku tan kena timubas arta	Asih (kanyaah) moal bisa dibeuli ku duit	Katresnan menika boten saged tinumbas arta	Kanyaah teu tiasa dipeser ku artos	Love cannot be bought with money
	Pak Tarsana wis tinimbalan Pak Lurah gara-gara perkara wingi	Pak Tarsana geus dicalukan ku Pak Lurah gara-gara kajadian kamari	Pak Tarsana sampun tinimbalan Pak Lurah kala wingi	Pak Tarsana parantos disauran ku Pak Lurah kamari	Mr. Tarsana was summoned by the village head because of yesterday's incident
	Pasrah penganten tinampa Bapak haryadi	Seserahan panganten ditampa Bapak Haryadi	Pasrah penganten tinampi Bapak Haryadi	Seserahan panganten ditampi ku Bapak Haryadi	The handover of the bride was received by Mr. Haryadi
	Kabeh lukisane Pranowo kaborong Pak Yopi	Kabeh lukisan Pranowo diborong ku Pak Yopi	Sedaya lukisanipun Pranowo kaborong Pak Yopi	Sadaya lukisan Pranowo diborong ku Pak Yopi	All of Pranowo's paintings were purchased in bulk by Mr. Yopi
5.	Cetakan kapisan buku iki katerbitake dening Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya	Cetakan kahiji buku ieu diterbitkeun ku Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya	Cetakan kapisan buku menika katerbitaken dening Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya	Cetakan kahiji buku ieu diterbitkeun ku Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya	The first edition of this book was published by Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya
	Wong tuwane kang lara-larane iku pungkasan kagawa nang rumah sakit	Kolotna anu geringan tungtungna dibawa ka rumah sakit	Tiyang sepuhipun ingkang asring gerah menika pungkasanipun kabekta dhateng griya sakit	Sepuhna anu teu damang ahirna (tungtungna) dicandak ka rumah sakit	His/her ailing parents were finally taken to the hospital

The findings reveal similarities and differences in the passive constructions of Javanese and Sundanese, both in the low and high speech levels. At least five types of passive sentences are found in Javanese, while in Sundanese, there are two types.

TABLE 2
THE COMPARISON OF JAVANESE AND SUNDANESE PASSIVE VOICE

Aspects	Javanese	Sundanese	Explanation
Number of Passive Types	5 Types	2 Types	Javanese is more diverse
Type I	Passive with the prefix <i>di-</i>	Passive with the prefix <i>di-</i>	Both are equally productive
Type II	Passive with the prefix <i>ke-</i>	–	Found only in Javanese
Type III	Passive with personal verbs (e.g., <i>dak-</i> , <i>kok-</i>)	–	Not attested in Sundanese
Type IV	Passive with the infix <i>-in-</i>	–	Characteristics of Javanese
Type V	Passive with the prefix <i>ka-</i> (denoting intentionality)	Passive with the prefix <i>ka-</i> (denoting unintentionality)	Both exist but differ in meaning
Semantic Aspect	Expresses intentional and unintentional actions	Expresses intentional and unintentional actions	Similar in general function
Social Aspect	<i>Ngoko</i> (low) and <i>krama</i> (high) varieties are used according to social status, social relations, and relationships among speakers	<i>Kasar</i> (low) and <i>lemes</i> (high) varieties are used according to social status, social relations, and relationships among speakers	Both are culturally loaded
Main Feature	<i>More complex, with richer morphological variations</i>	<i>Simpler, dominated by di- and ka-</i>	Javanese has a richer set of passive structures

V. DISCUSSION

The findings identify five passive sentence types in Javanese and two in Sundanese, as described below.

A. Type I Passive Voice

In Javanese, Type I passive sentences are those whose predicates consist of verbs affixed with *di-*, *di-* *-i*, and *di-* *-ake* (*ngoko*) or *dipun-*, *dipun-* *-i*, and *dipun-* *-aken* (*krama*). In Sundanese, the predicate consists of verbs affixed with *di-*, *di-* *-an*, and *di-* *-keun*, both in low and high speech levels. The meaning of verbs affixed with *di-*, *di-* *-i*, and *di-* *-ake* or *dipun-*, *dipun-* *-i*, and *dipun-* *-aken* in Javanese, as well as *di-*, *di-* *-an*, and *di-* *-keun* in Sundanese, the subject undergoes or is affected by an intentional action performed by the agent. The event experienced by the subject is thus something deliberate or planned.

This type of passive sentence is the result of transforming an active sentence whose predicate uses verbs affixed with *N-*, *N-* *-i*, and *N-* *-ake/-aken* in Javanese, or verbs affixed with *N-*, *N-* *-an*, and *N-* *-keun* in Sundanese. The transformation from active to passive causes the object of the active sentence to become the subject in the passive sentence, while the subject in the active sentence becomes the agent of the action. Some examples are given below.

- (3) a. *Pak Abdul Azis gek (lagi) mbimbing mahasiswa.* (4) a. *Pak Abdul Azis keur ngabingung mahasiswa.*
 b. *Mahasiswa gek (lagi) dibimbing Pak Abdul Azis.* b. *Mahasiswa keur dibingung Pak Abdul Azis.*

Translation:

(3a) and (4a): 'Pak Abdul Azis is **supervising** the students.'

(3b) and (4b): 'The students are being **supervised** by Pak Abdul Azis.'

Sentence (3) is an example from Javanese *ngoko*. Sentence (3a) is active, while (3b) is passive. In (3a), *Pak Abdul Azis* is the subject, *gek (lagi) mbimbing* is the predicate, and *mahasiswa* is the object. Its structure is S-P-O. However, when changed into passive, as in (3b), *mahasiswa* becomes the subject, *gek (lagi) dibimbing* is the predicate, and *Pak Abdul Azis* serves as the complement. The structure changes into S-P-Comp. The affix marking the active verb in (3a) is the nasal prefix *m-*, while the affix marking the passive verb in (3b) is *di-*.

On the other hand, sentence (4) is an example from the Sundanese language. Sentence (4a) is active, while (4b) is passive. In (4a), *Pak Abdul Azis* is the subject, *keur ngabingung* is the predicate, and *mahasiswa* is the object. The structure is S-P-O. After being transformed into passive, as in (4b), *mahasiswa* becomes the subject, *keur dibingung* is the predicate, and *Pak Abdul Azis* is the complement. Its structure is S-P-Comp. The affix marking the active verb in (4a) is the nasal prefix *nga-*, while the affix marking the passive verb in (4b) is *di-*.

When examples (3) and (4) are expressed in the high speech levels of Javanese and Sundanese, the forms become (5) and (6), respectively.

- (5) a. *Pak Abdul Azis nembe mbimbing mahasiswa.* (6) a. *Pak Abdul Azis nuju ngabingung mahasiswa.*
 b. *Mahasiswa nembe dipunbimbing Pak Abdul Azis.* b. *Mahasiswa nuju dibingung Pak Abdul Azis.*

Translation:

(5a) and (6a): 'Pak Abdul Azis is **supervising** the students.'

(5b) and (6b): 'The students **are being supervised** by Pak Abdul Azis.'

Sentence (5) is from Javanese *krama* (high speech level). Sentence (5a) is active, while (5b) is passive. In (5a), *Pak Abdul Azis* is the subject, *nembe mbimbing* is the predicate, and *mahasiswa* is the object. The structure is S-P-O. After transformation into passive (5b), *mahasiswa* becomes the subject, *nembe dipunbimbing* is the predicate, and *Pak Abdul Azis* is the complement. The structure becomes S-P-Comp. The affix used to mark the active verb in (5a) is the nasal prefix *m-*, while in (5b) the affix is *dipun-*.

Sentence (6) is from Sundanese *lemes*. Sentence (6a) is active, while (6b) is passive. In (6a), *Pak Abdul Azis* is the subject, *nuju ngabingung* is the predicate, and *mahasiswa* is the object. The structure is S-P-O. After transformation into passive as in (6b), *mahasiswa* becomes the subject, *nuju dibingung* is the predicate, and *Pak Abdul Azis* is the complement. The structure is S-P-Comp. The affix used in (6a) to mark the active verb is *nga-*, while in (6b) the affix is *di-*.

These data demonstrate that the structure of Type I passive sentences in both languages—examples (3b) and (4b), as well as (5b) and (6b)—is identical, namely S-P-Comp. In both Javanese and Sundanese, the subject in passive sentences is always the entity affected by a deliberate action of the agent, while the predicate is consistently marked by the passive affixes *di-*, *di-* *-i*, and *di-* *-ake* (*ngoko*) or *dipun-*, *dipun-* *-i*, and *dipun-* *-aken* (*krama*), and by *di-*, *di-* *-an*, and *di-* *-keun* in Sundanese, whether in *kasar* or *lemes*.

B. Type II Passive Voice

Type II passive sentences are those whose predicates are verbs affixed with *ke-* or *ke-* *-an*. The meaning of verbs affixed with *ke-* or *ke-* *-an* in Javanese, the subject undergoes or is affected by an action unintentionally. The event experienced by the subject is accidental, occurring without intention, unexpectedly, or without prior planning.

Some examples of Type II passive sentences in Javanese are presented below. Sentences labelled (a) are in the *ngoko*, while those labeled (b) are in the *krama*.

- (7) a. *Biyen sikilku tau kecepit lawang sepur.* (8) a. *Tanggamu kerep kemalingan?*
 b. *Rumiyin suku kula nate kecepit kori sepur.* b. *Tetangga panjenengan asring kepondungan?*
 'My leg **was** once **caught** in the train door.' 'Has your neighbor often **been robbed**'?

- (9) a. *Aku tau ketiban andha nalika isih cilik.*
 b. *Kula nate kedhawahan andha nalika tasih alit.*

'I was once struck by a ladder when I was a child.'

In sentence (7), *biyen* and *rumiyin* in (7a) and (7b) are adverbials, *sikilku* and *suku kula* function as subjects, *tau kecepit* and *nate kecepit* function as predicates, while *lawang sepur* and *kori sepur* function as complements. The structure of both sentences is therefore identical, namely K-S-P-Comp, with the predicate consisting of verbs affixed with *ke-*.

In sentence (8), *tanggamu* and *tetanggi panjenengan* function as subjects, while *kerep kemalingan* and *asring kemandungan* function as predicates. Thus, the structure of both sentences is S-P. The predicate in each passive sentence is a verb affixed with *ke-an*.

In sentence (9), *aku* and *kula* are subjects, *tau ketiban* and *nate kedhawahan* are predicates, *andha* functions as a complement, and *nalika isih cilik* and *nalika tasih alit* serve as adverbials. Hence, the structure of both sentences is S-P-Comp-K, with the predicate consisting of verbs affixed with *ke-an*.

Sundanese also has Type II passive sentences, which convey the same meaning as those in Javanese, namely that the subject is affected by an action unintentionally. However, the predicates are verbs affixed with *ka-* or *ka--an*. The meaning of verbs affixed with *ka-* or *ka--an* in Sundanese is also equivalent to verbs affixed with *ter-* in Indonesian. Examples are provided below. Sentences labelled (a) are in the *kasar*, while those labelled (b) are in the *lemes*.

- (10) a. *Baheula suku urang pernah kajepit panto kareta.* (11) a. *Tatangga maneh sering kamalingan?*
 b. *Kapungkur sampean abdi kantos kajepit panto kareta.* b. *Tatanggi anjeun sering kapalingan?*
 'My leg was once caught in the train door.' 'Has your neighbor often been robbed?'
- (12) a. *Urang pernah katimpa taraje keur leutik.*
 b. *Abdi kantos katiban taraje nuju alit.*

'I was once struck by a ladder when I was a child.'

In sentence (10), *baheula* and *kapungkur* are adverbials, *suku urang* and *sampean abdi* function as subjects, *pernah kajepit* and *kantos kajepit* function as predicates, while *panto kareta* functions as a complement. Thus, both sentences share the same structure: K-S-P-Comp, with the predicate marked by *ka-*.

In sentence (11), *tatangga maneh* and *tatanggi anjeun* function as subjects, while *sering kamalingan* and *sering kapalingan* function as predicates. The structure of both sentences is therefore S-P, with the predicate marked by *ka- - an*.

In sentence (12), *urang* and *abdi* are subjects, *pernah katimpa* and *kantos katiban* function as predicates, *taraje* functions as a complement, and *keur leutik* and *nuju alit* serve as adverbials. Thus, the structure of both sentences is S-P-Comp-K, with the predicate consisting of verbs affixed with *ka-* in *kasar* and *ka- -an* in *lemes*.

From these examples, it can be observed that the structure of Type II passive sentences in Javanese and Sundanese is consistently parallel. If Javanese passive sentences take the structure K-S-P-Comp as in (7a) and (7b), Sundanese passive sentences also follow the same structure, as in (10a) and (10b). If Javanese passive sentences have the structure S-P as in (8a) and (8b), Sundanese passive sentences also follow the same structure, as in (11a) and (11b). Likewise, if Javanese passive sentences follow the structure S-P-Comp-K as in (9a) and (9b), Sundanese passive sentences also share the same structure, as in (12a) and (12b).

Nevertheless, a slight but interesting difference can be noted between Javanese and Sundanese in the way they express 'my leg' and 'your neighbor' as subjects in sentences (7) – (8) and (10) – (11). In Javanese, 'my leg' is expressed as *sikilku* (*ngoko*) or *suku kula* (*krama*), while in Sundanese it is expressed as *suku urang* (*kasar*) or *sampean abdi* (*lemes*). Meanwhile, 'your neighbour' in Javanese is expressed as *tanggamu* (*ngoko*) or *tetanggi panjenengan* (*krama*), whereas in Sundanese it is expressed as *tatangga maneh* (*kasar*) or *tatanggi anjeun* (*lemes*). This indicates that Javanese *ngoko* employs bound pronominal clitics for first- and second-person singular (*-ku* and *-mu*), whereas such clitic forms are absent in *krama*. In contrast, Sundanese does not possess the clitic forms *-ku* or *-mu* at all.

Closer examination reveals that in all the above examples, the subject suffers from an unintentional event denoted by predicates marked with *ke-* or *ke--an* in Javanese, or *ka-* and *ka--an* in Sundanese. The agent in such sentences is typically a noun functioning as a complement directly following the verb, such as *lawang sepur* or *kori sepur* in (7a) and (7b), and *panto kareta* in (10a) and (10b), as well as *andha* in (9a) and (9b), and *taraje* in (12a) and (12b). On the other hand, in sentences (8a) and (8b) as well as (11a) and (11b), the agent is not explicitly expressed, though it can be inferred to be *maling* or *pandung* in Javanese (8a, 8b) and *maling* or *paling* in Sundanese (11a, 11b).

C. Type III Passive Voice

Type III passive sentences are constructions whose predicates consist of a personal verb (personal pronoun + verb), emphasizing the subject or recipient of the action rather than the agent. In fact, this passive form is also the result of a transformation of active sentences whose predicates are formed with the prefixes *meng-*, *meng--i*, or *meng--kan*. However, when the subject of the sentence is a personal pronoun, passivization is carried out in a way that differs from the strategy used in Type I passives.

An active sentence with a personal pronoun as the subject, when passivized, becomes the following:

- (13) a. *Aku wis ngumbahi kabeh klambi kang reged.*
 b. *Kabeh klambi kang reged wis dikumbahi aku.*
 c. *Kabeh klambi kang reged wis takkumbahi.*
 d. *Kabeh klambi kang reged wis aku kumbahi.* Translation:

(13a): 'I have already **washed** all the dirty clothes.'

(13b—13d): 'All the dirty clothes have already been **washed by me**.'

Sentence (13a) is an active sentence. When passivized, it becomes (13b), (13c), and (13d). However, the only acceptable passive structure in Javanese—if the subject of the active sentence is a personal pronoun—is the structure in (13c), not (13b) or (13d). The structure of (13b) is S-P-Comp (where *kabeh klambi kang reged* is the subject, *wis dikumbahi* is the predicate, and *aku* is the complement). The structure of (13c) is S-P (*kabeh klambi kang reged* as subject and *wis dakkumbahi* as predicate), whereas (13d) also has an S-P structure (*kabeh klambi kang reged* as subject and *wis aku kumbahi* as predicate). The passive predicate in *ngoko* must appear in the form of a bound personal pronoun (e.g., *dak-*) + verb, as in (13c). If the predicate uses a full personal pronoun (*aku*) + verb, the sentence becomes unacceptable, as in (13d). Both (13c) and (13d) share the same S-P structure, but only (13c) is grammatical, which is largely a matter of convention.

When expressed in the high speech level (*krama*), the acceptable structure appears to be the same:

(14) a. *Kula sampun ngumbahi sedaya rasukan ingkang kotor.*

b. *Sedaya rasukan ingkang kotor sampun dipunkumbahi kula.*

c. *Sedaya rasukan ingkang kotor sampun kula kumbahi.* Translation:

(14a): 'I have already **washed** all the dirty clothes.'

(14b—14c): 'All the dirty clothes have already **been washed by me**.'

If an active Javanese *krama* sentence, such as (14a), is passivized, the structure changes into (14b) and (14c). However, the only acceptable passive structure—when the subject of the active sentence is a personal pronoun—is (14c), not (14b). The structure of (14b) is S-P-Comp. (*sedaya rasukan ingkang kotor* as subject, *sampun dipunkumbahi* as predicate, and *kula* as complement), whereas (14c) has an S-P structure (*sedaya rasukan ingkang kotor* as subject and *sampun kula kumbahi* as predicate).

On the other hand, Sundanese active sentences whose subject is a personal pronoun, when passivized, appear as follows:

(15) a. *Urang geus nyeuseuh kabeh baju anu kotor.*

b. *Kabeh baju anu kotor geus diseuseuh (ku) urang.*

c. *Kabeh baju anu kotor geus (ku) urang/kuring seuseuh.* Translation:

(15a): 'I have already **washed** all the dirty clothes.'

(15b—15c): 'All the dirty clothes have already been **washed by me**.'

Sentence (15a) is an active sentence in Sundanese *kasar*. When passivized, the structure becomes (15b) and (15c). However, the acceptable passive form in Sundanese is (15b), not (15c). The structure of (15b) is S-P-Comp. (*kabehbaju anu kotor* as subject, *geus diseuseuh* as predicate, and *urang/kuring* as complement). The structure of (15c) is S-P (*kabeh baju anu kotor* as subject and *geus (ku) urang seuseuh* as predicate).

When expressed in a high speech level, the acceptable structure is also consistent:

(16) a. *Abdi parantos nyeuseuh sadayana acuk anu kotor.*

b. *Sadayana acuk anu kotor parantos diseuseuh (ku) abdi.*

c. *Sadayana acuk anu kotor parantos abdi seuseuh.* Translation:

(16a): 'I have already **washed** all the dirty clothes.'

(16b—16c): 'All the dirty clothes have already **been washed by me**.'

If an active Sundanese *lemes* sentence, such as (16a), is passivized, the structure becomes (16b) and (16c). However, the acceptable passive structure in Sundanese is (16b), not (16c). The structure of (16b) is S-P-Comp. (*sadayana acuk anu kotor* as subject, *parantos diseuseuh* as predicate, and *abdi* as complement), whereas (16c) has an S-P structure (*sadayana acuk anu kotor* as subject and *parantos abdi seuseuh* as predicate).

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that there are differences between Javanese and Sundanese passivization in Type III passive sentences. The difference lies in the form of the predicate. In Javanese, the predicate of a passive sentence may consist of a bound personal pronoun + verb (in *ngoko*) or a full personal pronoun + verb (in *krama*). In contrast, Sundanese, both in *kasar* or *lemes*, consistently employs predicates with the prefix *di-* or *di-keun*. To express the meaning 'all the dirty clothes have already been washed by me,' Javanese uses the S-P structure (*kabeh klambi reged wis dakkumbahi* \[ngoko] or *sedaya rasukan kotor sampun kula kumbahi* \[krama]), whereas Sundanese uses the S-P-Comp. structure (*urang geus nyeuseuh kabeh baju anu kotor* \[kasar] or *sadayana acuk anu kotor parantos diseuseuh abdi* \[lemes]).

Thus, it can be concluded that Sundanese passive structures do not allow predicates in the form of a bound personal pronoun plus verb or a full personal pronoun plus verb. This also indicates that Sundanese does not have bound pronoun forms such as *ku-* 'I' and *mu-* 'you'.

D. Type IV Passive Voice

Type IV passive sentences are those in which the predicate employs verbs with the infix *-in-*. The meaning of verbs with the infix *-in-* in Javanese is that the subject is affected by an action intentionally carried out. Type IV passives appear to exist only in Javanese, as no such passive sentences with predicates containing the infix *-in-* are found in Sundanese. The following examples illustrate this construction in Javanese, both in *ngoko* (a) and *krama* (b):

(17) a. *Katresnan iku ora bisa tinuku nganggo dhuwit.*

b. *Katresnan menika boten saged tinumbas ngangge arta.* 'Love cannot be **bought** with money.'

- (18) a. *Tarsana wis cineluk Pak Lurah gara-gara perkara wingi.*
 b. *Tarsana sampun tinimbangan Pak Lurah jalaran perkawis kala wingi.* 'Tarsana **was summoned** by the village head due to yesterday's incident.'
- (19) a. *Pasrah nganten tinampa Bapak Haryadi.*
 b. *Pasrah penganten tinampi Bapak Haryadi.*
 'The handover of the bride **was received** by Mr. Haryadi.'

In (17a–b), the phrases *katresnan iku* and *katresnan menika* serve as the subject, *ora bisa tinuku* and *boten saged tinumbas* function as the predicate, and *nganggo dhuwit/ngangge arta* act as an adverbial. Thus, the structure of both sentences is S–P–Adv., and their predicates are formed with the infix *-in-*.

In (18a–b), *Tarsana* functions as the subject, *wis cineluk/sampun tinimbangan* as the predicate, *Pak Lurah* as the complement, and *gara-gara perkara wingi/jalaran perkawis kala wingi* as an adverbial. The sentence structure is therefore S–P–Comp.–Adv., with the predicate again marked by the infix *-in-*.

In (19a–b), *pasrah nganten/pasrah penganten* serves as the subject, *tinampa/tinampi* as the predicate, and *Bapak Haryadi* as the complement. Both sentences thus have an S–P–Comp. structure, with predicates also marked by *-in-*.

From the collected data, no Sundanese passive sentences were found with predicates containing the infix *-in-*. Instead, Sundanese uses the prefix *di-* to express the equivalent meaning, as illustrated below:

- (20) a. *Kanyaah eta moal bisa dibeuli ku duit.*
 b. *Kanyaah eta teu tiasa dipeser ku artos.* 'Love cannot be **bought** with money.'
- (21) a. *Tarsana geus dicalukan ku Pak Lurah gara-gara kajadian kamari.*
 b. *Tarsana parantos disauran ku Pak Lurah gara-gara kajadian kamari.* 'Tarsana **was summoned** by the village head because of yesterday's incident.'
- (22) a. *Seserahan panganten ditwas receivedampa (ku) Bapak Haryadi.*
 b. *Seserahan panganten ditampi (ku) Bapak Haryadi.* 'The handover of the bride by Mr. Haryadi.'

In (20a–b), *kanyaah eta* is the subject, *moal bisa dibeuli/teu tiasa dipeser* are the predicates, and *ku duit/ku artos* serve as adverbials. The structure is S–P–Adv., with predicates using the prefix *di-*.

In (21a–b), *Tarsana* serves as the subject, *geus dicalukan/parantos disauran* as the predicate, *Pak Lurah* as the complement, and *gara-gara kajadian kamari* as the adverbial. The sentence structure is S–P–Comp–Adv, with predicates marked by *di-- keun (kasar)* or *di--an (lemes)*.

In (22a–b), *seserahan panganten* is the subject, *ditampa/ditampi* the predicate, and *Bapak Haryadi* the complement. The structure is S–P–Comp., with predicates formed with *di-*.

E. Type V Passive Voice

Type V passive sentences are those in which the predicate employs verbs with the prefix *ka-*. In Javanese, verbs with the prefix *ka-* carry the same meaning as verbs with the prefix *di-* in Indonesian, namely intentional action where the subject is deliberately affected by the agent. The following examples illustrate this construction in Javanese *ngoko* (a) and *krama* (b):

- (23) a. *Kabeh lukisane Pranowo kaborong Pak Yopi.*
 b. *Sedaya lukisanipun Pranowo kaborong Pak Yopi.*
 'All of Pranowo's paintings **were bought in bulk** by Mr. Yopi.'
- (24) a. *Cetakan sepisanan buku iki katerbitke Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya.*
 b. *Cetakan kapisan buku menika katerbitaken Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya.* 'The first edition of this book **was published** by Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya.'
- (25) a. *Wong tuwane kang lara-laranen iku wusanane kagawa menyang rumah sakit.*
 b. *Tiyang sepuhipun ingkang asring gerah menika pungkasanipun kabekta dhateng griya sakit.* 'His/her ailing parents **were** eventually **taken** to the hospital.'

In (23a–b), *kabeh lukisane Pranowo/sedaya lukisanipun Pranowo* serve as the subject, *kaborong* as the predicate, and *Pak Yopi* as the complement. The structure is S–P–Comp., with predicates marked by *ka-*.

In (24a–b), *cetakan sepisanan buku iki/cetakan kapisan buku menika* serves as the subject, *katerbitke/katerbitaken* as the predicate, and *Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya*, as the complement. The structure is S–P–Comp., with predicates marked by *ka--ke (ngoko)* or *ka--aken (krama)*.

In (25a–b), *wong tuwane kang lara-laranen iku/tyang sepuhipun ingkang asring gerah menika* serve as the subject, *wusanane kagawa/pungkasanipun kabekta* as the predicate, and *menyang rumah sakit/dhateng griya sakit* as the adverbial. The structure is S–P–Adv., with predicates marked by *ka-*.

In Sundanese, passive sentences with predicates marked by the prefix *ka-* also exist, but the meaning denotes unintentional action (see the discussion of Type II passives in 3.2). Passive sentences with predicates marked by *ka-* to indicate intentional action, as in Javanese, are not found in Sundanese. Instead, Sundanese uses the prefix *di-* to express the same meaning, as illustrated below (a = *kasar*, b = *lemes*):

- (26) a. *Kabeh lukisan Pranowo diborong ku Pak Yopi.*
 b. *Sadaya lukisan Pranowo diborong ku Pak Yopi.*
 'All of Pranowo's paintings **were bought up** by Mr. Yopi.'
- (27) a. *Cetakan kahiji buku ieu diterbitkeun (ku) Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya.*

- b. *Cetakan kahiji buku ieu diterbitkeun (ku) Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya.*
'The first edition of this book **was published** by Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya.'
- (28) a. *Kolotna anu geringan tungtungna dibawa ka rumah sakit.*
b. *Sepuhna anu teu damang tungtungna dicandak ka rumah sakit.*
'His/her ailing parents **were** eventually **taken** to the hospital.'

In (26a–b), *kabeh lukisan Pranowo/sadaya lukisan Pranowo* serve as the subject, *diborong* as the predicate, and *(ku) Pak Yopi* as the complement. The structure is S–P–Comp., with predicates marked by *di-*.

In (27a–b), *cetakan kahiji buku ieu* serves as the subject, *diterbitkeun* as the predicate, and *(ku) Citra Jaya Murti, Surabaya* as the complement. The structure is S–P–Com., with predicates formed with *di-...-keun*.

In (28a–b), *Kolotna anu geringan/Sepuhna anu teu damang* serve as the subject, *tungtungna* functions as an adverbial, *dibawa/dicandak ka rumah sakit* as the predicate, and *ka rumah sakit* as an adverbial. Thus, sentence (28a) has the structure S–Adv.–P–Adv., while (28b) has the structure S–Adv.–P. The predicate in (28a) and (28b) is marked with *di-*.

The review of the previous subsections yields several key findings. First, the Javanese passive voice exhibits considerable variation, influenced by speech levels (*krama* and *ngoko*), which affects both passive markers and syntactic patterns. Second, Sundanese passive constructions are comparatively simpler, with fewer variations and more consistent markers across speech levels. Third, the comparison reveals a structural asymmetry: Javanese has at least five passive types, while Sundanese has only two. Fourth, sociolinguistic factors—especially politeness and speaker–hearer relations—significantly influence passive choice in both languages. Finally, typologically, both languages reflect broader Austronesian passive patterns while maintaining distinct local innovations that characterize their grammatical systems.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that Javanese has five types of passive constructions, namely passives whose predicates employ: (1) verbs affixed with *di-*, *di- -i*, and *di- -ake* (*ngoko*) or *dipun-*, *dipun- -i*, and *dipun- -aken* (*krama*); (2) verbs affixed with *ke-* or *ke- -an* (both in *ngoko* and *krama*); (3) personal verbs, either bound personal pronoun + verb (*dak-/ kok-* + verb in *ngoko*) or full personal pronoun + verb (*kula/panjenengan* + verb in *krama*); (4) verbs with the infix *-in-* (in both *ngoko* and *krama*); and (5) verbs affixed with *ka-...* (in both *ngoko* and *krama*). Meanwhile, Sundanese has only two types of passive constructions, namely passives whose predicates employ: (1) verbs affixed with *di-*, *di- -an*, or *di- -keun*, and (2) verbs affixed with *ka-* or *ka- -an*. Sundanese passive constructions lack predicates formed by personal verbs, either with bound or free personal pronouns, indicating the absence of bound first- and second-person pronouns in Sundanese. Semantically, passive constructions in both languages can express the meanings of intentionality and non-intentionality. In Javanese, intentionality is expressed through: (1) verbs affixed with *di-*, *di- -i*, or *di- -ake*; (2) personal verbs; (3) verbs with the infix *-in-*; and (4) verbs affixed with *ka-* or *ka- -an*. Meanwhile, non-intentionality is expressed through verbs affixed with *ke-* or *ke- -an*. In Sundanese, intentionality is expressed by verbs affixed with *di-*, *di- -an*, or *di- -keun*, while non-intentionality is expressed by verbs affixed with *ka-* or *ka- -an*, in both the *kasar* and *lemes* speech levels. The findings of this study aim to address descriptive gaps in Javanese and Sundanese grammar, particularly in passive constructions, and to contribute to the teaching of both languages.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alieva, N. F. (1991). *Bahasa Indonesia Teori dan Deskripsi* [Indonesian Language: Theory and Description]. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius. Retrieved October 15, 2025, from <https://balaiyanpus.jogjaprovo.go.id/opac/detail-opac?id=48853>
- [2] Ardiwinata, D. K. (1984). *Tata Bahasa Sunda* [Sundanese Grammar]. PN Balai Pustaka. Retrieved September 2, 2025, from <https://repositori.kemendikdasmen.go.id/2644/1/Tata%20Bahasa%20Sunda%20%281984%29.pdf>
- [3] Arifin, S. (1999). *Kalimat Pasif dalam Bahasa Jawa* [Passive Sentences in the Javanese Language]. Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Retrieved September 1, 2025, from https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Kalimat_pasif_dalam_bahasa_Jawa/svxHAAAAMAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0&bsq=inauthor:%22Sjamsul%20Arifin%22
- [4] Atmawati, D., Kurniawati, W., Sumadi, Damayanti, W., Suyadi, Wahyuni, S., Aji, E. N. W., Utami, R. E., Hendrastuti, R., Izzak, A., & Purnami, W. H. (2024). Indirect Speech Acts in Javanese. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(12), 3804–3813. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1412.14>
- [5] Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena. In *Questions and politeness strategies in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Bruening, B. (2019). Passive Do So. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 37(1), 1–49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/sll049-018-9408-1>
- [7] Coolsma, S. (1985). *Tata Bahasa Sunda* [Sundanese Grammar]. Djambatan.
- [8] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Sixth edition). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [9] Djajasudarma, T. F. (1994). *Tata Bahasa Acuan Bahasa Sunda* [A Reference Grammar of the Sundanese Language]. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Retrieved September 2, 2025, from <https://repositori.kemendikdasmen.go.id/3691/1/tata%20bahasa%20acuan%20bahasa%20sunda%20%20%20259.pdf>
- [10] Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- [11] Gotowski, M. (2019). The Acquisition of the Get-Passive. *Source: Language Acquisition*, 26(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2017.1391268>

- [12] Grosvald, M., & Khwaileh, T. (2019). Processing Passive Constructions in Arabic and English. *Al-'Arabiyya*, 52, 1–28. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48600453>
- [13] Hatikah, T. (1988). *Kalimat Pasif dalam Bahasa Sunda* [Passive Sentences in the Sundanese Language] [Thesis, Universitas Gadjah Mada]. Retrieved October 17, 2025, from <https://etd.repository.ugm.ac.id/penelitian/detail/3528>
- [14] Holmes, J. (1994). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. *Language*, 70(3). <https://doi.org/10.2307/416511>
- [15] Kats, J., & Soeridiradja, M. (1982). *Tata Bahasa dan Ungkapan Bahasa Sunda* [Sundanese Grammar and Expressions]. Jakarta: Djambatan. Retrieved September 1, 2025, from <https://inlislite.uin-suska.ac.id/opac/detail-opac?id=1859>
- [16] Lee, J. F. (2019). The Second Language Processing of Passives, Object Pronouns and Null Subjects. *Hispania*, 102(1), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2019.0013>
- [17] Lee, J. F., & Doherty, S. (2019). Native and Nonnative Processing of Active and Passive Sentences. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(4), 853–879. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226311800027X>
- [18] LeSourd, P. S. (2020). Denominal Verbs in Algonquian: Verbs of Acquiring. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 62(4), 307–336. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27170938>
- [19] Lyra, H. M. (2024). *Kalimat Pasif Bahasa Sunda Konstruksi di-, di--an, dan di--keun* [Passive Sentences in Sundanese: The di-, di--an, and di--keun Constructions]. In *Bookchapter Pesona Bahasa dalam Kajian Linguistik Mikro 2*. Jatinangor: Unpad Press.
- [20] Moeliono, A. M., Lapoliwa, H., Alwi, H., Tjatur, S. S., Sasangka, W., & Sugiyono, S. (2017). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia* [Standard Grammar of the Indonesian Language]. In *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia edisi keempat*. Badan Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa. Retrieved October 15, 2025, from <https://archive.org/details/badan-bahasa-2017-tata-bahasa-baku-bahasa-indonesia-edisi-keempat-tbbbi>
- [21] Murphy, A. (2021). Rightward verb movement. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 24(3), 319–376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10828-021-09130-8>
- [22] Poedjosoedarma, S. (1979). *Tingkat Tutur Bahasa Jawa* [Javanese Language Level]. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [23] Purwo, B. K. (1994). Analisis Klausa, Pragmatik Wacana, Pengkomputeran Bahasa [Clause Analysis, Discourse Pragmatics, Language Computing]. *PELLBA 7: Pertemuan Linguistik Lembaga Bahasa Atma Jaya Ketujuh*, 271.
- [24] Putri, F. A., & Nugraheni, A. S. (2020). Sociolek Review on Speech Level Javanese Sundanese Language in Indonesia. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 9(4). Retrieved November 2, 2025, from www.ijstr.org
- [25] Quinn, G. (2011). Teaching Javanese Respect Usage to Foreign Learners. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8, 362–370. Retrieved November 3, 2025, from <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/>
- [26] Ramlan, M. (1981). *Ilmu Bahasa Indonesia: Sintaksis* [Indonesian Linguistics: Syntax]. Yogyakarta: U.P. Karyono.
- [27] Rusady, D., & Munawarah, S. (2021). Linguistic Evidence in Question of Language and Dialect for the Badui Tribe. In *Sociolinguistics and Dialectological Studies in Indonesia* (pp. 95–117). Nova Science Publishers, Inc. Retrieved December 7, 2025, from <https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85116809055>
- [28] Sasangka, S. S. T. W. (2014). *Kalimat Pasif Bahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Jawa: Suatu Kajian Perbandingan* [Passive Sentences in Indonesian and Javanese: A Comparative Study]. Yogyakarta: Azzagrafika.
- [29] Sasangka, S. S. T. W. (2016). Pasif Periferal: Struktur Egatif dalam Bahasa Indonesia [Peripheral Passive: Ergative Structure in the Indonesian Language]. *Metalingua*, 14(2), 233–242. Retrieved October 15, 2025, from https://download.garuda.kemdikbud.go.id/article.php?article=953227&title=PASIF+PERIFERAL+STRUKTUR+ERGATIF+D+ALAM+BAHASA+INDONESIA&val=14688&utm_source=chatgpt.com
- [30] Sasangka, S. S. T. W. (2018). *Paramasastra Gagrag Anyar Basa Jawa* [Paramasastra Gagrag Anyar of Javanese Speech]. Jakarta: Paramalingua. Retrieved November 13, 2025, from https://books.google.co.id/books/about/Paramasastra_gagrag_anyar_basa_jawa.html?id=XrKqAAAACAAJ&redir_esc=y
- [31] Sasangka, S. S. T. W. (2019). *Unggah-Ungguh Bahasa Jawa* [Unggah-Ungguh in Javanese Language]. Yogyakarta: Buana Grafika.
- [32] Slametmuljana. (1955). *Kaidah Bahasa Indonesia II* [Indonesian Language Rules II]. Djakarta: Penerbit Djambatan. Retrieved September 1, 2025, from https://books.google.co.id/books/about/Kaidah_bahasa_Indonesia.html?id=-JYPAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- [33] Sudarwati, E., Sukarsono, & Rahayu, N. S. (2024). On Directive Acts among Arek-Dialect Javanese Speakers: A Politeness Aspect. *XLinguae*, 17(1), 200–215. <https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2024.17.01.14>
- [34] Sudaryanto. (1991). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Jawa* [Standard Grammar of the Javanese Language]. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana.
- [35] Sukesti, R. (1998). *Diatesis Aktif-Pasif dalam Wacana Naratif Bahasa Jawa (Novel Tunggak-Tunggak Jati)* [Active–Passive Diathesis in Javanese Narrative Discourse (The Novel Tunggak-Tunggak Jati)]. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- [36] Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- [37] Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). USA: Wiley-Blackwell. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://mrdowportal.weebly.com/uploads/1/0/1/8/10183165/wardhaugh-fuller2015-an_introduction_to_sociolinguistics.pdf
- [38] Wedhawati, Nurlina, W. E. Siti, & Setiyanto, Edi. (2001). *Tata Bahasa Jawa Mutakhir* [Contemporary Javanese Grammar]. Pusat Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.



Sry Satriya Tjatur Wisnu Sasangka is a senior researcher at BRIN's Research Centre for Language, Literature, and Community. He graduated in Education from Jakarta State University (2006) and specializes in Indonesian and Javanese linguistics, including sociolinguistics, clause analysis, passive constructions, lexicography, and Javanese speech-level systems. His work has been published nationally and internationally. His e-mail is srys001@brin.go.id



Heksa Biopsi Puji Hastuti is an Associate Researcher at BRIN, Indonesia. She holds degrees in English Literature and Cultural Studies and is pursuing a doctorate at Universitas Hasanuddin. Her research on language, literature, and culture has been published nationally and internationally. E-mail: heks001@brin.go.id



Jusmianti Garing is a senior researcher at the Research Center for Language, Literature, and Community, National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Jakarta, Indonesia. She received her master's at Radboud University, the Netherlands, in 2011. Her research interests focus on linguistics, particularly anthropolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, language and education, and sociolinguistics. E-mail: jusm001@brin.go.id



Wati Kurniawati is an Associate Researcher at the National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN) of Indonesia. She has a doctorate in linguistics. Her writing on language in sociolinguistics, dialectology, comparative historical linguistics, pragmatics, and semantics has been published in books, as well as in national and international journals and proceedings. E-mail: watikurniawati62@yahoo.com



Wiwin Erni Siti Nurlina is a senior researcher at Indonesia's National Research and Innovation Agency, specializing in linguistics, literature, and culture, with publications in journals, monographs, dictionaries, and conference proceedings both nationally and internationally. She can be contacted via email wiwi019@brin.go.id



Buha Aritonang, born on February 1, 1963, in Onangjang, North Sumatra, is an Associate Researcher at BRIN's Research Center for the Preservation of Language and Literature, specializing in linguistic theory, with a master's degree in management from Kusuma State College (1986). The e-mail address is buhaaritonang@yahoo.co.id



Nontje Deisye Wewengkang, born on December 2 in Kapataran, is a Language and Literature Researcher at BRIN. She holds a bachelor's degree in Indonesian Language and Literature Education (1995, IKIP Negeri Manado) and a master's degree in Indonesian Language Education (2010, Universitas Negeri Manado). E-mail: deisy020912@gmail.com



Dharma Satrya HD is a researcher at Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional. His interests include literary study and theatre. He has been active in several conferences and has published works focusing on Indonesian and Lombok Literature. E-mail: धार005@brin.go.id



Ery Agus Kurnianto, born on August 29, 1975, in Purwodadi, Grobogan, is an Associate Researcher at BRIN's Center for Language, Literature, and Community Studies, specializing in interdisciplinary literary studies, with a master's degree in literature from the University of Indonesia (2009). His e-mail address is eratomainaka@gmail.com



I Wayan Tama, with a bachelor's degree in Indonesian Literature (1985) and a master's degree in Linguistics (1996) from Universitas Udayana, is a Senior Researcher at BRIN, possessing extensive experience in language development, including previous roles at the Bali and Central Kalimantan Provincial Language Offices. E-mail: iway025@brin.go.id



Siti Djuwarijah, born in Yogyakarta in October 1970, is a researcher at BRIN's Research Organization for Archaeology, Language, and Literature. She holds a bachelor's degree from STIBA Malang (1995) and a master's degree from Universitas Mataram (2023), specializing in Landscape Linguistic Studies, with experience in interdisciplinary literary research. Her email address is yuhuiyuri@gmail.com