

LEXICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CILACAP JAVANESE AND STANDARD JAVANESE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Dinda Ayu Nawang Sasi¹,

¹Universitas Ahmad Dahlan/Indonesia

Corresponding Author:

Dinda Ayu Nawang Sasi,
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Ahmad Dahlan University.
South Ringroad, Tamanan, Bantul, Yogyakarta
Email: 220003016@webmail.uad.ac.id

Article Info

Received: 15-11-2025

Revised: 25-11-2025

Accepted: 01-12-2025

Online Version: 16-12-2025

Abstract

This study examines the lexical differences between Cilacap Javanese, a variety of the Banyumasan dialect, and Standard Javanese used in the Yogyakarta–Surakarta cultural region. Using a qualitative descriptive comparative approach, the research focuses on identifying variations in vocabulary that reflect regional linguistic diversity. Data were collected through semi-structured online interviews with native speakers of the Cilacap dialect and supported by documentation in the form of recordings and field notes. Additional lexical data were obtained from digital sources that represent authentic language use in daily communication. The findings reveal 42 lexical items that differ in form but share the same meaning across the two dialects. These variations demonstrate the linguistic richness of the Banyumasan variety and show how geographical, social, and cultural factors shape lexical development within Javanese

Keywords: Lexical Variation, Javanese Dialect, Comparative Linguistics



© 2025 by the author(s)

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

Journal Homepage

<https://jurnal.educatech.id/index.php/felle>

How to cite:

Nawang Sasi . (2025). LEXICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CILACAP JAVANESE AND STANDARD JAVANESE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY. *Frontiers in English Language and Literature Education*, 1(1), 18–27.

Published by:

Indonesia Cakap Digital

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is known as a country with a high level of ethnic and cultural diversity, including in terms of language. Language plays a major role as a means of communication between individuals in social life. The diversity of ethnic groups in Indonesia has given rise to various

regional languages spread throughout the archipelago. In this context, there is an expression that reminds us of the importance of maintaining linguistic balance: prioritize Indonesian, preserve regional languages, and master foreign languages. According to (Triyanto et al., 2019), language is the most complex symbolic system that humans possess, so that language can represent the culture of an ethnic group (ethnoculture) through the diversity of its dialects or accents. Each dialect in society becomes a unique identity that distinguishes one culture from another. This variety of dialects arises due to geographical differences and variations in the social environment among community groups. In line with the opinion (Mailani et al., 2022) that language plays a very important role in various aspects of human daily activities. Meanwhile, the opinion (Nurhasanah, 2017) states that language has a major role in human life in the world, because through language a person can communicate and interact with others. In addition, language is also an important resource in social life. Therefore, a linguistic approach is the appropriate approach to examine dialect differences and compare linguistic elements from various regions scientifically. Language is a form of technology developed by humans as a tool for communication (Yahya et al., 2020).

The branch of linguistics that focuses on the systematic and targeted comparison of two or more languages or dialects is comparative linguistics. According to (Hasibuan, 2016), linguistics is the scientific study of language. The term "linguistics" comes from the Latin word *lingua*, which means "language." This word form can still be found in a number of languages that have Latin roots, such as French (*langue, langage*), Italian (*lingua*), and Spanish (*lengua*). In the past, English also adopted a similar term from French, which is now known as *language*. (Effendi, 2012) states that linguistics is the science that studies language comprehensively, including analysis of various types of languages, such as regional languages, Indonesian, and foreign languages. Due to its broad scope of study, which is not limited to one language, this field is also known as general linguistics. This is in line with the opinion of The main objective of linguistics is to conduct descriptive studies or analyses of a language. The main purpose of this approach is to identify similarities and differences in language structure. In the context of regional languages, comparative linguistics plays an important role in revealing the diversity of languages that have developed due to geographical, social, and cultural differences. Through this study, we can understand that language is not static, but is constantly changing in accordance with the dynamics of the community that speaks it. Therefore, comparative language studies are necessary to enrich linguistic documentation and preserve the cultural heritage reflected in language.

One element of language that is often the subject of comparative linguistic studies is the lexical aspect. Lexical refers to the vocabulary or word bank used by speakers in everyday life. Lexical differences are usually seen when two language communities use different words to convey the same meaning. Vocabulary is an aspect that is highly sensitive to change because it is influenced by social, environmental, and local cultural factors. Therefore, lexical studies are important not only to examine language diversity but also as a reflection of the identity and collective experiences of the speaker community. Differences in vocabulary are also often a characteristic of a region that distinguishes one dialect from another. Lexical meaning is one of the forms of meaning in semantic studies found in the Malay language (Salleh et al., 2020). Meanwhile, according to (Laurensia Elya Puspita & Ratini, 2024) lexical meaning refers to the

basic meaning of a linguistic symbol that has not been influenced by connotations or grammatical relationships with other elements. The term "lexical" itself comes from the word *lexicon*, which means 'dictionary'. Therefore, lexical meaning is often interpreted as the meaning of a word as listed in a dictionary.

A striking example of lexical variation can be found in Javanese, particularly between the dialect spoken by the people of Cilacap and Standard Javanese, which developed in the Yogyakarta and Surakarta regions. Cilacap Javanese is included in the Banyumasan dialect, which is known to have distinctive characteristics in terms of phonology and vocabulary. Phonology is a branch of linguistics that studies the sounds in speech and how these sounds are

produced and used appropriately in oral communication (Hidayat, 2019). The people of Cilacap, for example, use the word *esih* for 'still', while in Standard Javanese, *ijik* is used; *langka* for 'none', the equivalent of *ora ono*; and *kepriben* for 'how', which in the standard dialect is called *piye*. Such variations illustrate the lexical richness within a single language family and demonstrate the diversity of dialects that remain alive in the communities where they are spoken.

This linguistic reality indicates that Javanese has a wide spectrum of variations, which are formed and maintained by the social and geographical contexts of the community. However, in everyday practice, the use of Standard Javanese tends to be prioritized, especially in formal contexts such as education, media, and government administration. As a result, local dialects such as those used in Cilacap are beginning to be marginalized and are threatened with decline. Therefore, research on local lexical varieties is important as a form of preservation and documentation. Such studies also contribute to our understanding of internal variation within a language, especially in Javanese, which has a large number of speakers in Indonesia. This study aims to specifically examine the lexical differences between Cilacap Javanese and Standard Javanese. This study focuses on differences in vocabulary used in informal everyday life. Vocabulary used in everyday situations usually reflects the most authentic language with minimal influence from formality.

Through observation and analysis of these lexical forms, this study not only describes word variations but also explores the socio-cultural elements behind these differences. Thus, the results of this study are expected to provide a more comprehensive picture of the lexical characteristics of the Javanese language in Cilacap and its differences from Standard Javanese. The findings of this study are not only important for the development of linguistics, particularly in the fields of lexicology and dialectology, but also provide practical benefits in efforts to preserve regional languages. In addition, the documentation of these lexical differences can also be a reference source for the development of locally-based teaching materials and serve as preliminary data for further research on dialects in Javanese.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative research design with a descriptive–comparative approach. This design is selected to enable an in-depth exploration of lexical variations between Cilacap Javanese and Standard Javanese spoken in the Yogyakarta and Surakarta cultural regions. Qualitative methods allow the researchers to capture natural linguistic expressions directly from native speakers, while the comparative component facilitates systematic analysis of similarities and differences across dialects

Research Target/Subject

The subjects of this study are native speakers of the Cilacap Javanese dialect. Participants were selected based on criteria such as fluency, active daily use of the dialect, and representation across different age groups and social backgrounds. Informants were identified using purposive sampling, a technique suitable for qualitative research that prioritizes relevance and linguistic richness over numerical representation. The units of analysis consist of everyday vocabulary used by the Cilacap community and their equivalents in Standard Javanese

Research Procedure

The research procedure was carried out through several sequential stages: Preparation Stage: identifying research needs, determining participant criteria, and developing interview guidelines, Data Collection Stage: conducting semi-structured online interviews via video calls, recording lexical items, and documenting usage contexts through notes and audio recordings, Data Organization Stage: transcribing interview results, classifying vocabulary items, and organizing

lexical data into thematic categories. And comparative Analysis Stage: comparing Cilacap Javanese lexical forms with their Standard Javanese equivalents from Yogyakarta–Surakarta, supported by reference materials and expert validation.

Instruments, and Data Collection Techniques

The primary instrument in this qualitative study is the researchers themselves, who function as planners, data collectors, analysts, and interpreters. Supporting instruments include semi-structured interview protocols, audio-recording devices, digital documentation tools, and field notebooks.

Data were collected using several techniques

1. Semi-structured interviews to elicit natural lexical usage from informants.
2. Observation and documentation of recorded speech samples and digital media containing distinctive Cilacap vocabulary.
3. Verification interviews to recheck meanings, contexts, and pronunciation of key lexical items.

Data Analysis Technique

The collected data were analyzed using a qualitative analytical framework consisting of three interconnected stages:

1. Data Reduction: selecting, simplifying, and focusing on relevant lexical items that represent dialectal differences.
2. Data Display: organizing vocabulary comparisons in tabular or descriptive form for clear interpretation.
3. Conclusion Drawing: interpreting the patterns of lexical variation critically and systematically to answer the research objectives.

To strengthen the credibility of the findings, triangulation of sources was conducted by comparing lexical data from multiple informants of varied demographic backgrounds and confirming repeated usage across contexts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the analysis show that there are lexical differences between the Cilacap dialect of Javanese and Standard Javanese (Yogyakarta - Surakarta). These differences are presented in the following table:

| No | Cilacap Javanese | Standard Javanese | Meaning |
|----|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| 1. | Madang | Mangan | Eat |
| 2. | Maning | Meneh | Again |
| 3. | Nyong | I | I |
| 4. | Kepriwe | How | How |
| 5. | Ketone | Ketone | It seems |
| 6. | Nggolet | Searching | Searching |
| 7. | Esih | Isih/ iseh | Still |
| 8. | Kimutan | Kelingan | Remember |
| 9. | Wis | Alright | Already |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------|------------|-------------|
| 10. | Ntong | Ntek | Finished |
| 11. | Sepisan | Pisankas | Once again |
| 12. | Krasa | Kroso | Berasa |
| 13. | Dina | Dino | Hari |
| 14. | Ngarepna | Ngarepke | Hope |
| 15. | Big | Gedi | Large |
| 16. | Laka | None | Rare |
| 17. | Kudune | Sakmestine | Should |
| 18. | Rich like cake | Ngono | Like that |
| 19. | Siki | Saiki | Now |
| 20. | Ngeneh | Rene | Come here |
| 21. | Ngonoh | Mrono | Go there |
| 22. | Ndeleng | Ndelok | See |
| 23. | Perek | Close | Near |
| 24. | Long | Budhal | Go |
| 25. | Night | Night | Night |
| 26. | Ngesuk | Tomorrow | Tomorrow |
| 27. | There | Ndisek | Previously |
| 28. | Sedela | Sedilit | A moment |
| 29. | Mbok | To | Kan |
| 30. | Mengendi | Nyandi | Where |
| 31. | You | Your crew | You |
| 32. | Nglomboni | Ngapusi | Lying |
| 33. | Friendship | Tenane | Real |
| 34. | Intense | Gething | Hate |
| 35. | Drinking | Drink | Drink |
| 36. | Klalen | Forget | Forget |
| 37. | Gemiyen | Biyen | In the past |
| 38. | Sitting | Lungguh | Sit |
| 39. | Lewih | Turah | More |
| 40. | Ngandel | Percoyo | Believe |
| 41. | Kayane | Ketoke | Like it |
| 42. | Commotion | Noise | Noise |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese and the Yogyakarta-Surakarta dialect of Javanese, there are several lexical words that have different forms but the same meaning. In the Cilacap dialect of Javanese, the lexical meaning of "eat" is [madang], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [mangan]; the lexical meaning of "again" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [maning], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [meneh]; the lexical meaning of "I" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [nyong], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [aku]; the lexical meaning of "how" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [kepriwe], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [piye]; the lexical meaning of "seems" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [ketone], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ketoke]; the lexical meaning of "to look for" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [nggolet], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [nggolek]; the lexical meaning of "still" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [esih], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [isih/iseh]; the lexical meaning of "remember" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [kimutan], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [kelingan]; The lexical meaning of "already" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [wis], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [wes];

The lexical meaning of "finished" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [ntong], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ntek]; the lexical meaning of "once again" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [sepisan], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [pisan maneh]; the lexical meaning of "feel" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [krasa], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [kroso]; the lexical meaning of "day" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [dina], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [dino]; the lexical meaning of "hope" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [ngarepna], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ngarepke]; The lexical meaning of "big" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [gede], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [gedi]; The lexical meaning of "none" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [laka], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ora ono]; The lexical meaning of "should" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [kudune], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [sakmestine]; The lexical meaning of "like that" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [kaya kue], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ngono]; The lexical meaning of "now" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [siki], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [saiki]; The lexical meaning of "here" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [ngeneh], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [rene]; the lexical meaning of "there" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [ngonoh], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [mrono]; the lexical meaning of "to see" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [ndeleng], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ndelok]; The lexical meaning of "near" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [perek], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [cedhak];

The lexical meaning of "go" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [lunga], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [budhal]; the lexical meaning of "night" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [wengi], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [bengi]; the lexical meaning of "tomorrow" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [ngesuk], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [sesuk]; The lexical meaning of "formerly" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [disit], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ndisek]; The lexical meaning of "a moment" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [sedela], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [sedilit];

The lexical meaning of "kan" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [mbok], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [to]; The lexical meaning of "kemana" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [mengendi], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [nyandi]; the lexical meaning of "anda" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [koe], while in the

Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [awakmu]; the lexical meaning of "berbohong" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [nglomboni], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ngapusi]; the lexical meaning of "betulan" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [temenan], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [tenane]; the lexical meaning of "benci" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [sengit], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [gething]; the lexical meaning of "minum" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [nginum], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ngombe]; the lexical meaning of "lupa" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [klalen], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [lali]; the lexical meaning of "dulu" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [gemiye], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [biye]; the lexical meaning of "duduk" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [njagong], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [lungguh]; the lexical meaning of "more" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [leuwih], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [turah]; the lexical meaning of "believe" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [ngandel], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [percoyo]; The lexical meaning of "sepertinya" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [kayane], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ketoke]; The lexical meaning of "ribut" in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese is [geger], while in the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese it is [ribut].

When viewed from the table above, it appears that lexical vocabulary with different forms but similar meanings in the Cilacap dialect of Javanese and the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese shows the dominance of Banyumasan forms that remain alive and are used in everyday conversation by the people of Cilacap, while also indicating that this local dialect has a wealth of vocabulary that is worthy of preservation and linguistic study

CONCLUSION

This study found that the vocabulary of the Cilacap dialect of Javanese and the Yogyakarta dialect of Javanese shows significant lexical variation. This study specifically analyzed vocabulary that has different forms but the same meaning. From the analysis, 42 words were found to show lexical form differences but still refer to similar meanings. These differences reflect the existence of dialectal variations that are alive and developing in their respective communities () and demonstrate the cultural and linguistic richness of Javanese. These findings reinforce the importance of documenting and preserving local dialectal varieties as part of efforts to preserve regional language heritage amid the growing trend of language standardization

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to express their gratitude for the support and assistance provided throughout the completion of this research. Special thanks are extended to Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for the academic guidance and facilities that enabled the smooth implementation of this study. The authors also acknowledge the valuable insights from lecturers and peers during the preparation of this manuscript

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Look this example below:

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest. All analyses and interpretations presented in this study were conducted independently without any external influence. No funding sponsors

were involved in the selection of the research topic, the design of the study, data collection, analysis, interpretation, manuscript writing, or the decision to publish the results

REFERENCES

- Effendi, S. (2012). Linguistics as a Language Science. *Journal of* , 5(1), 10.
- Hasibuan, A. (2016). Differences Between the Linguistic Theories of Ferdinand de Saussure and Noam Chomsky. *Metamorfosa*, 3(2), 1–23.
- Hidayat, M. S. B. (2019). Learning Arabic Phonology with Minimal Praise and Tongue Twisters. *Tarling: Journal of Language Education*, 2
- Laurensia Elya Puspita, & Ratini, R. (2024). Analysis of Lexical, Grammatical, Referential, and Non-Referential Meanings in the Short Story Surat Rahasia Dari Tuhan (Secret Letter from God) by Amelia Bunga Nofitasari. *Fonologi: Journal of English Language and Literature*, 2 (3), 295–303. <https://doi.org/10.61132/fonologi.v2i3.939>
- Mailani, O., Nuraeni, I., Syakila, S. A., & Lazuardi, J. (2022). Language as a Communication Tool in Human Life. *Kampret Journal*, 1 (1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.35335/kampret.v1i1.8>
- Nurhasanah, N. (2017). The Role of Language as a Compulsory Subject in Indonesia. *Eduscience: Journal of Education*, 2, 87–93.
- Rahmatika Halil, Agustiar, N. S. H. (2024). ARABIC LINGUISTICS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF DR. H. SAHKHOLID NASUTION, S.AG, MA IN THE BOOK "INTRODUCTION TO ARABIC LINGUISTICS."3 (Table 10), 4–6.
- Salleh, S. F., Yahya, Y., Subet, M. F., & Daud, M. Z. (2020). Lexical Semantic Analysis in the Novel Sangkar by Samsiah Mohd. Nor. *Asian People Journal (APJ)*, 3 (1), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.37231/apj.2020.3.1.144>
- Triyanto, T., Fauziyah, F. A., & Hadi, M. T. (2019). Language as Cultural Education and National Character. *Jurnal Salaka: Journal of Indonesian Language, Literature, and Culture*, 1 (1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.33751/jsalaka.v1i1.1145>
- Yahya, Y. K., Mahmudah, U., & Muhyiddin, L. (2020). De-Sacralization in Arabic Language *JLA (Journal of Lingua Applicata)*, 3 (2), 57. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jla.57232>
- Isna, A. (2019). Language development in early childhood. *Al Athfal: Journal of Early Childhood Development and Management*, Budhianto, Y. (2018). Language learning as an effort to improve students' literacy skills. *FON: Journal of Indonesian Language and Literature Education*, 13(2).
- Utami, S. (2014). Language as the ultimate human identity. *Cemerlang Journal*, 2(2). Aini, N. (2019). Indonesian Language as a Tool for Daily Communication.

- Rahardjo, M. (2007). Language as a tool for public communication and discourse development. *LiNGUA: Journal of Language and Literature*, 2(1).
- Andayani, A., Wibowo, A. H., & Yuliana, M. (2021). Lexical variation in Javanese dialects across Central Java: A sociolinguistic mapping. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2), 945–960.
- Arifin, Z., & Yulianto, B. (2022). Banyumasan dialect vitality and its lexical distinctiveness in contemporary Javanese. *Lingua Cultura*, 16(1), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v16i1.7591>
- Fajriah, H., & Handayani, W. (2023). Comparative lexical analysis of regional Javanese varieties in Cilacap and Kebumen. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 10(2), 100–112.
- Fitriani, N., & Supriyadi, S. (2024). Language change and lexical shift in Javanese among young speakers. *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan*, 20(1), 35–47. <https://doi.org/10.35313/jlt.v20i1.4321>
- Hakim, L. (2020). Phonological and lexical variations in Banyumasan Javanese: A descriptive study. *Bahasa & Seni*, 48(2), 133–144.
- Kusuma, E., & Rahmawati, S. (2021). Preservation of regional lexicon: Documentation of endangered Javanese vocabulary. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 7(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.7.1.2481>
- Puspitarini, D. A., & Rahayu, D. (2022). The role of lexical variation in shaping Javanese dialect identity. *BASA Journal of Language & Literature*, 3(3), 220–230.
- Rohmana, R., & Damayanti, I. (2024). Comparative linguistics in Indonesian regional dialects: Lexical and semantic divergence. *Jurnal Metalingua*, 22(1), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.26499/metalingua.v22i1.1922>
- Rukmini, D., & Ramdani, A. (2023). Contemporary Javanese dialect dynamics: A lexical contrastive study. *Jurnal Sastra dan Bahasa*, 18(2), 89–101.
- Sari, A. P., & Hidayat, A. (2025). Understanding lexical discrepancies in Javanese through comparative methods: A study of Surakarta and Cilacap dialects. *Journal of Regional Linguistics*, 5(1), 55–68.

Copyright Holder :

© Sasi (2025).

First Publication Right :

© Frontiers in English Language and Literature Education

This article is under:

