LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION AND NATIONALISM

Lars S. Vikör

1. HISTORICAL SURVEY: FUNCTIONS OF LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION

In a certain sense, language standardisation is a universal human feature. Although language is never a monolithic and rigid structure - there always are and will be deviations and variations - an informal standardisation through social intercourse is invariably at work; in fact, the existence of language itself would have been impossible without it. However, the term 'language standardisation' usually refers to something else: a formal process, consciously pursued with a deliberate goal. The immediate goal is the establishment of a fixed linguistic code, but the final goal is something else. The achieved standard language has to function and serve specific interests within a given society. The study of language standardisation, therefore, must be combined with the study of the historical and social setting in which it takes place.

Already in pre-literate societies, the establishment of a formally standardised variety of the spoken language (more or less different from ordinary speech) took place, the standard usually having a ritual or sacred character. This development eventually led to the sociolinguistic situation called **diglossia** (Ferguson 1959), characterised by the existence of a superimposed linguistic variety which is nobody's mother tongue, but which is used within some narrowly defined fields of social and cultural life, usually by an elite or a ruling class, and which is socially uninterchangeable with the ordinary popular language. In other instances, this superimposed variety was or became the mother tongue of those elites, thus their chief medium of expression in all situations and not only within some formalised areas of social life. In that case, I shall speak of a **sociolectal cleavage**. A **sociolect** in this terminology is a language variety which as a natu-

Vikör, L.S. "Language Standardisation and Nationalism". In Perez, A.Q., Santiago, A.O. and Nguyễn Đ.L. editors, *Papers from the Conference on the Standardisation of Asian Languages, Manila, Philippines, December 16-21, 1974.*
C-47:105-130. Pacific Linguistics, The Australian National University, 1978. DOI:*10.15144/PL-C47.105*

ral language is confined to a specific social group or class, while the term **dialect** is only used of a geographically defined variety.

The establishment and codification of the oldest **written** languages represented a further stage in this development. Writing originally was a medium accessible to a select group, and its use was restricted to the formal sphere (religious and administrative - in ancient societies usually two aspects of the same thing). As time drew on, extensive literatures developed in the Classical Chinese, Sanskrit, Latin, Arabic and other written languages, testifying of rich and varied cultures, but these written languages and the oral linguistic codes upon which they were based remained confined to a numerically tiny elite. Partly, their function was to safeguard the exclusiveness of the elites and their cultures. In some cases, writing was even seen as a rather marginal medium of linguistic expression, e.g. in the medieval Islamic culture. This can be seen from the fact that orally transmitted traditions (**hadith**) about the Prophet were regarded as more trustworthy than written sources. Writing was only a method of supporting memory; "it is even related that such written notations were deliberately destroyed as soon as its contents were properly memorized" (Juynboll 1930:11-12). "Written documents (-) are legally invalid as proofs, except when the contents of the documents are conformed by trustworthy witnesses. But then the proof is not contained in the document, but in the declaration of the witness". (Juynboll 1930:318).

This sort of societies may be called **semi-literate**. More extensive literacy could before the invention of printing only be attained in small societies where relatively large sections of the population could take part in political activities and share a common culture on an egalitarian basis. The most prominent examples are Classical Greece and medieval Iceland. (For the social consequences of literacy, see Goody and Watt 1963).

A fundamental change in the prevailing situation occurred in the late Middle Ages and the following centuries. It was caused by the invention of printing and the development of nationalism. Until then, Europe had been characterized by diglossia and semi-literacy: it was a linguistic patchwork of oral dialects more or less related to each other with a somewhat revised variety of Classical Latin as a common cultural language, accessible, however, only to the Catholic clergy which represented the only centralised power. The establishment of national states must be accompanied by a break in the power of the church. In North-Western Europe, this break was made complete with the Reformation, while farther south it was only partial. But in all these states, the need for a separate language was felt. So, the most prestigious variety of the language spoken within each state was raised to the status of 'national language' and gradually, but deliberately, codified in a written and a spoken version. The usual bases of these national standard languages were the spoken languages of the upper classes of the respective capitals. But their function was different from that of the older, classical languages, in any case in theory. While literacy earlier had been an instrument for promoting the exclusiveness of an elite, now it gradually was transformed into a means of national integration and spreading of the religious, cultural and ideological principles upon which the states were built. One of the most important aims was to create an identification with the national state among larger sections of the people.

The technological innovation of printing made the standard language in its written form a reality in the lives of common people to an extent which was till then unknown. The spread of education worked in the same direction. However, the situation was less radically changed than it might seem. The command of the standard languages was still largely defined to the ruling classes; the role of common people was usually that of recipients of messages from above. The standard languages thus remained upper class sociolects, while the rest of the people still had the various local dialects as their natural media of expression. The usual way of regarding these dialects, however, was to dismiss them as deviations and vulgarisations of 'the language' - i.e. the standard language. The speakers of the dialects had no means to counter the propagation of this view, which was an integral part of nationalist ideology, and so they had to adopt it themselves. The fact that the dialects were autonomous varieties of the national language, having directly developed from a common source along with the standard language (and not from it) was not recognised before the rise of comparative linguistics and dialectology in the nineteenth century, and this had no consequences whatsoever for the social relations between standard languages and popular dialects, except in the case of Norway, to which we shall return presently.

The industrial revolution and the rise of modern technology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries brought about a new profound change in the state of things. The established standard languages (English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Russian and others) were not changed by it except in their vocabulary, as they were already fixed. But their function in a type of society based on mass production and mass communication had to be redefined. They could not remain upper class sociolects any more, if they should serve their ends properly. A linguistic standardisation of the whole society would be desirable if language should not turn into an obstructing factor in the technological development. Consequently, the pressure on the spoken dialects became stronger and more efficient than ever before. The same pressure has been felt by minority languages which are clearly different from the dominant language (Lappish in Norway, Frisian in Holland, Welsh and Gaelic in Great Britain and others). Particularly after World War Two, it has become more or less of a dogma that the spoken dialects of language communities like the English, French, Danish and Swedish were doomed to disappear as a result of the technological development in education, mass mediae (broadcasting, press, mass produced literature and colour magazines, etc.) and the like.

Modern language planning ideas have to a large extent been marked by this situation. Among the most important aims of language standardisation today is to promote efficiency and rationality in the communication process as much as possible. For a very consistent pledge on behalf of this view, I refer to Tauli (1974). He gives a viewpoint on the language planning problematics which must be called thoroughly technocratic: in his view, language standardisation and planning is a purely technical process where the principle of efficiency and rationality must play a fundamental part, while other considerations are dismissed as extralinguistic and irrational. I shall not discuss his views in detail here; the rest of this paper, however, will show that the present writer approaches these questions from a rather different angle.

In practise, the more technocratically oriented language planners are far from their aims. One reason for this is the conservatism of the traditional language standards; the orthographies of English and French are sufficient examples for this. Another reason is that the strength of the popular dialects has been underestimated; one thing is that they meet a very essential need on the part of those who have grown up with them, viz. the need for a means of identification with the immediate social environment in which one lives; another thing is that the linguistic barriers between the different social classes have not diminished, as could be expected. The political democratisation of Western Europe and North America has not been followed by a social, economic, cultural and linguistic democratisation. The cultivated standard language of mass mediae and educational institutions still functions as a means of preserving the exclusiveness of an elite, due to an elaborate syntax and vocabulary which is developed and cultivated by this elite and therefore tends to express its view on society and ideological framework. For a discussion of this state of things with reference to English-speaking societies, I refer to Bernstein (1970) and especially to Labov (1969).

2. AN ALTERNATIVE SITUATION: THE CASE OF NORWAY

The repressive sociolinguistic situation of the great Western language communities is usually accepted as unavoidable. The language ideology created by nationalism, that the standard language by definition is to be viewed as the language of the nation and all other varieties as vulgar deviations, has been so successfully implemented that an alternative situation has not only been impossible in practice, but to a large extent even unimaginable. If these standard languages were challenged at all, it was exclusively from the side of ethnic minorities with a definite linguistic identity of their own. In many cases, particularly within the multi-ethnic empires of Eastern Europe (The Habsburg Empire, the Ottoman Empire and Imperial Russia), the linguistic uprisings were part of national uprisings eventually leading to the establishment of new independent states (Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania and Greece). In all these cases, the idea of language as a unified medium of expression for a particular nation was an active force behind the liberation process.

Only in two cases, the latent linguistic dichotomy between different social classes within a single language community broke out into open conflict. I refer to Greece and Norway. In Greece, the establishment of a modern independent nation with its own cultural identity led to the creation of two distinct written idioms based on different sociolects. Katharevousa is a codification with a strongly archaic character based on upper class speech, while dhimotiki is a standardisation of modern popular speech. In part, these two standards co-exist in a sort of diglossia, each of them having a specific function in social and cultural life, but they have also been competing with each other about a general supremacy. The social and political character of this struggle may be discerned from the fact that the military junta that ruled Greece from 1967 till 1974 actively promoted katharevousa and suppressed dhimotiki.

The Norwegian case shall be dealt with in some more detail here, as it is a unique combination of these two types of language conflict: the emerging national state striving for a linguistic identity of its own, and the monolingual society where different social groups strive for a linguistic and cultural hegemony.

Scandinavia (Denmark, Norway and Sweden) has from ancient times been a single language area. There has developed a multitude of dialects, but no internal linguistic boundaries of a fundamental nature.

From the sixteenth century onwards, this area was divided into two national states, viz. Denmark (including Norway within its realm) and Sweden. Consequently the normal process of standardisation took place with the upper class sociolects of Copenhagen and Stockholm as the bases of the new standard languages. The national boundaries between Denmark/Norway and Sweden became (artificial) linguistic boundaries, even more so because the political relations between the two states were rather cook, marked by an endless series of border wars. The implementation of the standard languages as the only acceptable medium of communication on a formal level also took place in the same way as the rest of Western Europe.

In 1814, however, Norway was handed over to Sweden as a result of a truce in the Napoleonic wars, and in the following years a Norwegian nationalism (having manifested itself even earlier) began to grow with an accelerating speed. It sought its inspiration partly in the Middle Ages, when Norway had been an independent kingdom with its own written language which had been very extensively used and cultivated. This written language, Old Norse, had been replaced by Danish in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but most Norwegians spoke dialects descended from Old Norse and very different from the Danish standard language in character. The foreign character of this standard language was felt as a problem by the nineteenth century nationalists. Several answers were given to this problem, but only two of them were important. One was to adjust the Danish standard language to the speech of the urban Norwegian upper class, which spoke a sociolect based on the written standard, but with a distinct Norwegian pronunciation and many Norwegian expressions. The other possibility was to create a new standard language on the basis of the popular dialects (in my terminology called **Norse** to distinguish them from the Dano-Norwegian spoken and written standard (cf. Vikör 1975). This was done around the middle of the century by the self-educated linguist Ivar Aasen. After a thorough investigation of the rural dialects in most parts of the country, he reached the conclusion that, in spite of their diversity, they possessed certain fundamental structural traits in common that separated them from the Danish and Swedish written standards. Already before entering upon his comparative investigation of the dialects, he outlined a proposal for the codification of a Norse written standard like this:

> It is not my intention hereby to bring forward any single dialect. No, none of them should be the standard language, but it should be a comparison, a basis of all of them. To complete such a work, there should be collected words from all the greater provinces of the country, with grammatical

> information and certain explanations of the words. To produce these, one should encourage men who not only believe that they know the language of the people, but who also really do know it. These word collections should be sent to a society, founded by linguistically schooled men, who should make comparisons and make a selection, and after having thus defined the standard language, this society should produce a complete Norse dictionary and grammar.
>
> (Quoted after Hanssen 1969)

This plan was consistently carried out, not by any linguistic society, but by Aasen personally, and the result was the written language known as nynorsk (New Norwegian or, in my terminology, New Norse). Its initial success as a cultural and literary medium coincided with the political struggle for home rule and subsequently national independence from the Swedish monarchy. But this struggle intertwined with an internal Norwegian social conflict: The rural (agricultural) population strove to obtain its democratic right to participate fully in the political life of the country, against a powerful class of bureaucrats inherited from Danish colonial rule. The New Norse standard language thus had a double function: it was an expression of Norwegian linguistic nationality, and it was a means of developing a new cultural and social self-esteem among the rural population upon whose dialects it was built, and an efficient stimulator of cultural and literary activities in the countryside. In 1905, the union with Sweden was dissolved, and the nationalist appeal gradually lost weight. The new Norse language and its movement by then had penetrated the rural districts of Western Norway thoroughly, and these areas still remain its most secure footholds. In the rest of the country, it has till the present day failed to gain ground.

Two new approaches to the language problem appeared in the twentieth century. One of them was expressed in a movement on behalf of the dialects of South-Eastern Norway, which was active in the years after World War One. This part of the country was and is most thoroughly dominated by the Dano-Norwegian standard, and the aim of this movement was to raise the prestige of these dialects and their users as a part in a social democratisation process, as the New Norse movement had done in Western Norway. The New Norse standard itself was by these people accused of being too closely based on Western Norwegian dialects, and therefore unsuitable for common people in Eastern Norway.

The second approach was the idea of fusing the existing standard into one so-called Common Norwegian written language. The linguistic proximity between Dano-Norwegian and New Norse was and is sufficiently high to make this possible. The fusion was to be based on the South-Eastern Norwegian dialects, which linguistically were to be placed between the two competing standards, as they had the essential Norse structural features in common with New Norse, but in many details, particularly in the vocabulary, were strongly influenced by Dano-Norwegian. This policy was adopted by the state, and through three successive spelling reforms it was implemented under governmental supervision.

However, this policy was met with considerable resistance from the supporters of conservative (=Danish-like) Dano-Norwegian, which were mostly to be found in the urban bourgeoisie, and through an intense campaign in the 1950s they were able to stop the development towards fusion and even to reverse it to a certain extent. The reason must be sought in the economic structure of the country: the adherents of conservative Dano-Norwegian were to a large extent in control of economic development and, most important, of the big publicity mediae (press, publishing houses and so on), while the New Norse movement and the advocates of a Common Norwegian were financially weak and ideologically unprepared to defend their positions. Recently, however, a counter-offensive against Dano-Norwegian dominance has been initiated.

In the context of this paper, a sketch of the sociolinguistic structure of the Norwegian language community might be of interest, as it presents a picture rather different from that of the other Western European countries. We must then divide the country into three major areas.

1. The rural districts of Western and Central Norway. Here, the local dialects are the universal medium of expression as far as speech is concerned, while New Norse is almost equally universally used in writing. Also the instruction in the schools is given according to this pattern (local dialects spoken, New Norse written) - or, if the teachers come from elsewhere, the children are still free to use their dialects. The linguistic and cultural self-reliance among the population in these areas is high.

2. Northern Norway, parts of rural Eastern Norway and the South Coast. Here, Dano-Norwegian is the dominant standard language used in writing and partly in formal speech, while the local dialects are mostly used elsewhere. The schools are generally dominated by dialectal speech and Dano-Norwegian writing. The dialects are held in high esteem as a means of communication within the local sphere and identification with the local communities, while Dano-Norwegian is generally accepted for formal and nation-wide communication. The dichotomy between adherents of New Norse and Dano-Norwegian is often openly expressed in these areas.

3. South-Eastern Norway, where the relations between standard lan-

guage (exclusively Dano-Norwegian) and spoken dialects are very much like those of other Western European nation, i.e. the total acceptance of the standard language as the only legitimate medium of communication beyond the strictly intimate level. Also the schools in this area are marked by this view, contrary to the law which has been codified under the influence of the more democratic view of the New Norse movement and prescribes that instruction be based on the use of the local dialects.

This situation is not universally accepted. The social position of the popular dialects is one of the major issues in the Norwegian language conflict, besides the dichotomy New Norse vs. Dano-Norwegian. The language situation which the dialect promotors aim at, will be characterised by a linguistic decentralisation, based on the fundamental respect of the linguistic integrity of every individual. The standardisation of language, in this view, must be based on such a situation; in concrete, the standard language should be firmly rooted in popular speech, and allow for regional variations as far as it is possible without losing its character of a coherent structure. It must serve primarily as a written language (as writing necessarily must be more standardised than speech) and as a means of interdialectal communication when the pure dialects are not mutually intelligible (which, however, extremely rarely happens).

The question of mutual intelligibility in Norway and Scandinavia generally is an interesting one. Linguistically, the different varieties of Scandinavian are close enough to each other as to make such mutual intelligibility possible. But the establishment of the national standard languages in Sweden and Denmark has tended to isolate the inhabitants within these countries from each other, and today, this isolation is more complete than ever. For example books are usually not read in Swedish by Danes and vice versa, but translated, and even more important for common people: films and TV programmes with Danish speech is subtitled in Sweden and vice versa. However, in Norway this happens to a much lesser degree, and Norwegians generally tend to understand Danish and Swedish better than Danes and Swedes understand each other - just as interdialectal communication is very common in Norway, but relatively rare in Denmark and Sweden where the respective standard languages are resorted to. This should indicate that communication is not only a question of linguistic proximity, but also to a large extent of habit (Norwegians are generally from childhood accustomed to hear and understand different varieties of their language along with the neighbouring standard language, while this is to a much smaller extent the case with regard to the Swedes and the Danes)

- and sociopsychological considerations (you sometimes can hear well-bred Norwegians thoroughly despising New Norse and popular dialects claiming that they do not understand these language varieties - while others with the same social and linguistic background, but without prejudices, have not any difficulties at all in this respect).

One last point in connection with the Norwegian 'dialect movement'. Contrary to what one perhaps would believe, the strong position of local dialects does not reflect a spirit of particularism. In fact, the consistent use of a particular local dialect with a Norse character strengthens the identification with the Norse language in general, of which any dialect is regarded a worthy representative, against the Dano-Norwegian standard language, which is originally foreign, tied to an urban upper class and associated with economic and cultural centralisation in the urban areas. The diversity of the dialects is seen to essentially represent the basic unity of the Norse language.

The conclusion which one might draw from the Norwegian case, would be that a rigidly fixed standardisation of language is not necessarily the best possible way of achieving national unity in the linguistic and cultural area. Another possible conclusion would be that standardisation is not first and foremost a technical question, but it is to a large extent a question about which social groups or classes have the power to carry out this standardisation and implement its results on society. For detailed descriptions of the Norwegian language situation, I refer to Haugen (1966a), which concentrates particularly on the problematics of language planning and standardisation, and Vikör (1975), which is a description of the New Norse movement and its ideology on a historical and social background.

3. THE LANGUAGE PROBLEM OF THE NEWLY INDEPENDENT STATES

The language problems of the African and Asian states that have acquired independence after World War Two are partly similar to those encountered by the Western European nations two to four centuries ago, but partly they are widely different as a consequence of the specific historical situation in our time. This situation is characterised by the existence of a technologically advanced and economically powerful bloc of Western European and Northern American states that also linguistically dominate the world through the English and partly the French languages. Another factor is the multi-ethnicity and multilingualism of many states that have wrestled themselves free from colonial rule. Both these factors impede the acquisition of an independent linguistic national identity. As we know, different responses have been given to this problem.

One possibility is to adopt the former colonial language (mainly English or French) as the new national language. By this, one avoids stimulating internal ethnic rivalries (as far as language is concerned), and the technical problem of standardisation is solved, as these languages are already firmly standardised. However, it is still a question whether such a policy does not in fact create more problems than it solves. One thing is that the official standard language in such cases is usually the mother tongue of virtually nobody, or at most a numerically very tiny elite. Its function then would be to perpetuate a deep social cleavage inherited from colonial rule instead of the regional cleavage which was to be avoided. Another thing is that the dependence of the former colonial power (economically and culturally) would rather be strengthened than weakened.

The establishment of separate national standards is easier where traditional written and spoken standards are already in existence, as is the case in most Asian countries. However, even this situation creates its specific problems which should be (and are, of course) taken into account. The great advantage of such traditional standard languages which have functioned as vehicles of great civilisations, is their strong unifying force and nationalist appeal.

The cases of Arabic and Chinese are good examples of this type of situation. Classical Arabic was standardised through the writing down of the Koran in the seventh century and the subsequent vocalisation by the grammarians of Lower Iraq a century later (Beeston, 1970), and this standard is still valid. But already at the time it was standardised, the ordinary spoken dialects had grown apart from it, and this cleavage has grown and become unsurmountable. Today, the Arab world has been frequently mentioned as a prime example of diglossia. While Classical Arabic provides a definite and respectable cultural identity to the Arab world, and also is one of the strongest unifying forces between the different Arab states, it also forms a strong barrier for the common Arabs on their way to full literacy. (Altoma 1970). The chief linguistic problem in the Arab world, therefore, is: how to break down this barrier without endangering the linguistic unity of the Arab world? As yet, this question is unsolved. Among the solutions proposed are the implementation of a more or less modified Classical Arabic through a more efficient educational system (which, in view of the linguistically much more homogenous situation in Western societies where such a policy has nevertheless been a failure, does not seem realistic), and the development of national standard languages based on the so-called colloquials of the capitals. Another possibility is the development of a Common Arabic standard based on common traits in the regional dialects (so-called **koineization**, cf. Ferguson 1970:116-117 and Blanc 1960). In the People's Republic of China, the problem has been solved by developing a standard language based on the Peking dialect of Northern Chinese, a language that comprises some 70% of the population, and simplifying the script. In none of these cases, there existed a rival standard language with its own cultural, literary and political tradition within the territory covered by the language, as was the case in India.

Still another situation develops when an unstandardised lingua franca was established as standard language of a new nation. This was done with a remarkable success in Tanzania, and creolised languages like Papiamentu in the Dutch Antilles and Melanesian Pidgin English in Papua New Guinea seem to be gradually adapted to a similar task (Hall Jr 1972).

4. THE STANDARDISATION OF BAHASA INDONESIA - PROBLEMS AND PERSPECTIVES

The development of Bahasa Indonesia is sometimes taken as another instance of the last category of standardisation processes mentioned above, as it is seen as a codification of the so-called Bazaar Malay (Hall Jr 1972:151, Kahin 1970:39, 97n). However, this view contains only a part of the truth, and in my opinion not the most essential part. It is more fruitfully viewed as a standard language based on two very distinct sociolects, viz. the Classical Malay literary standard and Bazaar Malay, and heavily influenced from several other sources. This double origin makes it rather unique among modern national languages, and most of what remains of this paper shall be used to examine its development and standardisation more closely on the background of the general perspective outlined in the foregoing sections.

Einar Haugen has described language standardisation as a process consisting of four stages, viz. selection of a norm, codification, elaboration and acceptance by the society (Haugen 1966a:16-26; see also Fishman 1973). I shall base the following discussion on this scheme.

4.1. *SELECTION OF A NORM*

Indonesia is a multi-lingual society, and in theory, there were tens or even hundreds of alternatives for the choice of a national language. In practice, of course, the choice was much more restricted, as there were only three real candidates for the position of vehicle for the nationalist movement, viz. Dutch, Malay and Javanese. Dutch could immediately be rejected, as it was not only the language of the colonial power, but it even missed the advantage of a wide circulation on a global scale. Even the choice between the Indonesian languages Malay and Javanese was remarkably quickly and unanimously decided in favour of Malay. Oddly enough, the strongest pledge for the selection of Javanese came from the Dutch Indonesianist C.C. Berg and was rejected by the Javanese themselves (cf. Takdir 1962:1).

The reason for this was clear: Malay was already widely accepted as an inter-insular medium of communication, and could thus voice the idea of national unification much better than Javanese, which was largely confined to its own native area. Besides, the so-called 'ceremonial styles' of Javanese makes this language very difficult to access for non-Javanese.

However, the problem was by this only half-solved. There existed numerous kinds of Malay, most properly to be classified in three categories, viz. Classical Malay, Bahasa Melayu Pasar ('Bazaar Malay' - developed as a 'pidginised' or 'creolised' lingua franca throughout the archipelago) and the Malay dialects of the Malayan peninsula and Sumatra. Of these, Classical Malay naturally had the highest prestige as the medium of a traditional literary culture, developed at the courts of Malakka and Johore-Riau. The colonial masters, as far as they cared about indigenous languages, supported this evaluation. The English Malaicus C.C. Brown, on publishing texts in three Malay dialects, comments upon them like this:

> They both (The Malay of Kelantan and Trengganu - LSV) differ more widely from "standard Malay" than does any other Malay that I know, and the differences are not always to their credit. --- they do not come as well as Perak Malay out of a test by Sejarah Malayu standards --- But against these defects should be set the purity of the language.
>
> (Brown 1956:124)

However, the rigidly fixed standard of the Sejarah Melayu and the other works of Classical Malay literature was not to be maintained any more, as it had lost its contact with the actually spoken language. In the nineteenth century, more loosely standardised versions of it were used by the Chinese-Indonesian press, the Christian mission and the Dutch colonial administration. In the beginning of the twentieth century, an official standard was worked out by the Dutch scholar C.A. van Ophuysen, and this standard was subsequently adopted by the Indonesian nationalists and became the foundation of the further development of the Bahasa Indonesia.

4.2. *CODIFICATION OF NORM*

The formal codification of a written language relates to such areas as spelling, pronunciation rules and morphology. The spelling of a language is a seemingly strictly technical issue once the norms of pronunciation on which this spelling is to be based are established. However, the history of the Indonesian spelling clearly shows that there are ideological implications present in the standardisation process even at this level. As already stated, the Indonesian standard language was codified by van Ophuysen at the turn of the century. He based the spelling on Dutch rules, including such digraphs as dj, tj and oe (for u) - especially the last of these being completely irrational from a technical point of view, as it made superfluous the very common letter u (except in the diphthong au, where it is employed also in Dutch). During the independence war, the Indonesian nationalists abolished the oe and began to spell u consistently. Linguistically, they had all good reasons for doing so, but it is obvious that in the prevailing situation this change of a single spelling feature was symbolically associated with the struggle for independence from Dutch colonial rule. From about 1960, the preparations began for a co-ordination of the spelling systems of Indonesia and Malaysia, based on Dutch and English spelling conventions, respectively. The main features of this reform were clear already then: The English j (dj in Indonesian, j in Malay), ch (tj in Indonesian, ch in Malay), and y in yet (spelt j in Indonesian, y, in Malay) were to be spelt j, c, and y respectively. However, during the years of confrontation this reform could not be implemented due to the hostility between the two countries. Only after the political rapprochement could this be done, and it is still in some quarters symbolically associated with this political rapprochement and accepted or rejected according to the opinion one holds about the political relations between the countries. This in spite of the fact that the new spelling is a technical improvement of both the previous spelling systems, and that it probably has very little influence on the linguistic relations between the two forms of the language, generally.

If we consider the formal (phonological and morphological) structure of modern Malay and Bahasa Indonesia, we find that it is largely inherited from Classical Malay. A look at some modern Malay dialects (cf. Brown 1956) brings rather substantial differences to the light, e.g. with regard to the pronunciation of final consonants. The morphology of Malay/Bahasa Indonesia is, as is well-known, rather simple, and its basic rules are derived from the Classical Malay standard. An example which shows this rather clearly, is the fixation of the so-called prenasalisation rules. The prefixes me- and pe- are accompanied by a nasal consonant which is dependent on the initial consonant (or vowel) of the root morpheme, according to a fixed set of rules. However, Winstedt (1927:75) states: "These rules are fixed only in literary or Riau-Johore Malay, and even there with some few variants and exceptions." This makes Teeuw (1959) assume that the standardisation of these prenasalisation rules in itself is an exception, an artificial creation without any foundation in living speech.

After World War Two, the fixed morphological (and to a certain extent even phonological) pattern of Bahasa Indonesia is influenced by the Javanese mother tongue of many of its users. Thus, one can meet prenasalized verbal forms without **me-**, which are the regular forms in Javanese and Sundanese, but alien to Malay. Such forms usually have a colloquial Jakartan tinge, and in my impression, such and other morphological Javanisms can (as yet) not be said to be incorporated into the structure of Bahasa Indonesia.

4.3. *ELABORATION OF FUNCTION*

If the **formal** aspect of Bahasa Indonesia is largely inherited from Classical Malay, its **functional** aspect is much more determined by other sources. Classical Malay vocabulary and syntax were to a large extent adapted to its role as a vehicle of a rigidly traditional Islamic culture in a feudal society. Thus it was heavily influenced by the Classical Arabic written standard. Bahasa Indonesia is marked by a freer style, the result of a conscious liberation of expression modes from the iron girdle of Classical Malay stylistic norms. Especially in less formal contexts, stylistic and idiomatic influence from popular speech (especially in Jakarta) is allowed to make itself felt.

Strong influence upon the expression moods of Bahasa Indonesia is also exerted by the standard languages of Western Europe, formerly particularly Dutch, at present particularly English. This influence has affected even vital parts of the syntactic and semantic structure. One example of this concerns plurality. Traditional Malay had no plural forms of nouns, but it had a morphological category denoting indefiniteness and variety and characterised by reduplication (cf. Winstedt 1927:102). In present-day Bahasa Indonesia, however, this reduplication is often used simply as a plural form. Takdir (1962:11 and 1971:413) mentions other examples: Traditional Malay had so-called 'auxiliary numerals' (a category met with also in other Eastern languages even of a completely different type, such as Chinese). These words function as 'individualisers' of nouns when these are counted, the underlying idea being that nouns stand for concepts, not for the individual realisations of these concepts. In other words: **telur** means *egg*, that is the concept egg. If you have three eggs, you must 'individualise them' by using the word '**buah**' (actually *'fruit'*, but in such cases to be translated as *'piece of'*): **tiga buah telur** = *three pieces of egg*. However, *three eggs* (**tiga telur**) is the usual expression nowadays, due to the, in this case, simplifying influence of European languages.

More debatable is the syntactic influence. Teeuw (1955) notes that "the sentences in Bahasa Indonesia are generally much longer and more complex than in Classical Malay, where parataxis is the rule, and hypotaxis a (sometimes highly occasional) exception." (p.12). Takdir (1962, 1971) illustrates the nominalisation of Indonesian syntax with the following example: "The content of the sentence: *'If you want to regain your health, take medicine'*, (**Kalau kamu mau sehat, minumlah obat**) is today very often paraphrased as: *'For your healthiness sake, take medicine'* (**Untuk kesehatanmu, minulah obat**)." However, in such cases, it would be worthwhile to investigate the nature of the changes more closely, and above all how they are put out in practise (by whom and in what circumstances) before being too rash in concluding that there is a "general trend towards abstraction". (Takdir, 1962, 1971).

Syntax is usually not subjected to deliberate standardisation, but that does not mean that it develops freely on its own, any more than any other part of language. One of the most formative forces behind the moulding and fixation of syntax is what I would call the 'industry of words', including publishing houses, press and above all (in the semi-literate society that Indonesia still is) broadcasting. But it is a question of which we know as yet very little, whether the prestigious and elaborated modes of expression utilised by these institutions do in fact influence the speech of those who have no direct contact with these formative mediae, i.e. the great majority of the Indonesian population.

The most important area of Indonesian language planning and standardisation is undoubtedly vocabulary. Excellent descriptions of the problems arising in the development of a modern terminology have been given by Takdir (1962, 1971), who has been actively engaged in this process since the 1930s. In the following discussion, I shall try to examine some ideological aspects of it, from an angle different from that of Takdir.

The main difference of opinion with regard to the modernisation of Indonesian vocabulary, as sketched by Takdir, relates itself to the attitude towards European influence. One faction is puristic, wanting to base the elaboration of the vocabulary on linguistic resources already present in Malay and other Indonesian languages, and resort to other Asian languages (predominantly Sanskrit, but also Arabic) when the Indonesian languages prove insufficient. Takdir (1962:7) notes:

"In general we can say that for a great number of Indonesians Sanskrit words still have a certain emotional force (because the zenith of Indonesia as a political power is regarded as coinciding with the Hindu period of Indonesian history) which enhances self-confidence and national pride.--- The fact that 90 per cent of the population of Indonesia is Moslem has helped facilitate the introduction of additional Arabic words."

The other faction, to which Takdir himself belongs, consciously identifies itself with modern Western culture as opposed to past glory connected to stagnated cultures, and consequently is in favour of admitting European loanwords of Greek and Latin origin (or constructed from Greek and Latin elements). In this way, this factions want to open Indonesia to the influences of Western technological culture which is needed to bring her forwards, as they see it. Takdir outlines the basic principles behind this view in his 1962 essay, p.14-15. Modern man and modern culture, as he calls it, is characterised by the following features: activity, rationality, abstractness, business acumen, egalitarianism and internationalism. He wants a conscious language policy to promote these principles, and relates some of the changes of Indonesian language usage to them. Thus, the already mentioned decrease in the use of auxiliary numerals and the nominalisation tendency is related to the principle of abstractness, while the principle of activity is discerned in the increased use of the verbal prefix me- ('active' or 'agens-centered') instead of di- ('passive' or 'patiens-centered') which according to Takdir is taking place.

The belief that Western technology possessed the right means to develop the Third World, which was so widely held in the sixties, is no more unchallenged. The most frequent criticism against it is that it tends to benefit only those social groups in the developing countries that beforehand are best equipped to use this technology, in practise numerically limited and materially well-to-do groups. A similar criticism can also be levied against the language philosophy of Takdir. He strongly stresses the necessity of an international integration in the field of science, which must be promoted by an internationally standardised scientific terminology. However, such an internationalisation of terminology can result in a linguistic segregation (or strengthen the already existing segregation) within Indonesia itself. The crucial question in this connection, as I see it, is: will the adoption of a strongly Westernised vocabulary make Bahasa Indonesia more or less accessible to that large majority of Indonesians that do not receive education above the elementary level?

I am here not dealing with the language (jargons) of specialists, but of the vehicle of national linguistic unification in Indonesia. About the half of the Indonesian people is illiterate, and the majority of the other half receives only basic education. Their chief communication channel with the 'outer world' is the radio, and for those who can read, papers and popular magazines (and textbooks) are added. The language used in these mediae most properly deserves the designation 'national language'. It is most important, then, that this language is so designed that it serves the needs of the majority of the population, and not primarily of those who are in the position to acquaint themselves most thoroughly with Western languages, culture and technology. The argument levied by Takdir (1962:17) that the adoption of Greek and Latin terms would make it "much easier for the Indonesians to learn other modern languages and especially to read modern scientific words in other languages", must in my opinion be regarded as highly peripheral. Without dogmatically rejecting any source of enrichment of the language, I would basically hold the opinion that the development of any standard language should be based on popular speech, and that the necessary extension of the vocabulary should primarily be undertaken by employing indigenous material as much as possible, and use foreign sources (Asian and European) as supplements.

Even so, the situation is more complicated than this. The vocabulary of every language reflects the social context in which the language is employed, and in its turn influences social conditions, mostly strengthening the prevailing situation. Every child learns the basic social relations in which he/she is a part through language, and those relations which are simply expressed in the most fundamental vocabulary tend to have a profound influence upon the personality of the individual and tie him/her forcibly to the social structure of which he/she is a part. The personal pronouns of many languages and the rules guiding their usage offer numerous examples of this. Most European languages distinguish pronouns of 'power and solidarity' in the second person (cf. Brown and Gilman 1960). This is the case also in Indonesian, but here there is no simple dichotomy of two forms as in the European languages, but a rather elaborated (and fluctuating) system of addressing terms expressing the relationship to the person addressed. In a society with new democratic ideals and an increased social mobility, such a system cannot be kept intact. The experiment of introducing a neutral pronoun for the second person, **anda**, in the 1950s, at first did not meet with much success, however. It broke too sharply with the complex pattern of social relationships expressed in the existing system. However, I have the impression that it is slowly gaining ground at present, and with Takdir (1971:413) I believe that it will eventually be accepted. But I do not think that will happen without a profound change in the social relationships in an egalitarian direction.

A fundamental concept in the language philosophy of Takdir and many others is 'modernisation'. The foregoing passages will already have indicated that the present writer is rather skeptical towards this term, in any case the way Takdir uses it. In my opinion, the terms **modernisation** and **traditionalism** tend to obscure the more fundamental dichotomies underlying the social and cultural conflicts in countries like Indonesia. Such conflicts inevitably, of course, involve the use of language, but just as inevitably they involve a struggle for linguistic power. A social group which acquires the power to define which linguistic usage is acceptable and not acceptable, and to introduce and impose a terminology which is adapted to its view of life and society, by this acquires a mighty instrument through which it can exert cultural, social and political dominance. Groups who want to overthrow the existing social order, correspondingly, have to develop a vocabulary with a semantic structure that reflects **their** position. One of the few who have treated Indonesian linguistic problems from this angle is Leclerc (1972).

4.4. *ACCEPTANCE BY THE SOCIETY*

The term 'acceptance by the society' can mean several things. It can imply that the members of a society actively accepts and employs a given language standard, identifying themselves with it and contributing to its further development. It can imply that they actively supports and identify themselves with the standard language because of some nationalist or religious symbolic value without being able to participate in it, because it is too far removed from their actual speech, too elaborate in structure or because of lack of education (or all these factors together, cf. the position of Classical Arabic among common people in the Arabic countries). And thirdly, maybe it means that they simply accept its existence because of the lack of an alternative, or because they lack linguistic and cultural self-consciousness, without identifying themselves with it. In short, everything except absolute rejection can be called 'acceptance'.

Bahasa Indonesia is universally accepted as the national language of Indonesia, but it still awaits investigation what kind of acceptance this in reality is. In any case, it is very improbable that it is the first of the three degrees of acceptance that I have mentioned, as most Indonesians do not have Bahasa Indonesia as their mother tongue and are insufficiently educated in it (if at all). The active participation in the use of Bahasa Indonesia and its development is restricted to a well-educated elite. Tanner (1967) has described the complex sociolinguistic relationship between Bahasa Indonesia and, on the one hand, the **bahasa daerah** (regional languages) and, on the other hand, the foreign languages English and Dutch among this elite. He stresses that Bahasa Indonesia carries the great advantage of being neutral to ethnic cleavage (not being associated with any particular region or ethnic group) and also to social differences (not including the complex 'ceremonial styles' of Javanese and Sundanese).

Outside this elite, we probably can find varying degrees of acceptance, partly of Bahasa Indonesia as the language of national unity and national pride, partly as the inevitable language of power. While passive and to a certain extent active knowledge of this language is spread throughout the archipelago, there probably is no question of real participation in its development (as this is codified in the official standardisation) from those masses who have no access to the centres of power. Under the present circumstances, this even seems hardly possible. In such a situation, the standardisation and planning of language can hardly avoid degenerating into a bureaucratic process, which is conducted without contact with the people for whose benefit the standard language should ideally be developed.

In his analysis of Guided Democracy, Herbert Feith (1963) stresses the dichotomy between ideologists or 'solidarity makers' and technocrats or 'administrators' in Indonesian politics. With regard to language policy, too, this distinction may be fundamental. The 'solidarity makers' would regard it essential to create an active identification with Bahasa Indonesia on the part of the Indonesian people, as an element of a more general identification with nationalism. One of the methods employed to reach this aim would be the opposition to Western influence through loanwords, and in accordance with this to develop a vocabulary which, based on concepts from the cultural and social environment of the average Indonesian, could further a genuine identification with Sukarnoist ideology. The technocrats, on the other hand, would generally be more in favour of Takdir's views on these issues, i.e. seek to develop a linguistic medium through which the ideology upon which Western technology is based could be promoted. In this view, language planning is a technical affair to be assigned to the experts, who work within a given social and political framework. Unlike the 'solidarity makers', they would not see it as a task to influence and change this framework.

If we turn back to the three degrees of acceptance of a language standard, and relate them to these two basically different approaches to language policy, we would probably find that there is a connection. My hypothesis is that the approach of the 'solidarity makers', if it is successful, would result in an active acceptance and enthusiasm for the standard, even on the part of those who do not speak it themselves, and that this development in a later stage would create favourable conditions for an active participation in it. On the other hand, I fear that the technocratic approach would tend to make the standard language less accessible for those without a higher education and thus mark it as the language of power which can only be passively accepted by the powerless as inevitable.

As is well-known, the 'administrators' have had the upper hand in Indonesian politics since 1966. In my impression, standard Bahasa Indonesia is at present mainly informally standardised through press and broadcasting, as far as vocabulary and syntax (the functional aspects of language) are concerned, and this standardisation is rather fluctuating. "Vocabulary growth (or: change in vocabulary - LSV) is so rapid that students returning to Indonesia after a few years abroad sometimes jokingly comment that they can no longer read the newspapers - a statement which is only a partial exaggeration." (Tanner 1967:133). It is not possible for me to indicate how its real position among the Indonesian masses is - a thorough investigation would be needed to make a reliable statement about that.

5. CONCLUSION

> Every self-respecting nation has to have a language. Not just a medium of communication, a "vernacular" or a "dialect", but a fully developed language. Anything less marks it as under-developed. --- the national ideal demands that there be a single linguistic code by means of which (-) communication can take place. --- The dialects, at least if they threaten to become languages, are potentially disruptive forces in a unified nation: they appeal to local loyalties, which could conceivably come into conflict with national loyalty. --- Nationalism has also tended to encourage external distinction, ---. In language this has meant the urge not only to have one language, but to have one's own language.
>
> (Haugen 1966b:103=104)

If these ideals shall be fully realised, some other goals must be reached, viz. the active **identification** with and **participation** in the standard language of the nation by the entire population, and a linguistic and cultural **self-consciousness** on the part of this population. These ideals often come into conflict with each other, as the suppression of dialects and minority languages is liable to, sooner or later, provoke a reaction and thus further the disruptive forces which one wanted to keep down. After all, no language community is completely uniform, and there is no reason to think that that will ever be achieved, as language usage is liable to a constant and gradual change. The Norwegian case shows that intense loyalty to local dialects can very well be combined with a just as intense national loyalty. A decentralist policy, through which every existing variety (dialect) of a language is regarded as socially acceptable, and through which the basic national unity in dialectal diversity is stressed, can foster more successful and integrated language societies than the centralist approach of e.g. France (where the resistance of suppressed lingual minorities as the Basques and the Bretons is a lot more violent than the language strife in Norway has ever been). In Indonesia, this should mean that the regional languages are fully respected as legitimate modes of expression for the peoples concerned, while Bahasa Indonesia find its natural place as a nation-wide medium of communication besides them. As far as I know, this is today the common opinion in Indonesia. I quote the Sundanese Ajip Roside (1966:40):

> Certainly, the contradiction between Bahasa Indonesia and the regional languages is not of a fundamental nature. The function of Bahasa Indonesia as a national language and a national integration factor besides the flag, the national anthem and the national emblem cannot be challenged or taken over by any regional language. Thus, if in the future there arise voices in favor of granting the regional languages a better position, it should not be regarded as a danger towards the position of Bahasa Indonesia as a national language and as an element in the integration of the people.

Thus the motto of the Indonesian Republic: 'Bhinneka Tunggal Ika' (*'There are many - there is one'* or, more abstractly formulated: *'Unity in diversity')* has a definite linguistic relevance.

However, as I have also tried to show in this paper, these questions cannot be isolated from the power structure of the language communities concerned. A strongly hierarchical social structure tends to be combined with sociolectal cleavage and more or less intense suppression of popular speech, while a more egalitarian social structure would tend to increase linguistic freedom and solidarity across dialect boundaries, including the acceptance and active participation in a common national standard language. For those who are actively engaged in language planning and language standardisation I think it is important to be aware of these implications of their work. There is a relationship of mutual influence between the social structure of a community and its sociolinguistic structure, so that in standardising a language, one exerts influence upon the social and political structure of the community concerned, either strengthening or weakening it. On the other hand, this social and political structure itself determines the extent to which standardisation after a given principle can succeed. Language standardisation, in short, is a political as well as technical act, and in choosing between the possibilities being at one's disposal in any concrete issue one should always try to oversee the political and social consequences of one's choice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALTOMA, Salih J.

1970 'Language Education in Arab Countries and the Role of the Academies'. In: Fishman 1974:279-313.

BEESTON, ALF.L.

1970 *The Arabic Language Today*. London: Hutchinson University Library.

BERNSTEIN, Basil

1970 'Social Class, Language and Socialization'. In: Giglioli 1972:157-178.

BLANC, Haim

1960 'Stylistic Variations in Spoken Arabic: A Sample of Interdialectal Educated Conversation'. In: Ferguson, Charles A. ed. *Contributions to Arabic Linguistics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

BROWN, C.C.

1956 *Studies in Country Malay*. London: Luzak and Co.

BROWN, R. and A. GILMAN

1960 'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity'. In: Giglioli 1972: 252-282.

FEITH, Herbert

1963 'Dynamics of Guided Democracy'. In: McVey, Ruth ed. *Indonesia Southeast Asia Studies*, 309-409. Yale University.

FERGUSON, Charles A.
1959 'Diglossia'. In: Giglioli 1972:232-251.

1970 'The Role of Arabic in Ethiopia, a Sociolinguistic Perspective'. In: Pride and Holmes 1972:112-124.

FISHMAN, Joshua A.
1973 'Language Modernization and Planning in Comparison with Other Types of National Modernization and Planning'. In: Fishman 1974:79-102.

FISHMAN, Joshua A., ed.
1974 *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton.

GIGLIOLI, Pier Paolo, ed.
1972 *Language and Social Context*. Penguin Books.

GOODY, J. and I. WATT
1963 'The Consequences of Literacy'. In: Giglioli 1972:311-357.

HALL, R.A., Jr
1972 'Pidgins and Creoles as Standard Languages'. In: Pride and Holmes 1972:142-153.

HANSSEN, Eskil, ed.
1969 *Om norsk sprakhistoria*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

HAUGEN, Einar
1966a *Language Conflict and Language Planning - The Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

1966b 'Dialect, Language, Nation'. In: Pride and Holmes 1972:97-111.

JUYNBOLL, Th.W.
1930 *Handleiding tot de kennis van de Mohammedaansche wet volgens de leer der Sjafi'itische school*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

KAHIN, George McTurnan
1970 *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

LABOV, W.
1969 'The Logics of Non-standard English'. In: Giglioli 1972: 179-215.

LECLERC, Jacques

1972 'An Ideological Problem of Indonesian Trade Unionism in the Sixties: "Karyawan" versus "Buruh".' *Review of Indonesian and Malayan Affairs*, 6/1:76-91.

PRIDE, J.B. and J. HOLMES, eds.

1972 *Sociolinguistics*. Penguin Books.

ROSIDI, Ajip

1966 *Kesusastran Sunda dewasa ini*. Pasuketan, Tjirebon: Penerbit Tjupumanik.

TAKDIR ALISJAHBANA, Sutan

1962 *Indonesian Language and Literature*. New Haven, Conn.: Southeast Asia Studies, Yale University.

1971 'Language Policy, Language Engineering and Literacy in Indonesia and Malaysia'. In: Fishman 1974:391-416.

TANNER, N.

1967 'Speech and Society among the Indonesian Elite. A Case Study of a Multilingual Community'. In: Pride and Holmes 1972:125-141.

TAULI, Valter

1974 'The Theory of Language Planning'. In: Fishman 1974:49-67.

TEEUW, A.

1955 *De Bahasa Indonesia, de wereld en Nederland*. Amsterdam: Djambatan.

1959 'The History of the Malay Language'. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, vol.115:138-156.

VIKÖR, Lars S.

1975 *The New Norse Language Movement, A Norwegian Cultural Revolution*. Oslo: Forlaget Novus.

WINSTEDT, Richard

1972 *Malay Grammar*. London: Oxford University Press.

Vikör, L.S. "Language Standardisation and Nationalism". In Perez, A.Q., Santiago, A.O. and Nguyễn Đ.L. editors, *Papers from the Conference on the Standardisation of Asian Languages, Manila, Philippines, December 16-21, 1974*.
C-47:105-130. Pacific Linguistics, The Australian National University, 1978. DOI:*10.15144/PL-C47.105*