THE CONCEPT OF LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE INDONESIAN LANGUAGE

S. Takdir Alisjahbana

1. STANDARDISATION AS PROBLEM OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

In its very essence the problem of standardisation is the problem of social behaviour through which the individual communicates with its fellow members in the social group, because it is in the interaction within the social group that the members of the group need a basic uniformity of behaviour and concept, so that there is understanding and communication between them. Only through common forms of behaviour based on common concepts is it possible to arrive at a certain social integration, i.e. that the social group becomes efficiently organised to achieve its goals, its system of values. In this connection all social behaviour in an integrated social group is standardised behaviour. Through this standardised behaviour the members of the group can act and behave with a certain confidence and efficiency within the social group. Everyone knows the meaning of the behaviour of his fellow members, and also knows how his fellow members will react or respond to his behaviour. In this sense standardised behaviour within a certain integrated group is the generally expected behaviour.

In every society the generally expected behaviour is determined by social norms. In a face to face relationship within a primary group or *Gemeinschaft* the norms take the form of mores and folkways. In a modern social group, which is also called secondary group or *Gesellschaft*, above the mores and folkways develop the more abstract and consciously created laws and other regulations. It is through these mores, folkways and laws with the threat of their sanctions, that the social group determines the behaviour of its members, and thus achieves its values.

Viewed from the standpoint of social behaviour in the broadest sense,

every language as part of the totality of social behaviour of an integrated social group is standardized, because it is only through a certain uniformity in the use of words and language rules that the members of the social group can understand and communicate with each other efficiently. In this sense the rules of the grammar of a certain language are only part and parcel of the norms and especially of the mores and folkways of society.

2. THE STANDARDISATION OF MODERN LANGUAGES

Is the standardized character of the small tribe or clan language in a small social group within a limited area an obvious fact, because of the dense interaction and communication between the language speakers, the rise of the great national languages in Europe and later in the Asian countries, stretching out over extended areas and inhabited by people speaking different dialects and sometimes even languages, did bring about problems of conscious and purposeful standardisation. For the large European languages like English, German, French, Italian etc., which were established during the centuries after the Renaissance parallel to the creation of larger social units of nations, we know that besides political and administrative factors, progress in the means of transportation and communication, especially the invention of the printing press and the translation of the Bible have played an important role towards the unification and standardisation of these languages.

The problem of standardisation in a stricter sense, like the creation of a standard of correct language usage, became especially accute in Europe in the eighteenth century. It was according to Albert C. Baugh an age of which one of the first characteristics was "a strong sense of order and the value of regulation. Adventurous individualism and the spirit of independence characteristic of the previous era give way to a desire for system and regularity. This involves conformity to a standard that the consensus of opinion recognizes as good."¹ It was this intellectual tendency which was "seen quite clearly in the eighteenth century efforts to standardise, refine and fix the English language. In the period under consideration discussion of the language takes a new turn. Previously interest had been shown chiefly in such questions as whether English was worthy to be used for writings in which Latin had long been traditional, whether the large additions being made to the vocabulary were justified, and whether a more adequate

¹Albert C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956, p.313.

system of spelling could be introduced. Now for the first time attention was turned to the grammar, and it was discovered that English had no grammar".¹ About the regularisation of the language through grammar the second half of the eighteenth century showed great progress. "Whereas fewer than fifty writings on grammar, rhetoric, criticism, and linguistic theory have been listed for the first half of the eighteenth century, and still fewer for all the period before 1600, the publication in the period 1750-1800 exceeded two hundred titles. And most of these were concerned in whole or in part with solecisms, barbarisms, improprieties, and questions of precision in the use of English."²

The establishment of compulsory education in the European countries in the last century has finally stabilised the position of the standard languages until our age.

3. PROBLEMS OF LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION OF THE YOUNG ASIAN NATIONS

Parallel problems were faced when the Asian countries since the last century awoke through their contact with European societies and cultures. The Asian people, the colonized as well as the independent ones, gradually realized that their defeat or weakness vis-à-vis the Europeans was caused by the weaknesses and inadequacies in their own societies and cultures. They had to change many of their basic attitudes, concepts and ways of life, if they wanted to participate in the scientific, economic and technological progress of the modern world. This consciousness increased even more, when many of their children attended English, French, Dutch schools, etc. in Asia as well as in Europe. We all know that as a result of this education national movements started in the various countries of Asia, aiming at the liberation from their colonial masters, and their participation in the progress of the modern world. These facts suddenly dynamized the Asian societies and cultures. Viewed from the standpoint of their integration these societies and cultures lost their tranquility and uniformity. Many of the behaviours and institutions which in traditional society were considered true, good, beautiful, even holy, lost their values in the light of the new ideals and ways of thinking. A new generation which through its modern education has arrived at a new system of values, and a new way of life comes to the foreground. The changes which in Europe had taken place gradually since the Middle Ages from

¹ Albert C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956, p.314.

² Sterling Andrus Leonard, *The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage, 1700-1800*. New York, 1962, p.12.

an expressive culture, i.e. a culture oriented towards religious and aesthetic values based on feeling, intuition, and imagination, into a progressive modern culture dominated by science, economics and technology, are taking place in Asia in a relatively short time. The whole society and culture is in rapid change, even in revolution.

4. THE INDONESIAN LINGUISTIC SITUATION

I have tried to describe this situation in Indonesia of the last century in my collection of essays *Indonesia: Social and Cultural Revolution*.¹ In the great process of *Umwertung aller Werte* the language problems as part and especially as medium of the social and cultural revolution take more gigantic proportions.

There is first of all the Indonesian linguistic situation, resulting from the character of the country as an archipelago covering one-seventh of the equator, consisting of thousands of islands, of which the largest are subdivided again into many small isolated parts. During the centuries not less than two hundred and fifty languages and dialects have come into being, although most of them belong to the Malay or Indonesian language group, which is again a part of the larger Malay-Polynesian or Austronesian language group. In the intercourse and communication between the various groups speaking various languages in the Indonesian archipelago, a certain *lingua franca* gradually came into being, which had its source in the Malay language, the language of the most restless wandering people in South-East Asia. As the *lingua franca* in such an extended area, it was not possible for the Malay language to be a standardized language. It was a language which through its simple structure quickly adjusted itself not only to the situation in the harbour and the market place, but which easily has tolerated a mixture with local languages and dialects, as well as with foreign languages.

In the haphazard and superficial encounters in commerce, politics etc. between people speaking different languages, there was no need for a language with a clear standard of correct usage. This need made itself manifest only much later, at the time that the Dutch colonial government through the expansion of the colonial administration, considered it necessary to build schools for Indonesians, in order to function as medium of instruction in schools the Malay language needed to be standardised. It was the great merit of Ch. A. van Ophuysen, who was able to standardise the spelling, the word structure, as well as

¹S. Takdir Alisjahbana, *Indonesia: Social and Cultural Revolution*. Kuala Lumpur etc., Oxford University Press, 1969. pp-56-69.

the syntax of the Malay language, which under the name of school- or high-Malay dominated the language of schools and administration during four decades of this century.

This standardised school- or high-Malay of the early decades of this century, however, although important as forerunner of the Indonesian language, was still very limited. It was the medium of instruction in primary schools, in training colleges for teachers for schools outside Java and in the Malay area around Jakarta. In some primary and secondary schools in Java, Malay was incidentally also taught as a subject. Although it could be considered the second official language in the Dutch East Indies, its influence in Indonesian society at large, and especially in circles of Indonesian elite, was negligible. The language used by the press and in meetings of political and other institutions was still of the character of the unstandardised Malay lingua franca, with great variations in vocabulary and rules of grammar. The real official language and that of modern culture of that time was undoubtedly the Dutch language. For large groups of Indonesians it opened the road not only for leading and better paid positions in the colonial hierarchy, but it also gave the possibility for further study and means to participate in the progress of science, economics, technology of the modern world. Small wonder that it was especially this education in the Dutch language, which was the aspiration of the Indonesian middle class, so that very soon it became clear, that the Dutch government was not able to provide for the growing need of Indonesians for Dutch education. Meanwhile a large Dutch group in the colonial society realized that Dutch modern education, instead of bringing a more stable and peaceful relation in the colony, on the contrary threatened to create more and more dissatisfaction in the circles of the educated Indonesian group, which claimed more and more political, economic and other rights. Moreover this group started to become afraid that the Indonesian elite would gradually push it aside from its privileged political and economic position in the colony.

5. THE BIRTH OF THE INDONESIAN LANGUAGE AND ITS EARLIER DEVELOPMENT

The limited availability of Dutch education for Indonesians at the end of the twenties had made many Indonesians gradually realized that education through the Dutch language never would reach the great mass of their people. The growing conviction that only through the unity of the Indonesian people would it be possible to build up a force strong enough to face the colonial power, forced the Indonesians to look out for another language, which could unite all the people of Indonesia. It was this conviction which resulted in the well-

known oath of the Indonesian youth of October 28, 1928, of one country, one nation and one language, all called Indonesian.

For the political aim of uniting the Indonesian people, the Indonesian language undoubtedly proved to be a good solution, but it was clear from the outset that as the language of education from primary school until university, and especially as the language of science, economics and technology oriented modern culture, it could by far not bear comparison with the Dutch language. Although some improvement had been made during the thirties in the language, especially as the language of modern literature and social communication, it was not earlier than during the Japanese occupation that Indonesian was confronted with its task as the language of school, administration and modern communication. It was at that time that it started to face the problem of standardisation, which to a certain extent was only a part of the process of modernisation.

The first problem of standardisation the language was confronted with was in the schools, when suddenly Dutch was forbidden. Indonesian had suddenly to fulfill the role of a full-fledged modern language as medium of instruction from primary school until university. A committee came into being which had the task to translate in the shortest possible time all Dutch textbooks for junior and senior high schools. It was especially in translating various textbooks that the need was felt for a systematic coining and standardisation of new terms, so that within a short time the translators, later added by a team of experts and other interested people, decided to come together regularly to discuss and to co-ordinate the terms of the various school subjects. Soon, however, in the other fields such as administration, law, medicine, mining, agriculture etc. the need was also felt for a systematic coining and standardisation of terms. As it was also in the interest of the Japanese administration to improve the Indonesian language, it could not escape to establish an extensive committee for dealing with modernisation and standardisation of the Indonesian language. This committee was the *Komisi Bahasa Indonesia*, which was established in 1942. Its task was to improve the language for its broadening function after the elimination of the Dutch language.

To lend this committee high prestige its membership included not only the most prominent Indonesian writers, linguists and cultural leaders, but also political celebrities, such as Sukarno and Hatta. Hatta himself was for many years personally active as chairman of the section in charge of scientific and technical terminology. I functioned as secretary of the committee and at the same time as Head of the Language Office, which prepared and acted upon the committee's decisions.

The committee was from the beginning divided into three sections for the tasks of:

1. determining a new technical and scientific terminology,
2. writing a new grammar, and
3. selecting words of daily usage.

The section for determining technical and scientific terminology was of course the most important and urgent. Its task was concrete and limited to scope. Several persons already engaged in translating Dutch textbooks were able to provide the committee with list of Dutch terms and some tentative Indonesian equivalents. To complete these lists the committee asked the teachers who taught various subjects in schools, to submit lists of terms used during the initial months after the schools had been re-opened. In this way the Committee had at its disposal several lists of terms of e.g. botany as they were provisionally used in schools. The task of the staff of the secretary at the language office was to compare the various Indonesian terms, to subject them to severe criticism, and to try to collect other relevant information from additional sources. As a rule the staff then made a choice between various terms in the lists, but occasionally introduced new words which were considered more satisfactory. The new list of terms arrived at through this process was sent to the botany teachers in Jakarta. About a week thereafter the Committee invited them to a meeting for a preliminary decision on these terms, with other people who by profession or for other reasons were considered competent in botany. The group attending this first session was called the sub-section of botany, consisting of persons with the same subject of study or interest. The decision of this meeting was mimeographed and sent to the members of the section on terminology for a second decision at a higher level. The section on terminology had to decide on all technical and scientific terms, and consisted therefore of members from different branches of learning and occupation. The words decided upon in a given sub-section were studied and co-ordinated with the terms decided upon in other sub-sections, e.g. in that of zoology etc. After a certain number of lists dealing with different subjects had been decided upon in this section, the secretary would arrange a plenary meeting of the committee, where the terms were formally confirmed. The first set of terms arrived at in this way was published by the Japanese military authorities in the official Government Gazette and thus received the official sanction of the Japanese government.

The selection and determination of words of daily usage was important, since so many words from dialects, regional or foreign languages penetrated into the Indonesian language. As has been said, already as

lingua franca the Indonesian language had adjusted itself to local, regional and foreign languages in the whole of Indonesia. Thus the question is relevant which words could be considered belonging to the generally accepted Indonesian language, and which words should still be considered as foreign, regional or dialectal elements. The committee in charge of the selection and determination of words in daily usage looked through the vocabulary of newspapers, and other mass media, of books etc. There are of course many words which without discussion were accepted as Indonesian words. In the period of transition all high- or school-Malay words of the list of Van Ophuysen were accepted as the core of the Indonesian vocabulary, although later some of them fell in disuse. Many words, however, still bear the mark of the Jakarta dialect, the Javanese, Minangkabau, Dutch, English language etc. If such a word was encountered the committee could decide that it already belonged to the accepted Indonesian vocabulary. This committee was especially necessary, since the school Malay of the list of Van Ophuysen was very limited, consisting of not more than 10,130 words, while some of the school teachers at that time rejected the words which were not on the list. It is clear that in the fast expanding vocabulary of daily usage through the tremendous expansion of Indonesian, this committee was not very useful, since it could not keep pace with the speed of the growth of the language. What was really needed was a descriptive dictionary, registering and explaining the most common words. It is also clear that such a dictionary must be revised regularly in a short span of time. In the further development of the planning of the Indonesian language this Committee was not continued.

6. A REFORMULATION OF THE CONCEPT OF STANDARDISATION

The attempts for the determination of the modern Indonesian terminology and the selection and determination of the acceptable Indonesian words are clear efforts for the standardisation of the Indonesian language. Standardisation in this sense, however, is only a determination of uniform usage. But in the context of language planning - or in the terminology I usually use of language engineering - it is necessary at this point to discern at least two levels of standardisation.

The English spelling for example is a standardised spelling, since we can say without exaggeration that every educated Englishman pronounces and writes the English words in the same way. But if for example we compare how the various phonemes are written in English, we discover that the spelling is not standardised, because the phoneme /ə/ is written in English as: *a* in *alone*, *ai* in *mountain*, *e* in *system*, *eo* in

dungeon, *i* in *easily*, *ia* in *parliament*, *o* in *gallop*, *oi* in *porpoise*, *ou* in *curious*, *u* in *circus*. Viewed from this point there is also no standardisation in the relation between the pronunciation and writing of the English words: *I* and *eye*, *son* and *sun*, are pronounced in the same way, although the written images are quite different. It is already a known fact, that there are very few rules for the writing of English words, that there exist no relation between the English pronunciation and its written form. In this sense we nearly can say, that the English language does not take advantage of the simplicity and efficiency of the Latin alphabet with its twenty six letters for its phonemic system. The written English words are nearly comparable to the Chinese script: one must know how a word is written as a totality. An analysis of phonemes and letters will not be of much help. For its 40 phonemes it has about 2000 symbols. English educationalists have already since long complained about the burden, which the English children have to bear in learning to read the English language. They calculated that through the fact that there is no intimate relationship between pronunciation and spelling, the English child needs up to two years more than children of other nations with a more regular spelling of their languages, to command the simple art of reading.¹

7. THE INDONESIAN WORD AND SYLLABIC STRUCTURE

In the standardisation of their language the young countries of Asia have to aspire a higher level of standardisation, so that their language will be much simpler and easier to learn than English. The English words, for example, do not have a characteristic structure or pattern, and foreign words which have been accepted during the centuries more or less retain their original phonemic structure or spelling. With regards to the Indonesian language, it is still possible to determine its word structure on the basis of the simple Malay word pattern. As an agglutinative language its words show a very simple structure, which changes only by adding a limited number of clearcut syllables or morphemes. According to the hypotheses of Brandstetter² and Dempwolff³ on the structure of the syllables of Ur - or prime-Indonesian, the

¹ Compare J.A. Downing, *To be or not to be. The augmented Roman alphabet*. London, 1962; Axel Wijk, *Regularized English*. Stockholm, 1959.

² R. Brandstetter, *Wurzel und Wort in den indonesischen Sprachen* (Monographien zur indonesischen Sprache VI). Luzern, 1910.

³ O. Dempwolff, 'Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes', *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* XV, XVII, XIX, Beihefte 1934-1938.

Indonesian words were originally mono-syllabic like Chinese. The mono-syllabic words developed according to their theory into poly-syllabic one through the addition of affixes, by multiplication and by composition.

In counting the syllables of the present Indonesian words in the dictionaries of St. Moh. Zain and Purwadarminta a study of Mr. Sudarno¹ revealed that the great majority of Indonesian words consists of two and three syllables (75% and 18%). Mono-syllabic words are an exception and very often related to onomatopae, interjections, while four syllabic words are derivatives through the addition of affixes, or compound words through combinations. Another possibility is that they are loan words, for example from Sanskrit etc.

The further development of the Indonesian vocabulary should retain this simple structure as far as possible in the creation of new words or in the assimilation of words from the dialects, and from regional or foreign languages.

It seems that Van Ophuysen in his *Kitab Arti Logat Melayu* at the turn of the century, already realized the simplicity and regularity of the Indonesian word pattern, because in his word list only two and three syllabic words are included, with a few exceptions.

More simple is even the structure or pattern of the syllables of the Indonesian words. It has only four possibilities:

V in a-kan, su-a-ra, ba-u.

CV in ka-mi, me-ja, sa-ya.

VC in is-lam, mu-ak.

CVC in han-tam, hen-dak, pan-tang.

In sharp contrast to the Indo-European languages like Dutch, English and German, the Indonesian syllables do not show any consonant clusters. These four syllabic forms are further limited by the fact that mute e /ə/ cannot be used in open or closed end-syllables.

The acceptance of so many words from the dialects and regional languages through the rapid spread of the Indonesian language throughout Indonesia, and the acceptance of so many words from modern languages through the contact with modern culture, has during the last decades threatened to destroy the easy and simple Indonesian word- and syllabic structure. An avalanche of consonant clusters are introduced by these new loan words. From the Javanese language words such as *klana*, *kliru*, *prabot*, *trap*, *trampil*, *swara*, *swasa*, *kopyor*, are accepted in Indonesian. From Dutch and English: *blouse*, *crediet/credit*, *glas/glass*, *klas/class*, *proces/process*, *spiraal/spiral*, *stop* etc.

¹Sudarno, *Persoalan bunyi dan tatabunyi bahasa Indonesia serta usaha pembakuannya* (mimeographed).

Since the syllabic structures of Indonesian words are related to the phonemic change in the words through the addition of the prefix *me-*, the consonant clusters at the beginning of the words pose some problems, as is testified by the following examples: The prefix *me-* changes the phoneme *k* of the words *kirim*, *kejar*, into a kind of nasalisation *mengirim*, *mengejar*. The word *kritik* deriving from the Dutch *kritiek* or the English *critique*, when acquiring the prefix *me-* becomes *mengritik* / *mengkritik*. If the word, however, becomes first adjusted to the Indonesian word structure: *keritik*, the prefixation will follow regularly the Indonesian affixation pattern: *mengeritik*. Analogical to this the English word *stop*, adjusted to the Indonesian word structure becomes *se-top*. The nasalisation with the prefix *me-* should then be *menyetop*, analogical to *sebut*, which becomes *menyebut*. Since there are no mute *e*-s in the last syllables of the Indonesian words, Javanese words like *catet*, *sedep*, *mantep*, become *catat*, *sedap*, *mantap* in Indonesian. The same goes for the Dutch words *kamer*, *schoener*, which in Indonesian become *kamar*, *sekonar*. The mute *e* in open syllables also becomes *a* in Indonesian. Thus the Dutch words *acte*, *analyse*, becomes *akta*, *analisa*. If this structure is maintained in the new accepted and adjusted loan words, the Indonesian language will be able to maintain its simple word and syllabic structure throughout its total vocabulary. On the basis of these rules everybody can enrich the Indonesian language, irrespective of the origin of the new accepted words. Thus the English words *apple* (Dutch *appel*), *charter*, *palm*, *nationalism* (Dutch *nationalisme*) can easily be accepted in Indonesian as *apal*, *cartar*, *nasionalisma*, *palma*.

There still remain the new loan words, which consist of three and more syllables, like *gratifikasi*, *presiden*, *proklamasi*, *produksi*, *spekulasi*. If to the word *president* a mute *e* should be added between the *p* and the *r*, it would become a four syllabic word, which is exceptional in Indonesian. It might be advisable in such cases where the word would have four or more syllables, to ignore the syllabic forms of the Malay language, in order to avoid too long Indonesian words. Thus such words like *gratifikasi*, *presiden*, *proklamasi*, *produksi*, *spekulasi*, may retain their consonant clusters. Consonant clusters like *nt*, *nd* etc. at the end of words do not occur in Indonesian, so that the last consonant can easily be omitted.

8. STANDARDISATION OF VOCABULARY ON AN INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

The standardisation of the Indonesian vocabulary must even still further be pursued at international level. For words used to indicate measurements, such as *meter*, *gram* etc., chemical elements, and formula

etc., it is desirable for the Indonesian language to accept with as little change as possible the international words and symbols. Aside from these, however, there are still an abundance of words used by nearly all modern languages of the world, mostly deriving from Graeco-Latin. In becoming a modern language Indonesian will gradually accept more and more concepts of modern culture. If we know that the Indonesian language until this time has already coined or accepted more than 300,000 modern terms expressing modern international concepts, we will realize that it is moving faster and faster in the direction of the modern languages, leaving far behind the other not modernised Indonesian languages. Since the concept of science, technology and other aspects of modern culture are the same or nearly the same in all modern languages, it is of great advantage in learning modern languages and in the exchange of ideas, if the Indonesian language accepts words which are similar or nearly similar to those of other modern languages, such as atom, politik, radio, television, telephone, valuta etc., it is obvious that the acceptance of international words by the new languages is of the greatest advantage for the growing world community.

9. THE STANDARDISATION OF GRAMMAR

The standardisation of the rules of grammar of the modern Indonesian language must result in determining a normative grammar accepted by the language community. Such a grammar is first of all necessary for the use in schools, since it is primarily the school teacher who must have a standard of correct language usage, which he teaches to his students, and which gradually will be accepted by the whole community.

Perhaps it would have been possible to construct a grammar of the Indonesian language from the standpoint of this language only, to create new categories in order to arrive at a grammar best adapted to the structure and other characteristics of the language. Had this been done, the Indonesian grammar would only have been understandable within the framework of Indonesian or perhaps some other related languages.

Since the Indonesian language is supposed to be the medium of expression and communication in the modern world, it is advisable to write an Indonesian grammar which would describe the structure of the language with the use of - as many as can be considered proper - categories and terms of the grammar of modern languages like Dutch and English. In this way Indonesian grammar would not lose all contact with modern languages; on the contrary, a bridge could be erected between them, facilitating the learning of these languages by Indonesians, and vice versa. But since Indonesian had its own characteristics and categories, of course special attention had to be paid to them.

On various occasions I already indicated that modern linguistics as a whole pays very little attention to the writing of a normative grammar, which is understandable, since modern languages are already highly standardised.¹

The Indonesian language is one among about two hundred and fifty languages belonging to the same language group. The Malay language, as modern Indonesian was earlier called, is not even the largest and most important language in that group. As *lingua franca* of at least a thousand years in an area as large as the whole of Europe or the United States of America, its strength was in its adaptability, its lawlessness, i.e. everybody expressed himself in that language with a minimum of vocabulary and a minimum knowledge of its rules of grammar. Thus Malay became known as the easiest language in the world to learn.

It is clear that this ease, this lawlessness, which was a great advantage in the unsophisticated contacts between merchants and travellers in the bazaars and harbours, or between foreigners who happened to meet each other casually, would turn out to be of great disadvantage when the language became the national and official language of the country, the medium of instruction in schools, the language of law and official correspondence etc. Thus the problem of paramount importance was, how to change the rather pidgin-like *lingua franca* into a stable, sophisticated national and official modern language, which would become the vehicle of modern Indonesian thought and culture. Standardised prescriptive rules had to be determined for use in schools, by officials and the common people. A choice had to be made from among various existing rules, or new rules had to be created: Which of the various rules are better adjusted to the new task of the language as the bearer of new Indonesian thought and culture?

Besides the knowledge of the essential characteristics of the Malay language, knowledge of the general characteristics of related languages in the Indonesian area is also necessary for the writing of a normative grammar. Where ambiguity exists in the usage of the Malay language, general or predominant rules in other related languages could be of great help in teaching a decision on a uniform rule. In the case of Indonesian, it is the general or predominant rules of the Western part of the Malay-Polynesian language group that should be considered.

A knowledge of the characteristics of Malay and other languages of the western Malay-Polynesian languages does not, however, suffice for the creation of a normative grammar, since modern Indonesian has still

¹See my inaugural lecture delivered at the University of Malay: *Failure of Modern Linguistics in the Face of Linguistic Problems of the Twentieth Century*. Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaya, 1965.

another very important characteristic, expressed by the adjective 'modern'. Indonesian must be also a modern language, expressing modern thought and culture, comparable to English, French, German, etc.

10. WHAT IS MODERNISATION?

At this point I think I cannot escape the obligation to explain again succinctly my concept of modern thought or modern culture. My basic assumption is that cultural phenomena are uniquely related to human behaviour as a result of the special capacity of the human mind to evaluate his world (which includes himself), in contrast to animal behaviour which is based on drives and instincts. The human values resulting from this evaluating capacity can be discerned in the theoretical value aiming at the identification of things and processes in nature, the economic value aiming at their utilisation, the religious value aiming at the holy, the aesthetic value aiming at beauty, the power value aiming at power, and the solidarity value aiming at solidarity, i.e. love, friendship, etc.¹

All these values are represented in every culture. The difference among the various cultures throughout history is not that there are cultures without one or more of the six basic values, but that the patterns, the configurations of the six evaluational processes, and thus also of values, are different. On this basis we can divide cultures into two types, namely progressive cultures, in which the theoretical and economic evaluating capacities dominate, and expressive cultures, in which the religious and aesthetic evaluation capacities dominate.

Viewed from this standpoint, what we have called the modernisation process in the countries of Asia is nothing else than the change of the overall configuration of the evaluating process of these cultures from an expressive to a progressive culture. Thus the same progressive process which during the last four centuries changed the expressive culture of the Middle Ages in Europe into modern culture has now cast the expressive Asian culture into the throes of rapid social and cultural change, or even of revolution.

From this point of view the description of Riau Malay will not give us the vocabulary or the rules of grammar of modern Indonesian. We have to look for other criteria of modern Indonesian based on other research material.

¹For a further elaboration of this value theory in relation to cultural phenomena, see S. Takdir Alisjahbana, *Values as Integrating Forces in Personality, Society and Culture*. Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaya Press, 1966.

The problem then turns upon the question: who are the bearers of modern progressive Indonesian culture, and thus also of the modern Indonesian language? It is the written language of these people that may be used as the basis for determining the rules of a modern Indonesian grammar. Thus the first task is to make a list of individuals, who may be considered the best representatives of modern culture, and thus are the best users of the modern language.

Even this study of the language of a selected number of intellectuals or of the language of the press, parliament, radio, television and high schools, will not directly result in a structured set of rules, since even these intellectuals, as well as the press, the Parliament etc., are not using Indonesian language in a standardised way; compared to the great variations in local dialects, however, the differences in usage in this selected material are small and more manageable.

In the process of formulating rules of grammar from the analyzed material, the writer of a modern grammar still has to make various decisions, in order to be able to formulate clear rules that will form the structured frame-work of Indonesian. In various cases the rules of traditional Malay can be accepted without modification, for Indonesian is indeed a continuation of Malay. But since the language has continuously been under the influence of local languages and dialects as well as modern languages, like English and Dutch, the investigated material reveals differences in the use of affixes, syntax, as well as word formation and word usage. It is the responsibility of the grammarian to choose as best as he can from among varying, often contradictory, possibilities, in order to arrive at a balanced grammar, attuned to the requirements of modern thought and culture.

11. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF MODERN CULTURE

In reflecting on modern culture the following conclusions are relevant:

1. The modern world possesses a system of vocabulary on which modern thought and culture are based.
2. Compared to man in other epochs of history, modern man has various traits, which are more or less related to the characteristics of modern thought and culture. I wish to formulate these traits as follows:
 - a. He considers himself a center of activity. With his efforts he is able to change and use nature; he is even able to change his own destiny. This principle I would like to call the activity principle.
 - b. Modern thought is comparatively much more rational and abstract

than thought in any other culture in the past. This is not only a result of the importance of scientific, economic and technological thinking in the modern world, but it is also a part of the very essence of modern society, in which rational and abstract relationships in many respects have replaced the concrete, emotional face to face relations of man in earlier communities. A good example is the rationality and abstractness of modern codified law as compared with customary law in traditional societies. This I call the rational and abstract principle.

c. Related to the abstractness of modern society is also its *sachlichkeit*, its business acumen.

d. Another important characteristic of modern society is its egalitarianism, in contrast to feudalistic society with its clear-cut social hierarchy. This principle which I call the egalitarian principle, is especially relevant in Indonesia, where the most important language in the archipelago - namely Javanese - is built on the principle of a society with a sophisticated hierarchy. The child must use a second vocabulary when speaking with his parents, as must the common man when he addresses a person who is higher on the social scale.

3. Apart from these characteristics of modern thought and culture, the fact is very important that never before the unity of the world has been as great as in our epoch. The rise of new nations with their own languages will to some extent neutralize the advantages of modern means of communication and transportation, created by modern science and technology. Consequently we must explore the possibilities of a rapprochement between the modern languages in their spelling, their vocabulary, their syntax and their morphology. A study of the common features of languages might be very useful. It will only be to the advantage of the modern Indonesian language, if it has common elements - for instance in vocabulary, abbreviations etc. - with the most important modern languages of the world, without losing its own characteristics as an Indonesian language. This advantage is for example very clear in the names of the elements and the formulas of chemistry, in the standardisation of measurements and the like.

12. THE STANDARDISATION OF THE AFFIXES

Speaking about the standardisation of grammar in the Indonesian language, we are first of all concerned with the use of the affixes, since the use of the affix is the dominant characteristic of the Indonesian language as an agglutinating language.

In the standardisation of the use of the affixes, we face to a certain extent the same problems as in the standardisation of the

vocabulary. Every uniform use of an affix in certain functions may be considered a form of standardisation. However, in the context of language planning or language engineering the aim of standardisation must also include the attempt to arrive at the most simple pattern of their usage. Here again we must attempt to acquire the most consistent system of rules, with as few exceptions as possible. Learning the rules of declension in German, for example, becomes in the last analysis learning the manifold exceptions, the same as when learning the conjugation of the French verbs. In this connection a basic analysis of the various Indonesian prefixes is necessary.

Having made this statement we can take the next step in analysing the grammatical features of the Indonesian language. Since we are, to a certain extent, still in the beginning of language planning or language engineering, we must try to formulate some guidelines for maximum consistence and coherence of the grammar aiming at efficient expression and communication. In order to be able to get a survey of the forces and meanings of the Indonesian affixes, we have to find the basic meanings of the various affixes in Malay. It is clear that in the multitude of usage, even in the strict Malay speaking communities, we gradually discern the basic meaning and usage from the derivated usage or even from deviations. These deviations could be the result of foreign influences or misunderstandings. Where not so widespread and important in language practice, we could discard these deviations as dialectal forms or as sub-standard. There remain still the derivatives from the basic meanings and forms. To give an example: if we analyse the use of the Indonesian prefix *ber-*, it is very likely that its basic meaning is *to have*, e.g. *ber-uang*, *ber-baju* *to have money*, *to have clothes*. From the basic meaning *to have* it is easy to arrive at the derivative meaning *to use*, *to produce*, *to be in a situation expressed by the noun*, etc. In determining the rules for the basic meaning and the derivative meanings, a knowledge of the dialects and other regional Indonesian languages, belonging to the same group as the Malay language, is of great help, in order to make the rules more consistent and coherent.

It is clear that in the description and determination of the usage of a prefix as *ber-*, an attempt must be made to delineate its difference with the affixes nearest in meaning and form, in this case the prefix *me-*, especially since both form the predicate in the Indonesian language. It could be that the *ber-* and *me-* prefixes formerly were of the same origin, but in the course of history different tendencies were followed, so that at the time being the difference between the two prefixes is very clear. *Ber-* expresses more: *having* and *being in a situation*, while the prefix *me-* creates words which are nearer to the Indo-German

active transitive verbs. A comparison between a classical text like the *Hikayat Seri Rama* and a modern novel like *Layar Terkembang* shows the clear tendency in modern Indonesian to use more active predicate words with the prefix *me-* than with the prefix *ber-*, which functions more like an adjective. This tendency of the change of the predicate from the description of a situation to the description of an activity runs parallel with the social tendency of the individualisation and dynamisation of the individual subject in Indonesian culture today through the influence of modern culture. In this line of reasoning a guideline is found for the decision in alternatives, where two predicate words with different prefixes are used for nearly the same function and meaning, e.g. the form *bernyanyi* and *menyanyi* are used in Indonesia to express the same meaning: *to sing*. *Menyanyi* is used more and more, and is according to the line of reasoning about also preferable to *bernyanyi*.

13. THE PROBLEMS OF THE DERIVATION OF LOAN WORDS

One of the difficult grammatical problems faced in borrowing words from a foreign language is the question, in which grammatical form should foreign words be accepted: in the plural or the singular, as a verb, an adjective, a substantive, or some other form. In the beginning the situation was very confusing. For the word *element*, for example, two Arabic forms were used, namely *unsur* and *anasir*, one in the singular and the other in the plural form. Persons using the Arabic plural *anasir* often used the word again in the Indonesian plural by re-duplicating it: *anasir-anasir*.

The intellectual who can speak and write Dutch has the tendency to use Dutch words according to Dutch pronunciation and grammatical form. But once a word is used by the common people who do not know Dutch, a new development starts. Let me elucidate this with an example. After the liberation everybody spoke of *proklamasi kemerdekaan*, *the proclamation of independence*. But in the sentence: Indonesia proclaimed its independence on August 17, 1945, *proclaimed* is translated into Indonesian as *mem-proklamirkan*, because of the Dutch verb *proclameren*. It is clear that the acceptance of a word both as a verb and a noun will make the Indonesian language needlessly complicated and difficult. The transition from *proklamir* to *proklamasi* will not be understandable in the Indonesian grammar, or the grammar must introduce new affixes. It should be enough to incorporate in the Indonesian language one of the two forms and treat it further in accordance with the rules of Indonesian morphology. Thus it is possible to accept the noun *proklamasi*

from Dutch *proclamatie*. But if *proklamasi* is to be used as a verb according to the rules of the Indonesian language, the form *to proclaim* should be *mem-proklamasi-kan*. It is of course also possible to adapt the verb *proklamir*; the Indonesian noun derived from it should then be *proklamir-an*. It is, however, more or less accepted that for the adaptation of a European word into Indonesian the substantive form should be preferred.

More difficult is the problem of the adaptation of a group of European words deriving from the same stem, but through affixation representing a great variety of forms and meanings, such as *ratio*, *rational*, *rationality*, *to rationalise*, *rationalisation* and *rationalism*. At present the word *rasio* is accepted as an Indonesian word. The same is true of *rasionalisasi* (from the Dutch: *rationalisatie*); the word *rationalism* can be translated as *serbarasio* or adapted as *rasionalisma*, *to rationalise* is now *merasionalisasi*. For *rational* the common usage is *rasional* (Dutch *rationeel*), because of the influence of the Dutch pronunciation. Should *rasio*, *rasionalisasi* and *rasional* be accepted as separate, isolated words, or should new suffixes be introduced in the Indonesian grammar borrowed from Graeco-Latin or modern languages, in order that the relationship between these three words becomes understandable in Indonesian? The latter will have many consequences, and would only be advisable if this introduction of new suffixes really has a chance to be less complicated. I am of the opinion that a more satisfactory system will be achieved by attempting to withdraw from Indonesian the form *rasional* or *rasional* through replacing it by an Indonesian prefixation *berasio*, meaning *having ratio*. The word *rasional* or *rasional* is already so popular, that at the moment there is little chance that *berasio* will be able to take its place soon.

14. ABSTRACT CONCEPTS

Another guideline is also needed in the expression of abstract concepts in Indonesian. Compared with the old Malay language, modern Indonesian uses much more abstract concepts like *kebangsaan nationality*, *kebenaran truth*, *kebanggaan pride*, etc. which arise clearly under the influence of modern thought, which is more abstract than the old Indonesian way of thinking. The modern Indonesian language expresses this abstract concept with the use of the prefix *ke-* in combination with the suffix *-an*. There was a time that the translation *Minumlah obat untuk kesehatanmu* for the Dutch sentence *Neem medicijn voor je gezondheid take medicine for your health* was not acceptable, because it was considered a too literal translation from the Dutch language.

According to traditional Malay rules and thoughts the Indonesian sentence should be *Minumlah obat supaya engkau menjadi sehat* *Take medicine in order that you become healthy*. The decision for the standardisation of modern Indonesian should accept this new grammatical form expressing new abstract concepts and logic of modern thought.

The breakthrough of abstract modern thought in the Indonesian language is clearly expressed in the decrease of classificatory numerals like *buah* for round things, *batang* for elongated things, *ekor* for animals, etc. Where the correct usage of numerals in the Malay language indicate the number of things and animals by classificatory numerals, such as *sebuah telur* *one (fruit) egg*, *sebatang rokok* *one (stem) cigaret*, *dua ekor anjing* *two (tail) dog*, in modern Indonesia these classificatory numerals are less and less used. The numerals themselves are already considered sufficient like in English: *an* or *one egg*, *a* or *one cigaret*, *two dogs*, which are in the Indonesian language now very often translated by *satu telur*, *satu rokok*, *dua anjing*. It is in the context of abstract modern thinking, that we can accept this new grammatical form of the numerals.

The crisis in the use of pronouns reflects the change of social relationship. The old pre-Hindu native Indonesian languages know a great variety of pronouns, especially of the second and third person, expressing the dominant position of the family relationship of its social structure. People of the same age or of the same family line as mother and father, are also called *ibu* *mother* and *bapak* *father*, while people of the same generation are called *kakak* if they are older, or *adik* if they are younger.

During the Hindu epoch of Indonesian history the hierarchical system of feudalism expressed itself in a system of pronouns differentiated according to the hierarchy of status and age of the speaker, the addressed or the third person. The lower in status or in age has to use the more modest and refined pronouns, in addressing an older person or one of higher status. This fact is for example clearly discernible in the Javanese language, where the other words are also classified according to low, middle and higher language forms. Even until now the usage of pronouns is still not yet sufficiently standardized. For the first person singular the word *saya* is more and more used, for the plural *kami* and *kita*, the first excluding the addressed, the second including the addressed. The word *aku* is used in more intimate relations. For the second person singular *kamu* and *engkau* is used, comparable to *tu* in French and *Du* in German, further *tuan* *gentleman*, *nyonya* *mrs.*, *nona* *miss*; while in the plural *sekalian* is added. The national movement in this century has made popular the democratic word *saudara*

brother, but after Independence *bapak* *father* and *ibu* *mother* are used more and more in addressing older persons or persons of a higher status. More in the line of a clear-cut democratic attitude is the word *anda*, which has been coined a decade ago. Gradually this word has dominated the sphere of advertisement, announcements and other abstract relationships with the public. During the last year it also started to be used by radio and television, and sometimes in official correspondence. It is very likely that the word *anda* will be the future standardised form of the Indonesian second person, comparable to the English *you*. The third person is more standardised in the form *dia* (singular) and *mereka* (plural). Sometimes *beliau* is used, to express respect for an older person or a person of higher status.

15. THE CHANGE IN THE SYNTAX

As a consequence of the absence of declension and conjugation Indonesian syntax is dominated by word order and accentuation of the words in the sentence. The rule of Indonesian word order is that the following word determines the previous one. In conformity with this rule the predicate comes after the subject, the adjective after the substantive.¹

Even in a compound the second element determines the first. In the meaning of a sentence the word order can be changed by the accentuation of the sentence. In this case inversion can also take place. In the determination of the new standardised word order, the problem is, to what extent the influence of the more dynamic European languages can be accepted in the rather rigid system of Malay word order. Dutch which had a strong influence on the educated younger generation, shows more freedom in the placing of the adverb or adverbial phrase than does Indonesian. The sudden increase of the use of Indonesian by Dutch educated intellectuals tends to make the Indonesian sentences more variegated and flexible in their word order.

16. THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE UNIFICATION AND STANDARDISATION OF THE INDONESIAN AND MALAYSIAN LANGUAGE

It is to the advantage of the Indonesian and Malaysian language as modern languages, if a standardisation of spelling, grammar and vocabulary could be achieved as soon as possible alongside with a co-operation in the provision of books, encyclopaedias and other necessities. A

¹There are several exceptions to this rule such as the place of numeral adjectives before substantives, etc.

common language institution will surely work to the advantage of both participating countries.

The efforts at a common spelling dated already from the 17th of April 1959, when Malaya or the Persekutuan Tanah Melayu came to an agreement with the Republic of Indonesia.

In December of the same year, a discussion took place between the Malaysian and the Indonesian Committee for a common spelling in the Latin script, called the Melindo spelling. This spelling should at the latest be announced in January 1962, but political difficulties between both countries in the following years prevented the realisation of the Melindo spelling. After the end of the political confrontation between both countries, the Committees of both countries came to a new agreement on the common spelling, which should have been proclaimed in Indonesia during its fourtieth celebration of the Pledge of the Indonesian Youth on October 28, 1968. The resistance, however, of public opinion against this common spelling was so strong that this new concept was again cancelled.

At last after various deliberations in a better political atmosphere the new common spelling was announced at the Indonesian Independence Anniversary by the President of Indonesia on August 17, 1972, while an announcement by the Malaysian government also took place on the same date.

It is clear that after the proclamation of the same spelling for the Indonesian and Malaysian language, the most urgent problem is the co-ordination or unification of modern terminology and grammar for both languages.

It is encouraging to see that the newly published Malaysian dictionary, the *Kamus Dewan* by Dr. Teuku Iskandar in Kuala Lumpur has included all Indonesian words of the Indonesian dictionaries *Kamus Umum Bahasa Indonesia* by W.J.S. Poerwadarminta and the *Kamus Moderen Bahasa Indonesia* by St. Moh. Zain, so that it is now the most complete dictionary of the Indonesian-Malaysian language.

I have especially put the co-ordination and standardisation of the Indonesian and Malaysian language as an important issue of the Indonesian language, since I am convinced that the importance of a language, to a great extent, depends on the number of users of that language. A language with a greater number of users has greater potentialities for development and progress than a smaller one. With the Malaysian language and the Malay language of Singapore and Brunei, the Indonesian/Malaysian language will be the sixth largest language in the world, used by about 140,000,000 people. If we remember, that the same language is also spoken in the southern part of Thailand and even in some

parts of the Philippines, its position is even stronger.

The UNESCO project for the study of Malay culture, which is supported not only by Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines, but also by Singapore, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam, even Madagascar, will undoubtedly give to the Indonesian/Malaysian language a chance to play in the future an even more important role in the whole of South-East Asia. The Indonesian/Malaysian language is the most important language of the Malay-Polynesian group which has the opportunity to become a large, mature language in the modern world. In this connection I should like to mention that in Australia the Indonesian language is already available for students at high schools and in some places even at primary schools.

It is to be hoped that the Indonesian government will take the initiative and also the leadership in the co-ordination and standardisation of the Indonesian and Malaysian language in the advantage of both countries and the whole of South-East Asia.¹

¹For a survey of the problems of language planning or language engineering in connection with the modernisation and standardisation of the Indonesian language, see my book: *Language Planning for Modernisation: The Case of Indonesian and Malaysian*, which will be published by Mouton Publishers, The Hague, Netherlands, for its series: *Contributions to the Sociology of Language*, under editorship of Prof. Joshua A. Fishman.