PRONOUNS, POLITENESS AND HIERARCHY IN MALAY

RICHARD MCGINN

1. INTRODUCTION[1]

All Indonesian languages seem to display some mechanism for the linguistic expression of what Brown and Gilman (1960) call "the power semantic" (see Appendix). In the simplest case, a second person singular pronoun is exchanged asymmetrically for a special honorific pronoun (which may double as the plural form). The meaning of the two pronouns, over and above their reference, has roughly the force of Latin *tū* and *vōs*. As has become standard in the literature, I shall refer to these meanings as T and V. A well-attested case is Toba Batak, spoken in North Sumatra. In this language the asymmetrical exchange of *ho* 'intimate' and *hamu* 'honorific' expresses the power semantic independently of the rest of the linguistic and social context. Available choices generate the following relationships.

(1)   Toba Batak power/solidarity semantic

ho	+	*ho*	=	T+T	=	social equality/intimacy
hamu	+	*hamu*	=	V+V	=	social equality/mutual politeness
ho	+	*hamu*	=	V+T	=	inequality/power

To be sure, numerous overtones accompany the use of pronouns in T/V languages like Toba Batak and the European examples discussed by Brown and Gilman: gestures, tone of voice, willingness to obey – and a host of supplementary linguistic forms like vocatives, titles, kin terms, names. These may add to or subtract from the status accorded an addressee by pronoun-choice. But supplementary messages can be avoided; the pronouns are often compulsory.

Another mechanism for conferring status on an addressee is the well-known case of the Javanese speech-levels (Geertz 1960). According to Errington (1986) the speech-levels can profitably be analysed and understood in terms of Brown and Gilman's power/solidarity semantics. Errington argues convincingly that the following are implied by choice of speech level in Javanese.

(2)   *ngoko*   +   *ngoko*   =   T+T
      krama   +   *krama*   =   V+V
      ngoko   +   *krama*   =   T+V

---

[1] I wish to thank Zainab Bakir, Director of the Research Institute, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, for much valuable assistance. Also to be thanked are Ellen Rafferty and Tish Bautista for extremely helpful criticisms of an earlier draft. All errors of fact and interpretation remain mine alone.

This paper will describe a third type of power/solidarity semantic found in Indonesia, that of Standard Malay.[2] A brief overview of available second person address-forms is provided by four example sentences below. These data are taken from a comic book and the December 1989 issue of *Bobo,* a magazine for children published in Jakarta. They illustrate three high-frequency dyads, namely, adult-adult, mother-child and father-child. (In the examples all second person references will be presented in capital letters.)

In the first example, an adult comic-book character (who happens to be a duck) speaks to a Police Inspector (a dog) who has burst in saying "May we come in?" The answer:

(3)   *ANDA sudah   di dalam.*
       YOU   already in(side)
       YOU are already in.   *Menjadi Sinterklas* AWD.424:32

In the next example, a mother speaks to her seven-year-old daughter:

(4)   *KAU tidak ada   pekerjaan rumah?*
       YOU   not   have   work-home
       Don't YOU have homework?   *Bobo* 37.XVII:7

In the third example, a father addresses his daughter:

(5)   *IRA pasti malu   memakai jas hujan ini.*
       IRA is   ashamed wear   coat-rain this
       YOU are embarrassed to wear this raincoat.   *Bobo* 36.XVII:33

In the fourth example, the daughter responds to (5):

(6)   *Berkat jas hujan AYAH,   Ira[3] tidak terlambat.*
       Thanks coat-rain FATHER Ira not   late
       Thanks to YOUR raincoat, I was not late.   *Bobo* 36.XVII:33

The problem is to account for the fact that the analogue of English 'you (singular)' is expressed in four ways in the four examples: in (3) the pronoun *ANDA* occurs; in (4) the pronoun *KAU* is used; in (5) the name *IRA* appears; and in (6) the kin term *AYAH* occurs. As the paper will demonstrate, the structure underlying these choices is quite complex and determined by a suitable generalisation of Brown and Gilman's rules. For example, the exchange of a name in (5) for a kin term in (6) will be accounted for in terms of a presumed asymmetrical exchange of T and V between father and daughter, both of whom speak in a speech-'mode' distinguished by the total avoidance of first and second person pronouns. In contrast, the choices of *ANDA* and *KAU* in (3) and (4) represent a second class of asymmetrical exchange wherein T and V are expressed by selection of an appropriate pronoun (*KAU* or *ANDA*).

The obligation to choose between T and V is the distinguishing feature of T/V languages. The data of examples (3)-(6) seem to support the idea that Malay is a special kind of T/V language. This claim constitutes my working hypothesis. Nevertheless, Malay obviously differs from 'classic' T/V languages because it has the ability to confer relative status on an addressee by means other than

---

[2]'Standard Malay' is an idealisation I will use throughout the paper to refer to common structural features shared by the national languages of Indonesia and Malaysia. However, the actual data I will cite is restricted to written sources originating in Indonesia.

[3]Ira uses a pronoun-substitute as first-person reference instead of the pronoun *saya*. This feature is explained later in the paper.

pronouns. In fact, the device of using kin terms and names as second person address forms means it has (virtually) an open class of distinctions at its disposal.

An obvious implication of the hypothesis may be derived from Brown and Gilman's rules. T/V languages seem indicative of ideology; in particular, they are linked to 'stratified' societies. Does the implication apply in the case of Malay? Much recent literature suggests that Malay would be considered an exception to this generalisation. For example, Malay is often characterised as 'flat' and relatively egalitarian compared to languages like Toba Batak and Javanese. The supposed 'relative stylistic simplicity' of Standard Malay is praised as a special political and social advantage.[4] Colourlessness is what is sought; a national language **ought** to be egalitarian and offer relief from the pressures of linguistic etiquette imposed by the 'native' languages. This theme has been sounded recently by Lowenberg (1990:112), who quotes B. Anderson (1966) concerning the political role played by Malay in the early part of this century:

> It [Malay] was a language simple and flexible enough to be rapidly developed into a modern political language...This was possible because Malay had ipso facto an almost statusless character, like Esperanto, and was tied to no particular regional social structure. It had thus a free, almost 'democratic' character from the outset...(Anderson 1966:104)

Claims like this are common enough in the literature, but they are restricted to broad summaries and are not backed up by analysis. In contrast, analytical studies of Malay which might be offered as evidence for or against such claims do not pay attention to broader implications. As far as I know, there are no analytical studies of Malay that have claimed that the language is particularly simple, nor indeed statusless and free of ties to social structure. So there is a discrepancy between what one is led to believe about the language by reading a typical summary statement about the status of Malay on the one hand, and a typical analysis of Malay structure on the other.

This paper will attempt to bridge the gap by arguing that broad, often-quoted claims like the above reflect an 'outsider's view' of Malay that rests on a very insecure foundation. It is a view that seems to have developed in the minds of foreign scholars and other second-language users of Malay (including Indonesians) who for one reason or another have felt obliged to give reasons why Malay has proven to be such a felicitous choice to serve as the basis of the national languages of Indonesia and Malaysia. The purpose of this paper is to do a small bit of analysis and then to point out why the analysis (and by implication **any** serious analysis of the language) fails to support the standard view.

An interesting case in point concerns the recent introduction of the second person pronoun *anda* in both Indonesia and Malaysia. According to Kridalaksana (1974:20, n.5), *anda* 'you (singular)' was coined by governmental language-planners in 1957 to eliminate "the chaotic, undemocratic and inefficient" Indonesian pronominal system. Kridalaksana remarks that whereas *anda* "has become widespread and has certainly enriched the vocabulary, it is hard to say that it has made the Indonesian system more 'democratic' than it was".[5]

This paper will describe the 'undemocratic' pronominal system of Standard Malay as anything but chaotic and inefficient. The paper will argue that (a) Malay displays a richer power semantic than

---

[4]Errington (1986:335) notes that Malay's perceived simplicity made it 'a congenial choice of the nationalist movement' in Indonesia.

[5]Kridalaksana (1974) cites the 1957-58 volumes of the journal *Bahasa dan Budaja* for discussion of this subject. See also Prentice (1987:930), who states that *anda* has only added to the complexity of the Indonesian pronoun system.

classic T/V languages like Latin and Toba Batak, and that (b) the structure of the power semantic in Malay probably is similar – and may even be identical – to that of Javanese.[6]

To anticipate briefly, I will look at some evidence suggesting that second person address forms in contemporary Standard Malay are heavily power-laden in the sense of Brown and Gilman's rules. I then try to draw some sociolinguistic implications. In particular, the facts seem to refute the claim that Malay is 'democratic' and 'free of ties to social structure'. Furthermore, I will argue that the presence or absence of supposedly undesirable linguistic features may not directly bear on the issue of a language's political role. What counts in the political domain is not linguistic structure but history – the weight of years and the numbers of second-language users.

I wish to avoid the impression that the argument will proceed from an a priori premise. I believe specific evidence can be adduced that leads to the conclusion I aim to draw, namely, that obligatory linguistic features that carry implications of social hierarchy are compatible with the language's wider political and social role.

Among the things I shall take for granted in this paper are the following three: (a) there are native speakers of Standard Malay; (b) Malay speakers are comfortable using formal and informal styles; and (c) the public domain abounds with examples of Standard Malay in written form – newspapers, television, magazines, books (including comic books). In the public domain, Standard Malay is called Bahasa Indonesia (in Indonesia) and Bahasa Malaysia (in Malaysia).

Before concluding this introductory section, it is perhaps useful to make explicit an assumption about the notion 'honorific pronoun' or 'pronoun used to give V' that will be used in the paper. I assume that the following two formal features define an honorific pronoun. First, to be considered an honorific pronoun the form must refer unambiguously to second person *singular*, and be distinct from at least another second person singular pronoun that is used non-honorifically. These two criteria exclude 'you (singular)' in English, and they also exclude Malay *kamu*, which does not contrast with *kau* in this way.[7]

The criteria also exclude forms such as *IRA* and *AYAH* used as 'pronoun-substitutes' in examples (5) and (6). This term is adopted from Dardjowidjojo (1978), who used it in relation to Javanese. Pronoun-substitutes are used in Malay (as well as Javanese) as second person address forms. I will argue that *IRA* and *AYAH* in examples (5)-(6) are pronoun-substitutes that effectuate asymmetrical exchange of T and V between different-status individuals. By the above criteria, pronoun-substitutes are not simply a class of pronouns since there is inherent lexical content. The evidence for this claim is that pronoun-substitutes are systematically ambiguous whenever they occur: the actual reference (either third person or second person) must be inferred from context by the listener.[8]

The two formal features combine with a single pragmatic feature as well. That is, to be considered honorific, a pronoun must actually be used honorifically. The pragmatic feature rules out many dialect forms as honorifics. For example, Ujan Mas Malay (South Sumatra), and Bengkulu Malay

---

[6]This implies that the Javanese power semantic is distinguished by the fact that 'power words' beyond address forms are elaborated in the lexicon (Errington 1986).

[7]Historically it apparently did (Prentice 1987). Interestingly, there exist Malay dialects in South Sumatra that still use *kamu* honorifically. See Appendix.

[8]The criteria do not support characterisations like the following: "Indonesian is one of the few languages in the world in which pronouns are an open class with an infinite membership" (Prentice 1987:931). Rather, it is the pronoun-substitute class that is 'open' in the sense that it includes all names and kin terms.

(Bengkulu) distinguish second person masculine and feminine pronouns in the singular, and display a second person plural pronoun used for both sexes, but none of these forms are used honorifically. Rather, to confer status upon an addressee, these dialects utilise pronoun-substitutes exactly like Standard Malay. (See Appendix.)

The data for the first part of the paper have been limited to texts written specifically for Indonesian children. Later in the paper I will attempt to relate these data to some recent studies of spoken Bahasa Indonesia. Children's magazines and comic books offer an accessible, and reasonably rich, sampling of data on second person pronoun usage and avoidance. The data were taken from two series, both published in Jakarta: (a) the November and December, 1989, issues of *Bobo,* a children's magazine, and (b) five Walt Disney comic books translated into Indonesian from English, purchased in 1989. The sources are rather impoverished culturally speaking (a fact that will be emphasised when gaps in the data are discussed). For this very reason, I believe the data represent with special clarity the structure of the power semantic.[9]   Even in the most culturally bleached of children's stories, systematic and obligatory linguistic expressions of the power semantic are found on every page.

2. THE STRUCTURE OF THE POWER SEMANTIC IN WRITTEN STANDARD MALAY

In the sources I examined, the asymmetrical exchange of T and V takes place in two distinct 'modes' that I shall call Distal Mode and Familial Mode. In Distal Mode, T and V are exchanged by pronouns, as in examples (3) and (4); in Familial Mode, T and V are exchanged by names and kin terms used as pronoun-substitutes,[10] as in examples (5) and (6). The term Distal is meant to imply 'relative social distance', which is the interpretation assigned to the V pronoun *ANDA* in this system; the T pronouns *KAU* and *KAMU* are accordingly interpreted as expressing 'social proximity' or 'intimacy'. In the Familial Mode one avoids second person pronouns and uses pronoun-substitutes in their place. To express V in the Familial Mode, an appropriate kin term is given as address-form; to express T in the Familial Mode, the addressee's name or nickname is given.

The pronoun-substitiutes form a special category of nominals described by Dardjowidjojo (1978). Pronoun-substitutes are used in argument positions (subject, object, genitive) and refer to an addressee. In this paper I shall be concerned **only** with argument positions. (For an interesting study of names and titles used vocatively in Bahasa Indonesia, see Jenson 1988.)

---

[9]The content (as distinct from the language) of some of the data is devoid of references to Indonesian culture. The Disney comics, in particular, feature talking animals in settings that are either ambivalent or obviously Western. Even children's magazines like *Bobo,* although often depicting human kids in what look to me like typical Indonesian cultural situations, sometimes feature stories with decidedly 'international' themes. For example, the December 1989 issue of *Bobo* features one translated story from Holland and one comic section featuring the 'Snow Queen'.

[10]In the seven sources I examined, only the following pronoun-substitutes actually occurred. (See Kridalaksana 1974 for a more complete listing of pronoun-substitutes in common use in spoken Bahasa Indonesia.)

1st and 2nd Person Pronoun-Substitutes

Familial T (fT):   Ira
                    Fia
                    ...   (i.e. all children's names)

Familial V (fV):

Ayah	'father'	(used to refer to one's biological father)
Bapak	'father'	(general term of respect for males)
Ibu	'mother'	(used for biological mother or as general term of respect for females)
Paman	'uncle'	

The simple fact that T and V can be given in either of two modes generates a startling number of possibilities for expressing power relationships – namely ten. The dyad-types – or possible power relationships – fall into three sets as displayed in Table 1.

TABLE 1: MALAY POWER/SOLIDARITY SEMANTIC

(A) Distal Speech Mode   Example

I	T pronoun + T pronoun	=	dT+dT	*KAU + KAU*
II	V pronoun + V pronoun	=	dV+dV	*ANDA + ANDA*
III	V pronoun + T pronoun	=	dV+dT	*ANDA + KAU*

(B) Familial Speech Mode

IV*	name + name	=	fT+fT	*IRA + ALI*
V	kin term + kin term	=	fV+fV	*IBU + BAPAK*
VI	kin term + name	=	fV+fT	*IBU + IRA*

(C) Mixed-Mode Dialogue

VII*	T pronoun + V name	=	dT + fT	*KAU + NAME*
VIII*	V pronoun + V name	=	dV + fT	*ANDA + NAME*
IX	T pronoun + V kin term	=	dT + fV	*KAU + IBU*
X*	V pronoun + V kin term	=	dV + fV	*ANDA + IBU*

(Dyad-types for which no data were found in the sources are marked with an asterisk (*) and discussed in the next sub-section of the paper.)

The ten power relationships defined in Table 1 constitute the minimum structure needed to account for the four second person address forms in examples (3)-(6) above. The remainder of this section will be devoted to justifying this claim.

The pivotal opposition, the one that expresses the maximum asymmetry, is 'Familial V' (fV) and 'Distal T' (dT). This power relationship is represented as IX in Table 1. It is doubly asymmetrical because the superior partner expresses closeness with the T pronoun *KAU* 'YOU' in exchange for Familial V (e.g. kin term *IBU* 'MOTHER'). This relationship has been observed to exist in all mother-child dyads I found in the data. I shall return to this point later in the paper.

First let us examine the dyads that brought out **pronoun** choices from both participants (see Table 1 (A) – 'Distal Mode').

(A) T and V in Distal Mode: dT and dV

A total of six second person pronouns occur with high frequency in the data. One is the newly-coined *ANDA*, which occurs systematically in the comics in both symmetric and asymmetric dyad-types. *ANDA* is exchanged symmetrically by adult animal characters who are not well acquainted. Recall example (3) above. An adult character had discovered a police inspector in his house; the police had just burst in saying *Boleh kami masuk?* ('May we come in?') This question is answered by (3) (*ANDA sudah di dalam* 'YOU are already in').

ANDA (dV) also occurs in asymmetrical exchanges between adults in exchange for *KAU* and *KAMU*. An extended example occurs in the Disney comic AWD.422:8-16 titled *Ayam Bertelur Emas*. The story features Uncle Scrooge in the role of a foreigner speaking with another older man in

the role of native, or host, in a land Scrooge is visiting. Scrooge gives *ANDA* (dV) and receives *(ENG)KA<-M>U* (dT) throughout this story.

In the comics *ANDA* (dV) contrasts with a number of Distal Mode T pronouns (dT), which imply closeness or intimacy. The dT pronouns are *KAU, ENGKAU, KAMU*, the post-clitic *-MU* (all singular) and *KALIAN* in the plural. This set of five pronouns is exchanged symmetrically in child-child dyads and also in adult-adult dyads; and is given asymmetrically by adults to children in exchange for fV. The use of *-MU* is limited to post-nominal and post-verbal positions. I shall not attempt the formidable task of describing and differentiating these T pronouns beyond singular and plural. For my purpose, it is sufficient to observe the general fact that as a set they are **invariably** given to children in the comics. For this reason I have assumed that these pronouns represent the 'lowest' power word in the hierarchy. For convenience, I shall follow E. Anderson (1983) in treating all five pronouns as equivalent. I shall henceforth represent them all by the admittedly awkward formula *(ENG)KA<- M>U*.

In the first example *(ENG)KA<-M>U* is used by a child to address his pet.

(7) Child:

> *Oh, KAMU   tetap mau ikut main?*
> Oh, YOU-dT still   want to   play?
> Oh, YOU-dT still want to play?   *Bobo* 36:XVII.17

The following symmetrical exchange of dT occurs between a rabbit and an elephant.

(8) Rabbit:

> *Aku akan segera memanggil kawan-kawan-ku untuk menolong-MU.*
> I   will   soon   call   friend-s   my   to help   YOU
> I will call my friends to help YOU-dT.

(9) Elephant:

> *KAU telah menyelamatkan diri-ku.*
> YOU have   save   self-my
> YOU-dT have saved me.   *Bobo* 36:XVII.5

Adult animals in the comics 'think aloud' to themselves and converse with other animal characters in the same Distal Mode. Consider the following dialogue from a Walt Disney comic.

(10) Donald Duck (telling a lie to Daisy Duck):

> *Sayang, saya* [11]   *harus membuat-nya   kecewa! Karena sore*
> too bad   I   must   make-him   disappointed because afternoon
>
> *ini   harus mengantarkan KAMU ke tempat puisi!*
> this   must accompany   YOU   to place poetry
> Too bad I'll have to disappoint him. Because (I) have to take YOU-dT to the poetry reading this afternoon.

(11) Daisy Duck's response to Donald:

> *Yah, tidak apa-apa,   Donal! Lebih penting kalau KAMU*
> Oh   it   doesn't matter Donald more important that YOU-dT

---

[11] *Saya* occurred only once in the five comics I examined, *aku* being much the preferred form.

menengok mantan guru-*MU*   *itu.*
visit   former   teacher-YOUR-dT the
Oh, it doesn't matter, Donald. It's more important that YOU visit YOUR former teacher.

<div align="right">*Polisi Gunung* AWD 406.31</div>

To summarise second person pronoun usage, in the comics *(ENG)KA<-M>U* is always exchanged symmetrically between low-status individuals such as same-age children. *(ENG)KA<-M>U* is also exchanged symmetrically by same-age adults who seem to be friends. In contrast, *ANDA* is exchanged symmetrically between adults who are not acquainted (e.g. policemen, store clerks and the like); and finally *ANDA* may be exchanged asymmetrically for *(ENG)KA<-M>U* between adults of clearly different generations. In such cases, *ANDA* is always given by the younger adult in exchange for *(ENG)KA<-M>U* from the elder.

(B) T and V in the Familial Mode: fT and fV

In this sub-section, the pattern displayed in Table 1 (B) – the giving of T and V in the Familial Mode – will be illustrated. Familial dialogue occurs when second person pronouns are avoided by both participants, who employ pronoun-substitutes in their place. Several examples of two-way Familial Mode dialogues were found in *Bobo;* interestingly, none occurred in the five translated Disney comics I examined.[12]

A secondary diagnostic of the Familial Mode is replacement of *aku*[13] either by *saya* 'I' or the speaker's name.[14] Another diagnostic – and the one I am most interested in here – is the avoidance of second person pronouns. The third and final diagnostic is the selection of pronoun-substitutes in grammatical environments where second person pronouns would be expected to appear in the Distal Mode.

---

[12]I can think of no reason for this and would expect to find some examples of two-way, Familial Mode dialogues if more comics were searched.

[13]It seems reasonable to suggest that aspects of the Distal Mode could be characterised as 'private-language', i.e. the language Malay speakers use when thinking to themselves. This characterisation would account for the fact that Malay speakers generally report using *aku* (never *saya*) when thinking privately to themselves.

Not unexpectedly, people tend to 'think' in their native dialect. In the South, this means quite a different variety of Malay than the one that appears in the comics. But many Sumatrans from the northern provinces reported to me that they think in Standard Malay, and in a style that closely resembles the comic book style.

For what they are worth, the following anecdotes reveal some of the problems involved in any attempt to elicit 'private language' data from informants.

While travelling through Sumatra and Malaysia in November and December, 1989, I asked people from different dialect areas how they address themselves when they commit an obvious blunder. To elicit this information, I offered that in English, when angry at myself I usually address myself as 'you' or sometimes 'I' and say something like: "You idiot!' or 'I must be nuts!'

Based on scattered informants' responses to this informal inquiry, I discovered that Malays do not address themselves with a second person pronoun equivalent to my 'You ____!'; instead, they all reported using only a first person reference. Furthermore, all reported that the only pronoun possible for them in this kind of 'private' language is *aku* 'I' (never the Standard Malay pronoun *saya*). A typical response was: *Alangkah bodohnya aku ini!* ('How stupid I am!'). Significantly, there was agreement on the choice of *aku* over *saya* in this context. Thus, it appears that *aku* may be one diagnostic for private-language pronoun, whereas *saya* is indicative of 'social discourse'. See fn. 8..

The only clear case of a second person pronoun being used in 'private language' involved prayers addressed to the Deity. Nearly all of my informants reported using *Engkau* for this purpose.

[14]See fn. 3.

Theoretically, two-way Familial Mode dialogues may be symmetrical (T+T or V+V) or asymmetrical (T+V). However, the sources I examined produced no examples of T+T in the Familial Mode (NAME + NAME), but there were several examples of V+V and T+V.

An example of a symmetrical Familial Mode dialogue (V+V) is the following. In the story, a middle-aged woman is being drawn into a get-rich-quick scheme. When the con man arrives at the door the woman greets him politely:

(12) Adult woman to man at door (fV):

Ee ... Pak Jonto. Mari, Pak, silakan duduk di dalam.
Ee ... Mr Jonto come sir   please sit   in(side)
Ee...Mr Jonto. Come in, Sir, please sit down inside.

(13) Man at the door (fV):

Tak usah repot-repot, Bu.   Saya nanti akan ke sini sekitar jam 6.
no   need trouble   Ma'am I   later will to here around o'clock 6
No need to bother, Ma'am. I will be back here later at about 6 o'clock.

(14) Woman's response (fV):

Baiklah, saya tunggu kedatangan BAPAK.
fine   I   wait   arrival   YOUR
Fine, I will wait for YOUR-fV arrival.   *Bobo* 37.XVII:33

In this dialogue, the woman and man exchange V in the Familial Mode (fV + fV). As an indication of this, both use the first person pronoun *saya;* the vocative positions are filled by honorific words *Bu* and *Pak*.[15] Most importantly for the purposes of this paper, in example (14) the woman uses the second person pronoun-substitute *BAPAK* 'father' in genitive position.

Asymmetrical (fT + fV) exchanges may also occur entirely within the Familial Mode. This type of dyad was illustrated in example (5) and (6) above. Another example features the same father-daughter dyad. The daughter is named Ira. Judging from the illustrations, Ira is about seven years old. When speaking to her father, Ira gives fV and receives fT. An added twist is that both participants avoid the first person pronoun *(saya)* as well as second person pronouns. In other words, all references to either addressee are made with pronoun-substitutes.

(In the following examples, first person references will be underlined and second person references appear in capital letters as before.)

(15) Daughter to father (fV):

<u>*Ira*</u> *tidak mau pergi ke sekolah.*
Ira not   want go   to school
I don't want to go to school.

(16) Father to daughter (fT):

<u>*Ayah*</u> *mengerti. IRA pasti malu   memakai jas hujan ini.*
<u>father</u> understand IRA is   ashamed wear   coat-rain this
I understand. YOU-fT are embarrassed to wear this raincoat.

That evening Father asks Ira if she got to school all right and Ira responds as follows.

---

[15] See Jensen (1988) for discussion of vocatives in Bahasa Indonesia.

(17) Daughter to father (fV):

> *Berkat jas hujan AYAH,   Ira tidak terlambat.*
> Thanks coat-rain FATHER <u>Ira</u> not   late
> Thanks to YOUR-fV raincoat, <u>I</u> was not late.   *Bobo* 36.XVII:33

These choices are presumably accounted for by our working hypothesis. That is, it seems that Malay does in fact provide the necessary structure for exchanging T and V even in the total absence of second person pronouns. Assuming that a NAME (='YOU') in exchange for a KIN TERM (='YOU') constitutes an asymmetrical exchange of power-laden terms, it makes sense to suggest that the KIN TERM 'means' V and the NAME 'means' T. In other words, the choices made by Ira and her father are accounted for by Brown and Gilman's rules for T/V languages. The evidence supports the claim that Malay is a special kind of T/V language, one that has found a way to exchange T and V asymmetrically without pronouns.[16]

(C) T and V in doubly-asymmetrical ('Mixed') Modes

In the sources I examined, children, when speaking to adults, seemed limited to the giving of fV (=an appropriate kin term), never dV *(ANDA)*. However, a contrast was observed in the manner that adults return T to children. For example, in (5) and (16) above, a father gives the child's NAME (fT) whereas in (4) a mother gives *KAU* (dT). The latter pattern (dT for fV) was repeated in all the mother-child dyads that occurred in the sources.[17] This seems to constitute the polar relationship in the system (see Table 2, IX).

Again, we can turn to the Disney comic books for an abundance of examples. When speaking with his three young nephews, Donald Duck, as the adult, always gives *(ENG)KA<-M>U* (dT) and always receives the kin term *PAMAN* (fV) 'UNCLE' in return. The following are typical examples.

(18) Donald to nephews (dT):

> *Ayo, KALIAN masuk kamar tidur saja!   Biarkan aku sendirian!*
> now YOU-PL   go   room sleep only let   me   alone
> Now YOU-dT go to bed! Leave me alone!   *Polisi Gunung* AWD 406.4

(19) Nephew to Donald (fV):

> *Tidak datang-kah   surat yang PAMAN tunggu itu?*
> not   come-question letter that UNCLE   wait   the
> Didn't the letter that YOU-fV are waiting for arrive?   *Polisi Gunung* AWD 406.4

(20) Another Nephew to Donald:

> *Mengapa PAMAN tidak berlibur saja   dengan kami?*
> why   UNCLE not vacation only with   us (exclusive)
> Why don't YOU-fV take a vacation with us?   *Polisi Gunung* AWD 406.5

---

[16]The reader can gain an appreciation for the force of the exchange of T and V by imagining Father's reaction if Ira were to address him by name instead of the honorific kin term *Ayah*.

[17]There were an insufficient number of father-child dyads to be able to comment on the difference between mother-child and father-child dyads. Note, however, that in terms of the working hypothesis, all parent-child dyads were asymmetrical T + V.

Another example is from the story 'Father's raincoat' cited earlier. After receiving *IBU* (fV) 'MOTHER' from Ira, mother returns *(ENG)KA<-M>U* (dT).

(21) Mother to daughter (dT):

Nah anak   yang manis, [18] *gantilah   pakaian-MU.*
Ah,   child   sweet   change   clothes-YOUR
Now, sweet child, change YOUR-dT clothes.   *Bobo* 36.XVII:33

(D) Mode-switching

The next two examples below illustrate another twist, namely, Mode-switching by one partner in a dialogue. A switch is recognised when one partner begins in one mode (Familial) and then switches to the other (Distal). Brown and Gilman (1960:262) cite cases of speakers of European T/V languages switching from V to T in the course of a relationship or even a single conversation. Likewise, in Malay, speakers ought to be able to switch, potentially, between V and T and also between Familial Mode and Distal Mode. Interestingly, I found both types. Most interesting were the switches from Familial to Distal Mode (maintaining V as a constant). One example involves Donald Duck (an adult) and Uncle Scrooge (a generation older than Donald – Scrooge walks with a cane). In the opening frame of one story, Donald gives Uncle Scrooge the appropriate kin term *PAMAN* 'UNCLE' (fV), but in subsequent frames Donald switches to *ANDA* (dV). For his part, the older man (Scrooge) gives only *(ENG)KA<-M>U (dT)*.

As the story opens Scrooge is sitting on a huge pile of money:

(22) Donald to Scrooge (fV):

Bagaimana perasaan PAMAN duduk di atas uang   PAMAN itu?
how   feeling   UNCLE sit   on top money UNCLE that
How does it feel for YOU-fV to sit on top of YOUR-fV money?

(23) Scrooge to Donald (dT):

Cemas! Sedih! Sengsara!   KAU sih   tenang-tenang saja, Donal...
awful sad   miserable   YOU particle peace-of-mind just Donald...
Awful! Unhappy! Miserable! YOU-dT have nothing to worry about, Donald ...

In the next frame, Donald is clearly being ironic. He switches to the Distal Mode, maintaining V with the pronoun *ANDA* (dV).

(24) Donald to Scrooge (dV):

ANDA memang pantas   bersedih, ɣaman Gober!
YOU   really   appropriate be-sad   uncle Gober
YOU-dV have every right to be unhappy, Uncle Scrooge.
                              Gudang Uang Tembus Pandang AWD 417.11

Apart from the opening frame, therefore, this story illustrates asymmetry in the Distal Mode since *ANDA* (dV) is exchanged for *(ENG)KA<-M>U* (dT).

---

[18]Both Mother and Father refer to Ira as *anak yang manis* in vocative position, but this expression does not occur in argument position.

(E) Gaps in the data

Of the ten possible power relationships displayed in Table 1, only six were actually found in the data (see Table 1). The power relationships observed, together with the gaps in the data, are listed again and displayed alongside information about the speakers in Table 2. Roman numerals refer to the same dyad-types listed in Table 1.

TABLE 2: GAPS IN THE DATA

Potential dyad types				Evidence for in children's magazines
(A) Distal Mode				
I	*(ENG)KA<-M>U*	+ *(ENG)KA<-M>U*	= dT+dT	friend + friend (any age)
II	*ANDA*	+ *ANDA*	= dV+dV	store clerk + adult
III	*ANDA*	+ *(ENG)KA<-M>U*	= dV+dT	Scrooge + very old man
(B) Familial Mode				
IV*	NAME + NAME		= fT+fT	---
V	kin term + kin term		= fV+fV	woman + man at door
VI	kin term + NAME		= fV+fT	father + young child
(C) Mixed Mode				
VII*	T *(ENG)KA<-M>U*	+ NAME	= dT+fT	---
VIII	V *ANDA*	+ NAME	= dV+fT	---
IX	T *(ENG)KA<-M>U*	+ kin term	= dT+fV	mother + young child
X*	V *ANDA*	+ kin term	= dV+fV	---

Each of the four gaps involves a NAME, *ANDA* or both. In the sources I examined, the NAME was given only in the father- daughter dyad (examples (6) and (16) above). However, I suspect that the three gaps involving NAMEs may be accidental owing to the limited number of children's magazines I examined. Based on E. Anderson's (1983) statistical study of forms of address in Bahasa Indonesia, this would seem a reasonable guess. Perhaps further research would fill dyad-type X as well, that is, *ANDA* + KIN TERM (Anderson does not mention *ANDA* at all). All that can be said with assurance in this paper is that, in the limited sources I examined, the gaps are simply unexplained.[19]

Details aside, however, the conclusion seems unaffected by these gaps in the data. Malay's system of second person address forms is structured to provide ten distinct dyad-types. Even if some of the potential dyad-types are unrealised, it is not possible to simplify the structure and still account for the four categories of second person address forms that occur regularly in the data. The system conforms to the rules and expectations of Brown and Gilman's broad study of T/V languages. More than that, it does so not once but **twice**: in Distal Mode and in Familial Mode.

---

[19]Also unattested in my data are combinations of title+name used as pronoun-substitutes, e.g. Mas Mus, Mbak Tati, Bu Bandi, Pak Tikno and so on. The literature cites these as high- frequency combinations in spoken Malay. E. Anderson (1983) gives examples and percentage of use of these combinations in comparison with the occurrence of *(ENG)KA<-M>U* and kin terms. His paper will be discussed in detail in the next section.

3. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL HIERARCHY

In their most interesting generalisation, Brown and Gilman (1960) suggest that there is a worldwide trend towards egalitarianism in T/V languages that is marked by an increased tendency to ignore status differences. This means an increased tendency for family members to exchange T among themselves regardless of age and status; and for adult non-family non-intimates to exchange V symmetrically.

Both kinds of trend toward equality (and away from the power-laden asymmetry implied by T + V) are triggered internally by the 'tension' that is inherent in T/V languages. Brown and Gilman (p.258) point out that:

> The dimension of solidarity is potentially applicable to all persons addressed. Power superiors may be solidary (parents, elder siblings) or not solidary (officials whom one seldom sees). Power inferiors, similarly, may be as solidary as the old family retainer and as remote as the waiter in a strange restaurant.

Does Malay conform to the world-wide tendency towards democratic speech? Do 'modern' Malay-speaking parents increasingly draw T from their children nowadays? I found no evidence of this in the chidren's sources I examined. All parent-child dyads in the data were asymmetrical (T + V).

This fact might have significance beyond the data. Recall that some of my data involved 'fantastic' animal characters. If an 'egalitarian' trend in child-parent relationships were really a fact of spoken Standard Malay, one might expect the trend to show itself in these culturally-neutral settings. But no such trend was found. Comic-book animal-parents **never** exchanged solidary T or V with children; they **invariably** drew V and gave T. Further questions to ask are: How do 'real' modern parents relate to their grown children? Grown older-siblings to grown younger-siblings? Husbands to wives? Is there any evidence that T + T is on the rise among adult-intimates in Modern Indonesia or Malaysia? I shall return to these questions directly below.

Among adult non-intimates, on the other hand, V + V was common in the data (in both Modes). This fact raises further questions concerning its relevance to spoken Malay viewed now as a vehicle of inter-ethnic communication outside the home. Do adult-adult dialogues involving non-intimates tend to be 'more democratic' nowadays? In particular, are exchanges of *ANDA + ANDA* or KIN TERM + KIN TERM common betwen boss and employee? Officer and soldier? Passenger and pettycab driver? And so on.

As a beginning towards answering these kinds of questions, E. Anderson's (1983) statistical study of linguistic variation in Bahasa Indonesia as spoken in Bandung, West Java, offers some interesting data for interpretation. Anderson reported no instances of *ANDA* in his sample. Furthermore, he recorded no evidence of *(ENG)KA<-M>U* exchanged symmetrically (T + T) between same-sex **strangers**, and also none between same-sex **co-workers**. Between same-sex **friends** Anderson recorded only one case of *(ENG)KA<-M>U* (this constituted only 2% of the sample); whereas among **family members** he recorded only four instances of *(ENG)KA<-M>U* or 13% of the sample – all confined to the speech of young males. In sharp contrast, same-sex **strangers** used KIN TERMs 100% of the time, and same-sex **co-workers** and **friends** also used KIN TERMs 95% of the time. About half the cases displayed the KIN TERM with the NAME attached (e.g. *PAK SUTEDJO* in place of unmodified kin term *BAPAK*). I have treated this variation as insignificant (both signalling fV) for the purposes of comparison with the data from the children's magazines.

In sharp contrast, again, unmodified NAME (without a kin term attached = T) was rarely used outside the family: 5% between **co-workers** and 2% between **friends**; but the addressee's NAME was used relatively frequently inside the family (27%). In fact, if I interpret Anderson's data and analysis correctly,[20] the major interactive device within parent-child dyads involved the parent giving the child's NAME and drawing the appropriate KIN TERM. If so, Anderson's study clearly supports the hypothesis of this paper that T and V not only exist in Malay, but that T and V can be exchanged entirely in Familial Mode (using pronoun-substitutes instead of pronouns). Anderson's study thus validates the dialogue between Father and Ira recorded as examples (5)-(6) of this paper, and the intepretation that was given there.

Most of Anderson's figures can be interpreted in terms of the power-solidarity semantic and Brown and Gilman's rules. However, some interesting questions remain unanswered, especially with respect to his data on differences between men's and women's speech.[21] Anderson found that women tended to speak more formally than men, that is, were overall more likely to give V to an addressee. In fact, as mentioned above, the 'lowest' address form *(ENG)KA<-M>U* was restricted to the speech of younger men inside the family, where it accounted for 15% of the sample. This carries the implication that *(ENG)KA<-M>U* is never given to an adult of either sex (a claim that would require more data to fully substantiate).[22]

Anderson's study, while not pretending to be a large-scale one, draws upon a richer data base than my own analysis of pronoun use and avoidance in the comics. Combining our results, it seems to me that several preliminary conclusions can be drawn which suggest the direction that future research on these topics might take.

Despite a necessary qualification concerning the observed preference for 'Familial' Mode, Anderson's study supports my hypothesis that T and V are commonly exchanged asymmetrically in spoken Malay. The evidence thus clearly contradicts the notion that Malay is 'flat' if by this it is implied that Malay lacks this capability. However, it must be acknowledged that Anderson's study does support the idea that the style of Indonesian exchanged among adults **outside the family** tends toward polite exchange of solidary V. This finding, if truly generalisable, would suggest an 'egalitarian trend' of a potentially significant kind, perhaps comparable to Brown and Gilman's international trend cited earlier in the paper. For example, according to Brown and Gilman (p.257), after the break-up of the Roman Empire:

> Europeans became very conscious of the extensive use of V as a mark of elegance. In the drama of seventeenth century France the nobility and bourgeoisie almost always address one another as V. This is true even of husband and wife, of lovers, and of parent and child if the child is adult. Servants and peasantry, however, regularly used T among themselves.

---

[20]See especially E. Anderson (1983:14) for the first person and second person data displayed there.

[21]Another question relates to the phonomenon of switching between T and V. Anderson reported no cases of this. If such were found, it would constitute a clear sign of instability and potential change.

[22]This implication is more plausible within the context of some chilling facts of recent history. Prior to the failed coup attempt in 1965, a hallmark of the Communist movement was its attempt to replace the power semantic (as a feudal remnant) by solidary T. I am told that this attempt was misunderstood by the ordinary people, who interpreted it to mean that Communists 'have no respect'. This attitude makes it unlikely that Bahasa Indonesia will soon follow the example of French in conformity with Brown and Gilman's worldwide trend toward egalitarianism, at least not in the form of symmetrical exchange of solidary T.

It seems entirely reasonable to suggest (as a working hypothesis to guide further research) that a similar trend towards 'elegance' or 'refined speech' might be the motivating force behind the extensive and symmetrical exchange of KIN TERMS (V + V) among educated persons in Indonesia. However, the mere fact that Familial Mode V + V predominates in adult-adult dyads outside the home offers insufficient grounds to conclude that the Malay language is free of obligatory references to social hierarchy, for several reasons. First, the exchange of solidary V **in the form of KIN TERM** nonetheless implies its own inherent asymmetry because kin terms are exchanged not only as category-types but at the same time as term-tokens. Clearly the lexical content of *NENEK* 'grandmother' is not the same as *IBU* 'mother' although both may be used categorically as second person pronoun-substitutes. In the same way, the exchange of *BAPAK* for *IBU* is potentially asymmetrical. It should not be taken for granted that the two are perfectly status-equivalent; rather, this should constitute a research question. For example, why (in most areas) do adult males draw a distinction between *AYAH* (biological father) and *BAPAK* (general respect term for males) – both translated into English as 'father' – whereas females draw only the single the term *IBU* 'mother'?

Second, all the evidence suggests that explicit, obligatory reference to an addressee's relative status is a feature of stability in the historical relationship between parents and small children. This established, however, there remain open many questions (such as those posed above) that should be investigated in light of Malay's power/solidarity semantic.

Finally, my own brief analysis of address forms in the comics would seem to be most relevant for the style of Malay that is available at the other end of the social ladder – at the level of 'servants and peasantry' perhaps, of children, of young males (and students of both sexes), of adult native speakers when 'thinking privately' to themelves perhaps, and especially for the fantasy world of popular songs, foreign-movie subtitles, passionate letters, folktales, and the comics. This style, too (whether considered independently or in interaction with 'refined' speech) gives evidence that Malay address forms are rich with implications for the study of social hierarchy.

4. THE ROLE OF CONSERVATISM IN THE RISE OF MODERN STANDARD MALAY

I shall henceforth take it as established that Malay is a special kind of T/V language with intimate ties to social hierarchy. My focus of interest in the next three sections is to present a perspective on the history of the Malay language that is consistent with this conclusion.

As mentioned in the Introduction, it has often been assumed that Malay is a simple and 'democratic' language, but little analysis has been offered to back up this kind of summary statement. In American scholarship, at least, B. Anderson's (1966) view, quoted earlier and repeated in part below, has been cited by linguists as well as non-linguists, hence seems to represent something like the standard view. In part, the standard view includes the idea that there were important **linguistic** factors behind the choice of Malay (over, say, Javanese) as the national language of Indonesia. Further, the standard view explicitly suggests that Bahasa Indonesia was developed out of a kind of pidgin into a modern political language; and that the choice was felicitous because "Malay had ipso facto an almost statusless character, like Esperanto, and was tied to no particular regional social structure. It had thus a free, almost 'democratic' character from the outset..." (Anderson 1966:104). Earlier I dealt with some sociolinguistic evidence against this interpretation of Malay's current status. In the remaining space I shall attempt to challenge the historical corollary, namely, the idea that at some time in the past Malay was nothing but a simple pidgin or Esperanto-like language.

In a strict technical sense, the idea that Malay was ever merely a pidgin or Esperanto is patently false because it implies a time when there were no native speakers. However, I do not think this extreme version of the standard view is actually believed by exponents of it. It is enough that the role of native speakers has been underemphasised in the story of Bahasa Indonesia's development, and that correspondingly the role of non-native speakers has been overemphasised. I will argue against these emphases, and suggest that what eventually came to be the recognised standard for Bahasa Indonesia must have been substantially influenced by models provided by educated Malays on the mainland and on Sumatra, some of whom (such as the poet Amir Hamzah) spoke 'High' Malay natively (see below). On the other hand, it is clear that native speaker 'experts' did not simply dictate the terms of the emerging national language. The prevailing sentiment was aptly expressed in a poem by Rustam Effendy, himself a Sumatran (native speaker of Minangkabau Malay). The following was written around 1925:

> I am not a slave of this land
> Bound by the laws of the experts.
> I reject the rules of grammar
> The structure of the old poems.

> Translation by A. Teeuw (1967:19)

Teeuw rightly interprets Effendy's poetry as a declaration of independence from external standards, presumably including the particular programme promoted by the Dutch through Van Ophuysen's Malay grammar based on 'High' Malay.

Experimentation with language does not imply throwing language to the wind, however. Effendy's choices were extremely limited, and revolved around a few longstanding issues. For more than a hundred years, the Dutch colonial government's need to solve the language problem included some halting efforts at standardising Malay (Hoffman 1979). As Teeuw (1967:7) puts it, eventually "Malay took its irreplaceable position as the vehicular language, even though this solution to the language problem was neither consciously intended nor officially chosen by the Dutch". It is thus no wonder that the issues were simply carried over into the early nationalist period.

As reported by Rafferty (1989:1), "radically opposing views" as to the origin of modern standard Indonesian have been proposed by Teeuw on the one hand, and the prominent Indonesian scholar, S.T. Alisjahbana on the other. Alisjahbana's opinion (1962:1) squares with the standard view, cited above: "In a short span of time", he writes, "this language (Indonesian) has been transformed from an unintegrated, pidgin-like lingua franca into an official language". In contrast, Teeuw has maintained that the basis of Indonesian was the language encouraged by Dutch scholars, and promoted under the literary umbrella of the Balai Pustaka publishing house (1920-1942). The style of Malay promoted by the latter, called Balai Pustaka Malay (BPM) by Rafferty, was based on 'High Malay'. According to Rafferty, 'High Malay' is a cover term that includes classic literary Malay as well as the modern dialects spoken on both sides of the Malacca Strait, in Riau, Lingga and Johor. Rafferty notes that BPM was "based on van Ophuysen's Malay grammar which became the standard for teaching Malay at the time" (Rafferty 1989:1).

It is of interest in this paper to point out the narrow focus of this debate. The focus is on 'High' Malay (spoken by native speakers in the area around the Malacca Strait) versus 'Low' Malay (spoken as a lingua franca by non-native speakers). Totally out of contention at that time, apparently, were the hundreds of regional varieties of Malay spoken by millions of native speakers. These included, among others, Palembang Malay, Bengkulu Malay, Minangkabau, and Jakarta Malay (Betawi).

These varieties have been given the collective name 'Middle Malay', but in no way do they resemble a coherent grouping. The question that immediately comes to mind is, why did the debate over a suitable standard centre only on 'High' versus 'Low' Malay?

One likely reason is that the so-called 'Middle Malay' dialects, by the turn of the century, displayed so much diversity – that is, had changed so drastically in phonology and morphology – that they were unintelligible to outsiders. (And so they remain today. See Errington (1986) for an illuminating recent study of contrasts between Indonesian and Jakartanese Malay.)

Interesting linguistic evidence has recently come to light which supports this suggestion, and which throws light on the possible role of linguistic conservatism in the development of modern Bahasa Indonesia. According to Blust (1981), modern Standard Malay is extremely conservative when compared with other languages of the Malayo-Polynesian family. This is a remarkable conclusion in light of the debate outlined above. It implies that the language that emerged (Indonesian) shows little sign of 'language mixing' in key areas of structure. If true, this fact would be difficult to reconcile with the standard view that Indonesian simply arose from totally unintegrated, pidginised varieties.

Blust's evidence is drawn from pronoun forms, phonology, and 'basic' vocabulary. 'Basic' vocabulary in this context involves everyday words like 'two', 'five', 'eye' and 'louse'. Common vocabulary items are generally assumed to be relatively stable and resistant to borrowing. Based on a fair sampling of Malayo- Polynesian languages in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Blust found that Standard Malay has changed less in the course of its separate history than any of the 800 or so languages in this family. Not only does Standard Malay retain *kau, kamu*, and several other pronouns from Proto-Malayo-Polynesian, it displays a startling 59% retention per cent of basic vocabulary. This retention percentage is compared to 40% for Tagalog (Philippines) and 30% for Jogjakartan Javanese. The next closest rival was found to be Minangkabau (50%). Minangkabau is arguably a dialect of Malay, but it has undergone a number of structural changes that render it unintelligible to other Malays, hence highly 'marked' as a local variety.

Even allowing for a wide margin of error in Blust's study, the implication for recent history is driven home quite forcefully. While playing host to multitudes of second-language users for centuries, and after intensive 'development' efforts to transform it into modern Bahasa Indonesia, the resultant language continues to exhibit more relative stability than any other language or dialect of the entire Malayo-Polynesian family of languages. This fact suggests strongly that although the language has changed and will continue to change, as does any living language, Malay remains relatively conservative at the core. For this to be possible, some recognisable core must have been held in high esteem for a very long time; otherwise, the hosts of second-language users would surely have had a more drastic effect on basic vocabulary and structure.

If accepted, Blust's conclusions would have to be regarded as little short of miraculous by anyone who holds the standard view that modern Bahasa Indonesian developed out of a mere pidgin or trade language.

5. REMARKS ON THE 'SUITABILITY' OF MALAY FOR ITS ROLE AS THE BASIS OF THE NATIONAL LANGUAGES OF INDONESIA AND MALAYSIA

In this section, I will develop a perspective on the history of Malay that is consistent with the idea, outlined in the previous section, that Standard Malay is relatively conservative as languages go.

The fundamental assumption I make is that the Malay heartland is the 'High' Malay region straddling both sides of the Malacca Strait. As it happens, for better or for worse as far as the Malays themselves are concerned, this region has always been of supreme international importance. Accordingly, many major historical 'centres' have been found in this region, for example at Palembang, Jambi, Johor, and Malacca, to name only a few (Coedes 1968).

The native language spoken on both sides of the Malacca Strait is of course Malay. I take it for granted that there is a certain naturalness to the suggestion that, historically, settlers who came to this region tended to be absorbed into the land and to adopt the Malay language and culture as their own. The pattern must have been repeated many, many times in the past. If so, then the term 'Malay' itself must clearly mean language and culture, not race. Likewise, historical mixing of races does not necessarily imply a hybrid language and culture. Only history can guide us here. Whether and how the Malay language and culture either shaped, or were shaped by, in-migrations, invasions, conquests, religious movements, and tourism is a question for research. Below I shall pose a few specific questions that future researchers might consider.

To account adequately for the position of modern Standard Malay, I believe a much greater explanatory role must be given to its continuity as an international language than has been accorded in the recent literature. (A notable exception is Teeuw 1967.) Scholars should take much more seriously the evidence of Malay's prestige in the archipelago. Most importantly, the temptation must be resisted to compare Malay's prestige with that of Dutch and English during the early colonial period. This period was, after all, one during which **all** peoples and cultures in the region underwent a decline of autonomy and loss of dignity. Accordingly, less importance should be given to the fact that Malay was pidginised and widely used as a trade language; and correspondingly, more weight should be given to the evidence that other languages of the area were never pidginised. In this context, it seems relevant to point out that only major international languages typically give rise to lingua francas in the first place. Latin, English, French, Spanish, Portugese, and Malay have given rise to such varieties. Why is it that German, Swedish, Japanese, Hindi, and Tagalog do not belong in this list? And, closer to the point, why has Javanese never been pidginised?

Once the continuity of Malay's historical role is considered seriously as a working hypothesis, it seems to matter much less whether Malay possesses (or lacks) this or that linguistic feature. In what follows, I will try to suggest the kinds of sociolinguistic generalisations which should be sought in future research.

Within the point of view I am developing, it seems important to underscore the fact that Malay's prestige, although seriously undermined by the Dutch presence during the colonial period, has apparently never been seriously challenged by another language in the region. In a significant sense, Malay's relative position has not been challenged since the seventh century.

Especially important are the bits and pieces of evidence concerning life in the archipelago between the seventh and fourteenth centuries. As pointed out by Lowenberg (1990:110):

> The first institutionalized spread of Malay occurred during the Srivijaya Empire (seventh through fourteenth centuries A.D.) which adopted Malay as its official language. From its capitol at contemporary Palembang in southern Sumatra and a secondary base at Kedah on the Malay Peninsula, Srivijaya eventually conquered all of Sumatra, West and Central Java, and the Malay Peninsula, and established colonies along all seacoasts and major rivers within its domain. It maintained diplomatic relations with both India and

China and effectively controlled both the Straits of Malacca and the Straits of Sunda for over five centuries.

The only problem I have with the above passage is the phrase 'adopted Malay as its official language'. What does it mean to say that Srivijaya 'adopted' Malay? Why not say that Malay was the language of the Empire? The Romans did not 'adopt' Latin as the language of the Roman Empire; Latin was ipso facto the language of the empire, by virtue of the fact that the centre was in Rome. Likewise Malay, as the native language of the Srivijaya capital at Palembang, Sumatra, was ipso facto the language of power.

Lowenberg's choice of terms betrays a second false assumption that I believe to be both unnecessary and unsupported by any evidence. I will call this assumption the 'phoenix' theory and oppose it to the 'continuity' theory which I defend. Since Malay was the language of Srivijaya, everyone acknowledges that Malay must **once** have had great prestige in the region. However, according to the phoenix theory, Malay's prestige thereafter died without leaving as much as a trace (much as did memory of Srivijaya itself).[23] There are variants of the phoenix theory, of course, but some scholars seem to hold a very strong version of it. Its utility is that it sets the stage for a dramatic story of the 'creation' of modern Malay (out of its own ashes, so to speak) by visionaries and 'language engineers'. The phoenix theory underlies typical summary statements like the following.

> ...the monsoon pattern made it impossible to complete the voyage (between China and India) without a pause of some months in the Malay-speaking region, a fact which resulted in Malay eventually acquiring the status of lingua franca throughout the Archipelago. (Prentice 1987:911)

If one is to believe the above statement, one is forced to conclude that Malay would not be widespread were it not for the language-learning efforts of overwintering foreign sailors. Moreover, one is left to imagine for oneself how these same sailors would have been able to convince other non-Malays to use this language over a vast geographic area roughly the size of the United States.

The obvious objection lies in the likelihood that the author of this often-repeated idea has got the implication exactly backwards. The sailors did not play a causal role in the spread of Malay; they found it convenient to use Malay because Malay was already widespread. What would motivate them to learn the language otherwise? Prentice is apparently aware of a gap in the standard argument, since he qualifies the above with his next sentence:

> Although this expansion of the language has not been documented, it is known that Malay was already in use in eastern Indonesia in the sixteenth century and it was considered quite normal for Francis Xavier to preach in Malay when he was in the Moluccas.

The reader should be mindful of the fact that the Moluccas are 2,000 miles from the Strait of Malacca. The author's mention of an undocumented "expansion of the language" betrays his acceptance of a rather strong version of the phoenix theory.

According to Lowenberg's (1990:111) account, quoting Alisjahbana (1976:33-34):

> ...in 1614 Jan Huygen van Linschoten, a Dutch navigator, observed that 'Malay was not only the most prestigious of the languages of the Orient...he who did not understand it

---

[23]The existence of Srivijaya was discovered in this century by Western scholars studying Chinese historical documents (Coedes 1968).

was somewhat in the same position as Dutchmen of the period who did not understand French.'

Surely such documents point to something important in terms of prior conditions. Why did Malay have such great prestige in 1614? It seems simplest to suppose that Malay's prestige had not been lost in the archipelago. Indeed, the available documents are perfectly consistent with the assumption that a rather direct line should be drawn between Srivijaya and modern Standard Malay.

Much evidence gathered by Prentice and Lowenberg can be used to argue against the phoenix theory. As they note, many Empires have come and gone in the region since the seventh century. But the geopolitical 'centre' of the archipelago – the lands and waters over which each successive Empire contested – has remained the land base from which to control the Strait of Malacca. The record lends no support to the idea that civilisation has ever declined in this region since the seventh century. There were many successive governments that followed in train, as is well known. Later empires originated as expansionist movements in Java; after Srivijaya (AD 650-1350) came Majapahit (AD 1293-1500), and Mataram (AD 898-1750). All three medieval empires had major centers in Sumatra and Malaya that competed with and sometimes launched bloody wars against Java (Coedes 1968:144). The last of the great empires to survive, Mataram, was brought to heel by the Dutch in the eighteenth century.

An interesting twist is of course the central role played by non-Malays in the Malay homeland, especially the Javanese. It need scarcely be questioned that Java's greatest export in the region has been government. For example, some ethnic groups of interior Sumatra even claim an affinity with medieval Javanese empires. The highland Rejangs of Bengkulu Province claim their culture to be linked directly with Majapahit. The Rejangs record in their oral history that a major change in their customary laws occurred when four 'princes' *(pangeran)* of Majapahit, after losing a dispute at court, fled to the hinterland in search of territory to rule. The four princes offered the people what they knew best: government. According to legend, the princes were freely elected by the Rejangs, who thereby overthrew their old customary laws based on the absolute power of the *ajai*'s(Hosein 1971). To complete the story it must be assumed that the princes originated in one of the 'centres' in Sumatra (such as Jambi), and spoke and were answered in Malay. Without these assumptions, the story could scarcely be considered possible.

Even if legends like the above are rejected, historical documents record a similar pattern in many other places in Sumatra and the Malay peninsula. According to Coedes (1968:245), the founder of the Sultanate of Malacca was a certain Parameśvara, a native of Palembang and the husband of a princess of Majapahit. (Parameśvara was probably ethnically Javanese himself, but he was at the same time 'a native of Palembang' as Coedes reports.) Failing to seize power in Palembang after the death of Hayam Wuruk (1389), he took refuge at Tumasik (Singapore) and killed its Malay chief, a vassal of the Siamese kingdom ruling there at the time. After reigning a few years, he was driven out of Singapore by the Siamese. He and his court fled first to Muar, then to Bertam, and finally to Malacca where a permanent kingdom was established.

The story of the Sultanate of Malacca is continued by Prentice (1987:916) as follows:

> After the defeat of Malacca by the Portugese in 1511 the court fled to the south and eventually established a polity which embraced Johor and the island groups of Riau and Lingga in modern Indonesia.

Prentice goes on to explain the relationship of these political developments and the Malay language:

The literary traditions of the Malacca sultanate survived the upheavals of the colonial period and continued at the court of the Sultans of Riau-Johor...The literary Malay of the court continued...to be regarded as the standard on both sides of the frontier and served in both areas as the basis for the future national language.

While the historical role of the Javanese in the Malay heartland has no doubt always been of extreme importance in the region, one crucial assumption must be added to gain closure in all these cases. That is, it is necessary to assume that business in the Malay heartland was conducted in a commonly understood language at each particular point in time. I know of no other possible candidate than Malay. Moreover, many who came as conquerors remained as settlers. If they did not impose their own diverse languages on the region, the implication is that the region absorbed them. Like the Normans of England,[24] many Javanese came as invaders and were eventually absorbed into the land.

The historical record thus presents a picture of intensive non-Malay activity in the region – Javanese, Chinese, Arab, European, and recently Japanese and American – but no break (save during the colonial period) in the continuity of Malay's position as the language of the 'centre'. Importantly, to maintain this picture, it is not necessary to assume that the Malays' political role was comparable in importance to their linguistic and cultural contribution.

In 1824 the British and Dutch split the Malacca Sultanate into two, leaving one half on the Dutch side and the other on the British side. This action no doubt contributed further to the precipitous fall in prestige of all native languages, including Malay, in relation to the European languages. There is ample evidence of early colonialist attempts to further denigrate Malay. It is sad to consider the possibility that echos of this anti-Malay ideology may still linger on in the standard view of the history of Malay language and culture.

While there seems to be no truth to the phoenix theory applied to medieval times, it seems nevertheless to be true that 'native' prestige must have reached an all-time low after 1824. However, by 1900 it was clear that an anti-Malay campaign in Indonesia had failed. That the failure was assisted in part by Dutch progressives does not alter the point being made here (Hoffman 1979). Beginning in 1886 the Dutch, goaded by some of their own scholars and by liberal movements in Holland, began promoting the use of Malay actively in the colony, which of course helped to set the stage for nationalist revolution. It seems that no other language of the region has ever posed even a remote challenge to the position of Malay.[25]

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE PLANNING

Issues that warrant further study concern general sociolinguistic patterns associated with languages that function in inter-ethnic communication. One fairly recent line of research, called Accommodation Theory, has been launched by Giles (1979). Accommodation Theory investigates (among other things) the ways in which diverse ethnic groups behave when forced by circumstances to speak a common second language. The term 'Accommodation' here refers to the fact that intergroup and inter-ethnic relationships are subject to constant negotiation during the course of each interaction (Ellis

---

[24]The same relationship probably holds of Mandarin Chinese in relation to the long succession of rulers in Peking.

[25]Including, of course, Javanese. The paradox of Javanese is of course that whereas the culture has produced several great empires, the language has never been widely adopted by non-Javanese. This fact complements the Malay paradox studied in this paper. It is unlikely that either paradox can be resolved independently of the other.

1986:256). Below I suggest five assumptions that might be explored from the general perspective of non-Malays using Malay as a second language, and one from the perspective of native speakers.

First, a high level of prestige must be assumed to be attached to knowledge of Malay in the minds of non-Malays. This prestige must have existed for centuries, even when the numbers of proficient non-native speakers of Malay reached its lowest ebb, as it presumably did during the early colonial period. This factor would serve to motivate non-Malays to use the language for inter-ethnic communication; and some to try to master it to the best of their ability. Second, the practical utility of Malay as a lingua franca has probably always meant that to speak Malay even badly is nonetheless advantageous – another clear sign of Malay's prestige. Thirdly, the centres of Malay language and culture, while shifting from time to time amongst numerous sites in Sumatra and peninsular Malaya, have nonetheless always been recognisable and available to provide a model and standard of 'correct' style in both speech and writing. Fourth, there is plenty of evidence that Standard Malay has changed in many ways over the centuries. Based on its long history of writing, which can be dated from AD 683,[26] it is clear that Malay has undergone many linguistic and cultural changes internal to itself. Finally, Malay dialects relatively distant from the current centres of power have diverged even further, and have become thereby highly 'marked' as having merely local currency.[27]

Another research topic comes to mind that takes the perspective of native speakers. What characterises native speakers of widely-used languages? What are their attitudes towards the fact that their language is used as the medium of inter-ethnic communication? One would not be surprised to find that most native speakers of Standard Malay are habituated to the fact that their native language has inter-regional and inter-national 'responsibilities' and status. This fact seems automatically to induce tolerance of second-language users (Giles 1979). While the psychological traits of openness and tolerance are considered universals in Accommodation Theory, their enhancement in native Malay speakers could be investigated and verified as another noteworthy contribution of Malay culture in Southeast Asia.

7. CONCLUSION

The political task of this century was to build a new Indonesian nation the size and scope of Srivijaya and Majapahit. The task called for a unifying language. To select a language, and to determine what form it should take, politicians, poets, and language planners, while wrangling over details, re-discovered an ancient channel provided by history.

If the arguments of sections 1-3 of this paper are accepted, then some of the questions raised in sections 4-6 may be clarified. In particular, it should no longer be regarded as problematic to suggest that the system of address forms in modern Bahasa Indonesia carries strong implications for the study of hierarchy in social structure.

---

[26]Prentice (1987:915).

[27]For example, Palembang-Malay is quite divergent from Standard Malay. My comparison using a modified Swadesh 200 item word list indicates only 80% shared 'basic' vocabulary between Palembang-Malay and Bahasa Indonesia (=Standard Malay as it is recognised in Indonesia). This implies that Palembang, although as the seat of the Srivijaya Empire it represented the 'centre' from the seventh to twelfth centuries, is today relatively distant from the *current* centre of Malay language and culture. This implication seems consistent with the facts.

APPENDIX: SECOND PERSON PRONOUNS IN SELECTED INDONESIAN LANGUAGES

In this appendix are listed the second person pronouns in common use in a number of Indonesian languages. See Appendix 3 for sources of data on these languages.

1. NON-MALAY

Language	Province	1SG	2SG	2PL	Honorific
Acehnese	Aceh	*kee*	*kah*	*kah*	*droe* [28]
Batak	North Sumatra	*ahu*	*ho*	*hamu*	*hamu*
Rejang	Bengkulu	*uku*	*ko*	*udi*	*kumu*
Lampung	Lampung	*nya'*	*niku*	*kuti*	*pusi-kam*
Kawi (Old Javanese)		*aku*	*ka(N)u*	*ka(N)u*	*kita*
Tengger-Javanese	East Java	*aku* *i(ng)sun* *(r)éyang*	*sira*	*sira*	*rika*

2.(a) 'CLASSIC' T/V DIALECTS OF MALAY (*KAMU* - HONORIFIC)

Language	Province	1SG	2SG	2PL	Honorific
Besemah	South Sumatra	*aku*	*kau*	*kamu*	*kamu*
Benakat	South Sumatra	*aku*	*kau*	*kamu*	*kamu*
OKI	South Sumatra	*aku*	*kau*	*kamu*	*kamu*
Belitung	Belitung I.	*aku*	*kau*	*kamu*	*ikam*

(b) MALAY DIALECTS THAT USE *KAMU* OR AN EQUIVALENT NON-HONORIFICALLY

Language	Province	1SG	2SG (masc)	2SG (fem)	2PL
Standard Malay	East Sumatra[29]	*aku*	*(ENG)KA<-M>U*	*(ENG)KA<-M>U*	*kalian*
Bengkulu	Bengkulu	*aku*	*kamu*	*kau*	*kamorang*

Language	Province	1SG	2SG (masc)	2SG (fem)	2PL
Ujan Mas	South Sumatra	*aku*	*kaba/denga* [30]	*kaba/denga*	*kamu*
Palembang	South Sumatra	*tubu*	*awak*	*awak*	*kamu*
Ogan Ulu	South Sumatra	*aku*	*ngan*	*ngan*	*ngan*
Kayo Aro	South Sumatra	*aku*	*nga*	*nga*	*nga*
Jakarta	Jakarta	*gue*	*kamu*	*kamu*	*sekalian*

---

[28] Achenese and Lampung express honorifics in all the pronouns, not just second person.

[29] The three northernmost Malay-speaking provinces of Indonesia lie along the Strait of Malacca and are said to use a variety of Malay natively that most resembles the 'received' Standard. They are the provinces of North Sumatra, Riau and Jambi.

[30] *kaba* is used to refer to same-sex individuals; *denga* is used for opposite-sex individuals.

3. SOURCES OF DATA FOR THIS APPENDIX

(a) MALAY DIALECTS (FW = fieldwork conducted by the author)

Language/Dialect	Province	Principal Source
Bengkulu	Bengkulu	FW, Amran Halim
Benakat	South Sumatra	Nangsari Achmad[31]
Besemah	South Sumatra	FW, Gaffar (1983)
Belitung	Belitung I.	FW, Husadi Fitoy
Kayo Aro	South Sumatra	FW, Chuzaimah Diem
Ogan Komering		
Ilir (OKI)	South Sumatra	FW, Moh. Junus
Ogan Ulu	South Sumatra	FW, Neli
Palembang	South Sumatra	FW, Amir Faizal
Ujan Mas	South Sumatra	FW, Nangsari Achmad

(b) NON-MALAY LANGUAGES

Language/Dialect	Province	Principal Source
Acehnese	Special province of Aceh	Durie 1985
Batak	North Sumatra	Van Der Tuuk 1971
Rejang	Bengkulu	McGinn 1982
Lampung	Lampung	Walker 1976
Standard Javanese	Central, East Java	Dardjowidjojo 1978
Tengger-Javanese	Special territory of East Java	Smith-Hefner 1988

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALISJAHBANA, S. T., 1976, *Language planning and modernization: the case of Indonesian and Malaysian.* The Hague: Mouton.

1978, The concept of language standardization and its application to the Indonesian language. In Perez, Santiago and Nguyen Dang Liem, eds, 1978:19-42.

ANDERSON, Benedict R., 1966, The languages of Indonesian politics. *Indonesia* 1/1:89-106.

ANDERSON, Edmond A., 1983, The meaning of variation in Indonesian. *NUSA* 15:1-26.

BECKER, A.L. and I Gusti NGURAH OKA, 1974, Person in Kawi: exploration of an elementary semantic dimension. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13/1-2:229-255.

BELLWOOD, Peter, 1985, *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian archipelago.* Orlando, Fla: Academic Press.

BLUST, Robert A., 1981, Retention rates in Austronesian languages. MS. (Cited in Bellwood 1985:118).

BROWN, Roger and Albert GILMAN, 1960, The pronouns of power and solidarity. In Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. *Style in language*, 253-276. New York: Wiley; also in Pier Paolo Giglioli, ed. *Language and social context*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1972, 1976.

COEDES, G., 1968, *The Indianized states of Southeast Asia.* Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press.

DARDJOWIDJOJO, Soenjono, 1978, Javanese honorifics and their linguistic implications. In the author's book of essays, *Some aspects of Indonesian and Javanese linguistics.* Honolulu: Department of Indo-Pacific Languages.

---

[31]Dr Nangsari is not a native speaker of Benakat-Malay, but a linguist who reported the data to me.

DURIE, Mark, 1985, *A grammar of Achenese on the basis of a dialect of North Aceh.* Dordrecht: Foris.

ELLIS, Rod, 1986, *Understanding second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ERRINGTON, J. Joseph, 1986, Continuity and change in Indonesian language development. *Journal of Asian Studies* 45/2:329-353.

FREIDUS, Alberta Joy, 1977, *Sumatran contributions to the development of Indonesian literature, 1920-1942.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

GAFFAR, Zainal Abidin, 1983, *Morfologi dan sintaksis bahasa Besemah.* Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.

GEERTZ, Clifford, 1960, *The religion of Java.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

GILES, H., 1979, Ethnicity markers in speech. In Klaus R. Sherer and Howard Giles, eds *Social markers in speech.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HALIM, Amran, 1978, The vernacular languages in relation to the standardization of Bahasa Indonesia. In Perez, Santiago and Nguyen Dang Liem, eds, 1978:297-303.

HOFFMAN, J. E., 1979, A foreign investment: Indies Malay to 1901. *Indonesia* 27:65-92.

HOSEIN, H. M., 1971, Rejang asal-usul. 58pp mimeo, edited by Abdullah Sani.

JENSON, Kenneth M., 1988, Forms of address in Indonesian. *Review of Applied Linguistics* 81-82:113-138.

KASWANTI PURWO, Bambang, 1984, The categorial system in contemporary Indonesian: Pronouns. *NUSA* 19:55-74

KRIDALAKSANA, Harimurti, 1974, Second participant in Indonesian address. *Language Sciences* 31:17-20.

LOWENBERG, Peter H., 1990, Language and identity in the Asian State: the case of Indonesia. *The Georgetown Journal of Linguistics* 1/1:109-120.

McGINN, Richard, 1982, *Outline of Rejang syntax.* Jakarta: *NUSA* 14.

McGINN, Richard, ed., 1988, *Studies in Austronesian linguistics.* Ohio University Monographs in International Studies 76. Athens: Ohio.

PEREZ, A.Q., A.O. SANTIAGO and NGUYEN DANG LIEM, eds, 1978, *Papers from the Conference on the standardization of Asian languages, Manila, Philippines, December 16-21, 1974.* Canberra: *PL*, C-47.

PRENTICE, J. D., 1987, Malay Indonesian and Malaysian. In Bernard Comrie, ed., *The world's major languages*, 913-935. New York: Oxford University Press London: Croom Helm.

RAFFERTY, Ellen, 1989, The formation of the Indonesian national language in the early twentieth century. (To appear in *NUSA.*)

SMITH-HEFNER, Nancy, 1988, Cara Tengger: notes on a nonstandard dialect of Javanese. In McGinn, ed. 1988:203-234.

TEEUW, A., 1967, *Modern Indonesian literature.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

1972, The impact of Balai Pustaka on modern Indonesian literature. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35/1:111-127.

TUUK, H. N. van der, 1971, *A grammar of Toba Batak,* translated by Jeune Scott-Kemball. The Hague: Nijhoff.

WALKER, Dale F., 1976, *A grammar of the Lampung language: the Pesisir dialect of Way Lima.* Jakarta: *NUSA* 2.