

ennek manipulatív hatása nem tudatosul a felsőfokú végzettséget nélkülöző befogadók többségében. Ugyanakkor felmerül a kérdés: ha a néző tisztában van a manipulatív technikával, ez nem a vizuális eszköz által közvetített üzenet elvetését vonja-e maga után. Ennek tisztázására a kutatók megvizsgálták politikusok kampányportréiban az asszociációs mellérendelésre adott nézői válaszokat. Kiderült, hogy a nézők többsége tisztában volt a standard asszociációs imázsokkal – mint a zászló, a család, a címer stb. –, de arra is fény derült, hogy ez a tudatosság a különböző társadalmi és gazdasági háttérű rétegekre nézve egyaránt igaz. A tudatosság nem mindig járt együtt a negatív válaszreakciókkal, hanem ellenkezőleg, ha a nézők elfogadták a politikus által sugallt imázst („patrióta”, „családszerető”, „környezetvédő”, stb.), akkor ez kedvezően hatott a politikus törekvéseire. Ezek az eredmények az imázstechnika behatóbb ismeretére ösztönöznek, azzal a kitétellemel, hogy bár a „vizuális műveltség” (a vizuális média technikai konvencióinak ismerete) elősegítheti, hogy a befogadók kritikusabbak, felkészültebbek legyenek az imázsokkal, a vizuális manipulációval szemben, de ez a műveltség semmiképpen nem helyettesítheti vagy pótolhatja a valóság tényeiről, attitűdjeiről való jólinformáltságot.

SÁNDOR ROT

### **Sanskrit, Arabic, Dutch and English Lexical Borrowings in Bahasa Indonesia and Problems of Variation in Language Planning**

The prolific scholarly oeuvre of Professor István Szathmári is a shining proof how fruitful the science of language may become when linguists have acute ears for low-level analysis, and imaginative minds for abstract hypothesis. Great is his contribution to the study of the formation of the Hungarian national language, its standardization and stylistic variation, which has a general linguistic overtone and thus may help methodologically in investigating the formation of national languages in the former colonial countries.

Bahasa Indonesia (both its standard type termed „resmi”, and its colloquial or daily variation named „sehar-hari”) is the most widely shared

and functionally loaded interethnic instrument of human communication and the official language of contemporary Indonesia consisting of over 13000 islands, and inhabited by about 146 700 000 people belonging to 310 different ethnic groups. These ethnicities use about 418 mutually often unintelligible vernaculars pertaining mainly to the Malayo-Polynesian language family (See: NABABAN 1983; LOWENBERG 1983).

The majority of these regional and ethnic vernaculars are functioning in the sparsely populated eastern islands of the country by at most a few thousand speakers each. However, 24 languages, including Madurese used on the island of Madura and in East Java, Javanese (krama inggil 'very high', krama 'high', and ngoko 'low') in Central and East Java, Sundanese (les halus 'high', kasar 'low') in West Java, Balinese in Bali, Bugis/Makassar in Sulawesi, Minangkabau, Batak (Mandailing Batak, Toba Batak), Palembang in Sumatra, are spoken by more than two million people. In addition Cantonese, Mandarin, Hakka and Hokkien are used by more than three million Chinese living in the seaports and larger cities of Indonesia (See: NABAN 1983).

The speakers of these different ethnic and regional vernaculars, have for a millennium used in their interethnic communication Malay, as a „lingua franca”. Some aspects of this sociolinguistic position Malay preserved even during the Netherland's colonization of Indonesia (1600–1942), when Dutch was imposed over its aboriginal population as the principal language of the colony. Malay became the second official language of the country, especially for local administration and kept its status as the most important means of interethnic communication.

When at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries the young aboriginal patriots of the Indonesian islands began to strengthen their fight for the independence of their homeland, they started to use the ethnically „neutral” Malay as an important means of communication, as „a weapon in struggle for life” (Goethe) and the formation of a modern nation. In 1928 they proclaimed this interethnic vernacular as Bahasa Indonesia „The Indonesian Language”. This new sociolinguistic prestige of Malay gradually increased, and even the Japanese occupation of Indonesia (1942–1945) could not become a serious obstacle on the road of turning Bahasa Indonesia into a modern national language. On the contrary, dismissing the Dutch language from the administration, court, education, culture, public life, industry, etc. and replacing it by Malay, the Japanese military administration objectively helped to increase the sociolinguistic mobility of Bahasa Indonesia.

Thus, when in 1945 Indonesia proclaimed its independence, Bahasa Indonesia was ready to fulfil the role of a national and official language of

the new born state. And it had no serious rivals for this noble task (DIAH 1982). However, like other national and official languages formed after World War II in states coming to life in the former colonial countries, Bahasa Indonesia had to overcome a lot of difficulties in developing its systems and structures, in codifying and standardizing its language elements and patterns. This demanded a very flexible attitude to principles of language planning and variation. This noble task is being fulfilled by the Indonesian National Centre for Language Development (Djakarta) which continuing the noble task of its predecessor language planning institution has coined, adopted and codified during the last 45 years or so over 380 000 lexical units. However, many of these „neologisms” are seldom used. They remain on the periphery of language usage (KAEHLER 1978).

Inherent variability of spontaneous development and the linguistic interference of different types and subtypes of „non-code switching” and „code-switching” language contacts with a great number of languages, and Sanskrit, Arabic, Dutch and English in particular, has helped Bahasa Indonesia to act in the line with the „teleological metaphor” (R. JAKOBSON) and fulfil its noble task of becoming a reliable instrument of communication and means of expressing feeling in our modern times.

Our studies have shown that variable rules of „inherent variability” act in Bahasa Indonesia together with the linguistic interference of „non-code-switching” language contacts with other Malayo-Polynesian vernaculars, and it is difficult to separate from each other the results of their work. The division of their work cannot be marked by a single sharply drawn line, like the boundary between France and Spain. There are no Pyrenees between the results of the work of actuation riddles (or motive forces) of linguistic change and language development brought to life by „inherent variability” and „non-code-switching” language contacts.

It has become plain that the intralinguistic actuation riddles (or motive forces), mainly: the law of analogy (J. KURYŁOWICZ; Z. GOMBOCZ; V. ZHIRMUNSKY; V. MAŃCZAK; S. KÁROLY), the principle of economy of linguistic effort (ARISTOTILE; A. MARTINET), the reestablishment of „temporary equilibrium” (N. S. TRUBETZKOY; T. LOMTYEV), etc., and extralinguistic factors, mainly folk-psychology (J. GRIMM; W. VON HUMBOLDT), culture (W. WUNDT), historical events (O. JESPERSEN), social changes (J. MARR), geographical circumstances (P. OSTHOFF; M. BARTOLI), differences between generations (H. PAUL), „mixing” of languages or interaction of languages or language contact (H. SCHUCHARDT; V. ASCOLI; A. MEILLET; U. WEINREICH; S. ROT), and so on, acting as actuation riddles (or motive forces) in linguistic change and development of Bahasa

Indonesia, form a rather complicated dynamic hierarchic structure where any „curved” trajectory of their function may be modified, or even eliminated by the function of the neighbouring one which tries to capture the dominant position in this hierarchy (See details in: ROT 1991). Therefore the functions displayed by these „curved” trajectories of both intralinguistic and extralinguistic actuation riddles (or motive forces) make up an intervoven bundle which in a mode of non-linear causality works in linguistic change and the development of Bahasa Indonesia, in the process of its standardization, i.e. the formation of a literary standard.

A literary standard is not necessarily a written language, neither is it a prerogative of civilized peoples. It is reported that the Saramaccaner Bush Negroes of Dutch Guiana, descended from escaped slaves and normally speaking the lingua franca known as Talkee-Talkee, have a special noble language appropriately called Deepee-Talkee. This is reserved for their religious ceremonies and songs and is unintelligible to other inhabitants of the country.

The process of codifying and standardization began in Bahasa Indonesia long before 1945, i.e. before its status and prestige was risen to „the official and national language of the country”. In Indonesia, as in other countries freed from colonialism, this process of codifying and standardization in Bahasa Indonesia has been intimately tied to the history of the formation of the Indonesian nation itself. And this demanded its accelerated „drift” down time and space (SAPIR 1949, 150) in which both inherent variability of spontaneous linguistic change and conscious language planning played an important role.

When English scholars and writers of the 18<sup>th</sup> c. debated whether the norms of their standard language should be regulated by a specially founded Academy, the proposal was rejected largely because the idea of such an institution came from France and the English did not wish to duplicate what they regarded as „French tyranny”.

Therefore the British Academy and other language institutions of the English speaking countries stick even nowadays to the view that the linguist is not a judge to decide and doom after a tribunal hearing what is „good English” and what is „bad English”, he is only a witness of the process of spontaneous development of the language. In spite of the fact that the standards of all the national varieties of the macrosystem of Present-Day English are their „dominants”, these codified varieties cover sociolinguistically only from 4.5 % to 6 % of the communicative manifestation, their language institutions do not apply the principles of „language planning” in enriching their systems and subsystems by language

elements and patterns taken from their „non-standard” varieties (ROT 1991a).

On the other hand, it is on knowledgeable lips that vernaculars of the former colonial countries which during the last 50 years or so received the status of national and official languages in their efforts to keep pass with the functional demands of the „teleological metaphor” and strengthen their sociolinguistic positions of a modern language have to apply methods and principles of language planning. This is the case with Bahasa Indonesia as well.

A thorough analysis of concrete linguistic material (25 000 pages of text of different genre and 12 hours of tape-recorded speech) brought about in the years 1950–1990 in Bahasa Indonesia, has made it plain that its standard termed Bahasa Indonesia resmi is, in the words by E. VENDRYES, „an icy crust over the river” (VENDRYES 1949, 253). The river that flows under the ice sheet is the non-standard, i.e. the natural popular language (Bahasa Indonesia sehari-hari), Djakarta slang, other sociolects and regional varieties which are a fruitful source of enriching it. However, very important sources in enriching Bahasa Indonesia, and its lexis in particular, are lexical borrowings from Sanskrit, Arabic, Dutch and English.

I. Malay has a very long history of different types and subtypes of language contacts with the vernaculars of the Indian subcontinent, and primarily with Sanskrit. The results of linguistic interference of these language interrelations are to be found mainly on the lexico-semantic level of Bahasa Indonesia.

Loanwords, lexical penetrations<sup>1</sup> and loan-translations of Bahasa Indonesia the genetic, primarily historical and historical sources<sup>2</sup> of borrowing of which go back to Sanskrit entered different lexico-semantic microsystems of the receptor-language, but mainly:

(a) The lexico-semantic microsystems<sup>3</sup> of terms of kinship and human relations, e.g., BI *saudara* ‘brother, thou’ < Skrt. *sahodara* ‘brother’, etc.;

(b) the lexico-semantic microsystems of terms of religion, learning, etc., e.g., BI *bahasa* ‘language’ < Skrt. *bhasa* ‘id.’; BI *sastera* ‘literature’ < Skrt. *sastra* ‘theory, learning’, and others;

(c) the lexico-semantic microsystem of terms of every-day life, e.g., BI *warna* ‘colour’; *bewarna* ‘coloured’; *mewarnai* ‘to paint’ < Skrt. *varna* ‘colour’, etc.;

(d) the lexico-semantic microsystem of political terms, words denoting professions, social ranks, etc., e.g., BI *Perdana Menteri* ‘Prime Minister’ < Skrt. *pradhana mantri* ‘minister of highest rank’; BI *duta* ‘ambassador’ < Skrt. *duta* ‘messenger’; BI *kebangsaan* ‘nationality’ < BI *ke-* + Skrt. *vamsa*

'clan'; BI *purnawirawan* 'pensioned military officer or veteran' < Skrt. *purna* 'complete' + BI *viryawan* 'warrior'; BI *tunakarya* 'unemployed' < Skrt. *tuna-* 'without' + BI *karya* 'work, job'; BI *tunasusila* 'immoral; prostitute' < Skrt. *tuna-* 'without' + BI *susila* 'morality'; BI *tunawisma* 'homeless; urban squatter' < Skrt. *tuna-* 'without' + BI *wisma* 'dwelling; home'; BI *Dwi Darma* 'two necessities for Indonesia's development: political and economic stability' < Skrt. *dwi* 'two' + BI *darma* 'necessity'; BI *pancasila* 'the five fundamental principles of the Indonesian state: monotheism; nationalism; humanism; social justice and democracy' < Skrt. *panca sila* 'five fundamental principles', and many others.

II. Together with the Islam spread vigorously beginning with the Middle Ages in the Indonesian islands, different types of Malay–Arabic language contacts, but mainly non-marginal language interrelationals (the role of the Koran!) have been brought to life. The results of the linguistic interference of these age-long language contacts can be found on all language levels of Modern Bahasa Indonesia, but mainly on its lexico-semantic level.

Loanwords, lexical penetrations and loan-translations taken over mainly from Classical Arabic entered different lexico-semantic microsystems of the receptor-language, but primarily:

(a) The lexico-semantic microsystems of terms of religion, philosophy, learning, etc., e.g., BI *koran* 'the sacred text of Islam' < Arab. *qura'an* 'id.' (from *qur'an* 'reading, recitation'; from *qar'a* 'to read, recite'); BI *adat* 'traditional law' < Arab. *adat* 'habit'; BI *pikir* 'think' < Arab. *fikr* 'thought'; BI *syarat* 'condition'; *bersyarat* 'conditional'; *mensyaratkan* 'to set conditions' < Arab. *sart* 'condition', and many others;

(b) the lexico-semantic microsystem of terms of every-day life, e.g., BI *salam aleykum* 'good morning (afternoon)'; *liler* 'peace to you' < Arab. *salam aleykum* 'id.'; BI *sukran* 'thanks' < Arab. *shukran* 'id.'; BI *sehat* 'healthy' < Arab. *sihhat* 'health', etc.

III. Almost three and half centuries of Dutch colonial rule over Indonesian islands paved the road to different types and subtypes of Malay–Dutch language contacts, including natural (or social) coordinative and subordinative plurilingualism (N. DENISON). The results of the linguistic interference of these language contacts can be found on all levels of Bahasa Indonesia, but mainly on the lexico-semantic level.

Loanwords, lexical penetrations and loan-translations of Modern Bahasa Indonesia which had Dutch as their genetic, primary historical or historical source of borrowing entered different lexico-semantic microsystems of the receptor-language, but primarily:

(a) The lexico-semantic microsystems of terms of social life, administration, names of institutions, etc., e.g., BI *koperasi* 'cooperation'; *bekoperasi* 'to cooperate'; *perkoperasian* 'system of cooperation' < Du. *cöperatie* 'cooperation'; BI *universitas* 'university' < Du. *universiteit* 'id.', and others;

(b) the lexico-semantic microsystems of terms of science, technique and every-day life, etc., e.g., BI *pabrik* 'factory' < Du. *fabriek* 'id.'; BI *fotografi* 'photography' < Du. *fotographie* 'id.'; BI *listrik* 'electricity' < Du. *electrisiteit* 'id.', and many others.

IV. A thorough analysis of a large corpus of extralinguistic and intralinguistic material has given plenty of evidence that during the last 50 years or so Bahasa Indonesia has established its most dynamic language contacts with the macrosystem of English, consisting of its American, Australian, British, Canadian, and New Zealand national varieties, their standards and non-standards (including the regional dialects and sociolects, as well as its acculturized vernaculars).

Loanwords, lexical penetrations, loan-translations functioning mainly in the written manifestation of Modern Bahasa Indonesia which have the macrosystem of English as their genetic, primary historical and historical sources of borrowing entered different lexico-semantic microsystems, but mainly:

(a) The lexico-semantic microsystems of terms of science, technique, etc., e.g., BI *astroloji* 'astrology' < GE *astrology* 'id.'; BI *psikoanalisa* 'psychoanalysis' < AE *psychoanalysis* 'id.'; BI *irasional* 'irrational' < GE *irrational* 'id.'; BI *intelijensi* 'intelligence' < GE *intelligence* 'id.'; and others;

(b) the lexico-semantic microsystems of political and social terms, e.g., BI *is(y)u* 'issue, rumour' < GE *issue* 'question that arises for discussion'; BI *kalangan atas upper class* 'upper class' < GE *upper class* 'id.'; BI *proporsi* 'proportion in political and social development' < GE *proportion* 'relation of one thing to another in quantity, size, etc.; relation of a part to the whole'; BI *efektif* 'effective' < GE *effective* 'id.'; BI *polusi udara* 'air pollution' < GE *pollution* + BI *udara* 'air', and others;

(c) the lexico-semantic microsystems of terms of economy and business, e.g., BI *bisnis* (lexical penetration primary Malay: *dagang*) 'business' < AE *business* 'id.'; BI *ngobyek* 'to use property belonging to one's employer for the purpose of moonlighting' < AE *object* 'something that can be seen or touched; material thing'; BI *drop* 'to give funds or goods to an area which needs them' < GE *drop* 'to cast, throw'; BI *efektif* 'effective' (trade, business) < AE *effective*; BI *manajer* (lexical penetration; primary Malay:

*pemimpin*) 'manager' < AE *manager* 'id.'; BI *kredit* (lexical penetration; primary Malay: *piutang*) 'credit' < GE *credit* 'id.', and many others;

(d) the lexico-semantic microsystem of terms of every-day life, e.g., BI *representatif* 'good looking; making a good impression on people (a secretary or receptionist)' < GE *representative* adj. 'of serving to portray or show; serving as an example of a class or group'; BI *kompak* 'unified, harmonious' < GE *compact* 'closely packed together; nearly fitted', and many others.

The lexical borrowings from Sanskrit, Arabic, Dutch and English have received in Bahasa Indonesia different degrees of linguistic assimilation (from  $Q^4 \leq 0.08$  to  $Q \leq 0.01$ ), i.e. belonging to the class of „foreign words” („fremde Wörter” and „Fremdwörter”) as well as „loanwords” („Lehnwörter”).

In the process of codifying and standardizing Bahasa Indonesia both „spontaneous” lexico-semantic development and „language planning” are taking place. The main problem in language planning is linked with the dilemma either to use Sanskrit and Arabic lexical borrowings (or monomorphs), and thus to emphasize the traditional values of life, or to take over English and Dutch loanwords, lexical penetrations and loan-translations and so to help Bahasa Indonesia resmi in increasing its communicative efficiency in the country and the world. Indonesia's current language policy, adopted in 1976, backs both trends and therefore in the process of codifying and standardizing variation and synonymy are preferred.

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup>On the difference between a loanword and a lexical penetration see: ROT 1991, 62–4.

<sup>2</sup>On the differences between the „genetic”, „primary historical”, and „historical” sources of lexical borrowing see: ROT 1991, 26–31.

<sup>3</sup>On the linguistic essence of a „lexico-semantic” microsystem and its relations to TRIER's „lexical fields” see: ROT 1991a, 18–20.

<sup>4</sup>Q denotes the deviation from the primordial prototype; see details in: ROT 1991.

#### Abbreviations:

AE = American English; the American national variety of English

Arab. = Arabic

BI = Bahasa Indonesia

Du. = Dutch

GE = General English, an invariant of the macrosystem of English

Skt. = Sanskrit

#### References

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

- BEG, M. A. J., 1979: Arabic loan-words in Malay, Kuala Lumpur.
- GONDA, J., 1973: Sanskrit in Indonesia, New Delhi.
- DIAH, M., 1982: National language policy and writing curriculum in Indonesia: a case study, Urbana (Ill.).
- KAEHLER, H., 1978: Standardization and development of newspapers' Bahasa Indonesia; in: PERZ, A. Q., SANTIAGO, and LIEM NGUYEM, D. (eds) „Papers from the Conference of Standardization of Asian Languages” (Manila, December 16–21, 1974), Canberra, pp. 243–50.
- LLAMZON, T. (ed.), 1979: Papers on Southeast Asian Languages, Singapore.
- LOWENBERG, P. H., 1983: Lexical Modernization in Bahasa Indonesia. Functional allocation and Variation in Borrowing, „Studies in the Linguistic Sciences”, vol. 13,2.
- NABAJAN, P. W. J., 1979: Languages of Indonesia; in: LLAMZON, T. (ed.) „Papers on Southeast Asian Languages”, Singapore, pp. 259–91.
- PERZ, A. Q., SANTIAGO, and LIEM NGUYEM, D. (eds), 1978: Papers from the Conference of Standardisation of Asian Languages (Manila, December. 16–21, 1974), Canberra.
- ROT, S., 1991: Language Contact, Frankfurt am Main–Bern–New York–Paris.
- ROT, S., 1991a: Non-Standard English, Budapest.
- SAPIR, E., 1949 (repr.): Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech, New York.
- SOEBADIO, H., 1969: New Sanskrit loanformation in Bahasa Indonesia, „Cultural Forum” 11, 3–4: 22–30.
- SPITZBARD, H., 1970: Sanskrit loan-words in Bahasa Indonesia, „Journal of Oriental Research” 36: 29–47.
- VENDRYES, L., 1949: Le langage. Introduction linguistique á l 'histoire, Paris.

## SIPOS LAJOS

### **Babits Mihály: A gyémántsóró asszony (Adalékok egy vers keletkezéstörténetéhez)**

1924 januárjában, feltehetően a hónap legelején, a *Nyugat* szerkesztősége nevében Gellért Oszkár kérte fel Babits Mihályt a februári Móricz- emlékszámban való közreműködésre. Babits a levél kézhezvételekor még nem döntött, tanulmányt, visszaemlékezést vagy verset küld, ahhoz azonban nem férhetett kétség: valamilyen módon részt vesz a köszöntésben.<sup>1</sup>

Az OSzK Babits Archívumában pontosan nyomon követhető az a folyamat, amelyiknek végén 1924. február 16-án a folyóiratban első közleményként megjelent az üdvözlő vers, *A gyémántsóró asszony*, Móricz Zsigmondnak szóló ajánlással.