

CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDIES OF THE
MODERN INDONESIAN LANGUAGES IN THE SOVIET UNION*

Liudmila N. Demidyuk
and
Vladimir A. Makarenko
Moscow State University, Moscow

The present paper gives mainly a review of the sociolinguistic studies of the modern Indonesian (or Malay) languages in the Soviet Union in the '60's and '70's. It continues to one extent or another a similar description of the history of Malayo-Polynesian philological studies in the Soviet Union made by Boris B. Parnickel and Ūlo H. Sirk in "Bijdragen" in 1965¹ and review of the Philippine studies in the USSR by Vladimir A. Makarenko in 1967.² The present review provides a systematic analysis of the most essential studies of the Indonesian sociolinguistics in our country. The general review of Indonesian linguistics in the Soviet Union (most essential studies of the Malay, Malaysian, Indonesian, Javanese, Sudanese, Buginese, Tagalog, Cebuano, Iloko, Malagasian and other languages of this group) was given in the special description by L. N. Demidyuk and V. A. Makarenko in "Bijdragen" in 1980.³

During the 1960's and 1970's Soviet linguists (after the '20's and '30's) became greatly interested in sociolinguistic studies, the interrelations between language and thinking, the psychic activities of man and the social life. Prime attention was given to the social role of languages in the newly independent states of Southeast Asia, for which the problems of conscious influence on these languages have become critical, particularly in such multiracial and multilingual countries as the Republic of Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore, the Republic of the Philippines. The essential socio-political processes in these countries are directly reflected in the language situation obtaining there. The study of the evolution of these languages will help to promote a better understanding of current developments in these countries. The following are among the most prominent works written collectively by the soviet authors concerned with this region: 'Modern Literary Languages of Asian Countries' (1965), 'The Language Situation in Asian and African States' (1967), 'Studies of the Language Situation and the Language Problem in Asian and North African Countries' (1970), and 'Language Policy in Afro-Asian Countries' (1977 - all in Russian).

During the period under review many studies were made of the role of languages, the language policy and the language situation in individual countries, as well as in the Southeast Asian region as a whole (i.e. the comparative aspect). Elena A. Kondrashkina pointed out the broadening communicative functions of Bahasa Indonesia during the past thirty years of independent Indonesian development, the growing bilingualism, and the penetration of English vocabulary into the Indonesian languages. She cites the common, unitary orthography that was introduced in Indonesia and Malaysia in 1972, and the trend towards an international standardization of terminology as important steps in the language policies in these countries. As she observes in her work, local languages have developed slowly in Indonesia in the last few years, and the number of

studies devoted to them is insufficient. Tatyana V. Dorofeeva wrote a series of articles on the various aspects of language situation and policy in Malaysia, language standardization, and the development of scientific technical terminology in Malay. She pointed out that there are many contradictions in the various classifications of Malaysian languages (which distinguish from 6 to 17 language groups) and that there is a complex ethno-linguistic situation in the country. As her article entitled 'Language Situation and Language Policy in Malaysia' (1977 – in Russian) puts it, despite the 1967 proclamation that Malay is the only state and official language of Western Malaysia, English often replaces it in official situations, such as instruction at secondary schools and institutions of higher and college education. She presents an interesting analysis of language distribution for various spheres of social activities (government, education, the press, belles-lettres, etc.), and discusses various types of Malaysian bilingualism. In T.V. Dorofeeva's opinion there is a slow but steady shift towards the use of Malay in education, and this will help to oust English from the country's life. Vladlen V. Gordeev, whose monograph tackled the sensitive nationalities question, inevitably touched upon the language problem in modern Malaysia and analyzed the social interrelation of these two phenomena.⁴

Various aspects of the language situation and the language policy in the Republic of the Philippines are discussed by V. A. Makarenko in a number of articles which embrace both the situation obtaining there today and the history of the language problem in the Philippine Islands, along with trends in language development in that country. The main aspects of this research are systematized in this author's article entitled 'The Language Situation and Language Policy in the Philippines' (1977 – in Russian), which analyzes diverse factors in the present-day language situation in the country, shows their historical origins and outlines the stage-by-stage changes in the country's language policy in accordance with its socio-political development. Special consideration is given to the interrelations between the language situation, literature, and the mass media, as well as to secondary and higher or college education. In analyzing the postwar language situation and the language policy of the independent Republic of the Philippines, the author emphasizes the fact that Tagalog, which has been used as the National Language since 1937, has at present an ever widening function. He agrees with those Philippine linguists who predict a further extension of these functions by the year 2000 as a result of the purposeful, although not always effective language policy, and in particular, the policy of bilingualism in education (in its realization). V. A. Makarenko does not agree, however, with the idea that there exist evident and essential linguistic differences between modern Tagalog and the so-called "Philippine language" or Pilipino which is to be based on Tagalog and used as an official national language. What he believes is a significant problem is the difference between literary and colloquial Tagalog, which has yet to be described by linguists. The language elements proper in the evolution of Tagalog have been described in some articles by V. A. Makarenko and I. V. Podberezsky.⁵

Natalia F. Alieva treats the specific nature of language norms formation in the process of the evolution of classical Malay, and the development of Indonesian on this basis.⁶ She is the author also of some articles on the language problems in Indonesia which were published in collections mentioned above.

Sociolinguistic problems, both inter- and intra-linguistic, are also frequently dealt with in many non-sociolinguistic works that are connected with analyses of vocabulary, grammar, word-building, etc. The first complete 'Grammar of Indonesian' (in Russian) was published in Moscow by N. F. Alieva and others in 1972. It sums up the results of

20 years of study of the varied problems and aspects of Indonesian by Soviet linguists. This grammar contributes a great deal to linguistic information published earlier in other countries, including Indonesia.⁷ Soviet grammarians and lexicologists have also given a great deal of attention to the problems of morphology and word-building – to the relations between morphology and word-building in the sociolinguistic aspect. The problems of the semantics, productivity and composition of word-building affixes in Indonesian have also been posed alongside those of the means of word-formation.⁸ V. I. Pechkurov has provided a thorough treatment of these problems in his candidate thesis dedicated to socio-political terminology of modern Indonesian.⁹ It is important to point out the semasiological aspect of studies, the formation of socio-political terminology and the general lexicological principles of its formation. In studying word-formation Soviet students of Indonesian take into account the meaning of affixes, their realization depending on the lexical grades of basic word-building, and the semantic structure of the derivative word and its relation to the initial basis.

V. A. Makarenko's and I. V. Podberesky's studies of word-formation in Tagalog center around analyses of the morphological elements of words, i.e. affix and root morphemes, their structure and semantics, the laws of their junction and morphophonemic boundary processes. These authors discuss the most general aspects of word-formation in Tagalog and another Philippine language (in comparative aspect), such as the main structural and semantic types and the models of words, and the main ways of word-formation (affixation, reduplication, duplication, composition). They point to the close structural-semantic similarity of affixation and partial duplication (or reduplication), and word composition and complete duplication. In these works word-formation analyses prevail over word-building syntheses. They also provide an almost complete inventory of the means of affixation in Tagalog.¹⁰

V. A. Makarenko's monograph, 'Word-Formation in Tagalog' (1970 – in Russian), presents a systematic analysis of word-building relations, the question of specific relations between word-formation and form-building, and a great number of syntactical means of word and form building. Such an analysis of word-formation system on a synchronous plane, and a consistent and systematic description of the main word-formative processes and acts in Tagalog, which has an extremely diversified word-formative system, is not only important in itself, but also contributes greatly to comparative and general linguistics. This study of the word-formative system and its simultaneous classification of word-formative models along with their comparative productivity reveals the main trends of morphological word-formation in Tagalog. The author establishes and describes in consecutive order the structurally significant elements of a word and their specific relations. In this way, a detailed description is followed by a systematic enumeration of word-formation instances in Tagalog. The book contains a "maximum formula of Tagalog word composition" and a "maximum formula of Tagalog morphological word-building". This monograph also has an extensive bibliography on Tagalog word-formation (pp. 154-164, listing about 240 works).¹¹ It is based on Makarenko's own, more detailed thesis.¹²

Comparative studies of word-formation problems have also been made. Mention should be made first of all of V. A. Makarenko's works of the '70's. Nominative word-building in Tagalog is especially important to typological studies because the main features of the general formula for Tagalog word-formation can be applied not only to

other Philippine languages, but also to cognate Indonesian and Polynesian languages of the Pacific. What is new in these studies of word-building is that they concentrate on the semantics of derivative units.¹³ This makes it possible to discuss the problems of word-formation synthesis in modern Indonesian languages.¹⁴

There are also some works on the written languages in the Indonesian group. Proceeding from and giving a summary of former studies,¹⁵ V. A. Makarenko and K. Y. Meshkov systematized the most essential problems of the old Filipino script, which by the middle of the 18th century had given way to the Roman alphabet in Tagalog, Bisayan, Ilokano and some other Philippine languages. Their articles support the view that the Filipino script is of South-Indian (or Dravidian) origin and was introduced via the old Javanese written language by a process of cultural interference.¹⁶

The modern written languages like Bahasa Indonesia, Javanese, Budinese, Sundanese, Minangkabau, Malagasy and Tagalog have been dealt with in a well-known reference work on the world's written languages. There have already been several editions of this work and it has been translated into English.¹⁷ The works mentioned above, with their numerous objectives, illustrate various up-to-date methods of the Soviet linguistic study. They have paved the way for further linguistic studies and the theoretical understanding in the Soviet Union of the various languages of the Indonesian (or Malay) group.

NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

*This is a shorter version of the paper delivered at the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics held at Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia from January 19 to 24, 1981.

1. B. B. Parnickel, U. H. Sirk, 'Austronesian Philology in the Soviet Union', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 1965. 121-2:245-258.
2. V. A. Makarenko, 'Izuchenije v SSSR filippinskikh jazykov do i posl Oktyabrya' (The Philippine languages studies in the USSR before and after the October Revolution), *Narody Azii i Afriki (NAA)* 1967-6:100-107. See also: J. Genzor, 'Philippine Studies in the Soviet Union: Part II', *Asian and African Studies*. Bratislava, 1979-XV:165-176.
3. L. N. Demidyuk and V. A. Makarenko, 'Indonesian Linguistics in the Soviet Union in the '60's and '70's', *BKI* 1980:136-4.
4. V. V. Gordeev, *Natsional'nyj vopros v Malajzii* (The Nationalities Question in Malaysia), Moscow: Nauka, 1977. 146pp.
5. V. A. Makarenko, 'Development of the Modern Language Situation in the Republic of the Philippines and its Main Trends', in: 'Studies of the Language Situation and the Language Problem in Asian and North African Countries'. Moscow: Nauka, 1970; 'The Language Situation and Language Policy in the Philippines (the main problems of research)', in: 'Language Policy in Afro-Asian Countries'. Moscow: Nauka, 1977; 'The Language Situation in the Philippines in the Past and Present', *NAA*, 1970-5:123-135; 'The Evolution of Modern Tagalog', *NAA* 1979-3:114-122; 'The Main Features of Post-war Philippine Literature', in: 'Literatures of Foreign Asia in the Modern Age'. Moscow: Nauka, 1975; I. V.

- Podberezsky, 'Tagalog in the Philippines', in: 'Problems of Language and Literature'. Moscow: MGIMO, 1969, p. 2.
6. N. F. Alieva, 'From the Malay language to Indonesian (problems of norms formation)', *NAA* 1976-2:112-120.
 7. N. F. Alieva, V. D. Arakin, A. K. Ogloblin and U. H. Sirk, '*Grammatika indonesijsko-gojazyka* (A Grammar of Indonesian language)'. Moscow: Nauka, 1972, 462 pp.
 8. V.I. Pechkurov, 'On Productive Word Building Morphemes in the Socio-Political Terminology of Modern Indonesian', in: 'Foreign Languages', No. 4, Moscow, 1968; L.N. Demidyuk, 'Duplication in modern Indonesian', Candidate thesis, Moscow, 1972; N.F. Alieva, 'The Interrelation of Word-building and Syntactical Functions of Verb Affixes in Indonesian', *Voprosy Yazykoznanija*, Moscow, 1963-2: 103-111, and others.
 9. V.I. Pechkurov, 'The Socio-Political Terminology of Modern Indonesian', Candidate thesis, Moscow: 1970.
 10. V.A. Makarenko, 'The Morphological Structure of Words in Modern Tagalog,' in: 'Scientific Conference "Lomonosov Readings"', Moscow: Moscow State University (MGU) Press, April 1965; I. V. Podberezsky, 'The Morphological Structure of Words in Tagalog', in: *Southeast Asian Languages*. Moscow: Nauka, 1967. etc.
 11. V.A. Makarenko, 'Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta' (VMU). Ser. XVI. Mostokovedenje', MGU, 1972-2.
 12. V.A. Makarenko, 'Morphological Word-formation in Modern Tagalog,' Candidate thesis, Moscow, MGU, 1966.
 13. V.A. Makarenko, 'Tagalog-Indonesian Word-formative Parallels', in: 'Problems of Philology of SEA Countries', MGU, 1965; V.D. Arakin, 'Typological Features of Word Building Systems in Some of the Indonesian Languages', in: '*Southeast Asian Languages*'. Moscow: Nauka, 1967.
 14. L.N. Demidyuk and V.A. Makarenko, 'Structural Principles of Word-Formative Systems of Substantives in Indonesian and Tagalog', VMU, 1973-1.
 15. See V.A. Makarenko, Some Data on South Indian Cultural Influences in Southeast Asia: The History of the Origin and Development of the Old Filipino Script, *Tamil Culture*. Madras, 1964-11-1: 58-91.
 16. V.Z. Makarenko and K.Y. Meshkov, 'The Main Problems with regard to Old Filipino Script Studies', in: '*Sovetskaja Etnografija (Soviet Ethnography)*', Moscow, 1973-2 (in Russian language).
 17. R.S. Gilyarevsky and V.S. Grivnin, *Languages Identification Guide*, Rev. and Supplemented, Moscow: Nauka, 1970 (1st ed., 1965, in Russian)