

Reorientation of Literary Study: From Indonesian Literature to Literature in Indonesia

Dr. Pujiharto, M. Hum

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
pujiharto@ugm.ac.id

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2016.v7n3p288

Abstract

This writing concerns a need to know how far the implication of defining Indonesian literature by basing it on the language used is on literary study in Indonesia in relation with the function of literature as agent of nation building. In response to that need, a library study has been made, using the method of interpretation involving both types, i.e., analysis and synthesis. Results of the study indicate that defining Indonesian literature by basing it on the language used has the implication of creating a counterproductive condition from the point of the function of literature as agent of nation building. The wealth of literary works living and growing among the various regional ethnic groups existing in Indonesia has been insufficiently followed up with cross-literary study that would be supportive to the formation of being Indonesian. Past events indicate the following instead: (1) lack of government attention to regional literary development; (2) insufficient recognition of regional literature people as people of Indonesian literature; and (3) colonial construction concerning Indonesian literature resulting in the occurrence of de-characterization of Indonesian literature as agent of nation building. In order that literature could function as agent of nation building, literary study needs to be reoriented from study of Indonesian literature to study of the literature all over Indonesia.

Keywords: function of literature, nation building, the literature all over Indonesia

1. Introduction

The act of defining literature as agent of the nation's culture formation, with the formation being part of nation building, as far as what is observable, is done in two ways. One way is to use as basis the name of the language or the country in which the literature concerned lives. The definition of literature with a related language as basis occurs in many countries: English literature is the literature using English, French literature is the literature using French, Japanese literature is the literature using Japanese, German literature is the literature using German, Dutch literature is the literature using Dutch, and so on. However, not all definitions of literature are based on the language used. In the context of Singapore, for example, as soon as it separated itself from Malaysia, people of literature living in Singapore were no longer those of Malaysia; they became those of Singapore. All their literary works which used Malaysian were immediately called Singaporean literature. The literature living in America and Australia, though using English, is respectively named American and Australian literature.

Defining literature as above is closely related to the socio-cultural background of the country where the literature concerned lives. What is worth underlining is that the defining of literature by using as basis the language used tends to happen in countries possessing homogenous culture. Such correlation occurs because language is indeed an inherent element in culture. On the contrary, defining literature by using as basis the name of the country of domicile occurs because in the country concerned there are a variety of cultures. In Singapore, for example, at least Chinese culture, Malay culture, and Indian culture are found. With different cultural elements, the same pattern also occurs in America and Australia. Though there is difference in socio-cultural background among the societies concerned, what is important to underline is that such definition-making is closely related to the function of literature as agent of nation building for the people concerned.

In relation with the characteristics of the above mentioned countries, Indonesia is more like the countries possessing many cultures such as America and Australia. However, while such a country as Australia stands as a continuation of previously occurring English colonialism, Indonesia is a country that resisted colonialism and then became an independent country; while the national language of America and Australia is English, which is the language of the country that used to colonize the regions that have now become their territory, Indonesian, the national language of Indonesia, was at first Malay, the language of one of the ethnic groups found there. Indonesia itself is a name coined later without any cultural reference to a preceding era. Indonesia, as a word at first used in the field of ethnology to refer to the region with many islands and in which there are many races such as the Javanese, Sundanese, Balinese, and Bugis

racas, has then been adopted as the name of the state concerned.

However, such a condition as mentioned above implies that the definition of Indonesian literature is based on the language it uses instead of the country it is related to. It implies that Indonesian literature is the literature using Indonesian as its medium of expression. Why has such a thing happened? What factors have caused it? What has been the implication occurring afterwards or is such defining productive or, conversely, counterproductive from the point of nationalism? If it is counterproductive, what steps need to be taken? Based on the issues above, this paper seeks to criticize the direction of the development of Indonesian literature that has lasted this long, to evaluate, and offer a solution that is deemed most productive.

2. Conceptual Framework

To help addressing the problems above, the following are a few concepts that are relevant.

2.1 Definition

The term definition means "process, the way, the act to provide a definition". The term comes from the Latin word *definitio* which means "the determination of the meaning" or "restriction". There are two elements to the discussion on the definition, namely *definiendum*, that a concept is defined, and *definiens*, which is the explanation of *definiendum* (Vredendregt, 1978: 22-23). Based on the idea above, what is meant by definition is "the determination of the meaning or restriction of certain concepts that become the subject or study". The concept, which is important in defining the terms of the definition, is a term that is an abstraction used to question the observation of concrete (Vredendregt, 1978: 21). Thus, in the discussion on the definition has actually covered the "result of observation" that has been discussed much, that it was conceptualized. The definition of the concept of "the observation result" further serves as a determinant of meaning / barrier or as a guide. The first function appears in the definition of the concepts that are used as a conceptual framework in scientific research activity; the second function looks at the definition of the concepts used in policy decisions. An example of the second function appears, for example, in the definition of the concepts in the Presidential or Minister Decree and other regulations.

2.2 The Function of Literature

Description of the definition above has a close relationship with the function of literature since the function of literature as a concept should be formulated in such a way so as to describe what it is meant. The formulation is also a sense of determination / limitation of the concept of the function of literature, in the context of the research literature; it is very useful to achieve the research objectives. That is because, according to Vredendregt (1978: 22), the validity of the definition is determined by its purpose. In the context of development of the policy of literature, the definition of the concept of the function of literature is very useful for the implementation of the guidelines in an effort to realize the work program.

According to Wellek and Warren (1956: 26), the primary function of literature is in its loyalty to its own nature. What is expressed by Horace, *dulce et utile*; fun and useful, must be understood in a relationship of interdependence: fun in question is in the context of usefulness, and vice versa. However, the validity of the concept should be linked with the defining aim (Vredendregt, 1978: 22). Eagleton (1983: 8) argues that literature lays its literary definitions up to the way people decide to read. Vredendregt's statement reinforced by the Eagleton's statement, also applies to the definition of the concept of literary function. On the basis of such thinking, which then develop relevantly, is the function of "useful", that was selected for the purpose of this paper is more in respect to the "its usefulness". "Usefulness" in question is with the regard to its function as a means of nation building.

If what has happened in other countries mentioned in the introduction is used as reference, surely in order to be able to perform its function as agent of nation building, Indonesian literature ought to be defined with the country concerned as basis, namely, as the literature existing and growing in the state of Indonesia, instead of with the language concerned as basis, namely, as the literature using Indonesian as medium of expression. However, it has already become common knowledge that there is difference in socio-cultural background between one country and another. Such difference is surely worth making into an important consideration to be afterwards used as basis for policy making.

3. Method

The research method used is the documentary method. This method was chosen because the whole concept, statements, opinions, and arguments with the regard to the definition of the Indonesian literary which is underlying the development of the Indonesian literature policy over the years, which were selected as the data in this study, have been recorded in the written form.

To discover the answer to the several previously mentioned problem questions here, a research study has been conducted using a library research method. The collection of data has been done by making careful and repeated readings of various relevant literal data. There has been a reduction of data by dismissing those considered irrelevant. An interpretation has been made on the remaining relevant data. The interpretation has been of two types: analysis (separating) and synthesis (unifying) (Kuntowijoyo, 2013: 78).

4. Result and Discussion

4.1 Causative Factors

The definition of Indonesian literature used in various contexts both in the scientific activity in the teaching and learning process at high school or the university or in research or other scientific activity and in everyday discussion in printed and electronic media or in various other opportunities in daily life at present refers to the literature using Indonesian as its medium of expression. Such a definition has become a tradition strongly rooted in public consciousness and has therefore been accepted as true and considered having no need of any more questioning. It has occurred that way because the definition, which had been a legacy of the past, has been continuously preserved. The preservation has been done effectively in various ways, one of which that appears quite strong has been through the process of teaching and learning at school. The preservation is also done by establishing institutions in the form of study programs at universities specifically developing literary arts and tending to teach literature by first relating it to the language used in it; the preservation has also been done by establishing research institutions whose job is developing the language and literature scattered in various provinces in Indonesia. In other words, such a definition of literature, borrowing a term used by Gramsci (Simon, 2000: 19-22), is already highly hegemonic.

According to a search conducted, a definition similar to that is initially stated by the Dutch researcher A. Teeuw in the book *Voltooid Voorspel, Indonesische Literatuur tussen twee Wereldoorlogen* (1950), later translated into *Pokok dan Tokoh dalam Sastra Indonesia Baru I dan II* (1952). In the first paragraph of the content part of the book (Teeuw, 1955: 15)¹, his view about Indonesian literature being based on the Indonesian language is clearly written.

Barangsiapa hendak memperkatakan kesusastraan Indonesia, baiklah dengan cara yang agak panjang lebar membicarakan bahasa yang dipakai sebagai bahasa pengantar kesusastraan itu. Yang saya maksudkan bukanlah hal-hal istimewa yang terdapat pada tatabahasa dan logatnya – hal-hal yang demikian memang penting, hanya kurang tepat jika di sini dibicarakan. Tetapi perlu dengan cara mendalam dipersoalkan masalah betapa bahasa itu, yakni bahasa Indonesia – dengan tilikan selayang pandang seolah-olah secara tiba-tiba saja – telah menjadi bahasa pengantar kesusastraan yang baru, sebab bagi menyelidiki kesusastraan itu, banyaklah yang dapat dipelajari dari dan dijelaskan oleh peristiwa perkembangan bahasa Melayu menjadi bahasa Indonesia. ('Whoever would talk about Indonesian literature had better discuss in a somewhat lengthy manner the language used as language of expression in the aforesaid literature. I do not mean the special features of the grammar and dialect – though such features are important ones, they are just not so appropriate to be discussed here. But it is necessary to argue in an intensive manner about the matter of how that language, the Indonesian language – at a glance, as if all in a sudden – has become the language of expression of the new literature because, for those investigating the literature, much could be learned from and explained by the event of the Malay language developing into the Indonesian language.')

That statement of Teeuw's itself seems to appear as a manifestation of his interpretation of Sumpah Pemuda ('the Youth's Pledge') taken in 1928, which states that the young people of Indonesia acknowledge one motherland, Indonesia, that they acknowledge one nation, Indonesia, and that they respect the language of unity, Indonesian. In Teeuw's eyes, of the three points of the pledge, the act of defining Indonesian literature has the closest relationship with the third point. For him, literature is an entity which is inseparable from language; language is a basic material of literature (Teeuw, 1955:

¹The book cited here is the third edition.

15)². With such a perception, Indonesian literature also tends to be perceived as the literature using Indonesian as its medium of expression. It seems to stress that the spirit of being Indonesian should be expressed through the medium in the form of the Indonesian language.

Such result of interpretation is then also adopted by Indonesian literary historians after him and also by Indonesian literary experts in general in defining Indonesian literature, later gaining institutional support as has been mentioned above.

Such defining of Indonesian literature later proves to have an implication which, from the perspective of nation building, becomes counterproductive. First, by making Indonesian a basis of naming Indonesian literature, or, by making the use of Indonesian as medium of expression one of the bases in naming Indonesian literature, a subsequent implication is that the implementation of policies of improvement and development tend to treat regional language and literature unfairly (as if they were 'stepchildren'). Indeed, as expressed by Rosidi (1976), at first, regional language and literature kept growing and their development was guaranteed by Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, the Indonesian constitution. However, along with the strengthening efforts to form the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, the unfair treatment began to be felt. Samuel (2008: 73-74) indicates that since Indonesian was adopted as language of unity, in the sense that it became the state language and national language, less attention has been paid to efforts to develop regional language. An implication of that policy has been that regional literature, understood as the literature using regional language as medium of expression, has also experienced the same thing. Findings by Suwondo et al. (2006) in their research indicate that since Indonesian was declared as language of unity (or unitary, uniting, or unifying language), followed by the perception that Indonesian literature was literature of unity (or unitary, uniting, or unifying literature), attention to Javanese literature has been far less adequate compared to that to Indonesian literature. It is in spite of the fact that, as is the case with Indonesian literature, regional literature has also interacted with European culture. In the case of Javanese literature, its encounter with European culture, as expressed by Ras (1985), has given birth to modern Javanese literature. In fact, in view of the Javanese literature published by Balai Pustaka at its beginning (1920), as expressed by Rinkes (Quinn in Suwondo and Mardianto, 2001: 2), Sundanese and Javanese literary books published at that time were greater in number compared to Malay literary books; there were forty titles of books in Madurese, eighty titles of books in Malay, almost a hundred titles of books in Sundanese, and almost two hundred titles of books in Javanese. It seems that the case is likewise with other regional literature.

As expressed by Suwondo (2006), though proportionally lacking attention, Javanese literature, because its writers remain in love with literature and therefore possess a high spirit to keep writing, keeps being written by local Javanese writers and published through local Javanese newspapers, too. If efforts to improve and develop it had been done proportionally, there would have been many authors endlessly attempting to express themselves through Javanese literature. The lack of attention to and development of Javanese literature certainly has a serious implication, namely, Javanese writers' expression of nationalism being hampered. More careful observation indicates that the spirit of the youth expressed in the abovementioned pledge of the youth is of their love of their motherland and nation, Indonesia. As for the Indonesian language, it is for them placed in the position of the language of unity, meaning the language expected to be able to unite the regional ethnic groups differing and varying in culture and, inclusively

With Indonesian placed in the position of language of unity as above, surely any regional language is an entity that should continue to exist and to keep being developed in order that it could continue to survive and respond to the challenges of the times that occur. Likewise is the case with regional literature. In the effort to develop itself and to respond to challenges of the times, regional literature would show its ability in processing the values of nationalism by starting from local cultural wealth. In that way, since in Indonesia there are various regional literatures, surely varying expressions of nationalism would be seen within them. Thus, the unfair treatment given to regional literature has caused a great loss because it means hindering regional people's participation in expressing their national consciousness (or awareness) through the literary and cultural codes that they master.

Perhaps there are those who consider that the loss is in nature merely an assumption, which also means that there is a possibility of it being untrue. The following is proof reinforcing that indeed there is a loss suffered. Generally writers originating in Java would later in the 1980s, when using Indonesian as medium of literary expression, tend to insert Javanese vocabulary into their work because it seemed to them there was no vocabulary in Indonesian accurately representing what they wanted to say. Kayam (1982: 87-94) sees such a phenomenon in, for example, the works by Linus Suryadi A.G. and Y.B. Mangunwijaya. Viewed in a wider scope, a phenomenon like what is observed by Umar

² Later, in the book *Sastra dan Ilmu Sastra (1984)*, Teeuw makes some theorizing which explains that language is a basic material of literature and therefore a discussion of a literary work is inseparable from a discussion of the language used as its medium of expression.

Kayam above also occurs in literary works written by authors from other regions. Putu Wijaya, for example, who comes from Bali, inserts a sufficiently great quantity of Balinese vocabulary into the novel *Bila Malam Bertambah Malam* (1971). Korrie Layun Rampan, who comes from a Dayak community, also inserts a lot of Dayak vocabulary into the novel *Api Awan Asap* (1998). So is the case with authors coming from other regional ethnic groups?

Indeed such cases are understandably where regional language contributes to the effort of forming the Indonesian language: in order to become a strong national language, the Indonesian language needs the contribution of regional languages. If all the languages of the various sub-races in Indonesia have a share in giving such contribution, the Indonesian language would surely become a language that is quite rich with various vocabularies, something also indicating the richness of Indonesian people's knowledge of life around them. However, it needs to be understood that the discussion here concerns literature; if language is to be discussed, surely it has to be also within the framework of discussing literature. It has become common knowledge that the language of literature is a second-level meaning system. Lotman (Teeuw, 1984) calls it *secondary modelle bildende system*, Barthes (1968) calls it connotation. As second-level meaning system, literature should depart from its supporting language, which is its first-level meaning system, or denotation, or *primary modelle bildende system*. If the literary work is written with "a *gado-gado* language" (i.e., a language like *gado-gado*, a salad-like Indonesian dish, due to using vocabulary from different languages), could its literary meaning be enjoyed? Such a condition does not seem to make literature readers enjoy the aesthetic experience from only the literary and cultural codes they are already intimate with; instead, indeed reading it might conversely become a continuous searching and interpreting process in the course of understanding it, a ceaseless process in search of national identity (Damonte, 2007: xvi). Are such consequences indeed inevitable, with there being no other alternative that can better accommodate the variety of literature and culture in existence so that what is called *bhinneka tunggal ika* is indeed actually alive on mother earth, and not a mere jargon?

Second, by making the Indonesian language the basis for the naming of Indonesian literature, people of literature that counted as people of Indonesian literature early in its development also tended to refer to a very small number of people who have written their literary works in Indonesian. The Indonesian language has been treated as identifier of being people of Indonesian literature. People of literature who were very good in the 1920s in writing in Indonesian, which at that time was still called High Malay, were of course the ones already using Indonesian as their language of daily communication. In general, early Indonesian literature people came from Minangkabau (Hamzah, 1957: 23-24). Those who write literary works in a language other than Indonesian, though their works portray love of Indonesia, would not be put in the category of people of Indonesian literature. The category of their being authors would first be based on the language they use to create their literary works: those who write literary works in Javanese would be called authors or poets of Javanese literature, those who do that in Balinese would be called authors or poets of Balinese literature, those who do that in Sundanese would be called authors or poets of Sundanese literature, and so on.

By referring to only those who were good in using Indonesian, who generally came from Minangkabau, as early Indonesian literature people, a subsequent implication was that literature people coming from other regions who used their respective regional languages in writing their literary works would tend to be said lacking in possession of national consciousness and would be viewed as putting regional consciousness in front. Such a thing indeed seemed to actually happen. Therefore, a sufficiently fatal result became inevitable, namely, as has been mentioned above, an unfair treatment has happened to the development of regional language and literature. The Indonesian language, as has been pledged by the youth, is a language of unity, a language that unites the existing sub-races, including their respective regional languages, and it has become a hegemonic language (Faruk, 2007), which has the potential of extinguishing regional language and literature. It proves that there has been a change of orientation from that of endeavoring to build national consciousness in the course of being Indonesian without disturbing the growth of regional language, literature, and culture, into that of making Indonesian hegemonic at all lines and have the potential of displacing and extinguishing regional language and literature. It is so in spite of research on literary works in modern Javanese by Suwondo et al., for example, indicating that national consciousness also grows within them. In early Sundanese literature, as stated by Rosidi (2013), the existence of the national consciousness meant here is also portrayed. Hypothetically, surely the same phenomenon also appears in other regional literature. It means that the use of regional language, in the context of regional literary creation, actually has no positive correlation with the growth of the spirit of regionalism and the fading of the spirit of nationalism in the literature people concerned.

Besides, by acknowledging only the literature using High Malay as Indonesian literature, the people of literature using Low Malay in their works are not accommodated, either, as people of Indonesian literature. It is in spite of the finding that, when examined carefully, many literary works written in Low Malay express the national consciousness of the literature people concerned. Through the book *Tempoe Doeloe*, for example, Pramoedyana Ananta Toer (2003) shows how literary works in Low Malay in that anthology of his portray anticolonial attitudes. So is the case with some literary

works written by half-Chinese authors and collected in the six volumes of *Kesastraan Melayu Tionghoa dan Kebangsaan Indonesia* published by Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia. The writing by Pujiharto et al. (2014) about "Identitas Nasional dalam Cerita-Cerita Pra-Indonesia (National Identity on Pre-Indonesian Stories)" also indicates the same thing.

Also, in the field of social humaniora in the current era, there is already an appearance of the attempt to make the redefinition that one's nationalism is the result of construction (Heryanto, 2015). What is called native used to be also the result of construction. The interactions among different races or sub-races have gone on very intensely so that to become a member of which race is one's own choice. Also the concept of nation expressed by the youth in 1928, to which Teeuw refers as the basis of determining the nationalism of early people of Indonesian literature as written in his book about the history of literature seems to also need redefinition. As stated by Anderson (1991), a nation consists of imagined communities. How do we legitimize that someone is a member of an imagined community? How do we do it, moreover, when related to the socio-political reality in the 1920s, which at that time showed people still in the process of formation into a nation to be later called the Indonesian nation? This effort of redefinition would become a highly strategic basis for the determination of literary works that are the right and relevant ones to be included among parts of Indonesian literary history.

Third, by making literary works using Indonesian published by Balai Pustaka the basis for the determination of the birth of Indonesian literature, unconsciously Indonesian people are invited into a world whose creation should meet the criteria already set by Balai Pustaka itself and given the name of Nota Rinkes. As for what Nota Rinkes says, it is as follows: (1) any reading material published ought to fit the taste of the consumers' community, (2) any reading material produced ought to be able to increase the knowledge of the readers' society, (3) any reading material produced ought to enable society to fight backwardness, (4) any reading material produced ought to be able to keep society away from any matter that could damage government sovereignty and peace in the state (Damono in Faruk, 1999: 114-115).

By basing itself on Nota Rinkes, Balai Pustaka attempted to somehow direct the stories that it published so that they did not endanger the colonial people themselves. By giving native people of literature a chance to write for Balai Pustaka, the Dutch colonial government seemed to attempt to make the natives intellectuals, giving them a chance to express their cultural identity. However, hidden behind it, there was an intention of the Dutch colonial government at that time to keep maintaining its power over the colony. The Dutch colonial government made a very systematic effort by creating a certain discourse in the course of exaggerating and glorifying colonial culture and even the colonization practice that they had done. They exploited literary works created by natives by turning them in such ways that the story line went in the direction they wanted.

Such a suspicion was proven true later. Contemporary research studies done by researchers of Indonesian literature by using a post-colonial perspective indicates that early Indonesian literary works like *Sitti Nurbaya* by Marah Rusli (1922) and *Salah Asuhan* by Abdul Muis (1928) portray the operation of the colonial ideology in its effort to keep maintaining its grip on the natives. Instead of portraying anti-colonial attitudes, such novels portray identity crisis and praise for colonialism.

By means of his research, Pujiharto (2009: 62-86) shows that the story protagonist named Sjamsul Bahri, who seemed at first to be a good-natured and faithful character struggling to win his love, turned out to be a figure with colonial mentality who became a minion of colonialism. When frustrated due to his inability to win Sitti Nurbaya, he tried to end his life by committing suicide, and, failing in the suicide attempt, he enlisted in KNIL (*Koninklijk Nederlands-Indische Leger* 'Royal Netherlands East Indies Army'). When he was already a KNIL soldier, he was ordered to take part in putting down a rebellion taking place in Padang. Datuk Meringgih, an antagonist character presented as bad-natured, greedy, evil, and merciless, was one of the rebels. By being called rebels, the people concerned were all enemies of the Dutch colonial government. However, when viewed from a national perspective, actually the rebels were freedom fighters. It was at that time when Syam was in the position of being a minion of the Dutch colonial government that he then made use of the chance to take revenge on Datuk Meringgih. The battle between the two ended with the death of both men. With such a story line, the effect occurring in the reader is a kind of uncertain feeling, a condition which is ambivalent in nature: on one hand, the Dutch colonial government became a kind of *deus ex machina* for Syamsul Bahri, the story protagonist, because it was due to that government's help that Syam could slay his enemy; on the other hand, with both undergoing the kind of death called *sampyuh* (i.e., dying by slaying each other), it is seen that these two, who were both natives, were pitted against one another by the colonial government. The second-mentioned effect above seems to strengthen the view that the Dutch colonial government has practiced a policy of *divide et impera* through a story.

As observed by Hamid (2007: 113), Hanafi, who is said to die at the end of the story by committing suicide as the result of the identity crisis that he had undergone, because, on one hand, he had not been accepted as their equal by Europeans, and, on the other hand, he was ashamed of returning to his family because, in his opinion, they were low in

level, indicates the occurrence of a de-characterization process in native people on the face of the cultural change at that time.

In addition, it also needs to be told that, in publishing literary books, Balai Pustaka classified them into, for example, Javanese literature, (High) Malay literature, Sundanese literature, and so on. It seems that, behind such classification, there was an intention of the Dutch colonial government of making the archipelago called Nusantara remains in its diversity. Another result of it was the appearance of other genres, namely, Low Malay literature and Dutch Indies literature. By maintaining diversity, the colonial government would more easily identify, control, or break apart forces potential of endangering it. Such findings also strengthen the view that the policy of *divide et impera* was practiced not only through a story (such as that in *Sitti Nurbaya*) but also in real policy concerning language and literature development efforts.

4.2 From Indonesian Literature to the Literature throughout Indonesia

The discussion above indicates that defining Indonesian literature with only the use of the Indonesian language as its medium of expression as basis has a wide implication: studies concerning literature with literary works in existence in Indonesia as object of study are less conducive to efforts of nation building. As a nation possessing a diversity of cultural wealth, Indonesia, in relation with literary study, ought not to have placed literature in any position by basing it only on the language used but more on the consideration of literature as a means of nation building. The Indonesian language needs to be returned to its initial concept, namely, as language of unity (or to unite all). For that purpose, a reorientation of literary study needs to be made: from that oriented to the language used to that oriented to nation building, from Indonesian literature to the literature all over Indonesia.

The idea of the need for study on the literature all over Indonesia to be done in the sense of cross-literary study with literary works using as their medium the diverse languages still existing and living in Indonesia as objects of study was once suggested by A. Teeuw in 1981 in the occasion of celebrating the sixty-fourth anniversary of *Penerbit Balai Pustaka*. As has been mentioned above, Teeuw was the same person who, through his study on literary history in the 1950s, at first defined literature by basing it on the language used, stating that Indonesian literature was the literature using the Indonesian language as its medium of expression. There has not been any information yet that explains what has been the background causing Teeuw's point of view to change. As far as what is observable, such a change is something that commonly happens, especially when related to his position as scholar (of literature), for whom there is a demand for always being innovative. Whatever has been the reason for the change, that latter idea of Teeuw's, in the writer's opinion, has been a visionary one for his era. It also still remains relevant to be offered today. A question that arises in the writer's mind is as follows: while Teeuw's initial idea that the naming of literature be based on the language used has won so many followers among native scholars and has even been followed up with the government's steps of institutionalization by establishing language and literature study programs based on the language used, why has the response to Teeuw's later idea not as good as that to his former idea though the latter one is quite relevant to efforts of forming a sovereign nation? There seem to be several causative factors. First, research in the field of language and literature has not become a tradition yet in Indonesia. Among the human resource working in the academic world, more focus is on teaching rather than on research. Second, the scientific bureaucracy in Indonesia is rather difficult to undergo a change because the bureaucracy is already so institutionalized in relation with various parties, which makes the institution have to remain in place and makes it difficult to move out of that condition.

However, surely such matters above could not be made excuses. There are many ways that could be taken in order to be able to make cross-literary research. The government has poured so many funds that could be made use of by literary researchers to develop their creative ideas.

5. Conclusion

The occurrence of making hegemonic the definition of Indonesian literature as the literature using the Indonesian language as its medium of expression has implied the occurrence of the fading of study orientation leaning toward the effort of nation building through study of the literary works existing and growing in Indonesia. Such a counterproductive state needs to be directed to a more productive study conditioning; literary study in Indonesia needs to be counter directed to study of all and any of the types of literature throughout Indonesia.

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised edition, London – New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes, Roland. 1968. *Elements of Semiology*, New York: Hill and Wang.
- Damono, Sapardi Djoko. 2007. "Keindonesiaan dan Sebagainya: Sebuah Pengantar", *Keindonesiaan dan Kemelayuan dalam Sastra [Indonesianess and Others: An Introduction to Indonesianess and Malayness in Literature]*, Depok, Jawa Barat: Desantara.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1983. *Literary Theory An Introduction*, Oxford—Basil Blackwell.
- Faruk. 2007. *Belunggu Pasca-Kolonial Hegemoni dan Resistensi dalam Sastra Indonesia [Chain of Post-Colonial Hegemony and Resistance in Indonesian Literature]*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Foucault, Michel. 2008. *La Volonte de Savoir, Ingin Tahu Sejarah Seksualitas (terjemahan Rahayu S. Hidayat) [La Volonte de Savoir, Getting To Know the History of Sexuality, translated by Rahayu S. Hidayat]*, Jakarta: YOI.
- Hamid, Rahimah Haji A. 2007. "Pemaparan Krisis Identiti dalam Karya Pengarang Malaysia dan Indonesia: Suatu Perbandingan", *Keindonesiaan dan Kemelayuan dalam Sastra, [Exposure of Identity Crisis on Indonesian and Malay Authors: A Comparison, Indonesianess and Malayness in Literature]*, Depok, Jawa Barat: Desantara.
- Hamzah, Amal. 1957. *Buku dan Penulis [Books and Writers]*, 3rd edition, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Heryanto, Ariel. 2015. *Identitas dan Kenikmatan Politik Budaya Layar Indonesia [Identity and The Pleasure of Indonesian Background's Cultural Politic]*, Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Kayam, Umar, 1982. "Multilingualisme dalam Sastra Indonesia [Multilingualism in Indonesian Literature]," in *Sejumlah Masalah Sastra*, editorial by Satyagraha Hoerip, Jakarta: Sinar Harapan.
- Kuntowijoyo. 2013. *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah [Introduction to History]*, Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Pujiharto, 2009. "Puitika Pascamodernisme dalam Fiksi Indonesia [Post-Modern Poetry in Indonesian Fiction]", PhD Thesis, Yogyakarta: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya UGM.
- _____. 2009. "Nasionalisme dalam Sitti Nurbaya", *Dari Mistisisme Sampai Pascamodernisme Beberapa Catatan tentang Sastra Indonesia [Nationalism in Sitti Nurbaya, from Mysticism to Post-Modernism Notes on Indonesian Literature]*, Yogyakarta: Unit Penerbitan Fakultas Ilmu Budaya UGM.
- Ras, J.J. 1985. *Bunga Rampai Sastra Jawa Mutakhir [An Anthology on Modern Javanese Literature]*, Jakarta: Grafitipers.
- Rosidi, Aji. 1976. *Ichisar Sejarah Sastra Indonesia [Compedium of The History of Indonesian Literature]*, Bandung.
- _____. 2013. *Mengenal Kesusastraan Sunda [Knowing Sundanese Literature]*, Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya
- Samuel, Jerome. 2008. *Kasus Ajaib Bahasa Indonesia? Pemodernan Kosakata dan Politik Peristilahan [Extraordinary Case of Indonesian Language? Modernisation of Vocabulary and The Politic of Terminology]*, Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia, Ecole francaise d'Extreme-Orient, Pusat Bahasa Depdiknas, Forum Jakarta-Paris.
- Simon, Roger. 2000. *Gagasan-Gagasan Politik Gramsci [Gramsci's Political Discourses]*, 2nd edition, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Suwondo, Tirta; Sri Widati; Dhanu Priyo Prabowo; Herry Mardiyanto; Sri Haryatmo; Siti Ajar Ismiyati. 2006. *Antologi Biografi Pengarang Sastra Jawa Modern [An Anthology of Javanese Literature Author's Biography]*, Yogyakarta: Adiwacana.
- Teeuw, A. 1955. *Pokok dan Tokoh dalam Kesusastraan Indonesia Baru [Principles and Characterisation in Indonesian Literature]*, 3rd edition, Jakarta: P.T. Pembangunan.
- _____. 1982. *Khazanah Sastra Indonesia Beberapa Masalah Penelitian dan Penyebarannya [The Affluence of Indonesian Literature Research Problems and its Dissemination]*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- _____. 1984. *Sastra dan Ilmu Sastra [Literature and Literary Theory]*, Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya-Giri Mukti Pasaka.
- Toer, Pramodya Ananta. 2003. *Tempo Doeloe Antologi Sastra Pra-Indonesia [The Past: Anthology of Pre-Indonesian Literature]*, 2nd Edition, Jakarta Timur: Lentera Dipantara.
- Vredenburg, Jacob. 1978. *Metode dan Teknik Penelitian Masyarakat [Methods and Techniques of Community Research]*, Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Wellek, Rene, Austin Warren. 1956. *Theory of Literature*, New York: A Harvest Book, Harcourt, Brace and Company.