

COMMENTS ON

Indonesisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch (Kamus Bahasa Indonesia
Djerman). By Otto Karow and Irene Hilgers-Hesse,
Pp XIX, 483. 8^o. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1962.

CECILIO LOPEZ
University of the Philippines

Introduction

Father Arnold Purgmann, S. V. D. wrote an 11-line notice about this Indonesisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch (Bahasa Indonesia-German Dictionary, henceforth IDW) which according to him, among others, offers a glimpse into an extraordinarily active linguistic change and will serve first of all not only practical purposes but also will afford language theoreticians a wide field of observation of language phenomena (Anthropos 58:648, 1963). I have not come across any other notice or review of the IDW.

Between the two world wars linguistic publications on the Malay language by German scholars were in the main contributions by Otto Dempwolff and Walter Aichele, both

of the University of Hamburg. Dempwolff passed away in 1938, and Aichele has retired and has been publishing only occasionally because of poor health. Where Dempwolff and Aichele left off two successors have taken over, Hans Kaehler of the University of Hamburg and Irene Hilgers-Hesse of the University of Cologne. From Kaehler's prolific pen came the Grammatik der Bahasa Indonesia (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1956), a comprehensive pedagogically oriented grammar of Bahasa Indonesia which includes an anthology. Hilgers-Hesse is co-author of the dictionary here commented on.

Mrs. Hilgers-Hesse was on a study trip to Indonesia in 1956 (the year Kaehler's Grammatik was published) on a grant from her government. Among those whose help she acknowledges stands out W. J. S. Poerwadarminta who placed at her disposal his Kamus Umum Bahasa Indonesia (General Dictionary of Bahasa Indonesia), helped her gain access to the word-lists in the Lembaga Penyelidikan Dan Kebudayaan Bagian Lexikografi (Institute of Education and Culture, Section on Lexicography) and made critical revision of the manuscript of the dictionary. The finishing touches of the entire lexicographic material as well as the final format of

the manuscript for publication were the work of Prof. Dr. Otto Karow (V).

The IDW has a foreword of one and one-third pages (V-VI), a one-page guide to the use of the dictionary (with the suggestion that entries should be looked up in the stems), and a table containing a summary of the system of prefixation and suffixation and of the changes of the initial sound (of the stem) according to which the stems may be ascertained (VII), a half page of abbreviations, mostly of languages which are sources of loans, and a few others labeling levels of usage, classical (that is, literary), medical technical, Roman Catholic, colloquial and obsolete (VIII), a two-thirds page list of literature utilized (grouped under 1. Indonesische are six titles, including Ensiklopedia Indonesia and six of the Kamus Istilah series, two titles under 2. Japanische, and three under 3. Europaeische, including Wilkinson's A Malay-English Dictionary, 1959 (IX), and ten pages of a list of abbreviations commonly used in Indonesian publications (X-XIX). The text proper of the IDW covers 483 pages, double column, and the volume measures 9 3/4 by 7 1/2 inches, cloth.

Writing a bilingual dictionary of two languages as unrelated as Indonesian (used here as a short synonym of Bahasa Indonesia,

not as the sub-family of Austronesian) and German is beset with pitfalls. But before proceeding any further, it will be instructive to know what the authors aim to accomplish and the methodology they used.

According to the authors, the IDW is the first of its kind in the German language. It comprises a comprehensive coverage of the modern colloquial and written language of Bahasa Indonesia since the declaration of independence of the Republic of Indonesia in 1945 and contains materials for the scientific study of the Indonesian language in the universities as well as predominantly practical requirements of many professional groups which are interested in the study of the language, like physicians, missionaries, diplomats, scientists, engineers, technocrats, businessmen, etc. Much emphasis is laid therefore on the inclusion of current turns of speech and specialized expressions in all fields dealing with matters of interest to the state . . . , administration, economics, industry, technique and science. Beside many new forms recommended by the Komisi Istilah (Terminology Commission) as far as these have been accepted in the language of the publishing business, the authorities and business and scientific treatises, expressions which are somewhat

obsolete and less frequently used are taken into consideration because acquaintance with them is indispensable in reading ancient works which reveal relations to classical Malay and Javanese literatures (Vorwort, V).

This is as wide, and as deep, an objective that the authors have imposed on themselves. Further, the Indonesian language, as far as its vocabulary is concerned, is still in a state of flux, and in a dictionary of a language which is much alive and in the process of development, to aspire for completion can hardly be achieved. The language has been and is being enriched by regional languages, beside Minangkabau and Sundanese to a greater degree by Javanese, and vice versa, that is, its influence on these languages has become more and more obvious... The authors have been perspicuous in the organization of the constituents of words. Common homonyms are handled separately. The range of meaning of stems and their derivatives are given with their variations and nuances (V). On the aim and methodology, then, the user of the IDW is sufficiently forewarned. Whether the warning is observed or not, the following paragraphs will show.

On lacunae in general

The user of the IDW will look in vain for a guide to pronunciation, syllabication and accentuation of the entries and sub-entries. He will be at a loss to interpret certain symbols, like the hyphen and the apostrophe. The IDW is silent on diphthongs. Information on the system of affixation, a desideratum in a dictionary involving a language like Indonesian, should have been more exhaustive. Many entries are not glossed, cross-reference is confusing, and loans are inadequately handled. In short, the IDW takes too much for granted, assumes that the user is a linguist who has more than a nodding acquaintance with Indonesian. This may be less of a problem in the study of Indonesian in the universities where tutors are available for guidance, but a handicap to the predominantly practical requirements of many professional groups who may be occupied with the practice of the professions and have thus more urgent need of practical guide. Such lacunae are found in almost every page of the IDW in exasperating monotony.

On pronunciation

Knowledge of Arabic, which not all users possess, is necessary in order to pronounce, and syllabize, the following entries (items

in parentheses, if given, refer to main entries followed by numerals representing page and column) which are selected at random: with consonant clusters, achtadj (2, 1), afwah (4, 2), ahli (5, 1), bachsjis (25, 1), bahath (27, 1), faradj (96, 1), sjahwat (384, 1); with two like consonants, alkissah, allamah (10, 1), ammi (12, 1), sadd (339, 1); with hyphen and/or apostrophe, umu'lbuldan (buldan, 56, 2), ul-'alam (chalik, 62, 1), chattul-istiwa (62, 1), chul(a)' (62, 2), fardu fardu'l-'ain (fardu, 96, 1). One can only guess if the accented é is the pepet-vowel or not in débat (68, 1), dékté (69, 2), sjaré'at (384, 2). With initial homorganic nasal cluster mbokmas (239, 1) is a hapax and should rate at least some passing comments because such clusters are not common in Indonesian; so should ndak I, ndak II, and ndugal (258, 2).

On syllabication

The place of the hyphen in the following entries and sub-entries which are reproduced here as they occur in the IDW can not be ascribed to typographical error. The cases are too many to be errors in printing. (Entries under which the examples are found precede the numerals which stand for page, column, and

line.) Examples: bur-uk (biasa, 48, 1, 11), bid-ji-bidjian (bidji, 48, 2, 3), tang-an (bimbing, 49, 1, 28), bint-jatjau (bintjatak, 50, 1, 5), bit-jara (bitjara, 50, 2, 32), han-gat (darah, 67, 1, 27), seten-gah (utara, 478, 1, 20). The place of the hyphen will lead to wrong syllabication and pronunciation. Similarly with the following derived forms: men-gadréskan (adrés, 4, 1, 11), men-gaku (aku, 8, 1, 1), men-galang (alang, 8, 2, 41), men-galih (alih, 9, 2, 44), men-gambil (ambil, 11, 2, 29), pembojon-gan (bojong, 51, 1, 47), pembor-an (bor, 52, 2, 11), botjor-an (botjor, 53, 1, 22), kebrandal-an (brandal, 53, 1, 39), pengetahuan (buku II, 56, 2, 45), men-gurus (buku II, 56, 2, 55), golong-an (buruh, 60, 2, 10), perburuh-an (buruh, 60, 2, 10), pendarat-an (darat, 67, 1, 45), men-gubik (dalak, 68, 2, 47), gabun-gan (gabung, 97, 1, 38), ganding-an (ganding, 100, 2, 18), gandjar-an (gandjar, 100, 2, 36), pergantung-an (gantung, 101, 2, 36), pengolong-an (golong, 114, 1, 41). The position of the hyphen leads to phonological confusion; it is a sign of morphological division between stem and suffix at best, but even then it is not consistently used. And why the digraph ng, the symbol for the velar nasal is separated by the hyphen is inexcusable. The proofreader (?) did not seem to know what to do with pengolong-an.

On loans

Attention is called to the fact that the etymological indications of loan words from Asiatic, European and regional languages serve special linguistic interest. Although the IDW does not lay claim to replace an etymological lexicon of the language, which remains as ever an urgent desideratum (V). If etymological indications are to be of interest to linguistics, then in addition to identifying the sources of the loans (as is done by the use of abbreviations of the donor languages after the entries), the models in the donor languages should have been cited. This is not only not done but the identification of the loans - some are not identified at all - is sometimes misleading. For one thing, the Portuguese may not cherish the idea that their language is not reckoned among the European languages because words supposedly borrowed from this language are identified por while those from other European languages simply e. Identifying models from the specific European donor languages would have been more convincing since anyway the authors seem to be very sure of their identification from the regional languages (which are spelled out, from Ambonese, Balinese, Batak, Djakarta, Javanese, Old Javanese, Kawi, Malay, Menadonese,

Minangkabau, Minahasa, Palembang, Singapore, and Sundanese).

And not only that. Even obsolete words and words of classical, Protestant, and Roman Catholic usage and loans from Arabic and Chinese - even from Javanese - are likewise identified and labeled.

The models in the specific European languages should have deserved similar attention for after all only two European languages are represented in the Benutzte Literatur (Literature Used). Couldn't the Kamus Istilah series have been of help here?

Unidentified loans

There are no etymological indications of the following entries: afiun (4, 2), anteré, antré (17, 2), apiun (19, 1), bahasa (26, 1), behasa (26, 2), basa (34, 1), batia (35, 1), diafrakmir (73, 2), dinar (74, 2), dipan (75, 1), indera (134, 1), kasturi (148, 2), kati (149, 2), kétjap (173, 2), ketola (174, 1), legundi (207, 2), mahal (226, 2), maski (236, 1), muka (251, 1), ordi (266, 1), papa II (277, 2), pariwara (278, 2), peribahasa (292, 2), perunggu (295, 1), petola (297, 2), pilau (299, 1), rupiah (337, 1), sahbandar, sjabandar (339, 2).

On glossing and cross-reference

Quite disconcerting are the inconsistencies in glossing and cross-reference. Some entries are not glossed, others are not

cross-referred, and still others are not glossed and are misleading in cross-reference. The situation is no better in the case of prefixes which are simply cross-referred, without glosses, and with no information at all as to whether they are allomorphs or not. A few random examples: adan is cross-referred to azan, adzan (2, 2), but adzan which is cross-referred to azan (4, 1) has no cross-reference to adan, and azan has no cross-reference to adan, adzan (24, 2); ra'iat and ra'jat are cross-referred to rakjar (315) but rakjar is not cross-referred to either: beskit and beskuit (46, 2), and bisku(i)t and biskut (50, 2) are not cross-referred to each other; manakala, manakan and manalagi (all not glossed) are entered as separate entries and each is cross-referred to mana (232, 1), but s. v. mana are sub-entries manalagi, manapula, and manapula is not entered at all like manakala and the others; kemuntjak is cross-referred to puntjak (160, 2) with no information as to how p becomes m since only the derivatives of ke- . . . -an not ke- plus nasaler Ersatz (nasal substitution), are given (VII): mempelas is cross-referred to empelas (no gloss, 241, 1) but s. v. empelas (93, 1) mempelas is not entered although mengempelas(i) and pengempelas are sub-entries.

Confusion in glossing and cross-reference occurs in the case of gus (118; 2) which is cross-referred to sekaligus (no gloss), which in turn is cross-referred to kali (no gloss, 354, 2), and so are sekali, sekalian and sekalipun (all not glossed and cross-referred to kali), but instead of kali are entered qualified kali I, kali II, and kali III with different glosses (143; 1), although all the four derivatives, sekali, sekalian, sekaligus and sekalipun are sub-entries s. v. kali with sekaligus spelled with space sekali gus this time; daga I s (for Sanskrit) is entered followed by the reduplicated form daga-dagi, and this is cross-referred to dahaga, daga II (no etymological indication) is cross-referred to dahaga also, but there are two separate entries dahaga I and dahaga II (both without etymological indications), the latter followed by a sub-entry dahagi with another sub-entry, the reduplicated dahaga-dahagi. As we are told earlier, homonyms which are by means rare in Indonesian, are handled separately. This procedure seems to have resulted more in confusion than in clarity. Another addition: taufan (412) and tofan (452), which are cross-referred to each other, both have no glosses. Constituents of compounds are not glossed and have become 'ghost'-words. For

example, daba (62, 1) which is cross-referred to hawa daba (124, 1), lodan (219, 2) in ikan lodan (the compound is not entered s. v. ikan where ikan-compounds are sub-entries), lodéh in sajur lodéh (219, 2).

Puzzling is the identification of sarwal as ar (for Arabic, 350, 1) which is cross-referred to saluar as por (for Portuguese, 359, 1) and serawa(1) identified as min (for Minahasa, 370, 2); parapati identified as min (278, 1) is cross-referred to merpati identified as s (for Sanskrit, 245, 1).

This inventory of inconsistencies may be boring, but the reader must bear with the following few more examples: dimuka (not a stem but entered without gloss, 74, 1, 5 from bottom) is cross-referred to muka (251, 1), but dimuka is not a sub-entry; keduduk I. v. (again not a stem and entered without gloss) with the sub-entry mengeduduki is cross-referred to duduk (153, 2, 15), but keduduk is not entered s. v. duduk (89-90, 2-1); mendjak is cross-referred to semendjak (no gloss, 241, 2), but semendjak is cross-referred to sedjak (no gloss, 362, 1), not to mendjak, and s. v. sedjak I (another entry is sedjak II cross-referred to sadjak) neither mendjak or semendjak are sub-entries.

On 'ghost'-words

There are stems which occur as ghost-words, as already pointed out in some examples above, and in the following examples of compounds, reduplications and derivatives not only are stems un glossed but also one stem is not even an entry. Some examples under letter A: abrit-abritan (1, 2, no entry of abrit), adjuk I mengadjuk (3, 2, adjuk I not glossed), alih I alih kétéjek (9, 2, alih not glossed), amat II mengamat(-amat)i (hyphenated), memperamatamati (not hyphenated, 11, 1, amat II not glossed), ambai II ambai-ambai (11, 1, ambai not glossed), ambar II ar batu ambar, ambar kuning (11, 1, ambar not glossed), anjam, anjam-menganjam (16, 1, anjami not glossed), antré (berantré) (parenthesized, 17, 2), antui (antui hitam, antui kuning) again parenthesized, 18, 1, antui not glossed), etc.

On stems

Again we are told that in the IDW one must always refer to the stems (VII). In the following few examples, reference to the stems is confusing: adinda (no cross-reference to adik, 3, 1), alai-balai (cross-referred to balai under which there is no sub-entry alai-balai, 8, 1), anak(an)da (no cross-reference to anak,

13, 1), apakala (no cross-reference to apa, 18, 2), apalagi (cross-referred to apa (lagi) with a sub-entry apalagi with parenthesized (lagi), 18, 2), bagaikan (no cross-reference to bagai under which it is a sub-entry, 25, 2), bagaimana (no cross-reference to bagai under which it is not a sub-entry, 25, 2), etc.

On entries under letters F and P

The user is cautioned that words which are spoken of under F are to be looked up under or referred to those under P (95, footnote). But why this time-consuming cross-reference? Under F only eight items are cross-referred to P and since the F-entries are identified as ar it would have been simpler to the user who does not know Arabic, and more economical, had the P-variants been listed together with the F-entries and labeled "Indonesianized", or something of the sort. The entries concerned are faham cross-referred to paham (96), fardu to perlu (96) and perdu II also to perlu (291), fasal to pasal (96), fe(r)duli to perduli (96) but perduli is cross-referred to peduli which is cross-referred to nothing (291), fihak to pihak (96), fikir to pikir (96), frangko to prangko (96) which is cross-referred to perangko

(306), and fulan to polan (97). Only fasal and pasal are cross-referred to each other (96, 279).

On 'ghost'-prefixes

Similar to ghost-words, the following prefixes which are simply listed without illustrations are ghost-prefixes: bl- cross-referred to bel- (50), gr- to ger- (115), kl- to kel- (177), kr- to ker- (184), pl- to pel- (302), pr- to per- (305), sk- to sek- (385), sl- to sel- (385), sp- to sep- (387), sr- to ser- (397), st- to set- (387), tjere- to tjer- (cross-reference of longer to shorter variant, 445), tr- to ter- (455). The second of the variants is not cross-referred to the first. The mere listing of dh- cross-referred to d-; l-; g- (73, 2) is too cryptic to be included in a dictionary. If only for the sake of listing, if for no other, the following variant prefixes could have been included: be(r)- and bel-, pe(r)- and pel-, tepe(r)- and tepel-, mempe(r)- and mempel-; and the listing could have been balanced with the inclusion of the suffixes also, like -an, -i and -kan.

There is really no valid reason for ghost-prefixes. While the majority of the prefixes are merely listed, two are entered with detailed glossing. me- is glossed 'many verb-forms are provided

with the prefix me- (and prenasalization): these verbs (and their derivatives) are to be looked up under the stems concerned. '

(See introduction to Vorwort.) And se- is provided with ten glosses (351, 2). The other prefixes in the Anleitung (Introduction) should have been entered and similarly handled.

On some clitics

Commonly used enclitics are entered with very scanty or practically no information at all, like -kah I glossed 'suffix used in interrogative sentences (Zweifelsfragen, yes-or-no question)' with one-sentence illustration, and -lah I is simply glossed 'emphatic particle (zur Hervorhebung des Praedikats, to emphasize the predicate)' without any illustration at all. In a similar manner, to dismiss a much-used proclitic in two lines is far too facile, as is the case with di glossed '1. on, upon, in, of, at, by; before, in front of; for, because of; with (in connection with numerous nouns'; 2. 'verb prefix' (72, 2). In his Grammatik Kaehler devotes seven pages to di (91-97). And nja- is not even entered, which is a very serious omission.

On some misprints

For such a thick volume as the IDW the authors and the

publisher should be commended for the commission of a mere sprinkling of typographical errors. I have noticed only the following in addition to those cited in the preceding paragraphs: absence of scientific binomials of pisang ambon (ambon, 11, 2), indentation of ampu kaki (ampu 11, 12, 2), no hyphen in seluk beluk (beluk, 40, 2) but hyphen in seluk-beluk (seluk, 359, 2), spelling of membom-dardir (bombardir, 5, 2) no space in budjubusét (55, 2) but space in budju busét (busét, 60, 2), spelling of pengechusuan (chusus, 62, 2), italization of Um (jeksi, 139, 2). My school German makes me suspicious of the hyphenation of Insi-gnien (upatjara, 474, 2) and Verpflich-tung(en) (utang, 477, 2).

General recommendations

Even if the user of the IDW is a linguist he will not be sure of the pronunciation of the majority of entries, above all if he has no knowledge of Arabic. A guide to pronunciation, a description of the structure of the Indonesian word, including syllabication, and accentuation are indispensable desiderata. Stems as stems can be recalcitrant to glossing and only in derivations can their values become transparent. The clitics, although numerically few, are of frequent occurrence and should have been more exhaustively treated.

These are information which are generally found in the front pages of a dictionary, and in a dictionary like the IDW their absence is to be deplored.

Glossing and cross-reference should have been more rigorously observed. A judicious application of Occam's razor would have eliminated trivialities and ephemera and saved space which could have been utilized for more valuable purposes. On the other hand, I will be very happy to see more full illustrations of colloquial usage and quotations from classical literature if only to satisfy the predominantly practical requirements and the scientific demands as well as add to the completeness of the IDW.

It is very obvious that a revised edition of the IDW is urgently needed. (I was told one was in preparation, but I have not seen a copy if it is already published.) And in making a revised edition, profit may be gained by consulting Problems in Lexicography, IJAL 28 (April, 1962) 2, edited by Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta.

The reviewer's is not a pleasant task. But in spite of what has been said, the authors, who were perhaps too eager to see the volume through the press with the minimum of delay, should be

•

congratulated for their courage in putting up a dictionary such as this one. Its usefulness can better be appreciated when used as a companion volume to Kachler's Grammatik, which was printed by the same publisher.

I could not overlook the strange coincidence that the first and last entries under each letter of the IDW are almost identical with those of the Indonesisch-Nederlands Woordenboek (Indonesian-Dutch Dictionary) by W. J. S. Poerwadarminta and Dr. A. Teeuw (1950), except for the twenty-four entries under letter W, which are labeled e.

The draft of this review was completed in 1965.