

Russian threat that Japan was able to hold her opponent at bay on the eve of the hostility, preventing her from making an all-out effort to prepare for the eventuality. Both these facts have been largely ignored or under-estimated in western and Chinese literature.

The major weakness of the book is obviously the lack of original Chinese sources, which seriously compromises its structural soundness, for a general account of the war would have involved consulting all the important sources and works in the major languages concerned, and a criticism of the wartime journalism would also have needed sources from both sides of the hostility to check on the relevance of the coverage. For this reason, the reader is not afforded a comprehensive narration of the course of the hostility, nor an analysis of comparative strength and readiness of the antagonists. The result therefore takes the form of a compromise between a general history and a case study of journalism.

Mistakes in factual narration caused by quotations from unchecked sources would also have been easily avoided had the author had access to original sources. For instance, there were no “Moslem banners” in the Chinese military structure, as quoted in page 141, and *The New York Times*’s report that “the Chinese and Manchu soldiers frequently attacked one another, and many bloody fights have taken place” (p. 169), which is quoted as a fact, is in effect a hearsay never recorded by Chinese or Japanese sources. Fights between Chinese units did occur in the battles of P’yngyang and Port Arthur but they were the results of the confusion caused by countermands rather than ethnic hostility.

Furthermore, misdates such as the Emperors Kangxi and Yongzheng’s “combined rule extended from 1661 to 1799” (the correct dates should be 1661–1735) are hard to explain, and the combination of the Pinying, which is a pronouncing system used with the simplified characters in mainland China, and the traditional characters, which are used in Taiwan and Hong Kong with the Wade-Giles pronouncing system, gives the reader an odd impression.

LIU WEI
Zhejiang University, China

LOAN-WORDS IN INDONESIAN AND MALAY. Edited by RUSSEL JONES. pp. 360. Leiden, KITLV Press, 2007.

doi:10.1017/S1356186308009292

Finding comprehensive and reliable information about the origins of Indonesian and Malay loan-words has always been difficult. Few Indonesian and Malay general dictionaries, monolingual or bilingual, contain such information. Moreover, most of those that do mark loan-words, including Wilkinson (1959), Karow and Hilgers-Hesse (1962), Labrousse (1984), and some others, are out of print and difficult to find nowadays outside of scholarly libraries. The only recent bilingual dictionary that is readily available and that contains etymological information is Stevens and Schmidgall-Tellings (2004). In addition, a series of check-lists of varying quality exists, under the general title of the Indonesian Etymological Project, published irregularly between 1978 and 1997 that covers loan words from Sanskrit (1997), Arabic (and Persian) (1978), Chinese (in press) and European languages (1983). It is very difficult to find copies of the individual volumes in this series. There also exist some monographs, such as Santa Maria (1967) on Portuguese loans, and Kong Yuan Zhi (1987) on Chinese loans. The etymological information provided in general dictionaries, moreover, is most often limited to just an abbreviation for the source (for example, S for Sanskrit, A for Arabic, etc.) without any further details or discussion.

The book under review is therefore a welcome addition to our knowledge of loan-words in Indonesian and Malay. Based on meticulous scholarship and beautifully produced, this work has in-depth information about loan-words in Indonesian and Malay, contains much more reliable and

detailed information about these loan-words, and the information is presented in a way that is easier to access than in any of the works referred to above. Despite certain limitations, to be discussed below, this is a marvellous book. The degree of detail, the historical overview and the coverage are unparalleled and unlikely to be surpassed any time soon.

The editor, however, decided to cover only words borrowed from outside the Malay/Indonesian archipelago and peninsula. The book does not include borrowings into Indonesian from other languages such as Javanese and Sundanese and from other dialects of Malay (such as Ambonese, Manadonese and the dialect of Jakarta) spoken inside the archipelago, some of which have influenced Indonesian for centuries.

The book is very well organised. The first part, a 33-page introduction, lays out a brief history of the project, its objectives and limits, and the general principles behind the book. Next is a detailed discussion of the composition of the entries. This is followed by a brief discussion of the historical contacts that took place between each of the ten donor languages – Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian, Hindi, Tamil, Chinese, European languages (Portuguese, Dutch, and English), Japanese, Thai – and Indonesian/Malay. The next section is a five-page select bibliography. This is followed by a map spread across two pages showing where the donor languages are spoken and where Indonesian and Malay are spoken natively.

The body of the book contains a list almost 350 pages long and 20,000 entries of all the loan words from these donors in Indonesian and Malay. Each entry consists of: the headword, an English gloss, further information about the entry, the Chinese character (if the word comes from Chinese), the presumed source language, the form of the loan word in the source language, a reference to where the source word (except for those from Japanese and European languages) can be found in one of the dictionaries in the bibliography, some additional information about the history of the word, and finally variant spellings of the headword.

The book ends with three appendices: rare Chinese characters, a brief history of the Indonesian Etymological Project, and Acknowledgements. Last is a list of symbols and abbreviations. What is more, the book is accompanied by a CD which contains a facsimile edition of an Amoy-English Dictionary (Douglas, 1899), since most of the Chinese loanwords in Indonesian and Malay come from this variety of Chinese, and not from Mandarin.

Given the complexity of its formatting and the words referenced from many languages, it contains amazingly few misprints. I noticed the following ones: (p. 148) *kecap* ‘soy sauce’ should be *kécap*, (p. 319) *terka* ‘guess’ is out of alphabetical order. It should have appeared on p. 320. I am, however, unable to judge the correctness of the Chinese characters.

The work is comprehensive and very well-organised. There are, however, some problems. Some are minor and some are endemic to the nature of loan-words in Indonesian/Malay. One of the minor problems is that some words given as borrowings are almost certainly native words and are not borrowed. For example, *hari* ‘day’ given on p. 104 as borrowed from Sanskrit and *pandai* ‘smith’ given on p. 232 as also as borrowed from Sanskrit are undoubtedly native.

Some of the edition’s problems, however, are more pervasive and more endemic to the nature of loan-words in Indonesian/Malay. There are many difficulties in assigning the source language of words borrowed into Indonesian and Malay. For example, Professor Jones notes that words identified as coming from Sanskrit may actually have come into Indonesian via Javanese and not directly from Sanskrit. Another puzzle is: How do we know whether a European word, such as ‘amalgam’, comes from Dutch or English? The only way to decide this question would be to know when the word entered Indonesian, and this information is not given in the book and might not even be recoverable. How do we know whether a word comes directly from Arabic or through one of the Persianised Indian languages? Professor Jones does not gloss over these problems. Each of these issues, and others, is discussed in the Introduction to the book.

Another problem is coverage, what to include in the list of borrowings and what to exclude. There are now so many words that have been borrowed from English, how should we limit the list? In addition, there have been more and more Arabic borrowings into Indonesian in recent years. Where should we set the limits?

One example is the words containing prefixes derived from western or Sanskrit prefixes such as *anti-*, *ko-*, *kon-*, *hétero-*, *pasca-*, *tata-* and others as well as suffixes such as *-asi* and *-itas*. There are endless numbers of such words and for some of them, such as *pasca-* and *tata-*, new ones are being created constantly. Where should an etymological dictionary stop? I could easily have added scores of words to the list of European-derived words that made it into this dictionary.

A particularly telling example is the suffix *-itas*, now used to form so many neologisms in Indonesian. The basis for the assignment of the source language in this list is obscure to me. Only a brief mention is made of this suffix on p. xxxii of the Introduction. Just to choose some examples at random: *béstialitas* 'bestiality' on p. 27 is said to derive from either Dutch *bestialiteit* or English *bestiality*. On the other hand, *kréativitas* 'creativity' on p. 169 is said to come from Dutch *creativiteit*. But *konéksitas* on p. 163 is said to derive from *konéksi*, which is said to come from Dutch (the original Dutch spelling is not given in this article) plus the Latin suffix *-itas*. On the other hand *konéktivitas* 'connectivity' is not included here even though I find more than 60,000 hits on Google for this word in Indonesian contexts. And finally, *universitas* 'university' on p. 332 is derived from Latin *universitas*. What is the basis for these decisions and many others? I seem to remember (and I don't know where to find information on this) that in the 1960s or so there were discussions among Indonesian lexicographers about how to treat words ending in *-iteit* in Dutch and in *-ity* in English. The solution was to choose the Latinate suffix *-itas* instead. So since this was a more-or-less arbitrary decision, it might be pointless to try to decide on the etymology in individual cases.

The usefulness of this book goes far beyond the etymological information that it contains. It also brings together in a single volume many obscure or obsolete words known only within certain communities (such as in the Chinese community in Malaysia or among the people in the Minahasa area of North Sulawesi in Indonesia) or words borrowed from Japanese and used during the Japanese occupation of Indonesia. This book will prove very useful for someone who comes across an obscure word in either Indonesian or Malay, a word that might not appear in ordinary general bilingual dictionaries. It would otherwise be very difficult to track these words down.

My quibbles with this work do not detract from its importance. This is a beautiful piece of scholarship and one that will serve the community of Indonesian and Malay scholars well for many years to come.

References

- C. A. A. Douglas, *Chinese-English Dictionary of the Vernacular or Spoken Language of Amoy*. (1899).
 K. Karow and I. Hilgers-Hesse, *Indonesisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. (Wiesbaden, 1962).
 Kong Yuan Zhi, *A Study of Chinese Loanwords (from South Fujian Dialects) in the Malay and Indonesian Languages*. (Dordrecht, 1987).
 P. Labrousse, *Indonésien Français*. (Paris, 1984).
 Luigi Santa Maria, *I Prestiti Portoghesi nel Malese-Indonesiano*. (Naples, 1967).
 A. M. Stevens and A. E. Schmidgall-Tellings, *A Comprehensive Indonesian-English Dictionary*. (Athens, Ohio, 2004).
 R. J. A. Wilkinson, *Malay-English Dictionary (Romanised)*. (London, 1959).

ALAN M. STEVENS
 City University of New York (Emeritus)