
Dick van der Meij
Universitas Islam Negeri
Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta
dickvdm@yahoo.com

Indonesian is a complex and rich language, but many authors and speakers are incapable of using it in its full richness by lack of knowledge and also because a proper thesaurus of the language was not available. This situation has now drastically changed and no one can use the unavailability of a dictionary any longer as an excuse not to write proper Indonesian.

The thesaurus under discussion is quite rightfully not called a book of synonyms. Notwithstanding the fact that many words seemingly mean the same and are therefore called synonyms, in actual fact real one to one synonymy rarely, if ever, exists. Even though words might superficially mean the same, they may not be used interchangeably because there is a semantic, social, psychological, generational, local, or contextual difference or even a combination of any number of them. For instance, *enak* means tasteful but its use is not the same as *lezat* or *sedap* which have a more advertisement feeling. A young girl in Indonesian is *cewek* or *gadis* but the use of either word depends on the context. *Cewek* has a big-city ring to it and is therefore now used all over the country while *gadis* sounds old fashioned to most ears and is now confined to literature and old folks. The first may be used pejoratively as well while that would seem far fetched and highly unusual for the second.

The book under discussion is rich, very rich indeed and shows once again that the Indonesian lexical reality is complex and extensive. Indonesia has hundreds of languages spoken within its borders and each influences local forms of Indonesian. Javanese, with the largest number of speakers influences the language most profoundly while the language spoken in a far-off islet out in the far eastern part of the archipelago might perhaps have no influence on the modern language at all. The metropolitan melting pot Jakarta is a hotchpotch of all these languages combined with modern English, Arabic, Chinese and many other languages. The use of the language of this metropolis is distributed all over the country through soap operas which are extremely popular and any modern word finds its way to the most remote part of the archipelago through SMS and email messages.

The bibliography lists works that have been consulted or have been used as data sources, but they are not distinguished as such so that it is impossible to find out what book was used for what purpose, although it would seem
logical to assume that English language books were not used for data. The data sources consist mainly of dictionaries and wordlists and no literary works are listed at all. I think this may have seriously limited the number of literary idiom listed in the book. As a result there is also no designation provided for words which may be restricted to literary usage.

The entries are followed by their equivalents in strict alphabetical order. This has been done for consistencies’ sake. However, it carries the danger that a rare and hardly ever used synonym that directly follows the entry might therefore mistakenly be considered the best equivalent, which it often is not. No mention of frequency is provided so that a word used all over the place all the time is not distinguished from others that may be extremely rare. Hyponyms have been excluded in the dictionary since they are not the same as synonyms. This means that under the entry ayah and ibu the hyponym orang tua is not mentioned as it is not synonymous with either of them.

The introduction claims that full circularity has been adopted. This means that all the words considered ‘synonymous’ with the entry are themselves found as main entry as well. Thus, in the example above, gadis is entered as follows: gadis n bikir (kl), cewek (cak), dara, dayang (kl), kuntum (ki), perawan, putri. If full circularity would have been maintained, all synonyms would have been entered as entries. However, if we consult cewek the word dayang has been left out. The entry dara however adds perempuan and wanita (muda) which are not found with the rest. When consulting the entry bibit, (anak) has been added to dara, but then also the compounds anak wanita and anak perempuan might have been possibilities and what happened to perempuan and wanita (muda)? In short, the dictionary may be up for some revisions in this particular aspect.

At times I wonder if we can speak of synonymy at all. For instance the entry abad n daur, era, kala, kurun, masa, periode, zaman. Abad is a period of one hundred years and none of the synonyms refer to any period with a specific length of time so I wonder what is meant here. Full circularity has also not been maintained with this word as daur adds siklus, but leaves out zaman, etcetera.

The Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (1991 and 2000) have been used as source materials but the word publik is not mentioned under hadirin and under publik the meaning of hadirin is left out while this word is found in the Kamus Besar and I doubt whether this is the only example. It has therefore not become clear to me what precisely was considered data and how the sources have been used.

Other aspects of the dictionary give rise to questions as well. Abai is apparently not a synonym of masa bodoh since it is not mentioned as such, but mengabaikan is synonymous with menasabodohkan. I find it puzzling that two derivatives can be synonymous but the stems not?

Abbreviated forms of everyday words have also not been recognized as entries in their own right or are not mentioned at all. Tidak does not mention tak, while tapi is referred to tetapi but not mentioned under that entry and the
abbreviated form *nak for anak* is not mentioned at all.

Information about the regional origins of the words has not been maintained throughout, which of course would have been impossible given the sources used, but sometimes I am puzzled at everyday words that are omitted. Under the entry *kucing meong* is mentioned but where is *pus* which is used in everyday Jakarta parlance and far beyond?

Despite of what I said above, the dictionary is a joy. It gives many possibilities to make Indonesian an enjoyable language and the number of ’synonyms’ the author put together is enormous. My criticism is therefore mainly concerned with presentation and consistency. Some issues I would have done differently, such as the list of abbreviations which is now departmentalized and would better have been one list. Consulting it means five times browsing.

The dictionary also gives rise to laughter. Under the entry *marah* we find for instance *makan bawang* which sound funny and after checking none of my Indonesian friends had ever heard but found equally amusing. However, people who have no or restricted knowledge of Indonesian need to use the dictionary with care. Many words cannot be used in place of another and have specific meanings which need to be fully grasped before the word can be used. It is therefore in the first place an extremely useful tool for Indonesian native speakers.
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More than twenty years ago I took care of two large groups of Indonesian students in the Netherlands. They were sent to Holland to study regular university courses at any of the thirteen Dutch universities.