

McCUNE, KEITH MICHAEL. 1985. *The internal structure of Indonesian roots. Parts I and II.* NUSA Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and other Languages in Indonesia. Vols. 21, 22, 23. Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA. Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya. Pp. xvi, 412.

CHARLES E. GRIMES

Australian National University, Pattimura University,
Summer Institute of Linguistics

What do Indonesian *keliling* 'around, circumference', *kelok* 'curve', *guling 1* 'a bolster (Dutch wife)', *guling 2* 'roll over and over', *gulung* 'roll s.t., wind s.t.', *giling* 'turn, mill, press (through rollers)', *kelapa* 'coconut', *kelici* 'marbles', *gelang 1* 'bracelet', *kelak-keluk* 'curvy', *gelombang* 'wave', and *gelinding* 'a wheel, roll', have in common? According to McCune, each of these items (and many others) all begin with a submorphemic element which he symbolizes as **K!V!L-** (the notation means a velar stop followed by any vowel followed by a lateral). The semantics of this particular lefthand submorpheme [LS] have to do with 'curve'.¹

Submorphemes, however, just like morphemes, have homophones. Thus, **K!V!L-** 'curve' must not be confused with the homophonous **K!V!L-** having to do with 'covering, skin'. The latter may be illustrated by *kulit* 'skin', *kelambu* 'mosquito net', *kelemumur* 'dandruff', *kelalawar* 'bat', *keluang* 'a large bat', etc. Neither of these must be confused with the equally homophonous **K!V!L-** having to do with 'light, bright' illustrated by such items as *kilat* 'lightning, flash, shine', *kelip* 'twinkle, glitter', *gelas* 'drinking glass', or *kilap* 'shine, gloss', etc.

Just as lexical items may be related to other lexical items by regular semantic relations (e.g. CAUSE), so also lexical items may be related to their submorphemes by means of what McCune calls *Levi extensions* (adapted from Levi 1978). For example, *kelemumur* 'dandruff' is said to relate to the LS **K!V!L-** 'covering, skin' by the Levi extension AT (i.e. 'at the skin'), while *keladi* 'taro' is related to the same LS by the Levi extension HAVE (i.e. 'have skin'), or *giling* 'mash, flatten, run over' is related to have the LS **K!V!L-** 'curve' by the Levi extension USE (i.e. 'use a curved surface to flatten s.t.').

A lexical item may also be related to its submorphemes by means of metaphor themes

¹For the purposes of illustration, I am simplifying McCune's analysis, and in some cases putting words in different categories (discussed below). Reanalysis of this nature is consistent with the principles laid out by McCune, not in violation of them.

(expanding from Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Thus, *gelar 2* 'academic title' is related to the LS K'IVIL- 'light, bright' via the metaphor 'fame/honor is light'.

The above examples provide only a small glimpse of what one finds in this ambitious two-volume study. The study is significant in several ways. First of all, it is the first major study to explore submorphemics in a non-Indo-European language based on a large corpus of data. McCune analyzed the entire 11,000-12,000 entries in Echols and Shadily's 1975 *Indonesian-English Dictionary*. McCune notes: 'I am basing this study on an analysis in which I attempted to fit into submorphemic groupings every instance of the forms I looked at' (3). Secondly, he extends the notion of metaphor theme beyond the ways it has been used in other studies of submorphemics. He explores 90 Indonesian metaphor themes which he first justifies on the basis of idioms and other expressions and then shows how the same metaphor themes also appear in Indonesian submorphemes. Thirdly, McCune applies the notion of what he calls *Levi extensions* (which were developed to describe English noun compounds) to Indonesian submorphemics. He extends their use to explain predicates as well.

McCune additionally explores and contrasts semantic prototype theory with lexical decomposition, looks at degree of grammatical boundedness, portmanteau, extensions of meaning, homonymy, synonymy and other issues of interest. And he does a good job of it. He further notes that, 'submorphemic patterns complement and reinterpret (but do not nullify) historical or etymological relations' (3). Those who will find the study particularly useful and stimulating for possible new directions of study would be lexicographers (particularly those working on Austronesian languages, but not limited to them), semanticists, translators, specialists in Malay literature and Malay linguistics, and those interested in metaphor and prototype theory.

This reviewer began a detailed study of the two volumes sceptical, but willing to be convinced, as to the notion of submorphemics. After completing the volumes, a degree of scepticism remained, although admittedly a much smaller degree. Why? Although the discussion is thorough, involves a clear (and at times outstanding) discussion of the relevant literature, summarizes the issues, is often witty and usually persuasive, the real difficulty in being persuaded lies more with the organization and presentation of the study than with the principles and argumentation.²

A major barrier to the persuasiveness of the arguments is the choice of examples used to introduce the reader to the topic, to justify the existence of a submorpheme, to illustrate how a metaphor theme is used in a certain submorpheme, or to exemplify a methodological principle (the latter is usually done using English or Russian examples). Every dictionary entry from Echols and Shadily was given equal weight for analysis (as it should) and was equally available for examples in the text (Part I). It is the latter choice which inhibits the persuasiveness of the whole. To use the analogy of prototype theory and family resemblance models (see Lakoff 1987 and McCune chapter 7), there is a large core of trans-regional Indonesian vocabulary used in common activities and common speech domains, grading into more obscure vocabulary used in limited domains and specialized activities. While it is essential to the study that the entire vocabulary in the dictionary was explored for *analysis*, it is unfortunate that each item was given equal weight for *illustration*. While many of the items chosen for illustration would be known by (some) Javanese, they must be considered specialized vocabulary for a people that have a cultural propensity for doublets and onomatopoeic word play (as do the Javanese; see Suryadi 1981 for a literary example of this). While equal weight for all items in the dictionary may be adequate to persuade linguists specializing in submorphemics, it is not nearly as powerful as it could have been for those who know Indonesian well. (Note that the 'core/common' vocabulary *was* available for illustration. See Appendix XVI). To native speakers of Malay schooled in

²The reviewer assumes the organization of the study was appropriate to the particular constraints required for a University of Michigan dissertation. It is unfortunate that the organization does not appear to have been repackaged for a general audience.

Indonesian, many of the words chosen for primary examples are not known at all.³

Thus, instead of presenting a strong case for submorphemics argued on the basis of a few well-chosen examples, McCune argues an often elusive case on the basis of a massive amount of (legitimate but often obscure) data. On the one hand, one is left with the conviction that if one were to explore the submorphemics of Indonesian or any other language, McCune has laid the methodological and theoretical groundwork as to how one ought to go about it. On the other hand, the whole study can be seen as rigorously impressionistic, as it were. That is, the tone of the conclusions is highly dependent on the perspective of the researcher and on his or her feel for the target language (to a significantly greater degree than most types of study), while the principles around which the impressions are organized are fairly rigorous.

For example, in the second paragraph of this review, I have associated *kelelawar* 'bat' and *keluang* 'a large bat' with the LS K!V!L- having to do with 'covering, skin' because in my experience around Sulawesi and Maluku what people do with bats (besides eat them) involves what they do with the skin of bat wings. McCune, on the other hand, has associated *kelelawar* 'bat' and *keluang* 'a large bat' with the LS K!V!L- representing 'non-unidirectional; around and around; in all directions' (page 323) presumably because of the flitting nature of the flight path of a bat. But they could equally well have been placed under the homophonous LS K!V!L- meaning 'back and forth' (page 324) depicting the flapping of the bat's wings. Each, and in fact all, of these three submorphemic associations are equally valid within McCune's system. Thus, one researcher sees it one way, while another sees an entirely different association as the most salient at the time. It is precisely this 'squishy-ness' of analysis (acknowledged and addressed by McCune, e.g. pages 5, 23) that implies the whole analysis is idiosyncratic, i.e. it is not so much based on 'real' patterns in language, but on individual perceptions of pattern (to an extreme degree). McCune notes, 'Lest it appear that I have made my hypotheses unfalsifiable, I hasten to add that one thing I have found convincing is the sheer bulk of the submorphemic patterns' (5). The strength of the study is precisely that -- pattern.

In describing metaphor themes, McCune takes pains to justify various metaphor themes as emic to Indonesian. However, in describing semantic domains, it is not clear whether McCune intends them as an etic grid (i.e. universal), or as a grid emic to Indonesian derived from the data. When McCune says, 'For example, "light and vision" obviously shades into "energy/entropy" one of whose subsets is related to thermal energy' (40-41), this suggests neither an etic grid nor an emic Indonesian grid, but a western scientific grid!

The heart of the study, that is, the data and analysis upon which the study is built, is found in the very last appendix (Appendix XVI). The text of Part I (chapters 1-8) is primarily a discussion of the theory and principles behind the analysis in Appendix XVI. I would recommend the uninitiated reader go through the study in the following order: Chapter One (Introduction); Appendix XVI (the primary data and examples); Chapter Seven (a superb discussion of semantic prototype theory, lexicalization, and idiomatic usage); and then Chapters Five, Three, Four, Two, Six, and Eight. If the reader is already familiar with Lakoff (1987), Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and Levi (1978), he should be able to go through the study in the order it was published with their bearings in place.

McCune usually makes his assumptions explicit and the discussion is generally well cross-referenced within the study as to where fuller discussion takes place. Use of words such as 'might, if, perhaps, may, could, seems' sprinkled periodically through the text and notes do nothing to allay the sense that one is dealing with speculation (see note 107 on page 82 for an extreme case of this problem). The relevance to the discussion at hand of frequent comments on child language

³On a whim, as a check against the reviewer's own awareness of Indonesian, he asked two native speakers of Malay schooled in Indonesian to tell him what the four terms from McCune's first example (page 1) meant. The older of the two eventually dredged up meanings for *kebat* and *kembung* after initially not remembering them. The younger (35 years old) did not know any of the four terms including the more common, but regionally known *buntat* 'gallstone'.

development is not always transparent, although perhaps McCune intends them to strengthen his claims about submorphemes and cognition. A reference to McCune and Simin (page 33) is not found in the bibliography. More amusingly, Echols and Shadily's *Indonesian-English Dictionary*, the data upon which McCune's entire study is based, also does not appear in the bibliography. A minor, but notable, annoyance is the problem of notes. One must flip back-and-forth to the end of each chapter at a dizzying rate of sometimes three or four notes a paragraph (see pages 18, 20-21, 23, 41). In fact, Chapter One has 114 notes, Chapter Two a staggering 163 notes, Chapter Three a mild 52 notes, and so forth for 587 notes in just eight chapters!

Nevertheless, the study is significant. Not only does McCune's work expand frontiers of methodology, but it also opens new horizons in our understanding of Indonesian, and hence other Austronesian languages. As one interested in Indonesian and Austronesian linguistics, I expect to refer to McCune's study when dealing with such things as cultural metaphors, and Malay poetics and literature. As one also interested in lexicography, semantics, and translation, I expect to refer back to the study of McCune's discussions and summaries of such issues as lexicalization, synonymy, homonymy, polysemy, portmanteau, metaphor, lexical relations (particularly his application of Levi extensions), prototype theory, and possible even sub

REFERENCES

- ECHOLS, JOHN M. and HASSAN SHADILY. 1975. *Indonesian-English dictionary*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- LEVI, JUDITHN. 1978. *The syntax and semantics of complex nominals*. New York: Academic Press.
- LAKOFF, GEORGE. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LAKOFF, GEORGE and MARK JOHNSON. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- SURYADI, LINUS. 1981. *Pengakuan Pariyem*. Jakarta: Sinar Harapan.