

Exploring Medical Terminology in Miyatake's Malay-Japanese Dictionary (1942)

James Thomas Collins¹, Karim Harun^{2*} and Toru Ueda³

¹*Institute of Ethnic Studies (KITA) Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi 43600, Malaysia*

²*Malay Language Program, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi 43600, Malaysia*

³*Faculty of Foreign Studies, Setsunan University, Osaka 572-8508, Japan*

ABSTRACT

On January 31, 1942, a combined Japanese force launched a two-pronged attack on the island of Ambon. Within four days, the Japanese controlled the island, city and airfield. Nellie Jansen, the Dutch resident's daughter, provided us an eye-witness account of the early days of the occupation. As a volunteer and trained nurse's assistant, her observations center on medical resources and organization, including the presence of Japanese doctors and pharmacists from the first week of the occupation. She also observed the use of Malay dictionaries by Japanese authorities; for example, she wrote of her chat with a wounded officer: "*Dat feit scheen hem erg te vermaken, want hij greep schuddend van het lachen zijn maleise woordenboekje en zei, na er in te hebben gebladerd: "Doeloe besar, sekarang ketjil..."*". This article explored what bilingual Malay-Japanese dictionaries were available to Japanese military and civilians who occupied Indonesia. The focus was on the 1942 edition of Masamichi Miyatake's *Kamoes Baroe Bahasa Indonesia-Nippon*, first published in 1938. The semantic field studied in this article was medical terminology. Some of these medical terms were selected for comparison with Malay-English dictionaries available at the time, in particular Wilkinson, Winstedt and

Wilkinson. This paper is part of a project to examine and evaluate lexicographic resources developed by early twentieth century Japanese scholars and to situate that seldom-studied Japanese scholarship in the global tradition of Malay lexicography.

Keywords: Dictionary, Japanese, lexicography, Malay, medical, Miyatake, lexicography, terminology

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 20 August 2019

Accepted: 18 October 2019

Published: 18 December 2019

E-mail addresses:

jtcukm@yahoo.com (James Thomas Collins)

linguist@ukm.edu.my (Karim Harun)

ueda@ilc.setsunan.ac.jp (Toru Ueda)

* Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

On 31 January 1942, a combined Japanese force launched a two-pronged attack on the island of Ambon in eastern Indonesia (Military History Section Headquarters, 1953). Within four days, the Japanese had achieved total control over the island, its city and airfield. A young woman, Nellie Jansen (2004), daughter of H. J. Jansen, the Dutch resident at the time of the invasion, provided us with an eye-witness account of the early days of the occupation of Ambon. As a volunteer and trained nurse's assistant, many of her observations initially centred on medical resources and organization, including the presence of numerous Japanese doctors and pharmacists, even from the first week of the occupation. She also observed the use of Malay dictionaries by the Japanese authorities. For example, she wrote of her chat with a wounded officer in a hospital (Jansen, 2004). She had introduced herself as the daughter of the captured resident; then she noted his response:

“Dat feit scheen hem erg te vermaken, want hij greep schuddend van het lachen zijn maleise woordenboekje en zei, na er in te hebben gebladerd: “Doeloe besar, sekarang ketjil”....”

“That fact seemed to amuse him very much. Shaking with laughter, he grabbed his Malay pocket dictionary and, after having paged through it, he said: *“Dulu besar, sekarang kecil “....”*

When we stumbled on this account a few years ago, the initial response was: What dictionary was that? Of course, Wilkinson's (1932) Malay-English dictionary had been reprinted in a facsimile and smaller version (without the author's permission) in Tokyo in 1941 and, indeed, had been supplied to Japanese officers occupying the Malay peninsula. Was this the *woordenboekje* that the amused Japanese officer had paged through? Were there, in fact, bilingual dictionaries of Malay and Japanese in early 1942?

That story is a complicated one, but the brief essay presented here only explores one bilingual Japanese dictionary available to the Japanese military and civilians who occupied Indonesia (1942-1945).¹ This brief exploration is limited to Masamichi Miyatake's (1942) *Kamoes Baroe Bahasa Indonesia-Nippon*, first published in 1938. This lexicographic foray examines only a selected, focussed semantic field: Medical terminology.² Nonetheless perhaps through

¹ This article was written as part of a larger project that examined and evaluated the work of the Japanese lexicographic scholar, Masamichi Miyatake, and other Japanese scholars of the early twentieth century. The research was partially supported by Grant SK-2016-012 from the Sumitomo Foundation under the direction of Dr Karim Harun (National University of Malaysia) with the collaboration of Dr Ueda Toru (Setsunan University, Osaka).

² This essay was first presented on 26 June 2016 at the meetings of the Association of Asian Studies in Asia (Kyoto 2016) in the panel, "Medicine Talks: Perceiving Society and Individuals in Japanese Occupied Singapore and Indonesia" organized by Dr Bradley

this limited examination of Malay-Japanese materials, we can answer more general questions such as:

1. To what extent and how accurately did those dictionaries provide information to the Japanese speakers about Malay (Indonesian) vocabulary, and;
2. Is Miyatake's dictionary linked to the global tradition of Malay lexicography of that era.

In this essay, a brief discussion of the research methodology and the unexpected "resistance" we encountered, embedded in the text itself, is laid out. In the second part, some aspects of the project and a few examples are presented. Then, possible future directions are considered. There are, then, three sections to this brief essay:

1. Methodology: Troubling symptoms.
2. Results: Towards a diagnosis, and;
3. Discussion: Prognosis

In the conclusion, some suggestions about further research will be set forth.

METHODS: TROUBLING SYMPTOMS

To conduct this research the first step was to locate the Miyatake dictionaries. We had planned on focusing on the 1943 dictionary,

Horton. We express our deepest thanks to him. The following year, Dr. Karim Harun organized a subsequent seminar (28 February 2017) at the National University of Malaysia, "Kamus Masamichi Miyatake dan Perkamusan Melayu", where Collins presented a revised version of the Kyoto paper. Both of the other team members also presented papers.

Kamoes Bahasa Melajoe-Nippon jang lengkap, that Teeuw had mentioned in his bibliography. As he wrote (Teeuw, 1961):

... Miyatake (1941, 1943) ... seems to excel all European Malay dictionaries, at any rate quantitatively, judging by the nature and number of Malay keywords.

However, in the early stages of research, we were unable to examine this 1774-page dictionary.³ However, with B. Horton's generous help and hard work, in early 2016 we acquired a scanned copy of Miyatake (1942), *Kamoes Baroe Indonesia-Nippon*, held at the Waseda University library in Tokyo. This 1942 dictionary is a concise dictionary⁴--nonetheless of considerable length with its 334 pages. But even with the 1942 book on our screens, we encountered numerous problems that we had not even considered when we submitted our research proposal.

By focussing on medical terminology, there was no effort to devise a statistically based data file, for examples words on every tenth page and so forth. Instead, the semantics of the medical field circumscribed the data collection procedure. Similarly, with no ability to read Japanese (written in any orthography), there were other

³ In June 2016 we were able to purchase a copy of the comprehensive ('lengkap') dictionary in Tokyo.

⁴ This is clear in the Japanese title of the dictionary, *Konsaisu Maraigo shinjiten*, in which *konsaisu* means 'concise'; Teeuw (1961, p. 130) noted that by 1943 there had five editions of this pocket book dictionary.

obvious boundaries as well.⁵ The plan for this initial foray into Miyatake (1942) was to start with the Indonesian words. Two modest approaches were implemented: text comparison and lexical comparison.

First, we read through a medical book of roughly the same era as the 1942 dictionary. In 1939, *Malaria* was published in Malay/Indonesian by Balai Poestaka the colonial government's publishing unit. Significantly, this 32-page book was not a technical book for medical practitioners, but rather a small book for the general public (*Volkslectuur*) published in the late colonial era. Moreover, we know that, during his travels in Southeast Asia and later through his contacts in the region, Miyatake collected books and other print materials from precisely this era.⁶ From this 1939 book we extracted a handful of terms that were related to medicine and

illness, for example, *malaria* 'malaria', *cel darah* 'blood cell', *tablet* 'tablet', *waba[h]* 'epidemic' and *zat* 'mineral, chemical element'. Then we looked for these words in Miyatake (1942).

In addition, we examined some other print materials from roughly the same era. See for example, the advertisement of the Tanabe Gohei & Company, Ltd. published in early 1943. Note, the occurrence of words such as **disenteri** 'dysentery', **kinine** 'quinine', **hormone** 'hormone', **tablet** 'tablet' and **tuberculose** 'tuberculosis' as well as **malaria** 'malaria'.

Second, based on Collins's personal experiences in Indonesia and his readings in health and medical issues, using Indonesian print and electronic sources, he drew up a list of approximately ninety additional Indonesian words within this specific semantic field (health, medicine, disease, psychological disorders). These terms were then compared to the entries in the Miyatake dictionary. Some, indeed many, of these terms derived both from this idiosyncratic list, as well as from the 1939 book, were not found in the 1942 dictionary.

After drawing up lists of medical terms, we began to seek out research assistants who could translate the Japanese language definitions in the 1942 dictionary for the Indonesian words we hoped to examine. Collins met with a Japanese M.A. student, an excellent speaker of English and a recent graduate of a well-known university in Tokyo. He asked him if he could look at a few of the definitions in those selected

⁵ The Japanese language is written with three different writing systems—often used in the same text. The kanji system is based on Chinese characters (logograms). Two other systems, hiragana and katakana ultimately derive from abbreviated forms of Chinese characters used to represent syllables and, thus, yield a syllabary for Japanese. Seeley's (2000) book describes the differences and histories of these writing systems which complement each other in contemporary Japanese texts. As Honda (1997, p. 263) explained, "knowledge of at least 2,000 Chinese characters [kanji] in addition to two 50-character alphabets [hiragana and katakana] is required for functional literacy in the Japanese language."

⁶ See Goes (2015) about Miyatake's prewar visit to Java and elsewhere in Southeast Asia as well as Soedjono (1942) and Kuroiwa (2012) about his text collections.

entries. Unexpectedly, this university graduate and first-language speaker of Japanese could seldom understand the *kanji* definitions of the medical terms in the 1942 dictionary, for example the entry for *demam* 'fever'. Whereas in those sporadic entries for which a *kana* definition was available, he provided credible translations in English. This difficulty was observed with other younger Japanese speakers that we contacted. When confronting the 1942 text, seemingly few young Japanese could read many of the *kanji* definitions specifically for medical terms in Miyatake (1942). So we assumed there had been an orthography reform.

That assumption was supported by consulting Seeley (2000), especially Chapter 9 regarding reforms in modern Japanese script after 1945. But, the more we read the more we realized the complexity of the orthographic problem. On the one hand, is the history of Japanese writing systems and, on the other hand, is the history of medicine in Japan. As is well known, by 1940 Japan had achieved universal literacy (Honda, 1997), but changes in the use of the writing systems and their proportional distribution in a given text occurred frequently. Often these changes were made in specific settings. Seeley (2000) noted that after the invasion of Manchuria in 1931, "... the military ... favored a written style which featured heavy use of Sino-Japanese and difficult characters". But Kratoska (1997), writing about Japanese policies in the occupied Malay Peninsula, wrote:

"In conformance with a set of guidelines laid down by the Headquarters of the Southern Expeditionary Forces in January 1942, basic instruction given to school children included no *kanji*... and was confined to renderings of the language in the *katakana* syllabary."

Thus, details of the practice of writing Japanese may have varied in different regions and during different stages during the period of military dominance before 1945.

However, as noted above, another issue inserted itself. One must wonder specifically about the provenance of the medical terms themselves. What is the tradition of writing medical terms? The tenth century compilation of Japanese medical knowledge, *Ishinpō*, drew chiefly on Chinese medical texts; so, one assumes a significant use of perhaps archaic or at least specialist characters; see Kornicki (2001). Moreover, in the seventeenth and even more so the eighteenth centuries, another medical tradition from the west was impacting traditional Japanese medical practices. The influence of Dutch-mediated medical knowledge (*Rangaku*) perhaps reached its height in 1774 with the publication of *Kaitai shinsho* (A New Book of Anatomy), a Japanese translation of Dicke's Dutch version of a basic study of anatomy. Despite the importance of this publication, well into the nineteenth century neo-Confucian medicine remained a powerful force among Japan's practicing doctors (de Bary et al.,

1967). For that matter, the orthography of *Kaitai shinso* may need to be examined. Indeed, Kornicki (2001) noted that "... the Medical Academy ... published two Song dynasty medical texts and in 1860 the *Ishinpō*..." Yet, these thousand-year old texts were published and distributed in the midst of the dramatic cultural and political shifts of the 1850s and 1860s (Totman, 1995).

So we, Sumitomo project members, were faced with problems we had not considered when this lexicographic research was proposed. Perhaps we should have expected opacity in medical terminology. After all, the internet is chock full of sites, blogs and references to doctors' jargon and doctors' language among speakers of English, for example. So, focussing on medical terminology should have been approached more cautiously. However, the issue of medical jargon in Japanese is somewhat different because of the complex, composite orthography of Japanese that combines three different writing systems. Perhaps too it is complicated by a lexicographer's perspective that in a bilingual dictionary a definition should present a phrasal explanation of the meaning and then match it up with a one or two word gloss? In any case, thanks to the efforts of B. Horton and his colleagues, Takumi Nakamura, Tomoko Fujita and Shiori Yamamoto (personal communication, June 2, 2016), who produced a corpus of about 52 entries, based on a list of words we had found in the Miyatake dictionary of 1942 that apparently are connected broadly with medicine and well-being.

RESULTS: TOWARDS A DIAGNOSIS

In this "medical examination", the symptoms present themselves: a small corpus of about 50 dictionary entries that have been partially translated despite the problems raised by sometimes obsolete *kanji* characters. Above, in the first section, we briefly described the two collection procedures and the unexpected problems involved. Here, in the second section, a procedure to begin to identify or, at least, to describe what these materials suggest about Miyatake's approach to Malay/ Indonesian lexicography is set forth. First, a simple system of classifying the 52 medical terms is laid out. Next, three medical entries in that limited corpus of Miyatake (1942) are compared with the same headwords and entries in other Malay language dictionaries.

Classifying The "Medical"

We decided to divide the list of words into four basic semantic categories, partly based on terms used in Balai Poestaka's (1939) book on malaria:

- Medical staff and structures
- Names of medicines
- "Medical" conditions
- Names of diseases and illnesses

Surprisingly, these categories proved uneven in terms of coverage in Miyatake (1942).

Medical Staff and Structures

While we found **apteker** 'pharmacist', **bidan** 'midwife', **dokter** 'doctor' and **roemah sakit** 'hospital', we did not find

other words that we might expect, such as health officer, hospital admission, laboratory, nurse, ward, x-ray. Based on our limited exploration of the text, the human and physical infrastructures for medical treatment are not well covered in the dictionary. We might expect that terms, perhaps such as **djoeroerawat** 'nurse', **opname** 'hospital admission' or **ronsen/rontgen** 'x-ray', would be found in the dictionary. However, though these words apparently were in use in Indonesia during the 1930's, they did not find their way into the Miyatake dictionary.

Names of Medicines

Even more sparse are the names of medicines. Indeed we have not yet found any terms for names of medicines, except for the generic **obat** 'medicine' and some of its compounds, for example, **obat bidji** 'pill', **obat minoem** ('liquid medication, medicated elixir' and a few others), as well as possibly **apioem** 'opium'—if used medicinally? This contrasts with data from publications of the same period. Specific medicines were mentioned in publications of that era; for example in Illustration 3 above, we notice **kinine** 'quinine', and less specific terms, like **tablet** 'tablet',⁷ but these are not included in the dictionary.

“Medical” Conditions

The category, “Medical” conditions, however, is well-represented in the

⁷ Obviously, the compound **obat bidji** in Illustration 3 shares the same semantics as **tablet**.

dictionary. Within it, are many words related in a general way to health conditions and normal bodily functions. Terms, such as **penyakit** 'disease', **sakit** 'ill', **semboeh** 'cured', **sehat** 'healthy' and **poelih** 'recovered' for example, are found. Similarly a few terms specifically related to childbearing are also found, such as **bersalin** 'give birth' and **datang boelan** 'menstrual cycle, menstruation'.

Names of Diseases and Illnesses

This is another category that is represented by relatively many entries. For example, there are numerous entries for everyday tropical bacterial and fungal infections of the skin, such as **bisoel** 'boil', **koedis** 'scabies', **koerap** 'ringworm' and **panau** 'fungal infection of the skin, white spots' as well as a serious bacterial disease **koesta** 'leprosy, Hansen's disease'. Intestinal and stomach illnesses are also well represented; note the following entries: **moecal** 'nausea', **sembelit** 'constipation', **boesoeng**, 'distension of the stomach' and even **koléra** 'cholera'. Not surprisingly, that emblematic, if vague, Indonesian illness: **masoek angin** 'experience physical discomfort including fever, aches and flatulence', can be found in this dictionary! Still it is striking not to find: **diare** 'diarrhoea', **disenteri** 'dysentery', **maag/mag** 'stomach ulcer', **malaria** 'malaria' or **sipilis** 'syphilis'—all used in popular print media in the 1930's.⁸

⁸ Note **disenteri** and **malaria** in Illustration 3. Nonetheless, under the entry **penyakit**, the phrase **penyakit perempoean** 'venereal disease' is included.

“Medical Examinations”

In this section, three entries in Miyatake (1942) were examined more closely, first, by comparing them to the same entries in Wilkinson (1932), using the Tokyo photograph facsimile edition of 1941. We started with Wilkinson (1932) because, above all, it was deemed by Teeuw (1961) as the “the most reliable Malay dictionary”. Moreover, this dictionary, printed in a format of reduced size on onion skin paper to be used by the occupation forces, presumably was deemed important by the Japanese as well.⁹

Of course, Miyatake’s 1942 dictionary is a concise dictionary and Wilkinson (1932) is a rather encyclopedic compendium; so, we might expect these two dictionaries to differ in scope. The initial purpose of this comparative examination was not to measure the quantity of information but simply to try to ascertain the accuracy of Miyatake’s entries compared to other sources in so far as we had deciphered Miyatake’s definitions. Perhaps the examination would shed some light on Miyatake’s lexicographic process and the place of his endeavour in the history of Malay lexicography. The three words selected for this comparison were **batoek**, **bengkak** and **demam**—all belonging to the Names of diseases and illnesses category above.

If we compare only the Malay/Indonesian data in these two entries (**batoek/batok**), it is remarkable that all five phrases

or compound nouns defined in Miyatake were found among the fourteen Malay phrases in Wilkinson. If Wilkinson was the source for these materials, we noted a typographical or printer’s error; Miyatake’s **batoek baran angin** should be **barah**, not **baran**. However, there were also some other differences. Miyatake included an affixed form **membatoek**; this verbal form followed predictable morphological rules but, in fact, this affixed form (*membatuk*) is not found in today’s Malay and Indonesian dictionaries. Nonetheless, this affixed form is sometimes used in today’s online blogs. Another difference was found in the definitions. There were two phrases defined as ‘whooping cough’, namely **batoek lelah** and **batoek sisik**, but these were distinguished between terms for adults (大人) and children (子供) diseases. This is a semantic detail not found in Wilkinson (1932). However, it is precisely this distinction that is found in Winstedt’s *English-Malay dictionary* first published in 1913 and two later editions 1922 and 1939. Obviously, lexicographers rely on any available earlier sources, but in this case Miyatake may have been drawing not on Wilkinson (1932) or Winstedt (1913) but rather on Wilkinson (1901), where the distinction between the terms for adult and child pertussis is first made. Moreover, Wilkinson (1901) was the source for much of Winstedt’s (1913) dictionary according to Teeuw (1961). Indeed, all of Miyatake’s **batoek** phrases can be found in Wilkinson (1901).¹⁰

⁹ Referring to this Tokyo edition, Gullick (2001, p. 38) wrote: “...the dictionary was one of the few works reprinted by a Japanese publisher in a pirated edition.”

¹⁰ As Gullick (2001) pointed out many of the errors and shortcomings of the 1901 dictionary

In the respective entries for **bengkak** the differences between the Miyatake (1942) and Wilkinson (1932) were more striking. In these entries, there were very few similarities between Miyatake (1942) and Wilkinson (1932). None of Wilkinson's phrase examples formed with **bengkak** were included in Miyatake. According to Horton et al. (personal communication, June 2, 2016), we could translate Miyatake's terms 腫れる and 炎症, respectively as 'swell' and 'inflammation'; these match Wilkinson's 'swollen' and 'inflamed'. But if we examined Winstedt (1913), we found *inflammation bengkaknya*, *tumour bengkak*. These seemed to be connected to Miyatake's 炎症 and 腫物, if we recalled that tumor simply meant 'swollen part' or 'protuberance'. Miyatake's second definition, 癌 'cancer', was problematic and might have been intended as a more general meaning such as 'any disease characterized by tumours'. The only noun phrase that Miyatake offered was **bengkak paru-baru**, a term not found in Wilkinson (1901, 1932), Winstedt (1913) or, for that matter, Poerwadarminta (1952). Miyatake's definition of **bengkak paru-baru** was 肺炎 apparently 'pneumonia'. But again, in contemporary Indonesian, as demonstrated in online blogs and health-related websites (e.g. Dharmakesuma, 2012), **bengkak (pada) paru-paru** were corrected and improved upon by Wilkinson himself in the 1932 dictionary. The discussion below concerning *demam kepialu* is an example of the careful revisions Wilkinson undertook. Certainly, the 1932 dictionary marks a significant improvement over all earlier Malay dictionaries, including Wilkinson's own 1901 dictionary.

a symptom associated with many lung diseases including pneumonia and *interstitial lung disease (ILD)*. We are informed both by Kuroiwa (2012) and Soedjono (1942) that Miyatake made use of an extensive collection of contemporary newspapers and journals. Perhaps he found this usage in those primary sources.

Our exploration of **batোক** and **bengkak** suggests that Miyatake's chief dictionary resource may have been Winstedt (1913). There were three editions of Winstedt available and, thus, it may have been easier to access than Wilkinson's earlier (1901) dictionary. But we also note that Miyatake apparently had other resources, whether they were Indonesian assistants who worked with him, such as Sudjono (Soebagijo, 1983), or simply the many text materials he had collected since he had first studied Malay at Tenri School of Foreign Language (Kuroiwa, 2012).

Similarly, in the entries for **demam** a comparison of Miyatake and Wilkinson was complex. First, of the twenty-one types of fever set forth in Wilkinson (1932), Miyatake included only three. However, if we examined Wilkinson (1901), there were only ten kinds of fevers listed and Miyatake's three defined types of fever were among the first four types of fever in Wilkinson 1901.

Moreover, Wilkinson's definition of the phrase **demam kěpiyalu** 'malarial fever generally', was an erroneous definition that he then revised in his 1932 dictionary because definition **demam kepialu** referred to typhoid, not malaria. But in Miyatake's

(1942) dictionary, the matching phrase *demam kepialo* was defined as マラリヤ ‘malaria’. The retention of this mistaken 1901 definition suggested that, at least in the case of **demam**, Miyatake’s chief resource was Wilkinson (1901). He seemed to have selected from phrases from among the first few types of **demam**, choosing perhaps the one that was the most frequently encountered and most dangerous fever, namely malaria. Again we noted that Miyatake included an affixed form, **berdemam**, that did not occur in any Malay or Indonesian dictionary of Miyatake’s era, nor in today’s standard dictionaries. However, today **berdemam** occurred online in blogs, facebook chats and tweets, often followed by a noun (**berdemam Euro** ‘suffering from Euro fever’) or by a qualifying adjective (**berdemam tinggi** ‘suffering from high fever’). It is interesting to note that in the oldest Malay dictionary in English, Bowrey (1701) included the phrase **berdemam sedikit** with a sentence example **Ako sooda berdemam sedikit** ‘I am feverish.’

DISCUSSION: PROGNOSIS

What conclusions can we draw from this brief discussion about the future path of Malay lexicographic research? What directions should further research about this and other Japanese-Malay dictionaries of the early 1940’s take?

In Masamichi Miyatake’s short life (1912-1944), he studied and wrote about many languages (Kuroiwa, 2012). But surely his work on Malay/Indonesian must stand out as his most significant

contribution. In 1932, at the age of 20, he travelled to Semarang and Batavia (Goes, 2015); within four years he was already publishing essays about Malay sentence structures and dialects. In 1938 he produced a Japanese-Malay dictionary, in 1942 the concise Malay (Indonesian)-Japanese dictionary and in 1943 a comprehensive dictionary of Malay (Indonesian). (See Kuroiwa, 2012 and Teeuw, 1961).

As is often the case in the work of lexicographers, especially those working on well-documented world languages like Malay, he worked with colleagues who spoke the target language, collected contemporary print materials and, based on some of the comparisons presented here, used earlier published dictionaries—in particular the works of both Wilkinson and Winstedt. When Miyatake’s entries diverge from these two chief sources, we assume he was incorporating materials that he had collected or the information and judgements of his Indonesian colleagues. Thus, it is important to see the concise dictionary we looked at briefly here as a dictionary that is part of the larger Malay lexicographic tradition. Unfortunately, much of the research conducted by Japanese scholars in the 1930’s and 1940’s about Austronesian languages, in general, and about Malay, in particular, has not been fully incorporated into the existing academic discourse.

The 1942 dictionary is a concise dictionary so, even at its considerable length of 334 pages, the compiler of the dictionary had to make choices about what to include and how much to say about the

materials included. On the other hand, precisely because the dictionary was short and concise, there were many in use. For example, one of his wartime correspondents in northern Sumatra wrote that: "There are many of your "*New Concise Malay Dictionary*" in use in the region (Kuroiwa, 2012). Moreover, Miyatake's dictionary is not a wordlist or a glossary. Although there are no sentence-length illustrative examples except in the short precis of Malay morphology and syntax at the end of the book (pages 325-334), the reader will find alternative pronunciations and spellings, etymological identifications, numerous compound nouns and two-to-three-word phrases as well as morphologically complex forms (affixed words). We must always remember that Miyatake did not have an opportunity to publish revisions (like Wilkinson) or subsequent, improved editions (like Winstedt). His life was too short.

Frankly, although this essay has suggested how Miyatake set about his lexicographic task, the relevance of this dictionary and the medical terms in the broader field of Malay lexicography probably needs to be judged by relevant scholars, especially in Southeast Asia and Japan. Perhaps this brief essay has shed some light on the lingering archaism of medical terminology in an era when Japan had already become an advanced industrial country. But then again we have already noted the existence of medical jargon, both old and new, in English-speaking medical circles, as well. Another issue of some interest is the absence of many

medical terms that we know were in use in publications in Indonesia in the 1930's. Many of these terms were loanwords from Dutch. Some have speculated that Dutch words were avoided as remnants of European oppression.

Of course, we cannot completely dismiss the possible impact of the spirit of the times. Kuroiwa (2012) provided a glimpse of this perspective when he published a letter of the occupation era from Kazuo Azumi, with the Java Expeditionary Force:

"I wanted to ask a favour of a local nurse at a hospital the other day, but I was not sure what I should call her. The use of the word *zuster* (nurse) is outdated in view of the current situation."

In the end, he chose to call her *kangofus-san*—an ersatz loanword from Japanese that was short-lived.

However, we cannot attribute omission of some Dutch loanwords as an indication of wartime militarism! Presumably like many loan words from Dutch, many medical terms borrowed from Dutch were not included in Dutch-Malay (Indonesian) dictionaries in use in the 1930's, and some even were not included in Indonesian monolingual dictionaries up until the 1990's. Often such words were considered slang or the language of the streets and excluded from the formal entries of a national dictionary.

Given the complexities and the opacity of the orthography in Miyatake's 1942 dictionary—for example, the entry for **bengkak**, our larger project sought a new

approach to studying the definitions, one that differed procedurally from the one implemented here. Preparing this brief article simply focused on a semantic subset of the dictionary and even that has proven both a challenge and an indication of what hurdles lay ahead for future research.

CONCLUSION

When the proposal for a small project about Miyatake's Malay dictionaries was submitted to the Sumitomo Foundation, we had hoped to deepen our knowledge about the contribution of Japanese scholars to the study of the Malay language. At some Malaysian universities, courses about the history of Malay as well as Malay lexicography usually take note of the role of Japanese scholars and officials in the development of the Malay language in the twentieth century, but all too often that topic is treated only in a perfunctory manner. We had hoped that by studying, even in a limited way, Masamichi Miyatake's contributions to Malay lexicography the project would mark a starting point for deepening our understanding of the history of the Japanese role in Malay studies and also provide resources for the teaching of courses about the historical development of the Malay language and Malay dictionaries.

By studying Miyatake's concise dictionary (1942), we uncovered a perspective and a procedure rooted in the global traditions of Malay lexicography, but, at the same time, reflecting an individual scholar's unique understanding of the Malay

language.¹¹ We can trace the dictionary sources upon which Miyatake drew, especially Wilkinson (1901), but we also observe his personal input, especially with respect to affixed forms, and of course the inclusion of many Indonesian terms neither widely used in the former British colonies in the region at that time nor found in the standard Malay dictionaries of that era.

Dictionary compilers always consult earlier dictionaries¹²; see, for example, Svensén (2009). This is a practitioner's standard operating procedure. A good lexicographer aims to improve on earlier dictionaries by enhancing the quality of the entries and expanding their number. In a concise dictionary, the compiler must make decisions about essential words and priority definitions. With the advent of computer technology and online data sources, much has changed in the practice of dictionary compiling and editing, but the empirical, data-driven basis of lexicography remains its underlying strength. By examining

¹¹ Miyatake's 1942 dictionary contrasts with the much larger dictionary also attributed to him and published in 1943. The 1943 dictionary follows Wilkinson (1932) very closely and appears to be the work of a committee. Miyatake's personal input, additional affixed forms and his unique genius so obvious in the 1942 dictionary are not evident in the 1943 "lengkap" (comprehensive) dictionary.

¹² This a procedure implemented when those resources are available. Scores of minority languages in the Southeast Asia have not been documented and no dictionaries exist. This is not the case for Malay, a language studied by western scholars for 500 years.

Konsaisu Marai-go shinjiten. Kamoos baroe Bahasa Indonesia-Nippon, published more than seventy-five years ago, even in this cursory essay, perhaps we can appreciate both the global tradition of Malay lexicography and the methods and practices of lexicography in general, as well as the genius and dedication of Masamichi Miyatake.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article was written as part of a larger project that examined and evaluated the work of the Japanese lexicographic scholar, Masamichi Miyatake, and other Japanese scholars of the early twentieth century. The research was partially supported by Grant SK-2016-012 from the Sumitomo Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Balai Poestaka. (1939). *Malaria* (Third Printing). Batavia – Jakarta, Indonesia: Balai Poestaka.
- Bowrey, T. (1701). *A dictionary English and Malayo, Malayo and English*. London, England: Sam Bridge.
- de Bary, T., Carol, G., & Donald, K. (1967). *Sources of Japanese Tradition* (Vol. II). Columbia, USA: Columbia University Press.
- Dharmakesuma. (2012, January 24). Paru-paru: Rawatan.... [Lungs: Treatment...] [Blog post]. Retrieved January 28, 2012, from <http://dharmakesuma.blogspot.my/2012/01/paru-paru-rawatan.html>
- Goes, H. (2015). The Esperanto movement in the Dutch East Indies and Indonesia. *Wacana*, 16(2), 441-469.
- Gullick, J. M. (2001). Richard James Wilkinson (1867–1941): A man of parts. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 74(1), 1942.
- Honda, G. (1997). Differential structure, differential health: Industrialization in Japan, 1868-1940. In R. H. Steckel & R. Floud (Eds.), *Health and welfare during industrialization* (pp. 251-284), Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved January 13, 2015, from <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c7433>
- Jansen, N. (2004). *De memoires van Nellie Jansen*. Retrieved 13 January, 2015, from <http://www.hjjansen.nl/Memoires%20Nel%20Jansen.pdf>
- Kornicki, P. (2001). *The book in Japan. A cultural history from the beginnings of the nineteenth century*. Honolulu, USA: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Kratoska, P. H. (1997). *The Japanese occupation of Malaya. A social and economic history*. Honolulu, USA: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Kuroiwa, Y. (2012). Military mail for a linguist: Soldiers who support and profit from the language studies of Masamichi Miyatake. *Zinbun*, 43, 35-50.
- Military History Section Headquarters, Army Forces Far East. (1953). *Ambon and Timor invasion operations. Japanese Monographs No. 16*. Tokyo, Japan: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army.
- Miyatake, M. (1942). *Konsaisu Marai-go shinjiten. Kamoos baroe Bahasa Indonesia-Nippon* [New Dictionary of Indonesian and Japanese] (Ko-a Kyokai, ed.). Tokyo, Japan: Aikoku Shimbun Company.
- Miyatake, M. (1943). *Kyojun Marai-go daijiten. Kamoos baroe Bahasa Indonesia-Nippon* [New Dictionary of Indonesian and Japanese] (With Akiie Sonoda.) Tokyo, Japan: Hakubunkan.

- Poerwadarminta, W. J. S. (1952). *Kamus umum Bahasa Indonesia* [General Dictionary of Indonesian language]. Djakarta, Indonesia: Balai Pustaka.
- Seeley, C. (2000). *A history of writing in Japan*. Honolulu, USA: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Soebagijo, I. N. (1983). *Mr. Sudjono, mendarat dengan pasukan Jepang di Banten 1942* [Mr. Sudjono, landed with Japanese Troops in Banten 1942]. Jakarta, Indonesia: Gunung Agung.
- Soedjono. (1942). Kata pengantar [Preface]. In M. Miyatake, *Konsaisu Marai-go shinjiten. Kamoebaree Bahasa Indonesia-Nippon* (pp. 3-4) (Ko-a Kyokai, ed.). Tokyo, Japan: Aikoku Shimbun Company.
- Svensén, B. (2009). *A handbook of lexicography. The theory and practice of dictionary-making*. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Teeuw, A. (1961). *A critical survey of studies on Malay and Bahasa Indonesia*. Netherlands: 's-Gravenhage; Martinus Nijhoff.
- Totman, C. (1995). *Early modern Japan*. Berkeley, USA: University of California Press.
- Wilkinson, R. J. (1901). *A Malay-English dictionary*. Singapore: Kelly and Walsh Ltd.
- Wilkinson, R. J. (1932). *A Malay-English dictionary (Romanised)*. Tokyo, Japan: Daitōa Syuppan Kabusiki Kaisya.
- Winstedt, R. O. (1913). *An English-Malay dictionary*. Singapore: Kelly and Walsh Ltd.