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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is concerned with the study of English influence on the lexical expansion of Bahasa Malaysia.

The dissertation consists of 4 parts and 10 chapters. Part One contains 4 chapters which provide background information. Chapter 1 outlines the purpose and scope of the study, the materials and methodology used. Chapter 2 is a survey of literature relating to linguistic borrowing, lexical planning, and previous studies of English influence on the Malay language. Chapter 3 describes the growth of Malay from a lingua franca to its present status as national and official language. Chapter 4 examines the socio-cultural factors which help to promote English influence on Bahasa Malaysia.

Part Two contains 3 chapters which describe the processes by which English has influenced vocabulary development in Bahasa Malaysia. Chapter 5 examines the importation of pure loanwords and loanblends; Chapter 6, substitution, which gives rise to loan translations and semantic extension. The structural characteristics of these lexical innovations are described as well as their effects on Bahasa Malaysia at various levels. Chapter 6 also considers apt equivalent substitution in which equivalents from Malay or another foreign language are used in place of English terms, the first giving rise to direct and the second, indirect, equivalent substitutes. Chapter 7 examines the way English has stimulated native creation, primarily through affixation, compounding, reduplication, blending, and circumlocution.

Part Three contains two chapters which examine English influence on planned and spontaneous lexical innovation. Chapter 8 describes the conflict which has arisen between planning agencies as a result of different policies, mainly over the use of English as a source of terminological innovation. The official LPA, the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, motivated mainly by ideological concerns, has over-emphasised indigeneity in terminology preparation. The Universities, however, being more pragmatically oriented, have preferred importing English terms directly, and adapting them less drastically. Chapter 9
compares planned and spontaneous lexical innovation. The spontaneous sector was found to rely mainly on importation from English to meet its lexical needs; the planned sector made greater use of substitution and native creation to supplement importation. Unlike the planned sector, borrowing from English in the spontaneous sector was not just 'denotative', but also 'connotative' in nature. Chapter 9 also discusses the findings from an analysis of running texts. The 'official' Dewan publications did not differ significantly from the newspapers and popular magazines in terms of volume and form of borrowing preferred. The only real determinant of borrowing was established to be subject matter. Native creations tended to be used as 'stylistic alternants' rather than consistent replacements for English loans, irrespective of type of publication.

Part Four looks at the findings as a whole and considers their implications for the study of language contact in general, and the development of Bahasa Malaysia in particular.
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PART ONE

GENERAL BACKGROUND
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the Study

Writing just 60 years ago, Sapir discounted the influence of English as "negligible", adding that "there is nothing to show that it is anywhere entering into the lexical heart of other languages as French has coloured the English complexion or as Arabic has permeated Persian and Turkish."\(^1\)

Sapir died in 1939. He did not see the mushrooming of the new nations in the post-war world nor the tremendous growth in the importance of English during the last 30 years. As these new nations have been promoting and developing their 'national languages' during the same period that English has been expanding, it is inevitable that the latter should have left its mark on many of these developing languages.

Bahasa Malaysia, the national language of Malaysia, is one of these languages which have been developing at the same time that English has been growing in importance. This study then will show how in one aspect of its development, the modernisation of the lexicon, Bahasa Malaysia has been helped, and in some cases, hindered, by the influence of the English language.

The subject of English influence on Bahasa Malaysia, especially on its lexicon, has been and still continues to be an emotive issue. However, English influence on Bahasa Malaysia has not, till now, been investigated in a systematic manner and according to modern linguistic principles and procedures. It is hoped that this study will contribute in some measure to an understanding of the nature of that influence and, at the same time, help to reduce unnecessary misapprehensions among Malaysians.

---

It is also hoped that this study will add to the rapidly increasing literature on language contact and will make possible comparison with other linguistic studies for an explication of the processes of lexical innovation, particularly of borrowing which has played such an important role in the shaping of modern languages. Language planners and academicians concerned with the modernisation of Bahasa Malaysia may also find this study relevant to their work.

1.1 **Purpose of the Study**

The broad objective of this dissertation is the analysis and the description of the influence of the English language on the lexical expansion of Bahasa Malaysia. More specifically, this study attempts to

1. identify the historical, social, cultural, economic and political factors involved in the influence of English on speakers of Bahasa Malaysia and, consequently, on the language itself,

2. examine the linguistic processes by which English has influenced the lexical expansion of Bahasa Malaysia,

3. classify and describe the lexical innovations resulting from the operation of the processes in (2) above,

4. investigate the integration of borrowed innovations and their impact on the structure of Bahasa Malaysia,

5. examine the policies and practices of planning agencies concerned with terminology development, and

6. describe the differences in the way English has influenced planned and spontaneous lexical innovation.
1.2 Scope of the Study

The scope of the present study is limited: the investigation of English influence is restricted to the way it has affected lexical expansion in Bahasa Malaysia. English influence on the phonology, grammar, and style of Bahasa Malaysia will receive appropriate attention inasmuch as this is derived from or is related to its influence on the vocabulary.¹

No attempt is made to describe Bahasa Malaysia structure other than to the degree necessary to account adequately for the lexical forms presented (a summary outline of Bahasa Malaysia is given in Appendix 1). The emphasis is on the lexical forms themselves and on the salient morphological and semantic facts about them. The phonology of borrowed forms must remain a secondary consideration because the factors which determine their phonological representation are so highly variable. They include such things as the vagaries of the dialect backgrounds of individual speakers and their varying degrees of bilingual or multilingual accomplishment. Furthermore, a full phonological treatment is precluded by the fact that the data were taken mainly from written sources.

In the collection of data, written sources have been emphasized. This is because the attempts to adjust the lexicon of Bahasa Malaysia to the needs of the modern world have been directed at the written rather than the spoken language. The emphasis on written sources is further justified by the fact that Bahasa Malaysia, being the standard form of Malay, is the form that is used in writing. Furthermore, the greatest number of lexical innovations borrowed from English have entered by way of writing and as a result of translation.

¹. It is recognised that it is not possible, nor particularly useful, to attempt a rigid separation of the levels of language. There is considerable difference of opinion still as to where the lines should be drawn between morphology and syntax, grammar and lexicon. But this does not mean that no distinctions should be recognised. As Weinreich (1953) points out, "The main requirement is that in a given contact situation, both languages be described in the same terms", and to "treat these distinctions, for comparative purposes, as matters of degree" (Languages in Contact, 1953, New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, p.29).
Lexical change may be studied from the standpoints of either lexical expansion or the concomitant obsolescence and loss of vocabulary of reduced relevance to the culture; or else it may be treated with reference to both these aspects simultaneously. The present study is basically concerned with lexical expansion, though instances of the reverse phenomenon as a result of contact with English are also alluded to.

The study of lexical innovation is related to the general type of culture change and transformation. This study is limited as much as possible to the linguistic problems that are posed, though it is recognised that other, and as equally important, problems exist.

1.3 Materials and Methodology

1.3.1 Materials

The data used in this study were obtained from the following sources:

(1) Newspapers,
(2) Publications of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka,
(3) Popular magazines.

Data from these three sources were collected during a 2½ year span, from January 1978 to July 1980.

(4) Radio & Television Malaysia broadcasts (from February to April 1979).

(5) Dictionaries:


1. S.T. Alisjahbana has expressed the relationship thus: "since the vocabulary of a language represents the totality of concepts and since the structure of the grammar of a language channels the expression of thoughts, ideas and feelings of a culture and thus mirrors the whole way of life and worldview of its users, there is a dialectal interplay between the modernisation of the languages and the modernisation of the concepts of thought of Asian and African societies and cultures" (Language Planning for Modernisation: The Case of Indonesian and Malaysian, 1976, The Hague: Mouton, p.14).

2. The titles and circulation figures of these publications are given in Appendix 2.

3. The Jawi version was published in 1901 in Singapore by Kelly & Walsh Ltd.

Terminology lists and glossaries produced by the Dewan and the Universities between 1957-1980.1

Because of the size of sources 5(ii), 6, and 7, data were selected by systematic sampling.

Altogether, approximately 8000 different lexical items were analysed. Over 4000 of these items, obtained from sources (1) to (4) listed on the previous page, have been listed in the glossary in Appendix 7.

1.3.2 Methodology

The materials used in this study were stored and analysed using computer facilities at the Edinburgh Regional Computing Centre (ERCC). Two separate computer packages were utilised, REFER designed for information storage and retrieval,2 and CONCORD for literal text analysis.

From the sources outlined in Section 1.3, a corpus of approximately 8000 lexical items was collected and stored using REFER. Prior to storage, however, information about each of the items e.g. source, form class, semantic category, type of loan, etc., has been coded on a computer data sheet. The information was coded using a numeric classification system devised by the writer. This 'coding index' and a sample of a completed data sheet are given in Appendix 7.

The information on the data sheets was subsequently transcribed into machine readable form using the key-to-disk system which records the data onto a magnetic disk. The stored information could then be retrieved by specifying a particular classification or a set of classifications. For instance, to obtain a listing of loanwords from the political domain collected from the newspaper Berita Harian, the following set of classifications would be entered at the terminal: 240 and 810 and 660. The first number, 240, indicates 'Berita Harian'; the second, 810, 'loanword'; and the third 660, 'political domain'.

1. Full details of these lists and glossaries are given in Appendix 2.
2. REFER is no longer available but packages performing similar functions are FAMULUS and CATALOG.
A supplementary analysis was performed on a corpus of running texts, using CONCORD. This package was used to search for and numerically tabulate the frequency of occurrence of new lexical items in the text as well as cite the occurrences of such items in their context. These new items had first to be identified by the writer and this was done by attaching numeric suffixes to them. The numeric suffixes specify the type of lexical innovation and the form class to which the item belonged. The coding index used in this analysis, an example of a text whose new lexical items have been coded, as well as the sources of the texts used in the analysis are given in Appendix 3.

Statistical tests were used to establish whether findings are significantly different. These are the chi-square for goodness-of-fit and for contingency tables and the binomial, using the normal approximation. Details of these are given in Appendix 5.

The writer returned to Malaysia to carry out fieldwork for three months in 1979. Assumptions about various aspects of the study were checked by direct observation and interviews with native-speaker informants. A series of interviews was also conducted with various officials of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (The Literary and Language Agency) as well as the chairmen and members of terminology committees at the Universities to discuss policies and work in relation to terminology preparation. The writer was granted permission to attend a number of meetings of terminology committees of the University of Malayato see how terminology work was actually carried out.

1.4 Definition of Terms

The following are the general terms used in the discussion. Other terms will be defined as they occur in the course of the discussion.

(1) **Lexical Expansion.** The enlargement of the vocabulary of a language through borrowing or inherent word-formation.

(2) **Borrowing.** The process in which elements from one language are taken over and used "in the context" of another. Borrowing' or 'loan' are also used as general terms to refer to the item taken over, without specification as to type.

---

(3) Inherent or intrinsic word-formation. The enlargement of the vocabulary by means other than by borrowing.

(4) Lexical Innovation. The term refers to the same phenomenon as (1) on the previous page. It is also used to refer to the new vocabulary item that results from borrowing or inherent word-fashion.

(5) Linguistic Innovation. Any kind of new element in the language, whether in phonology, grammar or vocabulary.

(6) Lexical Item. A unit of the vocabulary which may be a word or phrase.

(7) Word. The sense in which this term is used here is "the physically definable unit which one encounters in a stretch of writing (bounded by space) or speech (where identification is more difficult, but where there may be phonological clues to identify boundaries, such as pause, or juncture features). 'Word' in this sense is often referred to as the 'orthographic word' (for writing) or the 'phonological word' (for speech)." ¹

(8) Form Class. "A set of forms displaying similar or identical grammatical features," ² traditionally, referred to as 'part of speech'.

(9) Semantic Domains. "A group of lexical items which are associated in meaning by occurring together in similar contexts."³

(10) English. The term 'English' covers all the dialects of English with which Bahasa Malaysia has come into contact. This is usually British English though contact with American English has been increasing.

(11) Bahasa Malaysia. The standard form of Malay as used in contemporary books, newspapers, journals, and magazines and, orally, on TV and Radio Malaysia, and by the educated people. It is also the variety of Malay taught in schools, hence its other name 'Bahasa Sekolah' (School Language). The terms 'Standard Malay' and 'Modern Malay' are also used to refer to Bahasa Malaysia.

2. Ibid., p.149.
(12) **Contact or Language Contact.** As used in this study, the term refers to the general concept of the direct or indirect influence of one language on another.¹

¹ The term "language in contact" is used in a more restricted sense in the study of bilingualism: "two or more languages will be said to be IN CONTACT if they are used alternately by the same persons" (Weinreich, 1953, p.1).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter examines a number of theoretical and descriptive works which are related to the investigation of English influence on Bahasa Malaysia described in this study. The purpose of the review is to provide a background for the discussion of basic concepts and findings in the chapters which follow.

The survey of literature is divided into three sections:

(1) Linguistic Borrowing
(2) Lexical Planning
(3) Previous Observations of English Influence on Malay

2.1 Linguistic Borrowing

The survey of studies in the field reveals the existence of a vast literature on the subject of linguistic borrowing. Louis Deroy's encyclopedic work on the subject, *L'Emprunt Linguistique*, published more than two decades ago, includes a bibliography which lists more than 1600 works dealing directly with the subject. Since then a great many more works have been added to this already impressive total.

The discussion which follows looks at the major areas of interest in the study of borrowing and how they have been approached.

---

2.1.1 The Definition of Borrowing

The study of linguistic borrowing is included in the field of language contact.  

Language contact is considered by some anthropologists as but one aspect of culture contact, and borrowing as an example of cultural diffusion, the spread of an item of culture from people to people. This view of borrowing is accepted by most linguists of the field from Sapir to Haugen.

Sapir states that whatever the degree or nature of the contact between cultural groups it is generally sufficient to lead to some kind of linguistic interinfluencing, and that the "simplest kind of influence that one language may exert on another is the 'borrowing' of words".

Haugen, whose research upon different forms of linguistic borrowing was primarily responsible for renewed interest in the field, refers to borrowing as "linguistic diffusion". He has also given the most accepted definition of borrowing, that is, "the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another".

Bloomfield divides the sphere of borrowing into cultural, intimate, and dialect borrowing. Borrowing is "cultural" when the boundaries of each linguistic community correspond to distinct geographical and political boundaries. It is "intimate" when the two

1. Other phenomena included in the field of language contact are bilingualism, substrata, linguistic convergence, language mixture, pidgin and creole languages, foreign accents, language learning, etc. (see Haugen, E., 1958 "Language Contact", Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Linguists, p.772).
languages involved are used within the same political domain. Dialect borrowing refers to the adoption of linguistic features from within the same speech-area. The latter category is a valuable one for it allows a distinction to be made between innovations introduced through foreign influences - whether they be through cultural or intimate borrowing - and those which may be simply of domestic origin.

Weinreich was the first to introduce the important theoretical distinction between borrowing and "interference" (referring to the former as "interference in language" and the latter as "interference in speech"). This distinction was subsequently emphasized by Haugen and Mackey. Mackey defines the relationship between borrowing and interference thus:

"Interference is the use of elements from one language while speaking or writing another.... It is a characteristic of the message not of the code. The effects of interference may or may not be institutionalized in the language, resulting in different degrees of language borrowing which affects the code and becomes the property of those who used the language - monolingual and bilingual alike."

2.1.2 Factors Determining Borrowing

A central concern of linguists of the field is the identification of the conditions which lead to borrowing. It is recognised that there are both stimuli and resistance factors to consider, and that both of these may be structural or non-structural, that is, socio-cultural in nature. Much remains to be done in this area particularly concerning the role played by linguistic structure. It is generally acknowledged, however, that lexical borrowing is governed largely by socio-cultural factors (see, e.g: Weinreich (1953) pp.61-2; Haugen (1958) p.784; Hasselmo (1961) Chapter 5).

4. Ibid.
Structural Factors

(1) Structural Congruence

Similarity of structure between languages which come into contact is often cited in the literature as one of the factors encouraging borrowing (e.g: Elliot (1889); Haugen (1953) p.380; Weinreich (1953) p.61; Trager (1972), p.105 ff).

Though there is evidence that similarity of structure facilitates borrowing, it has been less easy to prove the opposite, that is, that borrowing is restricted by difference in linguistic structures. The most that can be said in relation to the latter is that the difference in the structure of the source and recipient languages is likely to influence the form that borrowing takes. Thus Weinreich points out, the difference in structure between Sanskrit and Tibetan resulted in the latter restricting its borrowing from the former to loan translations, loanwords being resisted.4

(2) Degree of Boundness or Independence of Linguistic Items

The degree of boundness or independence of the linguistic items has been cited as a factor determining borrowing (e.g: Weinreich (1953) p.30 ff; Haugen (1956) pp.66-7). A "scale of adoptability" has been proposed on the basis of this (Whitney (1881); Haugen (1950) p.97; Weinreich (1953) p.35). Weinreich has related this scale to the integration of the morpheme: "the fuller the integration of the morpheme, the less likelihood of its importation". Thus "full" words such as nouns, verbs, adjectives (i.e. members of the "open" classes) are easily

3. Thus Weinreich states: "That there exists structural resistance other than the recognisability of transferred forms has not been proved" (1953, p.62).
borrowed; function words such as prepositions, conjunctions, articles (i.e. members of the "closed" class\(^1\)) less easily borrowed; and inflectional and derivational endings, the most structurally integrated, the least easy of all.\(^2\)

The above scale remains highly hypothetical in nature as Weinreich himself has been careful to stress\(^3\). Haugen agrees that "bound morphemes are less readily borrowed than free ones, and that high frequency (form) words are less readily borrowed than low frequency (content) words" but sees this as being "more matters of availability than structure".\(^4\)

Bynon has pointed out too that the nature of the sociolinguistic context determines the ease with which items belonging to the different form classes are borrowed\(^5\). Borrowing from the "closed" classes would only be possible in situations of intensive linguistic interchange since "it presupposes the cross-linguistic equation of syntactic patterns whereas mere lexical borrowing from open classes would require only a minimum of bilingual speakers in the transmission process".\(^6\) There is support for this view as the borrowing of items from the "closed" classes such as conjunctions is well-attested in bilingual communities (e.g. Rayfield (1970) for Yiddish in America).\(^7\)

(3) \textbf{Word Frequency}

The frequency of occurrence of words determines the likelihood of their being replaced by borrowings. Thus according to Weinreich: "Other things being equal, the frequent words come easily to mind and are therefore more stable; relatively infrequent words of the vocabulary are, accordingly, less stable, more subject to oblivion and replacement".\(^8\)

---

1. Ibid., p.47.
2. Weinreich, 1953, p.35.
3. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
(4) **Hononymy**

A word may be borrowed simply "to resolve the clash of homonyms" in a language (e.g. the Vosges patois is reported to have borrowed voiture and viande from French because of the clash between carrum 'cart' and carnum 'meat')\(^1\). However, the fact that a word from a foreign language is potentially homophonous with a word in a given language is unlikely to prevent the former from being borrowed into the latter.\(^2\)

(5) **Word Obsolescence**

Certain types of words become obsolete at a greater rate than others and thus create an "onomastic low-pressure area"\(^3\) where a constant flow of new items is required as replacements, thus encouraging borrowing. Weinreich (1953) and Hope (1964)\(^4\) single out affective words (e.g. euphemisms, cacophemisms) as being particularly prone to rapid obsolescence.

(6) **Insufficiency of Semantic Differentiation**

Another factor which frequently leads to borrowing has its roots in bilingualism. Bilinguals by their familiarity with another language may come to feel that certain semantic fields in their own language are insufficiently differentiated and, consequently, resort to borrowing to fill the 'gaps'. (See Weinreich (1953) p.59 for examples of such borrowings; also Noorsalu (1972) for examples in relation to the Swahili press\(^5\)).

---

1. Ibid.
2. See Weinreich, 1953, p.58, for examples of borrowings made in spite of the existence of homonyms between languages.
Non-Structural (Socio-Cultural) Factors

Socio-cultural factors which have been cited in the literature as affecting borrowing include:

1. The relative status (i.e. prestige) of the two languages

Most writers hold the view that the direction of borrowing is from the prestigious language to the less prestigious language. Bloomfield states this very clearly: "In all cases, ... it is the lower language which borrows predominantly from the upper".¹ Hoenigswald,² like Hockett,³ discusses the relation between socially "downward" and "upward" borrowings, suggesting that the latter were only "need-filling", while the former were mainly "prestigious".

However, Weinreich warns against concluding that "the direction of interference is exclusively from the dominant language to the non-dominant one".⁴ Haugen observes: "One can easily recall instances of lower-class and vulgar terms that have been diffused, upwards through a kind of prestige attached to 'democracy' or 'masculinity' or 'sportsmanship'".⁵

One actual case-study of the role of prestige in borrowing is that by Ball (1971) for Swahili.⁶ Ball demonstrates convincingly that the cultural circumstances which made Arabic the prestige language in the past have made English the prestige language in the twentieth century, and this has led to the latter supplanting the former as the primary source of borrowings.

(2) Designative Adequacy or Inadequacy of a Vocabulary

The existence of an adequate vocabulary reduces the necessity for borrowing. However, it does not prevent it as shown by the presence of "unnecessary borrowings of everyday designations for things which have excellent names in the language which is spoken" - these borrowings being a consequence of the source language being endowed with prestige.1

The most obvious motive for borrowing is to fill a 'gap' in the borrowing languages.2 Various linguists (Sapir (1921) p.192; Weinreich (1953) p.56-7) have pointed out that the need to designate new things, inventions, techniques, discoveries, concepts is a universal cause of lexical innovation. One of the most thorough investigations of lexical borrowing as a by-product of material innovation introduced through contact is that by Smeaton (1973) for Hawawi Arabic.3

(3) Historical Circumstances of Contact

Political-social conditions such as war, conquest, colonization, migration establish the dominance of one language over another and lead to "intimate borrowing". Intimate borrowing is one-sided; the borrowing goes predominantly from the upper or dominant language to the lower.4 But Bloomfield also points: "with a change of political or cultural conditions, the speakers of the lower language may make an effort to cease and even to undo the borrowing. Thus, the Germans waged a long and largely successful campaign against Latin-French loanwords, the Slavic nations against German".5

2. T.E. Hope argued against the idea of an actual 'gap' or 'case vide' in lexis, postulating instead a theory of "comparative efficiency" as against "absolute defecitivity" (see: T.E. Hope, 1964, p.72).
5. Ibid., p.468.
Some studies of borrowing which attempt to relate borrowing to the historical and social circumstances of the contact situation are those by Jazayery, Goulet, Bassman, and Harris.

(4) Attitudes towards Borrowing

If value is attached to purism there will be low tolerance of foreign influence in the language. Different attitudes to purism and their effects in resisting and encouraging borrowing are described by Weinreich (1953), p.83 ff.

The issue of purism may be considered so important as to give rise to institutional means for preserving the 'purity' of the language in the form of language academies (the French Academy being the best known example) and language committees. One study which described the attempts of language academies (in Latin America) to preserve the 'purity of language is that by Guitarte and Quintero.

Haugen and Hockett have observed that concerns about the 'purity of language' are likely to affect the way borrowing is made, that is, whether they are predominantly loanwords or loanshifts. Purists differ in their perception of the 'dangers' posed by loanwords and loanshifts, some consider the former to be less dangerous because they are less subtle while others, more concerned about the formal aspects of native structure, advocate the latter.

4. Harris, B.P., 1975, Selected Political, Cultural and Socio-economic Areas of Canadian English as contributors to the Vocabulary of Canadian English, Ph.D dissertation, University of Victoria.
Speaking of attitudes to borrowing, Jespersen observed that borrowing may be considered a kind of fashion or fashionable habit in some speech communities. Quakenbush and Ozawa have pointed out that this attitude to borrowing is one of the main factors for the massive borrowings in Japanese.

(5) Cultural Incompatibility

When cultures come into contact, the result is diffusion of culture items, both material and non-material. However, not all culture items diffused will be accepted; some, in fact, may be rejected. The "principles of selectivity and rejection of vocabulary" usually have its basis in the non-material side of culture. Thus Weinreich describes how cultural resistance of a religious kind had apparently led the Askenazic Jews to avoid words with specifically Christian connotations in their borrowing from German.

2.1.3 The Identification of Borrowing

Before borrowings can be analyzed, they have to be identified. Two major approaches have been used for the identification of borrowings. One approach uses strictly formal criteria, taking only the present state of the language into consideration. The most well-known example of a study that is based on the synchronic approach is that by Aasta Stene. Studies such as this investigate the manner in which 'foreign' elements are differentiated from native ones. This

6. Ibid.
is done by determining the points in which the 'foreign' elements fail to conform to native patterns by analysing the phonemic constitution and distribution of the 'foreign' elements and their morphological and syntactic patterning.¹

The other approach uses only historical evidence. The diachronic approach is best exemplified in the work of Einar Haugen.² According to Haugen "borrowing is a historical process and therefore to be identified only by historical methods":³ This means a comparison between earlier and later stages of a given language to detect possible innovations and, subsequently, a comparison of the innovations discovered with possible models in the language (or languages) with which it has come into contact. Such a procedure conforms with the generally accepted definition of borrowing as "the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another":⁴

The synchronic approach which attempts to identify borrowings by their structural irregularities is much less reliable⁵. In many cases the phonological structure of the loanwords matches that of the recipient language from the start or is so close to it that detection is avoided. In other cases, the integration of a loan is so complete that even the linguist has difficulty in detecting it. The identification of such borrowings is impossible without a knowledge of the earlier stages of the language, as well as of whatever languages it may have come into contact.

The diachronic approach, though fundamentally sound, is not without its problems. There is, for instance, the problem of international words - words which are difficult to assign to any particular source language because they are common to more than one

---

1. In this way, Stene compiled a list of English loanwords in Norwegian. She sets up a series of formal characteristics by which they reveal the fact that they are aliens in the system" (p.5). These include: non-Norwegian orthography, pronunciation, correspondence between spelling and pronunciation, musical accent, dynamic accent, morphology, word-formation and exotica (p.16).
4. Ibid., p.81.
5. Doubt has been expressed as to whether this is even possible. See, for example, Fries, C.C. & Pike, K.L., 1949, "Co-existent Phonemic Systems", Language, 25: "In a purely descriptive analysis of the dialect of a monolingual speaker there are no loans discoverable or describable".
(e.g.: vitamin, hotel, university, etc.). There is also the problem of "interlingual coincidences" where similarities in sound and meaning exist between two words in different languages. This usually occurs where the two languages involved share a common ancestry.

The problems faced by investigators using the diachronic approach are likely to be more numerous and troublesome if the languages in contact are cognate languages. Since the contact investigated in this study is between Malay and English to which it is not genetically related, and since the pressure on Malay is identified as being almost exclusively English, identifying borrowings diachronically is much less problematical.

2.1.4 The Description and Classification of Borrowings

Several ways have been elaborated for classifying the products of the process of borrowing. Haugen mentions the following methods which have been utilised in the literature on borrowing: ²

1. Alphabetically
2. By subject matter
3. By form classes
4. By grammatical levels
5. By degree or manner of integration
6. By their desirability
7. By the speakers introducing them and their attitudes

There are really only two basic methods, one using formal criteria, and the other, semantic criteria. The former is best exemplified by Haugen's study of borrowing by American Norwegian from English;³ the latter by Stene's study of English loanwords in Norwegian.⁴

Of the two methods, it is the first, utilising formal criteria that has proved to be the more satisfactory. The classification of borrowings according to semantic criteria is unavoidably subjective and arbitrary as well as fraught with difficulties. Stene has outlined

---

4. Stene, 1945, English Loanwords in Modern Norwegian.
these difficulties which include the number of categories to be decided upon, borderline cases, repetitions. However, classification of borrowings into semantic categories or domains does have its uses provided it is used mainly to supplement a classification utilising formal criteria. For by classifying borrowings into semantic categories it is possible to know which are the areas of vocabulary most influenced by contact with the foreign language. In the present study, therefore, though the main classification of English loans in Malay is based on formal criteria, it has been found useful to sub-classify the loans into semantic categories for comparative purposes.

The method of classifying borrowings on the basis of formal criteria has been developed in the United States and applied specifically to the study of borrowing between American Indian and immigrant languages on the one hand, and between these and American English on the other, in contexts which are predominantly oral and bilingual. The basic scheme was proposed by Haugen (1950) with a more detailed version being developed by Weinreich (1953).

According to Haugen (1950b) linguistic "loans of whatever kind may be analyzed and described in terms of the extent to which they are modified by substitutions of native habits." All types of loans may thus be said to fall between the two extreme poles of complete importation and complete substitution. On this basis, three major types of loans may be distinguished on the word level by a formal comparison of the model in the source language and its replica in the recipient language:

1. Ibid., p.175-6.
5. Ibid., p.288.
Loanwords, in which there is complete morphemic importation. Loanwords are further classified according to the degree of phonemic substitution which occurs: none, partial or complete.

Loanblends, in which there is only partial morphemic importation; a native morpheme has been substituted for part of the foreign word.

Loanshifts, in which there is complete morphemic substitution. Loanshifts are further classified into "loanshift creations" and "loanshift extensions". In the former, only the arrangement of morphemes in the model is imported; in the latter, only the meaning is imported.

Weinreich (1953) also bases his classification of borrowings on the fundamental distinction between importation and substitution in the borrowing process, calling the former transfer and the latter reproduction. Haugen, however, has been more consistent in applying this distinction between importation and substitution in classifying borrowings and applies it to all levels of language. Weinreich, however, applies the distinction only at the lexical level though he noted that the processes involved in grammatical and lexical borrowing are basically similar. As this is the case, a more economical and effective description would be obtained by combining both in a single description as does Haugen.

But as Haugen observes, "no classification can be airtight or apply to all languages". The scheme proposed by Haugen, though fundamentally sound and the most satisfactory so far, does have a number of limitations and disadvantages. Firstly, it places great emphasis on bilingualism and oral borrowings mainly because the scheme has been developed for bilingual and oral situations. Haugen stresses that borrowing is "unthinkable without the existence of bilingualism...". But in many language contact situations large-scale importation of loanwords has taken place in a predominantly monolingual context. Smeaton (1973) has described this very well in relation to the borrowing of

1. Weinreich (1953), following Betz, uses loan translations for those replicas which are structured exactly like their models, loan renditions for those which are not (p.51).
2. Ibid., p.47 ff.
English words by the predominantly monolingual Hasawi Arabs.

As Goddard's description of borrowing in Romance shows, in many contact situations the majority of borrowings have not been made orally in bilingual situations but have been transliterated from one written language to another. These were subsequently diffused through literary channels, before reading the spoken language where they then acquired a spelling pronunciation.

In descriptive terms these borrowings would apparently be "loanwords" according to Haugen's terminology. Transliteration, even with orthographic adjustments, produces forms which in most cases superficially resemble those which result from oral borrowing. But it is important to point out that different transmission processes are involved.

It is also vital to account for the role played by spelling. The spelling factor, in general, has been ignored by students of borrowing. But it plays an important part in the transmission of loans into many languages where the vast majority of loans are transmitted through the printed word (as is the case in Japanese and also Bahasa Malaysia). Monolinguals adopting these loans based their pronunciations of these on imperfect spellings, giving rise to so-called "spelling pronunciations".

Haugen suggests that "loanwords" can be classified further on the basis of the extent of the phonemic substitution which has occurred in the act of transfer into unassimilated, partly assimilated and wholly assimilated loanwords. Such a criterion, however, can be applied only to oral borrowings, where the morpheme and its phonemic shape are imported simultaneously. It cannot be applied to transliterated borrowings where the morpheme alone is imported, without the simultaneous transfer of its phonemic form. In such cases the orthographic adjustments made during transliteration would determine the phonemic form that the loans take in the borrowing language. Hence, in sub-classifying such "loanwords" orthographic criterion would have to be used.

Haugen's method is particularly apt when applied to oral borrowings. Even here there is a problem in sub-classifying loanwords on the basis of the extent of phonemic substitution which has occurred in the act of transfer. In certain linguistic situations the borrowing takes place not directly from the source language as spoken by native speakers, but rather through the intermediary of a local form which has already been adapted to a large extent to the structure of the recipient language.\(^1\) In such cases which is the "model" one should use in the formal comparison of model and replica? Haugen does not provide an answer to this problem because his scheme has been developed in a situation where native speakers provide the models in all cases. However, even if the model decided upon is that of the source language the influence of the 'local' model must be properly accounted for.

Haugen's scheme has also been developed for a contact situation involving cognate languages, viz., Norwegian and English. When applied to borrowing between non-cognate languages this scheme has certain limitations. This is apparent in the way Haugen has sub-classified semantic extensions (i.e. loanshift extensions). Semantic extensions are **homonymous** if the basis for the extension of phonetic similarity; they are **synonymous** if the basis for the extension is semantic; **homologous** if both phonetic and semantic similarities are involved.\(^2\) This threefold classification is useful only if the languages involved are cognates where "homonymous" and "homologous" extensions are more likely to occur. In contact situations involving non-cognate languages, there are unlikely to be enough "deceptive cognates" or "false friends"\(^3\) to justify the tripartite classification into homophous, synonymous and homologous extensions, as the vast majority of extensions would be "synonymous". Consequently a different classification needs to be evolved for semantic extensions.\(^4\)

---

1. For example, Bynon has noted that English loanwords in various Indian and Pakistani languages have been transmitted through the medium of 'Indian English' which opposes dental and retroflex consonants. Thus English three /Gri:/ becomes [tri:] and English station /stei:n/ becomes [stejan], [stejan] or [stejan] (Bynon, 1977, p.226-7).
4. A common classification of semantic extensions when the borrowing involves non-related languages is based on form classes, e.g: Ikara, B., 1975, English as a Factor in the Process of Language Modernization: A Study of the Impact of English on the Hausa Language of Northern Nigeria, Ph.D dissertation, University of Leeds; also this study.
There is little doubt that the distinctions that has been expressed in terms of importation (or transfer) and substitution (or reproduction) is central to the description of borrowing. It is also clear that a description of borrowing which limits itself to one of either kind of borrowing alone does not give an adequate picture of the total impact of one language on the other. Thus studies such as those by Stene, Czawa, Jazayery, Salami, etc. which treat only loanwords do not fully account for the extent of English influence on the languages they described.

Loanshifts, the products of substitution, are undeniably less accessible to investigation. Their identification, description and classification still remain problematical and the subject of much debate. Only further research will reveal the best way to improve the treatment of this intricate material. Loanshifts may be less conspicuous than loanwords but they are just as integral a part of the borrowing process, and their effects on the borrowing language just as great, if not more. In view of their importance, it is disappointing to find that in so many otherwise excellent studies (e.g: those mentioned above) they are omitted or dealt with summarily.

Finally, students of borrowing have not sufficiently emphasized the fact that borrowing is just one form of foreign influence, albeit the simplest and most obvious. The influence may also take the form of stimulating "native creation" in the "influenced" language. In describing the impact of one language on another it is necessary to consider the whole continuum of influence: importation - substitution - native creation.

3. E.g. in Sa'id, M.F., 1967, Lexical Innovations through Borrowing in Modern Standard Arabic, Ph.D dissertation, Princeton University, the writer is content with classifying loan translations into noun-noun, noun-adjective, and syntactic calques. This contrasts with the detailed treatment of loanwords (or as Sa'id refers to them, "loan-forms").
5. The only other study besides Haugen (1953) which deals with the whole continuum known to me is that by Ikara (1975).
2.1.5 The Integration of Borrowings

Two types of integration of loan material are discussed in the literature: linguistic integration and social integration.

2.1.5.1 Linguistic Integration

Linguistic integration is a matter of the adaptation of loan material to the phonological, grammatical, and lexico-semantic structures of the recipient language.

(1) Phonological Adaptation

Phonological adaptation has been studied far more than any other type of linguistic adaptation. This may be due to the accessibility of data and to the facility of the analysis.

The most common form of phonological adaptation is acknowledged to be phonemic substitution in which "the speakers replace the foreign sounds by the phonemes of their language". The extent of the substitution, however, is determined by structural as well as non-structural factors.

Thus, while most linguists concur with Bloomfield that the greater the difference between the phonological structures of the two languages, the more extensive the substitution, a number of later linguists such as Weinreich and Haugen have also stressed the role played by extra-linguistic factors. Among the latter is the prestige of the source language. Weinreich points out that if the source language enjoys great cultural or social prestige in the recipient language community, the pronunciation of loanwords in a phonemic form close to the model in the source language may serve as a mark of education or status. Other extra linguistic factors to be considered are the degree of bilingualism, monolinguals being more likely to "force the loanwords to conform to the native phonetic and phonemic patterns", and the influence of spelling when words are borrowed not by the "ear-route" but from the printed page, leading to "spelling pronunciations".

1. Bloomfield, 1933, p.446.
2. Ibid.
3. Weinreich, 1953, p.27.
5. Weinreich, 1953, p.28; Haugen, 1953, p.396, see also; Bloomfield, 1933, p.448-9
The phonological integration of a corpus of loanwords has been satisfactorily described for many languages, though generally the emphasis has been on structural factors affecting the process and relatively little on the role played by socio-cultural factors.

(2) **Grammatical Adaptation**

Generally, the grammatical integration of loanwords causes few problems. A word which has been borrowed from one language to another is subjected to the morphological structure and syntactic system of the borrowing language. Or, Bloomfield puts it: "Grammatically, the borrowed form is subjected to the system of the borrowing language, both as to syntax (some rouge, this rouge) and as to the indispensable inflections (garages) and the fully current, 'living' constructions of composition (rouge-pot) and word-formation (to rouge, she is rouging her face)."

As in phonological adaptation, the ease with which a borrowed item is integrated into the grammatical system is determined to a large extent by the degree of structural similarity between the borrowing and donor languages. Haugen states that as a rule "languages which have parallel structures have little difficulty integrating loan material: nouns are accepted as nouns and given inflections and syntactic position of nouns, adjectives as adjectives, etc." Thus Haugen found that in the case of English and Norwegian where the structures are closely

---


2. One of the exceptions is the Ph.D dissertation by Margaret Ball, Variations in the assimilation of Arabic and English loans into the Swahili of Mombasa, Kenya, University of Texas at Austin, 1971. In this study of loanword adaptation, the role of socio-economic factors is given central importance.


4. Haugen, 1956, p.44.
parallel, there was no problem at this level; English nouns were adopted as Norwegian nouns, and so forth.  

1  But between less related languages, exceptions to this rule have been found. It is reported that in Chiricahua, an Indian language, the Spanish adjectives loco 'crazy' and rico 'rich' are borrowed as verbs.  

Haugen points out (as does Weinreich) that the adaptation of loan material to the structure of the borrowing language involves some sort of analysis by the borrowers.  

3  This can lead to cases of erroneous analysis, even when closely related languages such as English and Norwegian are involved. So that, for instance, English -s (plural) may be borrowed with its stem and treated as if it were part of a singular noun. An example is kars 'car', plural karser.  

The most extreme form of morphological adaptation may be observed in the group of loanwords termed 'loanblends' or hybrid loanwords. Haugen observes that "in reproducing the forms of another language, speakers will frequently go farther in their adaptation than merely to substitute native sounds and inflections for the foreign ones. They may actually slip in part or all of a native morpheme for the foreign, as in AmPort. alvachus 'overshoes', alvarozes 'overalls', where the native prefix al- has been substituted for the English o-".  

In grammatical as in phonological adaptation, extra-linguistic factors may also intervene. Thus a desire to display the learning associated with the knowledge of a prestigious source language, or the awareness of the form system of both languages among bilinguals may prevent loanwords from being adapted fully. In such cases, the morphology of the source language is retained in the loanwords e.g. the Latin-type plurals minim-a, foc-i, formula-e instead of the English type

---

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p.396-7; Weinreich, 1958, p.47 ff.
5. Ibid.
minimums, focuses, formulas. Or, dual forms may result as in the plural of English index, which vacillates between indices and indexes.

The grammatical adaptation of loanwords in the recipient language has been described extensively (see studies referred to in footnote 1 on p.27). Within this, the classification of borrowed items into the morphemic categories of the recipient language is of particular interest, especially the integration of English nouns into the gender categories of other Indo-European languages.

(3) Lexico-Semantic Adaptation

The lexico-semantic adaptation of loan material has received far less emphasis than phonological and grammatical adaptation. This is probably due to the fact that this is a very much more complex problem and not easily accessible for study.

What is generally agreed is that lexical items are seldom, if ever, borrowed with the full range of meanings that they have in the source language. As a rule only one of the senses is borrowed but if the word is borrowed in more than one situation, it may have more than one sense in the borrowing language. The most detailed account has been given by Fisiak for English loanwords in Polish. In the list of English loanwords given the number of senses that they have in Polish are given, for instance (figures in brackets denote the number of senses): bluming (1) Eng. 'blooming' (7); boiler (2) Eng. 'boiler' (4); busz (1) Eng. 'bush' (10); etc.

Besides the quantitative reduction in their range of meanings, borrowed words may also have their meaning modified through a narrowing, extension or a shift in meaning. Narrowing of meanings (also termed 'semantic restriction') is illustrated by the word keks (from Eng. 'cake') which in Polish means only 'tea biscuit'; extension in meaning by

1. Weinreich, 1953, p.46.
5. Ibid., p.41.
6. Ibid.
mutokaa (from Eng. 'motor-car') which in Kamba means 'any wheeled vehicle', and shift in meaning by dzungla (from Eng. 'jungle') which in Polish means 'insurmountable mass of regulations'.

Weinreich has also noted that loanwords may undergo semantic specialization. This occurs when a word with an equivalent meaning exists in the borrowing language. For example, in American Yiddish "lojer is accepted as a term for 'a lawyer in the U.S'; it is thus far more specialized than the English 'lawyer'. The content of the old word advokat, has in turn become specialized accordingly to denote 'a lawyer elsewhere but in the U.S.', or just 'lawyer, without regard to country'.

Specialization of meaning can also occur when a word is borrowed more than once from related languages or from different dialects of the same language at different times. The terms are then designated as "doublets". Examples of doublets of the first type are sample and example in English, the former came from Norman French while the latter was derived from the learned spelling pronunciation of the Latin word exemplum. Trager describes the manner in which these doublets have become specialized in meaning: "A sample is an example of something, but examples are not always samples". An example of semantic specialization in a word borrowed from the same language at different times is the word kibuts which in medieval Hebrew denotes 'community'; the loanword kibuts transferred from modern Hebrew has the specialized meaning 'collective settlement in Israel'.

Weinreich has observed that loanwords may be specialized according to style. "In some contact situations, the borrowed elements all entered the 'learned' stylistic stratum of the recipient language, e.g., most Greek loanwords in English. Frequently, on the other hand, the transferred elements occupy a familiar or slangy stylistic stratum,

4. Ibid.
7. Weinreich, 1953, p.56.
acquiring pejorative connotations which they lacked in the mother-
tongue".¹

Bloomfield has observed, interestingly, how the psychological
impulse to render an initially unintelligible loan form intelligible
has given rise to the type of semantic modification represented by
popular etymology.² A classic example of this is the replacement,
in medieval German, of Old French arbaleste 'cross-bow' by the adapted
formation Armbrust, literally 'arm-breast'.³

2.1.5.2 Social Integration

The 'social' dimension of integration of loan material has
received only limited treatment.

It has been suggested that the degree of social integration of
a borrowed form may be signalled by phrases such as "as we say in
English" or by vocal quotation marks such as stress, pitch, changes in
tempo, etc.⁴ In writing, quotation marks, italics or different print
types may be used to indicate the status of the loan form.⁵

Greenberg has suggested that the degree of social integration of
loan material may be established by "sociological and psychological
indices" of assimilation.⁶ The sociological index includes currency
in various socio-economic strata and occupational groups. The
psychological index of assimilation involves the judgements of speakers
regarding the degree of 'nativeness' of forms of foreign origin.⁷

1. Ibid.
2. Bloomfield, 1933, p.450.
3. Ibid.
4. Weinreich, 1953, p.73; Haugen, 1953, p.64.
Symposium on Multilingualism, Brazzaville, p.169. Greenberg also
suggested as "linguistic indices of assimilation", adaptation to the
indigenous sound system, definite assignment of membership to a
grammatical class, e.g. nominal class, and full participation in
an inflectional system.
7. Haugen expresses strong misgivings concerning the social criterion
of appeal to one or more speakers because his experience has shown
that speakers are frequently mistaken about the linguistic origin
of given items (see Haugen 1953, p.49; p.68-9). Haugen considers
the linguistic criteria of phonology and morphology as far more reliable.
Parsons added two more criteria to Greenberg's "sociological and psychological indices", viz., (1) acceptance of the loan as a living, dynamic word capable of changing, extending and proliferating its meaning within the recipient language, and (2) complete acceptance as part of the conceptual corpus and cultural heritage of the receiving language, as evidenced, e.g., by the use of the word in proverbs or other fixed formulae.¹

Mackey's "availability tests" suggest another possible approach for studying the degree of social integration of loan material.² To determine the "index of availability" topics ("semantic fields") are chosen. Informants are then asked to supply all the words relating to those topics which they can think of in a certain length of time. The lists are then compared and borrowings isolated. The percentage of all lists on which any given item appears then becomes the availability index for that item.

Hasselmo has also devised a number of tests to determine the status of English loans in American Swedish. These are "acceptability", "identification" and "translatability tests" which are used to establish the degree of integration in terms of several different scales.³

The feasibility of the various tests of social integration outlined above has yet to be proved by their application in a wide range of sociolinguistic settings.

2.1.6 The Effects of Borrowing

A much discussed question in the literature has been: what does borrowing do to a language? The discussion has been centred on the consequences for the phonological and grammatical structures of the language and much less on the consequences for the lexicosemantic structure.

In these two areas of language, that is, the phonological and the grammatical, the general consensus is that borrowing is not likely to have a devastating effect. Most linguists (e.g. Vogt⁴, Weinreich⁵) agree

---

with Jakobson's statement that a language "accepts foreign structural elements only when they correspond to its tendencies of development".\(^1\) Weinreich adds further that "language contact and the resulting interference could be considered to have, at best, a trigger effect releasing and accelerating developments which mature independently".\(^2\)

But linguists such as Haugen have also pointed out that "a strong and long-continued influence of one language upon another may result in such a large influx of vocabulary that the make-up of the language is greatly altered", and he cited as an example the influence of Scandinavian and Norman French on English.\(^3\)

(1) **The Phonological Effects**

According to Haugen, a continued importation of loanwords from the same language may lead to (a) phonemic redistribution, and, (b) more rarely, phonemic importation.\(^4\)

(a) **Phonemic Redistribution**

This is a widely observed effect of borrowing: "Loanwords have notoriously brought with them unaccustomed arrangements of phonemics in every language".\(^5\) Haugen provides as an example the initial consonant cluster /sk-/ (e.g. skeptikko) introduced by English loanwords into American Finnish.\(^6\) Sapir\(^7\) and Bloomfield\(^8\) provide examples of phonemic redistribution in English introduced by Scandinavian loanwords (e.g. the cluster /sk/) and by Norman French loanwords (e.g. initials /v-, z-, dz-/).

However, Sapir and Bloomfield differ in their assessment of just how serious an impact innovations such as these have on the phonological system of the language. Bloomfield is of the opinion that "the phonetic system has been permanently altered by borrowing".\(^9\) Sapir, however, would allow only that the phonetic pattern of English has been modified by French only slightly.\(^10\)

---

2. Weinreich, ibid.
3. Haugen, 1953, p.408.
5. Haugen, 1956, p.56.
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(b) **Phonemic Importation**

The introduction of new sounds has been observed far less than phonemic redistribution. Haugen points out that despite the massive influx of Norman French words into English the only phoneme imported appears to be /r/, the last sound of *rouge*. Furthermore, Haugen believes that this importation must have been facilitated by the fact that English already had the same sound in the complex phoneme /dr/ as in *edge*.

Most linguists, like Haugen, have pointed out that all new phonemes imported "remain in a highly marginal position" in the phonological system of the recipient language. Many of them are limited to bilingual speakers, and the rest are limited to particular words and expressions. Sapir went even further in declaring that new sounds introduced through borrowing are "likely to melt away before long".

Phonological innovations introduced through borrowing, in the form of new arrangement or importation of phonemes, are a problem in the synchronic phonological description of a language. Much of the discussion concerns the relative merits of describing borrowings under a single phonemic system or under a separate, "co-existent system". According to Haugen and Weinreich the setting up of "co-existent systems" is only justified when describing interference in the speech of bilinguals, "which should be distinguished from the language as a system, even if influenced". In describing the more or less established 'borrowings' in a language, a single phonemic system is to be preferred.

Bynon suggests that quantitative considerations should be the basis for deciding how borrowings are to be treated in a synchronic

---
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phonological description. "Thus if only a small number of words violate the 'native' rules, it may be more economical to simply mark them as exceptional in the lexicon and to keep the phonological system intact. If on the other hand their number is large it may be found preferable to modify the system so as to accommodate them".¹ This seems a reasonable suggestion allowing flexibility and taking into account the different circumstances of separate description situations. But, Bynon herself admits this does not solve the problem entirely. There still remains the problem of how one should handle 'doublets', i.e., co-existing pronunciations of the same loanword, such competition between alternative forms being characteristic of recent borrowings.

(2) **Grammatical Effects**

The general opinion with regard to the effect of borrowing on the morphological system of a language corresponds to that expressed by Haugen: "Borrowings very seldom establish new categories in the receiving language. Only when they are numerous enough to create classes of their own can this occur, and then usually in derivation rather than inflection".²

For the consequences of large-scale borrowing on the derivational morphology of a language, linguists have often referred to English. Thus Bynon has pointed out that intensive borrowing into English from Romance is responsible for the fact that English now possesses two totally different derivational systems, one inherited and largely confined to the lexical resources of Germanic origin, the other the result of borrowing from Romance and largely confined to the Romance-derived sector of the lexicon.³

Weinreich has also observed that analogical extension of affixes, such as that observed by Bloomfield,⁴ can occur when free forms are imported into a language in pairs, with and without an affix:

---

². Haugen, 1956, p.58.
³. Bynon, 1977, p.239.
⁴. Bloomfield, 1933, p.454.
"The presence of the pair in the recipient language enables even its unilingual user to analyze the two-morpheme compound into a base and affix, and to extend the affix to other, individual bases." ¹ For instance, the English diminutive -ette in words like kitchenette represent a productive device introduced in such word pairs as statue-statuette, cigar-cigarette.²

Much of the discussion on the grammatical effects of borrowing has shown a similar emphasis on derivational morphology. The effects of borrowing on the syntax have been little discussed. For instance Sapir dismissed the effect of Latin-French borrowing on the syntax of English in a brief footnote.³ Though the borrowing of 'syntactic calques' has been reported for many languages, their effects on the recipient language have hardly been described, most studies (e.g. Sa'id (1964)) providing merely a list of 'syntactic calque' constructions. This is disappointing because it is in the area of 'calques' or loan-shifts in general that the impact of the foreign language is most far-reaching. In many cases (e.g. as in Malay), it is the extensive use of loanshifts that differentiates the pre-contact (or classical) form from the modern standard form of the borrowing language.

(3) Lexico-Semantic Effects

The effects of borrowing on the lexico-semantic structure of a language have yet to be fully discussed. Weinreich, one of the few linguists who have dealt with this problem adequately, has pointed out that the consequence of a loanword or loanshift on the miniature semantic system (or "field") of which the new word becomes a member is an integral part of the borrowing process.⁴

Weinreich stresses that "only the most concrete loanwords such as designations for newly invented or imported objects can be thought of as mere additions to the vocabulary".⁵ With the exception of such loans with entirely new content,⁶ Weinreich observes that the transfer

---
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3. Sapir, 1921, p.202, footnote 9: "In the sphere of syntax one may point to certain French and Latin influences, but it is doubtful if they ever reached deeper than the written language. Much of this type of influence belongs rather to literary style than to morphology proper".
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6. T.E. Hope has referred to these loans as extrinsically motivated as opposed to those which are intrinsically motivated (i.e. by the need to replace words which have become semantically inefficient over a period of time e.g. euphemisms and other terms whose semantic function depends upon affective impact). See: Hope, 1964, pp.62-3.
or reproduction of foreign words is likely to affect the existing vocabulary in one of three ways:

(1) Confusion between the content of the new and old word. E.g: in American Yiddish, some speakers confuse stein 'to put (upright)' and lejgn 'to put (horizontally or without regard to position)' - on the model of the English put.2

Weinreich points out that in such cases of semantic confusion as those described, "one of the terms may eventually become fixed as an expression of the combined content, and the other abandoned".3

(2) Old or native word discarded.
E.g: when English paper 'newspaper' was transferred into American Yiddish (pejper), the old words, blat or tsajtung were discarded.4

However, as Weinreich admits, it is not always easy to test whether the old word has been discarded or merely restricted in usage.

(3) Specialization in content of old word
E.g: as Gurage (Ethiopia) borrowed the Qabena word mata 'younger brother', the established wagi 'brother' was specialized to mean 'older brother'.5

Weinreich points out that the specialization in content usually affects both the old word and the loan-word if both survive.6

In addition to the three effects noted by Weinreich above, cases of "semantic displacement" have also been described by Haugen.7 In semantic displacement, the meaning of a native word changes on the model of a word in the source language "without colliding with any previous

---

1. Haugen uses the term semantic confusion for the same phenomenon (see Haugen, 1953, p.401).
2. Weinreich, 1953, p.54.
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term because it describes a phenomenon in the new culture roughly similar to one in the old. Thus AmPort used the originally Spanish term *peso* for the American dollar".  

There has not been a more complete account of the lexico-semantic effects of borrowing than that made by Weinreich. However, it would appear that the universality of the phenomena described needs to be confirmed by more case studies in different contact situations.

### 2.1.7 The Quantification of Borrowing

The most common type of measurement of borrowing in the loanword count. Attempts have been made to study lexical borrowing in relation to the total lexicon of the recipient language. The proportion of English loanwords in various immigrant languages in the U.S. has been ascertained (see e.g: Neumann for American Yiddish, Springer for Pennsylvania German). One actual count performed on the vocabulary of one single informant is reported by Haugen. More common are 'impressionistic' statements to the effect that a certain language has a lexicon consisting almost entirely of loans (see e.g: Haugen (1956), p.67; Bloomfield (1933), p.467).

Measurements of borrowing in terms of lexical subsystems are also common, the focus being on semantic fields and on form classes. One study of the former type included "spheres of activity" ranging from "autos and bicycles" and "city life" to "church" and "parts of body". The need for a careful selection of fields has been emphasized by Weinreich. Haugen has supplemented a count of loans by form class by a comparison with similar counts from two other languages.

---
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Investigations of texts normally deal with the number of loanword tokens in relation to the total number of word tokens in the texts. Such studies have been undertaken by Haugen for American Norwegian,\(^1\) Learned for Pennsylvania German,\(^2\) Whiteley for Swahili.\(^3\) Vildomec has published detailed analyses of written multilingual texts, including some information on lexical borrowing in terms of types and tokens.\(^4\) Issawi obtained a count of European loanwords in an Arabic novel and then compared it with those found in novels in Persian and Turkish.\(^5\) Demoz and Ronen, et.al\(^7\) concentrated on loanwords in Amharic and Hebrew newspapers respectively.

Almost all the measurements of borrowing outlined above have been limited to loanwords. This could be due to the fact that loanwords, being the most obvious type of borrowing, are most easily detected. But a measurement of borrowing that fails to take into account loan-shifts cannot reflect accurately the extent of borrowing. Furthermore, a comparison of the proportion of borrowings that are loanwords and loan-shifts is indispensable in establishing the nature of the borrowing process in a language - whether this is predominantly importation or substitution.

1. Ibid, p.95.
2.2 Lexical Planning

Writers, in studying lexical innovation, differentiate two separate areas: (1) planned, and (2) unplanned or spontaneous innovation.\(^1\)

Planned development of vocabulary involves linguistic intervention which is treated in linguistics in the field of study referred to as "language planning".

2.2.1 Language Planning

The term "language planning" was first used in the literature by Haugen in 1959.\(^2\) He defines language planning as "the normative work of language academies and committees, all forms of what is commonly known as language cultivation and all proposals for language reform or standardization".\(^3\) Fishman, describes it as "the organised pursuit of solutions to language problems, usually at the national level".\(^4\) In the same vein, Rubin and Jemudd define language planning as "decision-making about language"; they correctly note the large number of variables other than linguistic that have to be taken into account in studying it: economic, social, political, demographic and psychological.\(^5\) Therefore, as Garvin points out, "one of the key questions is the relation of linguistic to non-linguistic variables in the study of language planning".\(^6\)

---


2. Other terms used in the literature to refer to essentially the same type of linguistic activity are: glottopolitics, language engineering, language development. See: Karam, F.X., 1974, "Towards a Definition of Language Planning", Advances in Language Planning (ed) J.A. Fishman, The Hague: Mouton, p.104.


Activities that may be classified as language planning have been quite varied. Karam notes that some of these have dealt, or are dealing, with the development of vernaculars into national languages, as in the case of Indonesia\(^1\) or of the Philippines;\(^2\) others with the revival of ancient languages, as in the case of Ireland\(^3\) or Israel;\(^4\) with conflicting language loyalties, as in the case of Norway\(^5\) or India;\(^6\) and with large-scale language reform, including script replacement and the expansion and purification of vocabulary, as in the case of Turkey.\(^7\)

Language planning may involve the participation of more than one country. "Cross-national language planning"\(^8\) may be undertaken to preserve the semi-intelligibility that prevails between people who speak different but related languages. Some examples of this are the efforts of Tanzania and Kenya with respect to Swahili,\(^9\) and those of Malaysia and Indonesia with respect to Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia.\(^10\)

2.2.2 The Process of Language Planning

Most discussions on the process of language planning agree that it should include the following basic activities: policy formulation, codification, elaboration, and implementation. Writing in another article, Jernudd regroups them into three, renaming "policy formulation" as "determination" and combining "codification" and "elaboration" into a single category, "development." Karam too has three divisions: planning, implementation and evaluation, which are essentially similar to that of the above. In Fishman et al., "evaluation" is included under "implementation", while "codification" and "elaboration" (Jernudd's "development") is equivalent to Karam's "implementation." In Fishman et al. emphasize the role of the policy-making agency as well.

By whatever label it has been called, the first stage of the language planning process includes data collection and decision-making activities about language policies, including strategies for the establishment of the national language (and other indigenous languages). Fishman et al. emphasize the role of the policy-making agency as well.

The second stage (codification and elaboration/development/implementation) includes all the activities necessary for the execution of the plan. According to Fishman et al. "codification deals with the normalization (standardization) of regional, social, class or other variation in usage via the preparation of recommended (or "official") grammars, dictionaries, orthographic guides, etc. Elaboration deals with the need for intertranslability with other more functionally diversified languages by such means as the preparation of recommended (or "official") word lists, in particular, the substantive, professional, or technical fields." Karam includes in this stage the activity of "disseminating the codified form", which is stage three for Fishman et al. and Jernudd.

7. Ibid., p.295.
Karam's third stage is evaluation, which he defines as the stage which "involves monitoring and assessing the results of both the planning and implementation activities, including the development of the language itself and providing feedback to both planning and implementation". In Fishman et.al and Jernudd, it is found in the category "implementation".

Below is a diagrammatic representation of the interrelationship of the various activities involved in language planning.²

According to Karam, the three activities constitute an iterative process, as the information received on the language situation provides for the planning of the next phase of activity as well as for the modification of current implementation efforts.

Neustupny adds to these basic activities in language planning, another, viz., "cultivation".³ Neustupny views cultivation as being a sequentially later and more advanced stage of language planning, dealing primarily with stylistic varieties of the national standard focused upon during previous stages of language planning. From the examples used, largely drawn from Czech and Japanese, Neustupny indicates that the newly emerging nations are concerned with matters relating to policy formulation whereas the developed nations are concerned with matters pertaining to language cultivation (e.g. correctness, functions, and style).

This study is concerned with one aspect of the second stage of language planning, viz., to borrow Fishman's term, "elaboration" and specifically, lexical elaboration as part of the process of the development of Bahasa Malaysia.

Ferguson identifies three components in language development: graphization, standardization and modernization. He defines graphization as the "reduction to writing"; standardization as "the development of a norm which overrides regional and social dialects", and modernization as "the development of intertranslatability with other languages in a range of topics and forms of discourse characteristic of industrialized, secularized, structurally differentiated 'modern' societies". Ferguson sub-divides the process of modernization into two aspects: (a) the expansion of the lexicon of the language by new words and expressions and (b) the development of new styles and forms of discourse. Lexical elaboration, with which this study is concerned would be aspect (a) in the process of modernization as defined by Ferguson above.

2.2.3 Studies on Lexical Elaboration

In the field of language planning, lexical elaboration as conducted by language academies or other official and semi-official agencies has long occupied the limelight. Tauli has pointed out that the most extensive field of language planning is vocabulary planning and lexicology is the biggest section of TLP [Theory of Language Planning], constituting in itself an extensive branch of science. Nevertheless, as Tauli has noted, "elaboration of detailed and well-founded principles and methods of vocabulary planning is an urgent task".

Fishman observes that lexical elaboration is a task that can never really be completed: "whereas the creation and revision of writing systems, on the one hand, and the codification of 'langue' models, on the other hand, are normally either one-time or some-time pursuits of language planning bodies, the work of lexical elaboration goes on forever (or so it seems)".

2. Ibid, p.32.
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The size of the literature dealing with the subject of lexical elaboration indicates that the above assessment by Fishman is correct. There are studies concerned with the principles of lexical elaboration, for example, those by Alisjahbana (1960) for Bahasa Indonesia, Minn-Latt (1966) for Burmese, Fulass (1971) for Amharic, etc. There is an even larger group of studies which report on actual lexical planning efforts, for example, those by Haugen (1966) in relation to Norwegian. Heyd (1954) and Gallagher (1971) in relation to Turkish, Hamzaoui (1965) and Al-Toma (1974) in relation to Arabic, Fellman (1974) and Fellman and Fishman (1977) in relation to Hebrew, Weston (1965) and Whiteley (1969) in relation to Swahili, Kirk-Greene (1964) in relation to Hausa, Guitarte and Quintero (1968) in relation to Spanish in Latin America. These studies can be divided into two types on the basis of their emphasis: those which concentrate on the products of lexical elaboration (dictionaries, nomenclatures, etc.) rather than the process by which they were produced, and those which attend to the processes of lexical elaboration as well as the products of such efforts. Fishman refers to this difference as that between "content alone vs. structure-plus-content". The bulk of the studies is of the former


This study is of the same orientation as that of the second group, that is, "structure-plus-content". In examining the influence of English on lexical planning in Bahasa Malaysia, the focus will be on the products as well as the processes of lexical elaboration. In connection with the latter, that is, the processes of lexical planning, answers will have to be provided to a number of pertinent questions such as: Who are the lexical planners? What kind of knowledge and qualifications do they bring to their task? What are their attitudes with regard to sources and principles of terminological innovation? How is terminological work organised? What do planning agencies recognise as their goals? How do they choose between alternatives? How are decisions made? etc. "Process orientated research" such as this has only just begun and because of this is still "theoretically anaemic". However, only through further research along these lines will it be possible to gain the necessary insights needed to place this type of study on a sounder theoretical footing.

As yet, there has been little systematic investigation of the way international languages such as English have influenced the planned development of terminology (e.g. by providing the lexical model) in languages undergoing modernization. It has only been possible to locate one other study which, like the present one, has attempted to investigate this in detail, that by Allcny-Fainberg concerning the influence of

English on terminology development in Hebrew.¹ As far as it has been possible to ascertain, a comparison of foreign linguistic influence on the planned and unplanned vocabulary development of a language, such as this study attempts to do, has not been carried out. There are, in fact, few studies which examine both planned and unplanned vocabulary development, the practice being to concentrate either on one or the other. Exceptions are the studies by Morag (1959) and Hakulinen (1961).

Finally, one other aspect of "process oriented research" that needs to be extended but, unfortunately, is beyond the scope of this thesis, concerns the reception of the lexical products of planning agencies among various target populations. One example of such a study is Allony-Fainberg's inquiry into knowing and not knowing, using and not using, liking and disliking selected modern Hebrew terms for automobile parts among civilian drivers, army drivers and vocational high school students.² Other examples of research conducted to establish who accepts and who rejects 'academese' are those by the International Research Project on Language Planning Processes in Indonesia, Israel and Sweden.³

2.3 Previous Observations on the Influence of English on Malay

Introduction

A number of earlier observations have been made on the influence of English on the Malay language. They are in the form of articles, conference papers, academic exercises, dissertations, textbooks and as entries marked as 'English' in dictionaries. Very few, however, have dealt entirely or systematically with the subject of English influence.⁴

---

⁴ Prof. A. Teeuw's A Critical Survey of Studies on Malay and Bahasa Indonesia (The Netherlands Institute for International Cultural Relations: The Hague, 1961) has a section on "Foreign Influences on Malay". But among the studies listed, there is none which deals with the influence of English on Malay.
in spite of the fact that it has long been a topic for heated discussion. The numerous letters and articles appearing in newspapers and journals such as the Dewan Bahasa are an indication of the concern felt by many Malay speakers at what has been termed "pencemaran" (pollution) of Bahasa Malaysia.  

The following survey does not claim to be an exhaustive account of all that has been said or written on the subject of English influence on the Malay language. Much that has been written in the newspapers and journals has tended to be rather superficial and simplistic from a linguistic point of view. The survey, therefore, has included only those studies which have contributed in some way to an understanding of the subject or illustrate the manner in which the subject has been approached in the past. In the discussion, the 'gaps' and weaknesses in these studies which the present study hopes to remedy will be pointed out.

The studies are divided into two groups: (1) Observations prior to 1957 and (2) Observations after 1957, when Malay was made the national language of Malaysia. Most of the studies in the second group looked at English influence in the context of terminology development in Malay. Studies prior to 1957, on the other hand, have been concerned with the influence of English on the 'general' vocabulary of Malay.

2.3.1 Observations Prior to 1957

Most of the pre-1957 observations of English influence were made by writers of dictionaries and grammars of Malay. William Marsden, in the introduction to his Grammar of the Malayan Language published in 1812, made the earliest known observation of English influence on Malay. His conclusion was that compared to Portuguese and even Dutch, "English innovations have hitherto been very inconsiderable", attributing

1. This concern even led to the holding of a seminar on February 1979 at the Science University, Penang, which has as its theme, "Pencemaran Bahasa Malaysia" (The Pollution of Bahasa Malaysia).
this to "the more confined limits of our [i.e. English] establishments". \(^1\) In his Dictionary of the Malayan language published also in 1812, Marsden listed a mere six words as derived from English (Ingris 'English', urdi/rudi 'order, konsil 'consul', kubis 'cabbage', kupil 'to attach', Mr 'mister'). The scarcity of loanwords is hardly surprising as English-Malay contact at that period was still limited to trading. Transactions would have been conducted in the main commercial lingua franca, Malay (see Chapter 3.1).

R.J. Wilkinson published his Malay-English Dictionary in 1901. \(^2\) This is still considered as the most complete and reliable bilingual Malay dictionary (see: Teeuw (1961), p.18, Asmah (1975)\(^3\)). English influence on Malay was still negligible at this stage. Less than 1\%(198 items) of the approximately 20,000 entries in Wilkinson's dictionary are listed as originating from English. The majority of these loanwords pertained to the social and political-administrative spheres. In attempting to assess foreign influence on a language through this and other dictionary listings of loanwords, it is important, of course, to take into consideration the effects of 'decalage' or time-lag. At any given moment there will be a number of words in current usage which have not been recorded in a dictionary. Conversely, the dictionary will contain a number of words which have gone out of fashion and are no longer used (e.g: dokat 'dog-cart', sekunar 'schooner')\(^4\).

Up till 1950 at least the Arabic influence on Malay was considered the more important. For instance, Hendershot noted a large number of English loanwords in Malay especially in scientific terminology, but considered Arabic to the "the greatest contributor to, and enricher of, the Malay language", based on the fact that since the 14th century "all religious ideas and ideals [have taken] on an Arabic terminology". \(^5\)

---

2. Published in Jawi. In 1932 the Romanised version was published (London: Macmillan & Co.).
Similarly, Za'ba compared Arabic and English loans and found that the latter are concerned solely with the material world; he found none which are related to the realm of higher thought ("fikiran tinggi-tinggi") or inner knowledge ("ilmu yang dalam-dalam"). The same view has been expressed by other local Malay scholars, that is, that the influence of English is 'worldly' and thus inferior in quality to that exerted by Arabic, or even Sanskrit, which is 'spiritual'. This 'differential' attitude towards Arabic and Sanskrit and its effect on the acceptance of foreign loans will be discussed in a later chapter.

The influence of English on the Malay press, specifically in the language of the editorials, between 1880-1941 was noted by Mohd Taib Osman. He found that Malay journalists of that period borrowed extensively from English not only to denote new things and ideas but, even then, because of the need for precision. Thus "where the Malay equivalents given were not very apt English words were placed in brackets". This manner of ensuring precision has continued to this very day. Mohd Taib also compared the influence of Arabic on the Malay press with that of English. He found that though the volume of borrowings from English was greater, they were restricted to nouns denoting new things and ideas. Arabic borrowings were more varied - nouns, verbs, punctuation words, stylistic expressions were freely adopted. Mohd Taib's observations are not supported by any kind of statistical evidence and his account is largely impressionistic in nature. Like most other writers who have touched on the subject of English influence, Mohd Taib is content with providing examples of English loans with little attempt to analyse them from a linguistic point of view. Neither does he indicate the relative importance of the two types of borrowing, loanwords and loanshifts, in the material he has examined.

Another study which has commented on the influence of English on the Malay press is that by Gullick. Like that carried out by Mohd Taib, Gullick's study is highly impressionistic, lacking in any kind of statistical basis. Unlike Mohd Taib, however, Gullick states very positively that the type of borrowings preferred by Malay journalists is loanshifts - loan translations and semantic extensions. He observes that "the use of purely Malay words in new combinations or in new or extended meanings will probably have a greater effect on the development of the language than the random introduction of foreign words". It is disappointing that Gullick does not state his findings in a more precise and quantitative way. This would have enabled systematic comparisons to be made between the pattern of borrowing observed by Gullick in the 50's with that observed in a later study when a different set of sociolinguistic factors prevail.

2.3.2 Observations after 1957

Most of the discussion of English influence after 1957 has been related to the terminological development of Bahasa Malaysia. It is largely normative: suggestions and prescriptions on how to adapt English loanwords, translate them or replace them altogether through word-coinage. Thus Asmah, Ismail Dahaman, Lufti Abas, discuss general principles and procedures of terminology development. Chuah discusses

2. Gullick admitted this himself: "The examples given hereafter were collected from the newspapers in the course of reading and not in a systematic and comprehensive survey" (p.15).
3. Ibid., p.17.
terminological development in relation to biological terms, Lim\(^1\) discusses the same topic in relation to chemical terms, and Shaharir\(^2\) discusses it in relation to mathematical terms.

Most linguists, especially Asmah, stress the importance of exploiting the potentialities of Malay and favour the use of morphological processes inherent in the language. On the other hand, the scientists and subject specialists such as Lim and Shaharir tend to put practical considerations first; thus, international recognisability and systematicity of derivation are stressed. Lufti Abas is one of the few linguists who has shown the same practical orientation. He favours adopting English terms directly, pointing out the various difficulties and disadvantages of translating them into Bahasa Malaysia.

The preoccupation has been strictly with the normative aspects of terminology development. There has been no serious attempt to investigate and describe the actual process of terminology development itself and the sociolinguistic considerations which have determined the outcome. Neither has there been any evaluative study of the products of terminology development. The discussion of the effects of the large-scale borrowing of specialised terms from English is limited to occasional remarks made in passing here and there.

A few descriptive studies provide some general observations on English influence on Bahasa Malaysia. But they are not very useful or reliable for several reasons. Firstly, they have either not been based on data systematically collected (e.g: Sha'ayer Basheer,\(^3\) Tham,\(^4\) or have been confined to data obtained from dictionaries.

---

(e.g: Ghazali Othman, Abdullah Hassan). The effects of time-lag in relation to dictionaries have pointed out in Section 2.3.1. Furthermore, the Kamus Dewan (1970), the official dictionary of the LPA, the Dewan, which has been the most popular source of data for loanword studies, is unreliable where etymology is concerned. A large number of English loanwords (e.g: abnormal, agresif, absterak) are listed simply as "European", or not identified at all (e.g: presiden, premium). Also wherever parallel forms exist in Dutch, the English loanwords are attributed to Dutch. Thus studies such as those by Ghazali Othman and Abdullah Hassan which rely on information provided by the Kamus Dewan do not give an accurate assessment of the extent of English influence.

Secondly, none of the studies examined attempt to apply the principles and methods developed by modern linguists to the study of lexical innovations and the linguistic processes associated with them. A collection of loans presented without any attempt at a systematic classification or formal analysis such as that by J.S. Henry cannot be considered more than a collection of curiosities.

4. This orientation towards Dutch is due to a large extent to Indonesian influence. The lexicologist of the Kamus Dewan was an Indonesian Teuku Iskandar, who used as sources Indonesian dictionaries, such as: W.J.S. Poerwadarminta's Kamus Umum Bahasa Indonesia, 1954, and St. Mohd Zain's Kamus Moderen Bahasa Indonesia, 1954. Because of the long years of Dutch colonial rule, Dutch naturally had been the main source of European loanwords in Bahasa Indonesia.
5. Abdullah Hassan does acknowledge that the Kamus Dewan is unreliable. But his remedy was simply to exclude all items in the Kamus Dewan listed as "Dutch". He did not attempt to isolate the large number of English loanwords included among them, nor the equally large number among the items listed as "European".
6. Henry, J.S., 1979, "Effects of Borrowings from European Languages on the Vocabulary of Malay and Bahasa Indonesia", paper presented at the International Conference of Malay Studies on Malay Literary Language and Culture, Kuala Lumpur, 1979. The title is misleading as the writer does not discuss the effects, only exemplify borrowings.
Thirdly, many of the writers, probably because of nationalistic considerations, underestimate English influence by obscuring the English origins of many loans. It is common practice to list the loans as Latin or Greek or even as French, Dutch or German if parallel forms exist in these languages though English is the immediate source from which the loans have been made. For instance:

- ekonomi (Greek: Oikonomikas: oikos - house; nomos - manage)
- subversif (Latin: sub - under; vertere - to turn)
- berparlimen (French: parlement - parler, to speak)
- stok 'stock' (old Saxon).

Furthermore, the studies either exclude all considerations of English influence on specialized vocabulary, e.g. Abdullah Hassan (1974), or do not differentiate between English influence in that area and the non-specialized, or general, area of the vocabulary, e.g. Tham (1970). English influence has to be seen in relation to the whole lexicon of the language which means both the specialized and general lexicon. The first category of studies, therefore, does not give a complete picture of the English-Malay contact situation. It is also important to differentiate between English influence in the planned and unplanned, or spontaneous, areas of vocabulary development. For there are differences in the way this influence is manifested due to different priorities and considerations in the two areas.

Examination of the studies also brings out the tendency of writers to concentrate on loanwords in discussing English borrowings. Loan-shifts are rarely discussed and most writers exclude them, e.g. Henry (1979), Tham (1970). Even when they are discussed, they are usually not included in a quantitative assessment of English influence, e.g. Abdullah Hassan (1974); this is another way in which the extent of English influence is underestimated. The effects of loan-shifts have barely been touched upon though the character of modern standard Malay owes a great deal to them. Furthermore, the role of English in stimulating native creation in Bahasa Malaysia has not been discussed at all.

---
1. The examples below are found in J.S. Henry, 1979, pp.2-3.
Finally, there has been no attempt in the studies examined to examine the role sociolinguistic factors (e.g.; prestige, purism) have played in the borrowing situation. The discussion of the "interplay of structural and socio-cultural factors" which is central to any discussion of borrowing and foreign language influence is absent.  

From the preceding brief survey it is quite clear that the investigation of English influence on Bahasa Malaysia has been quite inadequate. The present study is an attempt to remedy some of the deficiencies outlined above through (1) a systematic collection of data from both primary and secondary sources, (2) a statement of English lexical impact on Bahasa Malaysia in a more precise and quantitative manner, (3) the use of a theoretical model that has been found to be applicable in a wide range of settings, but modified for the Malaysian situation, to classify and analyse loan material, (4) an investigation of the integration and effects of loans on Bahasa Malaysia structure, (5) a consideration of English influence on both planned and unplanned vocabulary development and the way it is manifested in each area, and (6) consideration of the interplay of structural and sociocultural factors throughout the study.

1. For a theoretical discussion of this, see: Sommerfelt, A., 1960, "External versus Internal Factors in the Development of Language", Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap 19, pp.296-315.
3. Primary sources refer to language in use, e.g. in newspapers, journals, books, etc. Secondary sources refer to dictionaries, glossaries, etc.
CHAPTER 3

THE HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF BAHASA MALAYSIA

3.0 Introduction

This chapter describes the development of Bahasa Malaysia from Malay, and discusses the factors which had helped or hindered its development.

3.1 Origin and Spread of Malay

The Malay language from which Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia (the national language of the Republic of Indonesia) are derived belongs to the Western branch of the Austronesian language family. All the indigenous languages spoken in Southeast Asia belong to the same family, such as: Tagalog, Javanese, Sundanese, Madurese, Batak, Minangkabau, Iban, etc.

Alisjahbana (1974) has commented: "The most remarkable fact in the context of the Malayo-Polynesian or Austronesian language family is the rise of Indonesian and Malay, which are basically the same language into one of the modern languages of the twentieth century. It is the national and official language of Indonesia, Malaysia, and of Brunei. It is also the national language of Singapore... It is thus spoken about 125,000 people in Southeast Asia, i.e. the sixth largest language in the world".

Malay has achieved this dominant position in spite of the fact that in terms of number of native-speakers, it is by no means the most important language in the region. It is the mother-tongue of only about 15 million people, whereas Javanese is spoken as a mother-tongue by more than 50 million people and Sundanese by 20 million people. The pre-eminent position of Malay in Southeast Asia is due to a number of factors, geographical, historical, social and political.

Southeast Asia is a region of great linguistic diversity. It is estimated that in the Malaysia-Indonesia-Philippines area alone, there are more than 350 languages spoken.\(^1\) Added to this is the great dialectal diversity of Malay itself. There is "a bewildering mosaic of rural Malay dialects"\(^2\) which may even differ from village to village. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the need for a lingua franca should arise in such a linguistically diverse area.

That it was Malay which eventually came to fill this role is due to the strategic location of Malay-speakers on both sides of the Straits of Malacca,\(^3\) the most important sea-route for communication and maritime trade between East Asia and West Asia and Europe. As traders and as immigrants, the Malays spread their language throughout Southeast Asia, to Borneo, Celebes, South Philippines and the Moluccas.

Equally important as the Malays themselves in helping to spread the Malay language were the foreigners who from very early times had congregated at the ports along the Straits of Malacca because of the strategic position of the Straits in commerce in Southeast Asia and as transit harbours between India and China. These foreign merchants and travellers (Indians, Chinese, Arabs and later, Europeans) had to rely on the Malay-speaking inhabitants for their trade and provisions and therefore had to make use of their language to communicate with them.

Furthermore, the Straits of Malacca had been for centuries the centre of great maritime empires such as Srivijaya, Majapahit, Malacca and Acheh. The central position of the Straits in trade, seafare and political power helped to establish the local language, Malay as the most important language for trade and communication in the region.

### 3.1.1 Sanskrit and Arabic Influences

There is some historical evidence to suggest that Malay was already being used as a lingua franca by the first century A.D. Chinese travellers who visited the Malay archipelago during this period had

---

2. Ibid.
3. Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula constitute the core-area of Malay language and culture.
found a lingua franca which they referred to as Kw'enlun in use in the archipelago. It is almost certain that Kw'enlun was a form of Malay.

It is known from Srivijayan stone inscriptions dating from the seventh century, that Malay by then was not only firmly established as a lingua franca, but also in full use as the literary, administrative, religious and court language of the empire of Srivijaya. This was also the period of Hindu or Sanskrit influence on Malay. The inscriptions, in a heavily Sanskritised Malay (termed 'Old Malay' by modern scholars), constitute the oldest written records, not only of Malay, but also of any Austronesian language. Slightly later inscriptions in a similar kind of Malay have been found in Java, indicating that Malay was also being used for official purposes outside the Malay-speaking area of the empire. The pattern of language use that we find in Malay today, i.e., as mother-tongue, lingua franca and official language was thus already established before the eighth century.

When Islam arrived in the region in the thirteenth century, the paramountcy of Malay was so widely accepted that it was Malay rather than Arabic that served as the vehicle for the dissemination of the new religion throughout the archipelago. Its association with Islam, however, had the effect of adding a heavy Arabic element to its vocabulary and led to the eventual replacement of the earlier Indian scripts by the Arabic script.

3.1.2 The Advent of the West and Early European Influences

Certainly by the time Europeans began penetrating into the region in the fifteenth and early sixteenth century, the Malay language had "reached its height of popularity and influence". This was the period of the Malacca Sultanate and has often been described as the 'Golden Age'.

2. However, it has been noted by writers such as William Marsden that the Sanskrit loanwords are very much more "intimately blended" with the Malay language than Arabic loanwords. Marsden compared the status of Sanskrit words with Arabic words and found that "their [i.e. Sanskrit] origin is not, in these days, suspected by the natives, whilst the Arabic terms, on the contrary (with a few exceptions) are known to be extrinsic, and seldom employed but in treating of religious and legal subjects" (William Marsden, 1812, A Dictionary of the Malaysian Language London: Longman, 1812, p.v).
of the Malay language. The small number of texts which have survived from this period (notably the Hikayat Raja-Raja Pasai, Hikayat Amir Hamzah and Hikayat Muhammad Ali Hanafiah) certainly indicate a flourishing literary tradition.

The records of the early European explorers provide further evidence not only of the spread of Malay but also its prestigious status among the other languages in the region. Pigafetta, who accompanied Magellan on his first voyage around the world, compiled the first Malay-European (Italian) word-list while the ships were harboured at Tidore in the Moluccas in 1521. This word-list is very significant as it shows that Malay which originated in the western part of the archipelago had by that time been disseminated to its easternmost part. The Dutch navigator Jan Huygen van Linschoten who visited the archipelago sixty years later (1614) wrote that Malay was not only merely known, but was also considered the most prestigious of the languages of the Orient and that he who did not understand it was in somewhat the same position as Dutchmen of the period who did not understand French.

From the accounts of these early Europeans we also know that the Malay trade-language they encountered was very little different from the variety of Malay in use today, called Bahasa Pasar ('Market language') and generally referred to in English as 'Bazaar Malay' or 'Low Malay'. It is basically a pidginised form of the language, with a much simplified vocabulary, morphology and sentence structure. In Malacca, Bazaar Malay itself became creolised; it became the mother-tongue of the Chinese community (referred to as the Babas) who had settled there since the fifteenth century and their present day descendants.

The capture of Malacca by the Portuguese in 1511 was a turning point in the history of Malaya as well as the Malay language. The Sultan and his court fled to Johore and the sultanate and the literary

tradition associated with it came to be centred in Johore and the Riau archipelago. This is the origin of the term 'Johore-Riau Malay', upon which standard Malay is based.

The Portuguese brought with them another lingua franca, Portuguese Creole. This language, which had already established itself along the coasts of Africa and India, spread rapidly throughout the Malay archipelago wherever the Portuguese set up trading posts.

"For many years Portuguese Creole and Bazaar Malay existed side by side in uneasy rivalry in the coastal cities and ports of the Archipelago. In the end, however, Bazaar Malay retained its predominance and Portuguese Creole gradually all but disappeared."¹

Today, Portuguese Creole continues to survive only in Malacca, spoken by a very small community (some 5000) of Eurasians, the descendants of the Portuguese colonialists of the sixteenth and seventeenth century.²

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the Dutch and English arrived in the region. The Dutch established themselves in Java and the English in Sumatra. In 1641 the Dutch ousted the Portuguese from Malacca. From that time on the power and influence of the Dutch spread—apart from a brief British Occupation of Java — until they were the masters of the archipelago.

Although by the middle of the seventeenth century the Portuguese retained footholds only in the Moluccas and in Timor, the influence of their language did not wane with their fortunes. Dalgado (1936) emphasises the importance of the Portuguese language throughout the East in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:

"Portuguese was spoken in its pure or corrupt form throughout the whole of India, in Malaysia, Pegu, Bumma, Tonquin, Cochin China, China in Kameran, in Persia, in Basra of the Turkish Vilayet and in Mecca in Arabia."³

Till the nineteenth century at least, European influence on the Malay language was mainly Portuguese. English influence was negligible,

² R.B. Le Page in his paper "Multilingualism in Malaya", in Symposium on Multilingualism, Brazzaville, 1962, has noted that this Creole is similar to the Creole in Macau though more conservative. He observes that it "exhibits the characteristics of Creole in many parts of the world, the inflectional endings of Portuguese have to a large extent been lost, there is a considerable overlay of Malay loanwords in the vocabulary, and the Portuguese base itself is archaic" (p.133).
³ Dalgado, 1936, Portuguese Vocables in Asiatic Languages, Translated by A.X. Soares, Baroda: Oriental Institute, p.53.
even less important than Dutch. Marsden, writing in 1812, noted European influence on Malay thus:

"Into this low dialect (i.e. bahasa kacukan) a number of European words and phrases found admittance during the time of the Portuguese domination of India...; and even the superior styles are not entirely exempt from them as the words 'tempo', 'senhor', 'masque' and a few others occur in the correspondence of persons of rank. Several Dutch terms have been in like manner adopted, but from the more confined limits of our establishment, the English innovations have hitherto been inconsiderable".2

As the incursions of the Portuguese, Dutch and English into the archipelago occurred at about the same time, it is often difficult to say definitely from which language the early European loanwords in Malay came from. This is especially so when the same word exists in slightly different forms in these languages. Dalgado (1936) has pointed out:

"In some cases there are great difficulties in ascertaining whether certain words really owe their existence to Portuguese or whether Portuguese itself received them from some other sources... again whether Portuguese or English or English is the real source of such words as biscoito 'biscuit', bothela 'bottle', batata 'potato', estela 'stable'."3

It is also difficult to tell whether or not Dutch has been the source. For example, a word like kamar 'chamber' may have come from Portuguese camera or from Dutch kamer. There are also the names of the months of the year. However, it is fairly safe to assume that, as Portuguese had a time lead of over 80 years on the Dutch and the English in this region, and as it was spoken over such a wide area, Portuguese was probably the source of these words. The Dutch and English forms would most likely have strengthened and encouraged the use of the Portuguese words.

3.1.3 English-Dutch Rivalry and Its Effects

At the end of the eighteenth and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, English influence spread in the area. In 1786 the English established a trading post in the island of Penang off the northwestern part of the Malay peninsula; in 1819 another was established in

1. Translated, 'bahasa kacukan' means 'mixed language', i.e. Bazaar Malay.
3. Dalgado, 1936, p.53.
Singapore. The strategic position of these ports at the northern and southern ends of the Straits of Malacca gave the English dominant control of the Straits. Inevitably, this brought them into conflict with the Dutch which was the other power with interests in this region.

After the Napoleonic wars, these conflicts were resolved by the Treaty of London of 1824, under the terms of which a demarcation line was drawn separating the English and Dutch spheres of influence;¹ the first of which later became Malaysia and the second, Indonesia.

The Treaty of London made in 1824 thus split the Malay-speaking world into two, each subject to different political and linguistic influences, and was to result over a century later in the emergence of two different standard forms of Malay.

In both the Dutch East Indies and the British-ruled territories, the language continued to be known by the generic term Bahasa Melayu ('Malay language') until the middle of the present century. After Indonesia regained its independence in 1945, the term Bahasa Melayu was rejected in favour of Bahasa Indonesia, a name which had been used among Indonesian nationalists since 1928. In the former British Territories of Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei, however, Bahasa Melayu continued to be the normal way of referring to the standard language alongside its official appellation Bahasa Kebangsaan ('National Language'). In Malaysia, Bahasa Melayu was replaced by Bahasa Malaysia after the racial riots in 1969, this being an attempt to dispel the image of the language as being the exclusive property of the Malays (language was one of the main causes of the riots).

One result of these changes in nomenclature is that the term 'Malay' has lost its former universality. It has become common practice, when talking of the two standard varieties, to restrict 'Malay' to the Malaysian variety. "But it cannot be seriously disputed that the standard variety used in Malaysia and that used in Indonesia are simply dialects of one and the same language".² In the rest of this dissertation, the term Bahasa Malaysia will be used when referring to the standard form of

---

¹. By this Treaty the British took over Malacca from the Dutch in exchange for Bencoolen in Sumatra.
Malay in Malaysia, the term 'Malay' referring to both Bahasa Malaysia and the language as a whole.

What then is the present relationship between Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia? Through the historical accident by which the Malay-speaking world was divided between the Dutch and the British colonial empires, these two dialects have developed differences. The most striking feature of these differences is that they are almost all to be found in the area of vocabulary. Though phonological, morphological and syntactic differences may be found, they are neither numerous nor particularly significant. However, the political compartmentalisation has aggravated differences in vocabulary as two different languages have been preferred as sources for borrowings, Dutch for Bahasa Indonesia and English for Bahasa Malaysia. Furthermore, in the development of the two standard varieties, Dutch has served as the language of reference for the former and English for the latter. The implications of this will be discussed in a later chapter.

3.2 British Colonial Policy and Its Effects on Malay

After the signing of the Treaty of London in 1824, the Dutch confined their interests to the East Indies, leaving the British to extend their influence in the Malay peninsula (and in India). By the middle of the nineteenth century, the British were no longer limiting themselves to commercial interests, but had begun to intervene in the political affairs of the Malay states. This culminated in the signing of the Pangkor Treaty in 1874 by which the British gained administrative control of the state of Perak. A series of similar treaties with the other Malay states followed so that by the end of the century, British control of the Malay peninsula was firmly established.

The language of administration of the British colonial government was, naturally, English. The British did not attempt to displace Malay altogether in the administration of the country as they recognised that it was only through Malay that they could reach the native population

1. In 1958 the territories of the English East India Company (E.I.C) had passed to the control of the British government.
of the country. The importance of Malay in day to day administration was acknowledged in that it was made compulsory for all civil servants (British and local) to pass special government Malay examinations. The study of the Malay languages and culture was actively promoted and through the scholarship of colonial officials, notably R.J. Wilkinson and R.O. Windstedt, some of the finest dictionaries and grammars of the Malay language were written. All this, however, could not hide the fact that Malay was subordinated to English in the administrative and political life of the country.

The importance of Malay was further undermined when English-medium education was introduced. From the very beginning English-medium education was highly valued because of the political and economic advantages that it brought. It was also identified with the privileged. In the schools set up for the children of the Malay aristocracy (such as the Malay College in Kuala Kangsar), the medium of instruction was English, not Malay. And unlike Malay-medium education, English education was not confined to the primary level, but was available up to university level. No wonder then, that Malay-medium education came to be looked upon as the poor man's education.

Nevertheless, in spite of the limited nature of Malay education during the British period, the foundation was laid for the use of Malay as a medium of modern education. Before British intervention, education in the Malay community was solely religious in nature, in the Koranic schools. Ability to read and write in Malay was not taught. This was justified, for example, by the Malay writer Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir (1796-1854), also known as Munshi Abdullah, on the grounds that it was not necessary for the Malays to learn the language as it is their own language. Furthermore, he considered it more important to learn Arabic as it is the language of the Koran.

Malay secular education started in the Straits Settlements which comprised Penang, Malacca and Singapore. The first Malay school

---


was established in 1855 in Penang and by 1892 the number of Malay vernacular schools had increased to 189. In most of the Malay states, secular education for the Malays in their own language was first introduced in the Koranic schools. They were given grants on condition that they taught the three R’s from books provided in Malay. In time, the Koranic schools became purely secular schools.

The colonial educational policy was designated to maintain the status quo, not to bring about radical changes in the way of life and thinking of the Malays. This may be seen in the clearly defined educational policy for Johore which is similar to the policies followed in the other states:

"In the Malay Boys' schools, the aim is to give a sound primary education (moral, mental and physical) to boys from 5 to 14 years of age. Special attention is to be paid to local crafts and industries and to gardening in rural areas".

The establishment of the Malay schools led as well to the establishment of teacher training colleges to provide the teachers needed. Between 1900-1919, three were established, in Malacca, Perak and Johore. The one in Perak, the Sultan Idris Teacher Training College at Tanjung Malim played an important role in the development of the Malay language, especially through its Translation Bureau. The functions of the Bureau included writing, translating and editing of educational publications and modern novels. It also undertook translations for government departments and to train translators. The activities of the Bureau were very significant because it was the first time that any organised effort was made to provide textbooks and reading materials in Malay for the schools and the public.

One further aspect of British colonial policy that was to have serious political and linguistic consequences and, ultimately, affected the position of Malay further, was the encouragement of mass immigration from China and India. This step was taken in order to obtain the necessary labour for the tin mines and rubber plantations that had been opened. It transformed Malayan society into a multiracial and multilingual society. Besides Malay and English, two other languages became prominent, i.e. Chinese and Tamil. This was reflected in the

establishment of parallel systems of education in the four languages. The divisive nature of such an education system is obvious; the differences between the three main races were emphasised through education in their own vernaculars. The English system (i.e. using English as the medium) was multi-racial in character but as English schools were situated in the urban centres, they attracted mainly pupils from the immigrant races who tended to concentrate there, especially the Chinese. The Malay vernacular schools were situated in the rural areas where the Malays predominated. Consequently, it was the immigrant races mainly which had access to an English education and the opportunities for economic advancement that it provided. This not only divided the Malays from the Chinese (and to a lesser extent, Indians) further but also the rural Malays from the small group of urban Malays. Though Malay continued to play a role as a lingua franca, it was mainly between the less educated members of the three races. It was English which was the inter-racial lingua franca, among the educated. Even when Malay was used as an inter-racial lingua franca, it was in its pidgin form that it was used i.e. Bazaar Malay, as the majority of the non-Malays had no incentive to acquire more than a rudimentary command of the language.

Therefore, either directly or indirectly the development of Malay was retarded during the British period. As it was not used for official purposes (or only in a very limited way) and higher education, it failed to develop a specialised vocabulary. Furthermore, it lost its prestige as it was English which became indispensable for political, economic and social advancement.

3.3 The 'Revival' of the Malay Language

It was the growth of nationalism which was to provide the impetus for the restoration of the Malay language. This came about largely after the Second World War. The Japanese Occupation of Malaya (1941-1945) though brief had destroyed the myth of European superiority and, as a result, accelerated the demand for self-government. The Alliance Party (comprising the United Malay National Organisation, the
Malayan Chinese Association and the Malayan Indian Congress) which
led the movement for independence made the establishment of Malay
as the national and official language part of its policy. The
importance of having a national language as a symbol of national
identity was stressed by the leader of the Alliance Party, Tengku
Abdul Rahman, who subsequently became the first Prime Minister of
the country:¹

"It is only right that as a developing nation we would want
to have a language of our own. If the national language is
not introduced our country will be devoid of a unified
character and personality - as I could put it, a nation without
a soul, without life."²

Malay was selected to be the national language mainly on the
grounds that it is an indigenous language of the country and the main
inter-racial lingua franca (English being the other but its use is
limited to a small group of people educated in English).

Malaya was granted independence in 1957 and in the Constitution
of the same year, Malay was formally declared the national language of
the new nation. However, for a period of at least ten years (i.e. until
1967), the Constitution allowed the use of English for all official
purposes, in the Supreme Court and all subordinate courts. Similarly,
until 1967 "and thereafter until Parliament otherwise provides", the
authoritative text of all Federal legislation was to be the English
language text.

The decision to delay implementing the policy of making Malay
the sole official language was made because of practical considerations.
Malay lacked the specialised vocabulary for it to be a viable official
language. Furthermore, the Government realised that the people, es-
pecially the non-Malay section of the population, was not yet prepared
for the change and would very likely have resisted if they were forced
to use Malay for official purposes immediately. The Government recog-
nised too that the majority of the non-Malays did not have the necessary
proficiency in Malay to enable them to communicate in the language for

¹ A national language is not, of course, the only kind of symbol that
is felt to be needed in newly independent nations. As R.B. Le Page
points out, they include as well a constitution, a national anthem,
a flag, national airline, etc., see The National Language Question
² Cited by Wong Hoy Kee & Eu Tiang Hong, 1975, p.78.
official purposes. Hence the ten-year interim period was granted to
the non-Malays to prepare themselves for the change and to learn the
language.

The Alliance Government saw and has continued to see as
one of its most vital tasks the unification of the different races
that make up the population of the country. For this was essential
to the political, economic and social stability of the country. This
need became even more pressing from 1963 onwards when the Federation
of Malaysia was formed with the inclusion of the Borneo States,
Sabah and Sarawak.¹ The number of racial groups increased further
as Iban, Dyaks, Melanaus, Kadazans, Muruts, and Bajaus² were added
to the three main groups of Malays, Chinese and Indians.

The Malaysian Government decided that the most effective way
of uniting all these different races was through the implementation
of a national system of education based on the use of the national
language as the main medium of instruction. This was legislated for
in the Education Ordinance of 1957. It was reviewed in 1960 and re¬
formulated as the Education Act of 1961, but as far as the status of
the national language is concerned, the policy as enunciated in the
1957 Ordinance remains unchanged.

As in the implementation of Malay as the sole official language,
the Government has taken a cautious approach in the implementation of
Malay as the main medium of instruction. The whole process is to be
staggered over a period of 26 years. It is not till 1983 that the
change-over to Malay is expected to be completed, in that year all
first year science courses in the universities will be taught in
Malay.³

1. Singapore was part of the Federation of Malaysia when it was for¬
med in 1963. However, disagreements between the Malayan and Sing¬
apore leaders forced the withdrawal of Singapore from the Feder¬
ation in 1965.
2. These indigenous people of Borneo are also considered like the Malays
as 'bumiputras' (sons of the soil) and, therefore, qualified for
special privileges with regard to allocation of positions in the
public service, scholarships and training facilities, and licenses
to operate trades and businesses.
3. The pledge of the Government to use Malay as the medium of instruction
at the university by 1967 was realised in 1965 when the first batch
of students from the Malay-medium secondary classes entered the Uni¬
versity of Malaya and received instruction in Malay. They were almost
all in the Arts stream. A start had been made in 1958 to provide
secondary education in Malay by setting up classes for this purpose
in former government English schools. The actual conversion of the
schools only started in 1970 when Malay was used to teach all sub¬
jects in Primary One (except for the English language subject).
To facilitate the implementation of the national language as official language and medium of instruction, a language and literature agency, the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (hereafter called the Dewan) was set up in 1956. Its tasks are:

1. to develop and enrich the national language
2. to promote literary talents, especially in the national language.
3. to print or publish or assist the printing or publication of books, magazines, pamphlets and other forms of literature in the national language as well as in other languages.
4. To standardise the spelling and pronunciation, and to coin appropriate terminologies in the national language.
5. to compile and publish a national language dictionary.

The Language Institute was also set up in the same year to provide a two-year course in training teachers to teach Malay as a second language.

In 1967 Malay was established as the sole official language by the National Language Act of the same year. In 1971, the Act was revised to reinforce its status as the sole official language. However, the use of English for official purposes is not entirely ruled out.

Clause (4) of the Revised Act of 1971 states:

"The Yang Dipertuan Agong may permit the continued use of the English language for such purposes as may be deemed fit."

It is now more than two decades after independence but the implementation of Malay as the national language has not yet covered all areas of official language use. In the courts and in legislation the main language used is still English. The immense difficulties involved in translating legal terminology and phraseology is the primary obstacle.

3.3.1 Development of Malay by Writers and Non-Governmental Agencies

Though governmental measures have been vital in restoring Malay to its former status, important contributions have also been made by writers and non-governmental agencies to the promotion and development of the Malay language. The non-governmental agencies are the

---

2. This was completed and published in 1970 as the Kamus Dewan.
3. In the Borneo States, Sabah and Sarawak, Malay was not to be implemented as the sole official language till 1973, under the special provisions of the Malaysia Act of 1963.
press, language and literary organisations.

Alisjahbana (1974)\(^1\) has pointed out that Munshi Abdullah was the first Malay writer who consciously accepted Western influence and who reflected it in his writings and it is with him, therefore, that modern Malay language and literature started.\(^2\) Abdullah's ideas and innovations, however, did not spread and after him "the thinking on the Malay language and the development of the Malay literature came to a standstill for about three-quarters of a century."\(^3\)

The next important stage in the development of the Malay language and literature came with the establishment of the Sultan Idris Teacher Training College and its Translation Bureau in 1922. Zainal Abidin bin Ahmad or 'Za'ba' was the first translator appointed, but he did not limit himself to translation alone, he wrote a series of books on Malay grammar and composition under the title Pelita Bahasa Melayu which are still widely used today. Za'ba's description of Malay grammar is based closely on the traditional model of English grammar as he himself admits in his preface to the first volume of Pelita Bahasa Melayu. A spate of books on Malay grammar was written in the '60's, but almost all followed the pattern set by Za'ba.

However, in the development of modern Malay, it is the press on the whole rather than individual writers which has played the more important role. The first Malay newspaper was published in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the Jawi Peranakan. From the very beginning, the Malay press has shown itself to be very innovative and receptive to foreign influences, first Arabic, and after the Second

2. Munshi Abdullah (1796-1854) was in close touch with Sir Stamford Raffles (to whom he taught Malay) and other Europeans during his lifetime. He learned English from the Protestant missionaries, and in turn, he taught them Malay. He translated the Ten Commandments, a Vocabulary in Malay and English, an Arithmetic and several school-books. He also helped a German missionary, Mr Thomson, in translating the Gospel of St Matthew and the Acts of the Apostles, "but Mr Thomson obstinately refused to adopt Malay idioms and spellings" (R.O. Windstedt, 1940, A History of Malay Literature, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, p.117). All these activities are reflected in his writings, especially in his autobiography Hikayat Abdullah, the first autobiography in Malay. Besides the use of English loanwords, Abdullah's description of the events of his time is quite different from that of the chronicles and stories of classical Malay literature.
world war, English. The most influential of the Malay newspapers, from the linguistic point of view, is the Utusan Melayu and, more recently, the Utusan Malaysia and Berita Harian (and their Sunday editions, the Utusan Minggu and Berita Minggu). Periodicals which have had some influence on the development of Malay include Guru Melayu (1924-1941) which was published by Malay school teachers, Bahasa (1957-) published by the Malay Language Association of the University of Malaya, Mastika (1947-) and the Dewan Bahasa (1957-), the latter being published by the Dewan.

A number of literary organisations have also played an important part in the development of Malay language and literature. The earliest of these organisations are the Angkatan Sasterawan 50 ('Generation of the Writers of the Fifties') and the Lembaga Bahasa Melayu ('Malay Language Institute'), the latter consisted mainly of Malay teachers. Both these organisations were formed after the Second World War. They reflected the rise of Malay nationalism after the war and were influenced by language and literary developments in Indonesia. The Angkatan Sasterawan 50 organised several Congresses for the promotion of Malay language and literature in the country. The first Congress was held in 1952 and attended by representatives of twenty Malay language organisations from Malaya and Singapore. The second Congress held in 1954 adopted the Roman script (Rumi) as the official script though it was decided that the Jawi script was to be retained.

The third Congress held in 1956 was the most important of all, not only because it was attended by representatives from fifty-one organisations and had the support of the governments of Malaya and Singapore, but also because of the resolutions that were made. Among these were the establishment of a permanent institute of language and literature


(to be called the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka), the promotion of Malay language and literature as widely as possible, the declaration that Malay (in Malaya) and Bahasa Indonesia are one and the same language, and that efforts should be made to arrive at a common spelling system. The last of these resolutions was made largely through the efforts of the Persekutuan Bahasa Melayu Universiti Malaya (Malay Language Association of the University of Malaya). This Association was established in 1955 and has ever since been a driving force for the promotion and development of Malay language and literature.

3.4 Problems of Development at Period of Study

After the survey of the growth and development of Malay to its present status as national and official language, it is appropriate at this point to identify the main problems that the language is facing in becoming a full-fledged modern language comparable to languages such as English, French, German, etc.

If we adopt Ferguson's three stages in the functional development of a language, i.e., graphisation, standardisation and modernisation, it is in the last two areas that attention must be focused. Very little remains to be done in the area of graphisation; Malay has two sophisticated writing systems, the Jawi (Arabic) script used since the thirteenth century and the Rumi (Roman) script formulated in 1904 by R.J. Wilkinson. The Rumi script has been chosen as the official script as it is far more efficient. For instance, the Jawi System provides for only three vowels: /i, a, v/, whereas Malay has six vowels: /I, e, a, œ, v, o/. The Rumi system provides for five vowels (the letter e symboling /e/ and /œ/). There is, therefore, a great deal more homography when Malay is written in Jawi, making reading very difficult.

It is at the levels of "standardisation" and "modernisation" that efforts to develop Malay must be concentrated. Ferguson (1968)

defines standardisation as "the development of a norm which over-rides regional and social dialects", and adds that it includes "the notions of increasing uniformity of the norm itself and explicit codification of the norm."\(^1\) It is the second aspect of standardisation that still needs to be attended to with regard to Malay. There has been established a standard form of Malay which is generally acknowledged as being based on the Johore-Riau dialect.\(^2\) But this "supra-dialectal norm"\(^3\) has to be standardised in the areas of spelling, grammar and specialised vocabulary, and this is the aspect of standardisation (in as much as English has a role to play in it) that is discussed in this study.

Modernisation is defined by Ferguson (1968) as "the development of intertranslatability with other languages", and he has pointed out that this has two aspects: (a) the expansion of the lexicon of the language by new words and expressions and (b) the development of new styles and forms of discourse."\(^4\) It is (a), that is, lexical modernisation, that has been regarded as the more immediate problem and where most of the efforts to develop Malay have been concentrated. This is reflected in the following statement by the Director of the Dewan, Syed Nasir:

"All it (the Dewan) was and is concerned with is to modernise the language as best it could and make it an effective instrument in the advancement of the nation's educational, economic and technological aspirations. It was imperative therefore for the language to possess a comprehensive modern vocabulary to enable the people, particularly students, the intellectuals, the professionals and government officers, to use the language as widely and as efficiently as possible".\(^5\)

And it is English influence on the lexical modernisation of Malay carried out by the Dewan and other agencies that is the theme of this study.

---

1. Ibid, p. 31.
2. The other main dialects being the Kedah, Perak, Negeriand Kelantan dialects. These dialects differ in the pronunciation of the vowels, the use of certain affixes and vocabulary items.
4. Ibid, p. 32.
CHAPTER 4

THE CONTACT SITUATION: FACTORS THAT PROMOTE ENGLISH INFLUENCE

4.0 Introduction

Before proceeding to examine in detail the ways in which English influence on the lexical expansion of Bahasa Malaysia is manifested, it would be appropriate to begin by identifying some of the environmental factors that help promote this influence.

4.1 English as an 'Official' Language

Conrad and Fishman (1975) include as criteria in their definition of 'official language' both policy and practice. In their discussion on the use of English as an official language therefore, Conrad and Fishman have distinguished two categories of countries. In the first category are the countries which have designated English as an official language in their language policy. In the second category are those countries whose policy does not designate English as official but, nevertheless, in practice, English is used to fulfil various official functions.

If the 'practice' definition is used, then English certainly has official status in Malaysia. Though the 1957 Constitution has declared Malay as the national language, it has allowed the use of English for all official purposes, in Parliament and in State Legislative Assemblies, in the Courts (Supreme and Subordinate) and for all legislation purposes for a period of 10 years (i.e. until 1967). Though Malay was subsequently designated as the sole official language in the National Language Act of 1967 and reinforced in its revised version, the Act of 1971, the use of English was permitted

in certain situations authorised by the Head of State. This is provided for in Clause (4) of the 1971 Act, "The Yang Dipertuan Agong may permit the continued use of the English language for such purposes as may be deemed fit".

It is clear that a partial bilingual situation exists in official language use and is likely to continue for a long time. Asmah writing in 1979 noted that "more than 10 years after 1967, English is used in both Houses of Parliament and in certain State Assemblies". In the courts and in legislation, English continues to be the main language used because of the problems of translating English jurisprudential terms into Malay. The bilingual situation that the provisions in the above-mentioned legislative acts imply provides opportunities for Malay and English to come into contact in the official area of language use. Furthermore, the various provisions for the use of English help also to increase the status of English as they acknowledge the difficulties of dispensing with English altogether.

The reluctance of the Government to dictate the use of Malay alone is not only because of practical considerations but also because of the need to consider the sensitivities of the non-Malay section of the population. The Government has repeatedly stressed that its national language policy would not be implemented so as to destroy the cultural life of the non-Malay communities. The Constitution has indeed affirmed the Government's intention "to preserve and sustain the use and study of the language of any other community in the Federation". Thus the lack of laws specifically forbidding second language use has left the door open for the spread of English influence.

4.2 English in Education

Since it was introduced in the early nineteenth century, English-medium education has enjoyed great popularity and prestige.

2. Article 152 (1) of the Malayan/Malaysian Constitution.
3. The first English school established was the Penang Free School in 1816.
Though the number of English-educated people has never been very large, they generally had an influence on the administrative and professional life of the country out of proportion to their number. Even today when English is no longer a medium of instruction, a knowledge of English is an advantage for promotion and is essential at the managerial level in the private sector and above the clerical level in most areas of government service.

Though English-medium education is being phased out, the English language has been given a very important place in the Malaysian education system. It is the second most important language and is a compulsory subject in all schools. The importance of English is reflected in the teaching time allocated to it, five hours a week in Primary One followed by an increased allocation at the higher levels.

It is, of course, the utilitarian aspect of English that is stressed: English is regarded as a 'tool' for obtaining specialised information and a means of communicating with the rest of the world. This is very clearly stated in the Third Malaysian Plan 1976-1980. "While the Government will implement vigorously the teaching of Bahasa Malaysia, measures will be taken to ensure that English is taught as a strong second language. This is important if Malaysia is to keep abreast of scientific and technological developments in the world and participate meaningfully in international trade and commerce." 1

In the universities and colleges, new students are tested on their proficiency in English. Students whose level of proficiency is found to be unsatisfactory are required to attend English language classes. 2 The emphasis has been mainly on proficiency in reading English. 3 Reading proficiency in English is vital as almost all the textbooks, journals and other reference materials used at the tertiary level of education are in English. The translation of English textbooks into Malay is mainly at the school level and even then is far

---

2. The level of competence whether in schools or at universities has been far lower than what is expected. This may have been caused by unrealistically high standards or unsuccessful teaching methods.
3. The University of Malaya, however, has begun to emphasize the acquisition of oral skills. In 1980, a project was launched to develop materials for teaching spoken English with the co-operation of the British Council. This project, the University of Malaya Spoken English Project (UMSEP), was preceded by a project for developing materials for teaching reading skills in English. The latter project, known as the University of Malaya English for Special Purposes Project (UMESPP) was carried out from 1975 to 1978.
behind what is needed. There are very few people who have the necessary qualifications to translate textbooks at the tertiary level, these qualifications being equal proficiency in both Malay and English as well as advanced knowledge of the specific field in question. The few lecturers who do have these qualifications usually do not have the time to spare to translate the necessary textbooks. Moreover, so rapid is the advance of knowledge that by the time the books are translated, approved and published, they are very likely out of date. The Government has recognised that the only way to prevent the country from lagging increasingly behind in technological information (upon which progress in the modern world depends) is to make sure that a sufficient number of people are equipped with a language of specialised information such as English.

In the last five years especially, with the implementation of the national language policy well under way and the association of English with colonial domination fading, the Government has been making greater efforts to improve the level of English teaching in the country, especially in the rural areas. Large numbers of teachers have been recruited from Britain in the belief that this is the most effective way of improving the quality of English teaching. The importance of English is continually being stressed by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Education and politicians in the media. Articles on the teaching and learning of English have been appearing regularly in the major newspapers and in journals and magazines. All this has helped to create a 'psychological climate' conducive to linguistic borrowing from English.

Furthermore, there has been a change of emphasis with regard to the target population to whom English is taught. Till recently, the teaching of English was confined mainly to an elitist and urban-centred education (i.e. English-medium education). In present Government policy, the teaching of English is spread over the whole education system. The emphasis now is not, as in the past, on a small group of people acquiring a near-native command of the language, but on some basic knowledge of English being acquired by the population as a whole. This change of emphasis is reflected first of all in the great efforts made to improve the level of English teaching in the rural schools.
where it has been given little importance. Secondly, it is reflected in the new English-language syllabus for secondary schools implemented in 1977, the 'Communicational Syllabus'. As its name implies, the new syllabus is designed to ensure that students acquire basic communicative skills in spoken and written English.

As Weinreich (1953) observes, the locus of language contact is the bilingual individual. The Malaysian education system with its emphasis on English as a second-language is not only perpetuating but increasing Malay-English bilingualism (or Chinese/Indian-Malay-English trilingualism). This makes possible a high degree of contact between the two languages and, consequently, facilitates linguistic borrowing.

Even if the actual level of competence in English reached is lower than that expected for true bilingual mastery, the introduction of English into 'mass education' (rather than restricted to 'elitist education' in the past) has resulted in very many more people having some knowledge of English. This familiarity makes it easier for the individual to 'pick up' and use English loans introduced by bilinguals and especially, by the mass media, and in this way, the diffusion of borrowings is facilitated. Furthermore, the 'mass familiarity' with English produced by the school system helps to encourage a more receptive and tolerant attitude to linguistic influences from English in the public.

Bilingualism is not only promoted by the education system in the country itself, but also through overseas education. The English-speaking countries, Britain, Australia, The United States, Canada and New Zealand have always played an important part in providing tertiary level education for Malaysians. In 1975, the number of Malaysians enrolled in institutions of higher learning abroad, mainly in the

2. The direct of influence is not, of course, only from English into Malay. Malay as well as Chinese and Tamil have also influenced the variety of English spoken in Malaysia, in pronunciation, grammar and lexis. For a description of 'Malaysian English', see R.K. Tongue, 1974, The English of Singapore and Malaysia, Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.
3. This may be defined as the ability to "produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language" (Haugen, E., 1956, Bilingualism in the Americas, Bloomington: University of Alabama Press, p.10).
countries mentioned was 31,500.\(^1\) This is half the total number of Malaysians receiving higher education in that year as the number enrolled in local institutions in the same year was 31,529.\(^2\) On completion of their studies, these Malaysians return not only with whatever skills they came to acquire, but also with a very much reinforced command of the English language. Back in Malaysia, they constitute an elite cadre of talent which cannot but be influential.

It is this very close association with higher education both at home and abroad and following from that, higher socio-economic status, that makes English such a prestigious language in Malaysia. The highly educated bilinguals whether diplomats, technocrats, academics, etc., in their writings or their appearances on television or radio are perceived to draw freely on their knowledge of English to eke out those areas of Malay vocabulary which they feel are insufficiently differentiated. Their linguistic innovations are then imitated by bilinguals as well as by monolinguals who use them to give an impression of modernity and to identify with a higher socio-economic class. The borrowings made in this manner have been referred to by Deroy as "emprunts par pur snobisme"- loans which reflect impulses of social pretension.\(^3\)

Viewed from the standpoint of national policy, it is clear that Malay-English bilingualism is not intended to be 'transitional' but to be 'institutionalised' bilingualism. That is to say English is not destined to 'go' as soon as Malay is sufficiently developed as a language of higher education. Viewed functionally, Malay-English bilingualism is intended as diglossic bilingualism as the Government has attempted to delimit the roles of English to that of a language of specialised information and a means of communication with the outside world. It will not be easy, however, to restrict English to these two functional roles because of the prestigious associations connected with its use.

2. Ibid, p. 399.
4.3 English in the Media

The mass media are undoubtedly a very important means by which English is promoted and popularised. On radio and on television, Malaysians are constantly exposed to English through the daily English news bulletins and through the English lyrics of pop songs on the international hit parade. Even in Malay language programmes, the use of English words and phrases is common in news broadcasts, in interviews and in discussion programmes. On television, exposure to English is much higher because of the heavy dependence of Malaysian television on the products of the American networks. A survey of the programmes published in Utusan Malaysia during June 1980 reveals that approximately 65% of daily programming time is provided by English language programmes. This figure is even higher if we include the three daily 40-minute English lessons telecast on educational television. Though some of the imported programmes are dubbed, the majority are heard in the original English with subtitles in Bahasa Malaysia. The imported films are very varied: soap opera, comedies, Westerns, detective series, documentaries, cartoons, etc. Besides the feature films on television, English language films are also shown in cinemas throughout the country. A survey of notices appearing in Utusan Malaysia during June 1980 indicates that approximately 50% of the films to be seen in the cities were in English. These films are virtually never shown without subtitles (in Chinese and in Bahasa Malaysia). Thus on radio and on television, and in the cinema, Malaysians cannot avoid being exposed to English. Furthermore, through television and the cinema, English is associated with the highly desired affluent life-style of the west.

Advertising is also an extremely potent force for popularising English and enhancing its image. The status, or rather snob appeal, associated with using English is particularly evident in advertising. Thus the use of English words and phrases is an essential part of posters, hoardings, slogans, jingles. The association of English with modernity, novelty, technical excellence and especially, universality, is stressed. English words or an English phrase in the middle of a commercial are commonly used to create the impression that the product is popular abroad. Supposed popularity in the English-speaking world
is thought to help sell a product in Malaysia. The 'selling power' associated with English is exploited as well by local manufacturers and traders in the very obvious preference for English names in trademarks and shop-signs.

English is also very prominent in the written media. There are eleven English language newspapers published locally with a combined daily circulation of about 500,000.\(^1\) This makes them the second largest group of newspapers after the Chinese newspapers of which there are twenty-five with a combined circulation of about 600,000.\(^2\) In addition to the daily newspapers, there are numerous magazines and journals in English, published locally or imported. These cater for a variety of interests, such as current affairs, trade and commerce, trade union, students' news, films, radio and television, entertainment and general interests. There is also a substantial amount of local book publishing in English.\(^3\) Book imports, especially of paperbacks are also very considerable. The spread of Malay medium education has also increased the readership of Malay newspapers which are a major source of lexical innovations. Their dependence on international news agencies such as Associated Press and Reuter for foreign news means that English news items are regularly translated into Malay and the structural and lexical innovations that result from this translation are now introduced to an ever increasing readership.

4.4 English in Government Development Strategy

The various policies pursued by the Government economic development also help to promote English influence. Heavy emphasis has been placed on the use of science and technology in developing the economy of the country. The series of 5-Year plans, especially the Second Malaysia Plan 1970-1975,\(^4\) have made this very clear. The emphasis on

---

2. Ibid, p.501 (Malay newspapers formed the third largest group; there are 11 different papers with a combined circulation of 280,000)
3. The total number of titles published in Malaysia in 1972 was 1,225 of which 524 or 43% was English. Cited in Conrad,A.W. & J.A. Fishman, 1977, p. 52.
4. From which the catchphrase 'a society oriented towards science and technology' originated.
science and technology in economic development has also been reflected
in a corresponding increase in education and training in the sciences
and technology. This has made it necessary for the Government to pro¬
mote the learning of English as a second language. The indispensability
of English in the acquisition of scientific and technological informa¬
tion and expertise is a point that the Government has been making
over and over again.

Furthermore, the emphasis on science and technology has also
made necessary the translation into Malay a large amount of scientific
and technical information that enters the country via the medium of
the English language. This necessitates the acquisition of a technical
lexicon by Bahasa Malaysia through borrowing and other means. In addition,
the process of translation itself brings the two languages into contact
and creates opportunities for English to influence Malay not only on the
lexical level but also on the syntactical level.

Another important part of the Government development strategy
is the promotion of manufacturing industries and its concomitant, urban
development.1 This together with the expansion of the transport and
communication system is drawing an increasing number of people from
the rural areas to the urban centres in search of employment. As En¬
GLISH is spoken and used mainly in urban areas, this 'rural migration'
has resulted in an even greater number of Malay-speakers becoming
exposed to English. As English is a symbol of urbanisation even the
monolinguals from the rural areas attempt to make use of English words
and phrases (originating from bilinguals) in their speech. Asmah (1975)
has noted how powerful English is as a means of social identification
(and discrimination) in the urban areas:

"In the upper class shopping centres such as those along Jalan Mountbatten
or even in the middle class section of Petaling Street, one is liable
to get better attention from the salesman or the salesgirl if one were
to speak in English (even if it were broken English) than if one were to
resort to Malay, the lingua franca. A glance should also be turned on
the individuals in high office and business, who until today still
hold preference for clients who can understand English."2

1. This is very clearly stated in the Third Malaysia Plan 1976-1980:
"... industrial development and concomitantly urban development will
continue to be aggressively promoted..." paragraph 160, p.43.
in Malaysian Linguistics, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka,
p.25.
Mention must also be made of the efforts of the Government to promote tourism which have given a further boost to English. The number of tourists visiting Malaysia has increased considerably over the years and further increases are expected with the boom in air travel and international tourist trade. In 1975 the number of tourists visiting peninsular Malaysia was 1.4 million and this is expected to increase to 1.8 million in 1980.¹ The popularity of English as a lingua franca among tourists is an international phenomenon. There is motivation, therefore, for those who are in any way connected with the tourist trade, such as personnel in hotels, travel and tour agencies, transportation, shopping centres, etc., to learn English. For Malaysians in general, the presence of large number of tourists means greater opportunities of coming into contact with English.

The policy of the Government of encouraging foreign trade and investment is also helping to promote English and enhance its status as an international language. The importance attached to foreign capital and investment may be seen in the wide range of economic concessions, tax incentives (e.g. tax holidays) and facilities such as Free Trade Zones granted to foreign entrepreneurs. But equally important are negotiations and discussions and for these an international language like English is required. Proficiency in English is also necessary for those representatives from Government and business corporations who participate in the investment conferences held each year in the capital, Kuala Lumpur, and abroad.

Furthermore, foreign companies, particularly those from English speaking countries also help to promote English. Though the national language is used for official purposes (e.g. communications with Government departments), at the managerial level English is the language that is used, for communication with Head Office and so on. Consequently, in employing local staff, the preference has been for those with some command of English for, among other things, they may be sent abroad to the United Kingdom, the U.S., etc., for training.

Both in its economic and foreign policy the Government is laying great stress on regional and international co-operation. This necessitates continual negotiations and discussions at various economic, political and military levels, with associations such as the organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Consequently, a command of English is essential for Government delegates to enable them to participate meaningfully in such negotiations and discussions. The emphasis on regional co-operation has also brought about a greater degree of contact with nations which have relatively a more receptive attitude toward the use of English, especially the ASEAN nations: Singapore, Thailand, Philippines and Indonesia. Co-operation with the 'linguistically liberal' Indonesians in the standardising of spelling and terminology from the late '60's onwards has helped to produce a more tolerant attitude in Malaysian planners towards the acceptance of foreign (i.e. English) linguistic influences.

4.5 Institutions Promoting English

There are also present in Malaysia certain institutions which actively promote western culture and the English language. The more important among these are the British Council, Lincoln Centre and the United States Information Service. Their libraries offer a wide range of books and magazines to the public. They also provide a varied programme of activities in English including films, documentaries, plays, poetry-readings and concerts. These events are generally well-attended and are indicative of the interest in the English language and western culture.

Besides these cultural organisations, there are also organisations which sponsor students for study in English speaking countries, especially the United States. Among these are the American-Malaysian Commission for Educational Exchange (MACEE), the Ford Foundation and the Asia Foundation.
4.6 Appeal of English as an International Language

Finally, but not the least important, the appeal of English as an international language is an important factor in itself in promoting English influence. Malaysians travelling abroad for business or pleasure return with their belief in the importance of the English language reinforced for they find that it is known by some persons in virtually every country in the world.

The appeal of English is well attested. Samarin (1962) has noted, "English... already meets many of the requirements of a true world lingua franca."\(^1\) Another survey carried out by Conrad and Fishman (1977) found empirical evidence to back claims that "English is the major language of wider communication and the primary natural language candidate for an international language in the world today".\(^2\)

The spread of English is not only due to its remarkable adaptability alone, but is also tied to a large extent to the "political and economy hegemony, past and present, of English-speaking powers".\(^3\) The predominance of English in the field of international communication is far from weakening inspite of the perceptible decline of British influence. This is because the influence of the other English-speaking nations, particularly, the United States, Australia and Canada, has been essentially on the rise. The dominance of American technology and multinational corporations in the world's economy can testify to this.

Finally, the spread of English can be attributed to the tremendous growth of interdependence among nations in the commercial, communication and diplomatic areas.\(^4\) There has been an increase in the share of income from trade for many countries, and Malaysia is no exception. In the field of communication, many countries, including Malaysia, have now been linked through the satellite communication

---

3. Ibid., p.55.
4. This trend has been noted by several authors. See: Cooper, R., 1968, Economics of Interdependence, New York: McGraw-Hill, and "Economics of Interdependence and Foreign Policy in the Seventies", in World Politics, January, 1972; Young, O., "Interdependence in world politics", in International Journal, Autumn, 1969.
system. In the diplomatic field, the growth of intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations since the second world war has been phenomenal. This interdependence among the countries of the world has undoubtedly promoted the growth of languages of wider communication (LWC), among which English has proved to be the most popular.

4.7 Summary of Chapter

The preceding discussion has attempted to identify the factors which directly or indirectly promote English linguistic influence.

Firstly, there are those factors which ensure a high degree of exposure to English. These include the bilingual situation provided for in official language use and, even more importantly, through second-language classroom and through the mass media. The Government's policy of industrial and urban development has also brought more people into the urban centres and, consequently, into contact with English. In addition, further exposure to English is provided through the activities of various cultural and educational organisations which actively promote the English language and western culture.

Secondly, there are those factors which contribute to or enhance the prestige of English. These include the very real economic and social advantages that a knowledge of English provides. Furthermore, the prestige of English has been further enhanced by Government policies. The Government's emphasis on the use of science and technology in economic development has made it necessary to promote English as a language of specialised information. Its emphasis on international and regional co-operation in its foreign policy makes necessary the promotion of English as an international language. Added to these is the powerful appeal of the international status of English itself. All these factors have helped to create an atmosphere conducive to borrowing and other kinds of linguistic influence.

Finally, the emphasis placed on the use of the national language is also a contributory factor in promoting English influence on Bahasa Malaysia. This has made necessary the translation of a vast amount
of information on various subjects encoded in English into Bahasa Malaysia. For this to be possible, the lexical resources of Bahasa Malaysia have to be expanded drastically and thus borrowing on an extensive scale could not be avoided. The process of translation has encouraged not only the transfer of lexical items, but also grammatical features from English into Bahasa Malaysia.  

PART TWO

THE PROCESSES OF LEXICAL EXPANSION
CHAPTER 5

THE PROCESS OF IMPORTATION

5.0 Introduction

In this chapter the most direct form of English influence on lexical expansion in Bahasa Malaysia is examined, that is, the borrowing of lexical items or 'importation' from English.

The term 'importation', as used here, is extended to cover the actual process of lexical transfer from English as well as the subsequent assimilation and integration of the transferred items into Bahasa Malaysia.

The collective term for the products of importation is Loanwords. There are altogether 3763 loanwords in the corpus. This accounts for 50% of the 7507 items under consideration in this study, and 61% of the total number of borrowing (6161 items) from English. Loanwords, however, may be divided into those which show no morphemic substitution, viz., Pure Loanwords, and those which do show partial morphemic substitution, that is, Loanblends. Of the total number of loanwords in this study, 73% (2752 items) are pure loanwords, and 27% (1011 items) are loanblends.

The following sections of this chapter consider in detail the types of pure loanwords and loanblends and examine the adaptation in both the importations and in the structure of Bahasa Malaysia.

1. In trying to determine the various types of borrowing found in Bahasa Malaysia, I have used Haugen's classification as a starting point and have adopted most of his terminology while adapting his categories to the special needs of this study. I have also incorporated some of Weinreich's terminology and establish a number of sub-categories which are relevant to Bahasa Malaysia. The works referred to are:


Weinreich, Uriel, 1953, Languages in Contact, New York: Publication of the Linguistic Circle of New York.
5.1 Pure Loanwords

Pure loanwords are direct borrowings from English whose overall morphemic shape is recognisably English, and which do not show any fusion with Malay elements. They may, however, show some phonemic substitution. Pure loanwords are the largest category of loans as they account for 45% (2752 items) of all borrowings in the corpus under study.

Haugen (1953) classifies loanwords solely by the extent to which substitution of individual phonemes has occurred in the transfer of the morpheme and its phonemic form into the recipient language: none, partial, or complete. Such an approach, however, can be applied satisfactorily only in the case of oral borrowings, where the morpheme and its phonemic shape are imported simultaneously, and where any substitution of individual phonemes is made in the act of transfer. In Bahasa Malaysia, however, the majority of borrowings from English have occurred through transliteration from written English to Bahasa Malaysia. They have subsequently diffused through literary channels before reaching the spoken language where they then acquired, in many cases, a spelling pronunciation. Consequently, in this study, the criteria used in classifying loanwords are primarily orthographic.

The following sub-categories for pure English loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia have been established according to their degree of assimilation into Bahasa Malaysia as this is reflected in the orthography. It must be borne in mind, however, that some loanwords fall into more than one category.

5.1.1 Unassimilated Loanwords

Unassimilated loanwords are loanwords which have not been orthographically adapted in any way. In writing, therefore, the model in English and the replica in Bahasa Malaysia will be identical in form and meaning. Unassimilated loanwords account for 1212 items or 44% of the pure loanwords in our study,

the largest of the sub-categories of pure loanwords.

Some linguists do not consider it valid to include unassimilated loanwords, in the sense in which they are described here, in studies of borrowing. Trager (1972) states, for instance, that: "a word or phrase has not been 'borrowed' until it has been adapted - phonologically and in other ways." As long as such items remain reasonably similar phonologically to their originals, and are treated morphemically and syntactically in special ways, they were not considered loanwords, for they remained unassimilated and foreign.

Others do not take unassimilated loanwords into consideration because, like Haugen, they regard them as examples of language shift. For, as Haugen (1953) puts it:

"It is not necessary nor even usual to take over a word with all its sounds, forms and meanings intact. To do so would involve a complete shift of language, which most speakers avoid by substituting some of the habits of their own language".2

From observation however, the use of unassimilated English loanwords in Malay sentences cannot be regarded as instances of language shift, as no syntactical modification is involved. In every case, it will be found that the overall structure is recognisably Malay. Only in larger units of discourse can we anticipate any significant instances of a shift of language.

There are other reasons too why unassimilated loanwords merit full consideration in our study. For one thing, the existence of such a large number of unassimilated loanwords testifies eloquently to the intensity of the flow of information from the West to Malaysian society. For another, they mark the initial stage of borrowing from English in Bahasa Malaysia. Their 'intactness' is the first step, before they go through the eventual process of transformation and metamorphosis. In a study such as this which attempts to study borrowing as an ongoing process all the forms

resulting from the different stages of borrowing must be taken into account. Furthermore, even if unassimilated loanwords were regarded merely as 'nonce' words, they would still be worthy of treatment in this study as a manifestation of the role played by English in contemporary life. In the final analysis, no part of the lexicon of any language is permanent.

It is relevant to consider how pure loanwords enter the language and their formal status vis-a-vis native words.

Undoubtedly, the language of advertising has one of the heaviest concentrations of unassimilated English loanwords. They are especially abundant in advertisements of foreign products. The impact of consumer product terminology from English on Bahasa Malaysia is particularly noticeable in the trade names of such products as cars and lorries, electrical goods, clothing, pharmaceutical products, cigarettes, toiletries, drinks, etc. Examples are:

- **Shell Super Plus minyak yang sentiasa mendahului zamannya...** (Utusan Malaysia 13/8/80)
- **Tenaga untuk rakyat - Generator Honda** (Utusan Malaysia 9/8/80)
- **Lady's Choice agar-agar senang dibuat** (Utusan Malaysia 9/8/80)
- **Walk-About kasut untuk setiap masa** (Utusan Malaysia 1/9/80)
- **Quaker Oats - anda yang terus memintanya lagi** (Utusan Malaysia 5/9/80)
- **Kini harga Breeze telah diturunkan!** (Berita Harian 28/5/79)

The citations above make clear the relative status of unassimilated loanwords vis-a-vis native words. The English words stand out in the receiving language with all their 'foreigness' about them.

Another area with a heavy concentration of unassimilated English loanwords, is, not surprisingly, the technical sphere. The flow of technical information is so great and their transmission so urgent that there is little time for technical terms to be assimilated before being transmitted. Many of the terms too, enter the language intact because being too technical, they are difficult to translate accurately. Such terms may be found, for instance, in the field of stereophonic equipment:

- **Stereo auto reverse cassette deck. Control amplifier**
- **Power Amplifier. Two-way high fidelity full range stereo speakers.**

(Berita Harian 31/5/79)
Some of such technical terms, no doubt, are beyond the limits of translatability. But these, like the loanwords in the language of advertising above, are common examples of English loanwords which infiltrate the language intact.

Another way by which unassimilated loanwords from English enter into Bahasa Malaysia is through the advertising by newspapers of English films and documentaries. Television, and to a lesser extent, radio programmes are a vital source of cultural influence and lexical impact. A list extracted from a single copy of the newspaper Berita Harian (6/6/79) indicates very clearly the range and diversity of English lexical infiltration into written Malay. Examples are:

Movie of the Week: Legend of Boggy Creek; Thrillmaker
Sports: Snacker; Recruit; The Rockford Files; Peyton Place; The Great Composers—Beethoven; Problems of Conservation: Wildlife, etc.

Undoubtedly, many of these could have been translated but they were not. The titles of such documentary films and series continue to change as many times as there are new films; thus emphasizing the sense of continuity and variety and widening still further the range and diversity of such English lexical items in written Malay.

Some of these items are not names of films and documentaries as such, but are simply descriptive titles of documentary or news features, and these could be translated into Bahasa Malaysia without difficulty. Instances of such English items are: His Majesty's Speech, Sports, Movie of the Week, etc.

Many English loanwords found in Bahasa Malaysia are unassimilated mainly because they relate to institutions and practices alien to Malay society. For example: Easter, Inn of Court, House of Lords, House of Commons, etc.

The presence of unassimilated loanwords in written Bahasa Malaysia is frequently indicated graphically, for example, by being

---
printed in italics. This could be due to the fact that writing increases self-consciousness on the part of the writer. Usually the unassimilated loanword is put within quotation marks (e.g. \textit{meng"edit"}) to show that the item in question is a foreign element\textsuperscript{1}. In some cases, the Malay equivalent or paraphrase follows the loanword and is normally bracketed. For example:

"... Ieng Sary dari Kampuchea yang xenophobic (benci terhadap orang asing)."\textsuperscript{2} (Dewan Masyarakat 15.1.79, p.24)

They may also translate the English item into Malay first if it is readily translatable, and then proceed to give the English original in brackets, or the defining phrase \textit{ia itu} 'that is' or the word \textit{atau} 'or', are used to introduce the loanword. For example: 'Jalan ladang atau farmroad'. This device of "parallel presentation" using \textit{ia itu} or \textit{atau} is common not only in writing but also in speech.

This kind of situation whereby different explanatory devices are employed in dealing with unassimilated loanwords has its parallel in linguistic history. According to Stone (1953), various explanatory and translational devices were used by the translators and compilers of Middle-French medical texts which suggest a tendency to avoid the abrupt presentation of unusual forms.\textsuperscript{3} The main aim, he says, was to clarify a term and to "cushion" an innovation or lend emphasis. But whereas Stone feels that the phenomenon is not a conscious technique "but rather the artless result presumably of striving for expression combined with the tendency to progress by stages evidently characteristic, at least for certain languages and periods, of the introduction of novel terms", in Bahasa Malaysia clarity and effectiveness in communications are consciously aimed at by means of this process of parallel presentation.

5.1.2 Partially Assimilated Loanwords

Partially assimilated loanwords are loanwords which show

---

1. In speech unassimilated loanwords may be marked off by 'vocal quotation marks', that is, special voice modifications (Stress, slight pause, change in tempo, etc.) Cf. Weinreich, 1953, p.73.
2. "...Ieng Sary from Kampuchea who is xenophobic (dislike of foreign people)."
evidence of the morphemic shape of their English originals with some degree of orthographic adaptation. Though these loanwords have undergone orthographical adaptation, they still retain features which are not part of Malay orthography. For instance, since in the autochtonous Malay phonological system, consonant clusters in word initial and final positions are unknown, they were not represented in orthography. Thus in the loanword skrip 'script', the consonant letter-sequence in word final position has been reduced by omitting the final component t; the initial consonant letter-sequence skr, however, is retained. Thus the loanword skrip is only partially assimilated. Another example of a loanword whose orthographical assimilation is incomplete is kolectif 'collective'. For complete assimilation, the c should have been replaced by k following the rules of Bahasa Malaysia orthography.

Partially assimilated loanwords account for 548 or 20% of the pure loanwords in this study. Perhaps nowhere is the inadequacy of Bahasa Malaysia as a medium for conveying modern information revealed as in the plethora of unassimilated and partially assimilated loanwords from English. By their number, variety, and frequency of occurrence, they indicate the heavy reliance on English to overcome the deficiency in Bahasa Malaysia lexicon.

5.1.3 Wholly Assimilated Loanwords

In practice, it is often difficult to identify loanwords which have undergone complete assimilation in Bahasa Malaysia. First of all, there are some English words, which, by their very nature, require only a slight 'adaptation' to be wholly assimilated. Though they may show complete assimilation as far as their formal shape is concerned, these loanwords may be relatively new entries in the lexicon and have yet to gain currency with the majority of Malay-speakers. On the other hand, there are some loanwords which have been in the language for many years and have become a regular part of the vocabulary of Malay. These have become so completely assimilated into the orthographical as well as the sound system of Malay that few speakers are aware of their English origin. Both these types of wholly assimilated loanwords are difficult to identify solely on formal synchronic criteria alone. To be able to isolate these as loanwords, we have
to have some knowledge of the historical and socio-cultural circumstances of the English-Malay contact.

The following 'established' loanwords in Malay show complete adaptation to Malay orthography:

- gebeng 'cabin'
- saman 'summons'
- opis 'office'
- lesen 'license'
- sekeru 'screw'
- loyar 'lawyer'
- ayan 'iron'
- derebar 'driver'
- leterik 'electricity'
- wayar 'wire'
- inci 'inch'
- sojar 'soldier'
- injin 'engine'
- setesen 'station'
- resip 'receipt'
- mesin 'machine'.

The above list can be extended and is meant only to suggest their range by way of domains of contact as well as the diversity of their formal assimilatory characteristics. The assimilatory devices include for instance not only the insertion of a vowel letter e (representing /a/) to break up a consonant letter-sequence (sekeru, derebar) but also contraction (leterik).

Wholly assimilated loanwords, such as those listed above, have become incorporated into the "system and feeling of the language" to such an extent that they are as much a part of the vocabulary of Malay as any 'native' words.

The number of wholly assimilated loanwords in the corpus is 48 which is 1.7% of the total number of pure loanwords. This small proportion of wholly assimilated loanwords indicates the relatively recent nature of the contact between English and Malay. The majority of English loanwords are still in the process of being assimilated or have yet to be assimilated to both the orthographical as well as the sound system of Malay.

5.1.4 Orthographically Assimilated Loanwords

Orthographically assimilated loanwords are loanwords which have been adapted by being re-spelled in Bahasa Malaysia such that they reflect their pronunciation in English. They are thus pronounced in Bahasa Malaysia exactly as in English; the only difference between these loanwords and their English originals is in their orthographic form.

This type of adaptation occurs because of the different nature of English and Bahasa Malaysia orthographies. English
orthography is not phonemic while Romanised Malay is phonemic and therefore, Malay spelling is a sound and systematic guide to pronunciation.

Some examples of English loanwords which have been adapted by being spelled in accordance with its pronunciation are: ajenda 'agenda, bil 'bill', cek 'cheque', yunit 'unit', gazet 'gazette', pas 'pass', etc.

Orthographically assimilated loanwords account for 23.3% (642 items) of the pure loanwords in this study.

5.1.5 Fused Compounds

These are English compounds borrowed as single units into Bahasa Malaysia which exhibit a loss of their bimorphemic identity. Some examples are: lokap 'lock-up', makap 'make-up', bairup 'busy-rope', koboi 'cowboy, pikap 'pick-up', bistek 'beef steak', kafling 'cuff-link', prikik 'free-kick', gostan 'go astern' (to reverse a car). As can be seen, some of them have become completely fused into indissoluble units and are comparable with similar instances in English such as: 'doff' from 'do off', 'don' from 'do on', 'atone' from 'at one'.

Fused compounds, however, do not seem to be common. Only 9 items have been found in this study.

5.1.6 Analysed Compounds

Analysed compounds occur when the elements of a compound are adapted to the syntactic patterns of the recipient language. In other words, the assimilation is morpho-syntactic: English words are adopted as analysed units and their morpho-syntactic order is adapted to Malay syntax. Examples of these are: bom atom 'atomic bomb', lif hidraulik 'hydraulic lift', orkestra simfoni 'symphony orchestra', muzik pop 'pop music', status sosial 'social status', etc. As can be seen from these examples, the English word-order Modifier + Head has been changed to the Malay word-order Head + Modifier.

Analysed compounds account for 10.4% (286 items) of pure loanwords in this study.

---

5.1.7 Truncated Loanwords

The Malay language is basically disyllabic in word structure. Words with more than three syllables (other than in derivatives, compounds and loanwords) occurred but rarely. This could be the reason why abbreviation of loanwords occurred. From the longer loanwords, consonants or whole syllables are pared, and the remaining syllables are sometimes rearranged. This process can be seen in lamnet 'lemonade', kamsen 'commission', gomen 'government', gabnor/gamnor 'governor', prinsip 'principle', orkes 'orchestra', opsir 'officer', simpatik 'sympathetic'.

Abbreviation can also occur in compounds so that only one part of a whole unit is left to represent it structurally and semantically. For instance, setering for 'steering-wheel', motor for 'motor-car'.

The loanwords listed above which have been abbreviated are almost all established loanwords which have long been in use in Malay. This raises the interesting question of whether recent loanwords which have four or more syllables will eventually be abbreviated in the same manner.

This characteristic of Malay to drop off consonants and syllables from longer loanwords, or a component word in a compound, could be quite significant in the process of vocabulary formation. There is some evidence to suggest that whether a linguistic form is accepted and becomes current depends on the complexity of its syllabic structure. Tham (1977) has pointed out that a linguistic form which is disyllabic is likely to gain acceptance and frequently replaces a more complex form which is already in use. As examples of complex forms which have been replaced by simpler forms, Tham cited the Dutch belasting 'taxes' which has been replaced by the shorter Hindustani cukai, Portuguese serdadu 'soldier', which has been replaced by Arabic askar.1 Thus there seems to be some evidence that the disyllabic nature of Malay morphological forms exert a linguistic pressure on emerging forms - a strain towards consistency. However, as large numbers of recent lexical innovations - borrowed as well as created - have four or more syllables, their presence in the language could well reduce the tendency in Malay to abbreviate long words.

Truncated loanwords are very few in the corpus examined; only 8 items were found.

5.2 Loanblends

In borrowing lexical items from another language, speakers will frequently go farther in their adaptation than merely to substitute native sounds for foreign ones. They may actually slip in part or all of a native morpheme for some part of the foreign term. A loanblend (or hybrid loanword) is therefore, the result of a process that combines morphemic importation and substitution in the same item. This structural hybridization occurs when a complex or a compound\(^1\) form is borrowed from English: one component of it is transferred and the other is substituted for by a Malay item.

The total number of loanblends, 1011, accounts for 16.4% of the 6161 borrowings from English in our study. They account for 27% of loanwords, the category of borrowings to which they belong.

Among loanblends in Bahasa Malaysia, the following types may be distinguished according to which part is imported.

5.2.1 Marginal Loanblends

In this type of loanblends, the stem is indigenous and the affix is borrowed from English. Only 5 instances of such loanblends occur in our corpus. These are: anti-pencemaran 'anti-pollution', anti-dasar 'anti-policy, anti-seni 'anti-art', pro-kerajaan 'pro-government', sub-golongan 'sub-group'.

5.2.2 Nucleur Loanblends

This type of loanblends combine an English stem or nucleus with a Malay affix. Some examples are: kestabilan 'stability', keharmonian 'harmony, penarik 'musician', pengeksport 'exporter', berdigniti 'dignified', berdipomasi 'diplomatic'. In some cases, the affix substituted is the Sanskrit loan affix -\(\text{wan}\). For example: dramawan 'dramatist', fisikwan 'physicist'.

The number of nucleur loanblends, 146, accounts for 14.4% of the total number of loanblends.

---

1. The term 'compound' is used here not only to refer to real compound words but also phrases (of not more than two items) which are borrowed as fixed collocations in Bahasa Malaysia.
5.2.3 Compound Loanblends

In this type of loanblends, there is independent morpheme substitution. One of the two morphemes making up the compound form is replaced by a native morpheme. Compound loanblends may be marginal or nuclear. If the nucleus of the compound is imported, the loanblend is defined as 'nuclear'. If the modifying element is imported, the loanblend is 'marginal'. Some examples of nuclear compound loanblends in Bahasa Malaysia are: jet pejuang 'fighter jet', krisis perlembagaan 'constitutional crisis', bom waktu 'time bomb'. Examples of marginal compound loanblends are: bantuan moral 'moral support', nilai kalorifik 'calorific value', sebutan standard 'standard pronunciation', tenaga solar 'solar energy'.

As mentioned above, compound loanblends form the largest category of loanblends. There are 860 items which account for 85% of loanblends in our study. The compound loanblends are more or less evenly divided between marginal (48%) and nuclear (52%) forms.

5.2.4 Tautological Loanblends

This type of loanblend appears to be peculiar to Bahasa Malaysia as I have not come across any similar phenomenon in the literature on borrowing. Tautological loanblends are pairs of words - one a loan, the other a Malay word - denoting similar referents. Some examples of these are: mangkok bol 'bowl', kasut but 'boots', pagar rel 'railing or rail, usually iron', baju wesket 'waistcoat', rotibiskut 'biscuit', api letrik 'electricity', paku skrup 'screw' alat instrument 'instrument. The simultaneous use of both English and native words to describe an artifact or innovation similar to something already existing in Malay culture may imply an unconscious desire to place the foreign innovation or artifact in a familiar context - to define it in a familiar frame of reference as provided by the Malay term in the blend. This would seem to be the case with the loanblend api letrik, in which letrik 'electricity' is attached to api 'fire' implying that the innovation 'electricity' has been classified as belonging to the conceptual category of 'fire'.

So far we have concentrated on describing the formal characteristics of English loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia and have used their differences as the basis for classifying them into different types. In the next part of the chapter, the specific ways in which English loanwords have been assimilated into Bahasa Malaysia on the phonological, orthographical, grammatical, and semantic levels will be examined as well as their effects on Bahasa Malaysia at these levels.

5.3 The Integration of Loanwords

In this part of the chapter, the adjustments that are made to English loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia at the phonological, orthographical, grammatical, and semantic levels are examined in more detail. Trager (1972) points out, when loans are taken over from one language to another, "there is always some departure from the original, in the phonology, in the morphology, in the semology."

The question of whether the importation of English loanwords has affected the structure of Bahasa Malaysia is also pertinent at this point. For though it is inevitable that loanwords should be modified by the borrowing language, it is equally inevitable that a massive influx of loanwords should have consequences for the recipient language. In this section, therefore, the effects that the importation of English words have had on the phonological, orthographical, grammatical and lexico-semantic systems of Bahasa Malaysia are considered as well.

5.3.1 Phonological/Orthographical Integration

The phonological and orthographical aspects of integration are discussed together because they are inter-related. As spelling in Bahasa Malaysia is phonemic or near phonemic, phonological adjustments of loanwords are usually reflected in a re-spelling. And conversely, an alteration in the spelling of loanwords can affect their pronunciation in Bahasa Malaysia. The influence of spelling on the pronunciation of loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia cannot

---
1. Trager, 1972, p.110.
be over-stressed. As the vast majority of importations are made from written English - a consequence of the need to translate a large volume of materials from English into Bahasa Malaysia - for the majority of the population the only guide to their pronunciation is the orthographical form which language planners, journalists and writers have decided they should have in the language.

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to treat in detail the phonological aspects of borrowing in Bahasa Malaysia. However, some general trends may be noted.

Loanwords often have phonological features that are foreign to the recipient language. The question then is, what happens to these alien features in the new linguistic environment? Henderson (1951) answers the question thus:

"Foreign words may be taken into a language in two ways: (a) they may be recast in a form already acceptable to the borrowing language; or (b) they may retain some alien features and so introduce new phonological patterns."

Whiteley (1967) refers to (a) "conformist" and (b) as "innovatory" assimilation.

Both types of assimilation may be seen in Bahasa Malaysia. Older loanwords which have become well established in the language have undergone for the most part complete phonological assimilation which is reflected clearly in spelling as well. For instance, butang /bvatŋ/ 'button', kobis /kobIs/ 'cabbage', sekeru /səkəru/ 'screw' have been so completely assimilated that their English origins are unsuspected by the majority of native Malay-speakers.

The reason for this extensive adaptation in older loanwords is that the number of speakers who were bilingual in English and Malay was very small in the early stages of contact. Therefore, when these words - usually the names of things introduced by the British for which no native word existed - passed into everyday language, they were used by people who were monolingual.

It is hardly surprising that these monolinguals, unfamiliar with English, should modify drastically the pronunciation of these words to fit the phonological patterns of their own language. The adjustment, in other words, is "conformist".

In Malaysia today, the number of Malay-English bilinguals\(^1\) is very much greater than in the past. Most of the young people are familiar with English as they have been taught it in schools. In the upper echelons of the public service and among businessmen who carry on international trade there are a large number who are proficient in English. Most teachers, clerks and shop assistants have a reasonably good command of English. This familiarity with English coupled with the fact that it is a 'prestige' language have resulted in people often endeavouring to pronounce and write English words in as 'English' a fashion as possible.

And as observed earlier, in recent years the flood of loanwords pouring into the language from English and through English (e.g. the international scientific vocabulary) is so great that the likelihood of their retaining their foreign features has increased, mainly because these features have become familiar to Malay-speakers through constant exposure. The assimilation in this case is "innovatory", as an innovation (e.g. a consonant cluster) is introduced into the language

Before proceeding to describe the phonological adjustments that are made to loanwords and to postulate rules to account for these adaptations, it is necessary to draw attention to the following points. First, the degree of adjustment is obviously greater in the case of the monolingual speaker. In other words, the assimilation will be "conformist", characterized by a high degree of substitution and minimum departure from Malay phonology. Among bilinguals, the extent of the adjustment also varies, depending on the degree of sophisticated bilingualism. Even when a single bilingual speaker is involved, it is often observed that he vacillates between different

---

\(^1\) "Bilingual speakers range all the way from a theoretical native-like ability in two languages to an almost passive and imperfect knowledge of a second language, confined to an aural and visual knowledge..." (J. Whatmough, *Language a Modern Synthesis*, 1960, Mentor Books, p.63).
renditions of the same loanword. The vacillation is governed by a number of extralinguistic factors. It is quite usual, for instance, for the bilingual speaker to have two sets of pronunciation for the loanwords he uses: a 'sophisticated' pronunciation (near-perfect rendition of the model - almost no phonological modification), and a 'folk' pronunciation (with phonological modification). Both types of pronunciation may be used by the bilingual speaker consciously or unconsciously, depending on the communication situation. He may use the 'sophisticated' pronunciation when speaking to native English speakers, other bilingual Malays, and in formal situations, but a 'folk' pronunciation when speaking to monolinguals and people of the older generation to avoid the impression that he is 'putting on an air' or that he is westernized.1

Furthermore, when speakers of different dialect backgrounds are concerned, their pronunciation of loanwords in standard Malay - as well as standard Malay itself - shows phonic carry-overs from their dialects.2

Taking the above-mentioned factors into consideration, one may postulate a 'stratigraphy' of possible renditions in Bahasa Malaysia of one loanword in decreasing order or resemblance to the English model. For instance, the possible renditions of draft would be:

1. The role played by the social context in determining pronunciation has also been described by Skinner for Arabic loanwords: 'It would, in fact, be perfectly possible for one and the same individual to pronounce the word in three different fashions on three different occasions (in the Mosque; speaking, say, to an official; and to one's wife), with degrees of consciousness of its Arabic origin ranging from one hundred percent to nil'. (C.Skinner, 1964, "The influence of Arabic upon Modern Malay". Intisari Vol. 2 (1), p.47).

2. Bador has pointed out that: "Everyone speaker of what has now been termed Standard Malay will show in his or her speech traces of his or her own dialect; and most educated Malays are 'bilingual' in standard and their own dialect" (Z.A.Bador, Word Forms in the Malay of Negri Sembilan, M.A. dissertation, University of London, 1964, p.7). For a description of the differences between the various dialects of Malay see: Asmah Haji Omar, 1977, The Phonological Diversity of the Malay Dialects, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan. Pustaka.
Another major factor to bear in mind in describing phonological assimilation of loanwords is the influence of spelling. The spelling factor has, in general, been ignored by students of borrowing, but it plays an important part in the transmission of loanwords especially in Bahasa Malaysia, since the majority of recent loanwords make their way into the language through print, or at any rate get their currency that way. Among monolinguals adopting loanwords, the pronunciation of the loanwords is based on spelling, which is phonologically 'imperfect' insofar as it leaves out critical information such as vowel length or stress placement. Both monolinguals as well as bilinguals are also subjected to the influences of 'spelling pronunciations', i.e. pronunciations based on the written form of the word, despite the existence of commonly used divergent spoken forms in the source language. Spelling pronunciations arise as a result of the discrepancy between pronunciation and spelling which is found in many words in English. Thus the word chemistry is pronounced /tʃemɪstrɪ/ by many Malay speakers on the basis of its spelling, instead of /kemɪstrɪ/.

The pronunciation of a loanword is also frequently determined by how it is spelled in Bahasa Malaysia, rather than the other way round. The individual (e.g. a journalist) or individuals (e.g. members of a terminology committee) who first introduced the loanword also decide on its spelling in the language, and the orthographical form that results is the basis of the pronunciation which the loanword subsequently assumes. For instance, the word act was introduced into Bahasa Malaysia in the spelled form akta, and because of this acquired the pronunciation /akta/. The re-spelling of many established loanwords has also changed their pronunciation, or created an alternate pronunciation, e.g.: the word commission, /kəmɪsən/, has been re-spelled as komisen and has acquired a second - and new-pronunciation, /komɪsən/. 
Another factor that makes it difficult to postulate rules for the phonological adaptation of loanwords has its basis in the conflict between the desire to adapt the loanwords to both the phonological and orthographical patterns of Bahasa Malaysia and the desire to preserve the etymology of the loanwords (especially if they are specialized terms). This often leads to inconsistencies in the adaptation of the loanwords as priority is sometimes given to phonological and orthographical considerations, and at other times, etymological considerations. However, this conflict has been resolved to some extent in recent years by the Dewan advocating that priority should, as a rule, be given to etymology in adapting specialised terms borrowed from English. (This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 8).

Finally, though rules for the phonological adaptation of loanwords may be postulated, they cannot be expected to have absolute predictive reliability. However, they are still useful as rough guidelines for an understanding of phonological adaptation of English loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia.

The main purpose of the description which follows is to give the reader an idea of both the phonemic and orthographic shape of the borrowed morphemes, that is, how the loanwords are realised in speech and in writing. The discussion on phonological adaptation is limited to segmental phonemes although it is recognised that phonological modification has also occurred on the suprasegmental level as well. It may be pointed out, however, that with regard to the suprasegmental features of loanwords, namely, stress and length, Bahasa Malaysia appears to ignore them. Length, as a rule, is ignored in Bahasa Malaysia. Stress is either ignored or changed to fit Malay phonemic/morphemic structure, that is, with the (slight) Malay stress on the penultimate syllable, thereby conforming to the normal stress pattern of Malay.

To facilitate comparison, details of the phonemic structure of English and Malay are given on pp.107-8.
The Phonemic Systems of English and Malay

1. English and Malay Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labio-</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palato-</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plosive</td>
<td>unv. P P</td>
<td>v. b b</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. k k</td>
<td>v. g g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate</td>
<td>unv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. t s</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. s s s</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. j j</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. h h</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. m m</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>unv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. n n</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. n n</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. j j</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>unv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. l l</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. r r</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td>unv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. r r</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-</td>
<td>unv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowel</td>
<td>v. w w</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The most detailed study to date of Malay sound system, and upon which the present description is based, is that by Yunus Maris, 1963, Malay Sound System, Kuala Lumpur: mimeograph.
2. **Pure Vowels**

Malay Pure Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.i</td>
<td>.u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>.e</td>
<td>.t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English Pure Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.i:</td>
<td>.u:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>.e:</td>
<td>.t:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.a:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Diphthongs**

Malay Diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.i:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>.ai</td>
<td>.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.ai:</td>
<td>.au:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English Diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.ie:</td>
<td>.ue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>.ei</td>
<td>.ue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.ai:</td>
<td>.au:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the outline of English and Malay phonemic systems given in the table and diagrams on pp 107-8, it may be noted that Malay provides 19 consonants by which to render 24 English consonants; 6 pure vowels and 3 diphthongs by which to render 12 English pure vowels and 8 diphthongs.

English phonemes with equivalents in Malay are substituted more or less automatically. For those phonemes in English which do not have equivalents in Malay, other Malay phonemes are substituted. These usually have some articulatory features in common with the English phonemes they replaced.

The charts which follow illustrate the manner in which phonemic substitution occurs in English loanwords in Malay. When the English phoneme is replaced by more than one phoneme in Malay, the one that is listed first is usually the most prevalent. It may be pointed out that the pronunciation of English loanwords indicated is not meant to be, and cannot be, definitive. This is because of the unsettled state of pronunciation of so many loanwords. However, the pronunciation of the loanword given is the one that is heard most often by the writer and subsequently confirmed by checking with a native Malay-speaker informant.¹

---

¹ The informant was Puan Siti Amhar, 27 years old, a native Malay-speaker from the state of Negeri Sembilan who, at the time of writing, was a student in the Linguistics Department of Edinburgh University. Her primary schooling was in Malay while her secondary schooling was in English. Her undergraduate studies were carried out in Malay; she holds a B.A. degree in Malay studies. Till her arrival in Edinburgh nine months ago, Bahasa Malaysia was the main language she used.
5.3.1.2 Vowels

1. Pure Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MALAY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic Notation</td>
<td>Orthographic Notation</td>
<td>Phonemic Notation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. /i/</td>
<td>ee, ea, i</td>
<td>/i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e, oe, oe</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ei, ey</td>
<td>ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ie</td>
<td>ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. /ɪ/</td>
<td>i, y, ye</td>
<td>/ɪ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e, a</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. /e/</td>
<td>e, ea, e</td>
<td>/e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. /ɛ/</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>/ɛ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. /ʌ/</td>
<td>a, u, o</td>
<td>/ʌ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>/kompas/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates new letter-combinations in Bahasa Malaysia.
– indicates no occurrence of loanwords with these letter-combinations in the data.
1. The exception in the data is the loanword resit /resɪt/ 'receipt,' where i is substituted for ei.
2. There are some exceptions. Of these, roket /roket/ 'rocket,' biskut /biskut/ 'biscuit,' and repot /repot/ 'report,' appear to have been assimilated on the basis of their English spelling.
3. The only exception in the data is injin /ɪndʒɪn/ 'engine,' and it is likely that this is assimilated from the variant English form /ɪndʒɪn/.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonic Notation</th>
<th>Orthographic Notation</th>
<th>Phonemic Notation of English Loanwords in Malay</th>
<th>Orthographic Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. /a:/</td>
<td>a, ar → a</td>
<td>/pas/ pas pass</td>
<td>Malay English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>er, ar → ar</td>
<td>/sadjan/ sarjan sergeant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al → aL</td>
<td>/pama/ palma palm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>au</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. /o/</td>
<td>o, ou² → o</td>
<td>/lori/ lori lorry</td>
<td>Malay English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>/waran/ waran warrant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ou, ow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. /o:/</td>
<td>or, or, our → o</td>
<td>/kot/ kot court</td>
<td>Malay English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>au</td>
<td>/otomatis/ automatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>/wad/ wad ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aw, au, or, oor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. /u/</td>
<td>u, o, oo, ou → u</td>
<td>/futbol/ futbol football</td>
<td>Malay English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. /u:/</td>
<td>oo, ou, u, ue, wi → u</td>
<td>/but/ but boots</td>
<td>Malay English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eu</td>
<td>/njiutral/ neutral neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o, ew, oe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Retained in Bahasa Malaysia in proper names, e.g.: Australia
2. Retained in Bahasa Malaysia in word-final position, e.g.: skor ‘score’
* indicates new letter-combination in Malay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MALAY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic Notation</td>
<td>Orthographic Notation</td>
<td>Phonemic notation of English Loanwords in Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɜː/</td>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>/ɜː/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɪ/</td>
<td>/ɜː/</td>
<td>/ɪ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>/o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>/æ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>/æ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>/æ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ər/</td>
<td>/ər/</td>
<td>/ər/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ər/</td>
<td>/ər/</td>
<td>/ər/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>/o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/or/</td>
<td>/or/</td>
<td>/or/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/er/</td>
<td>/er/</td>
<td>/er/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In established loanwords, er is represented in various ways, e.g., by æ as in modern /mɒdən/ ‘modern,’ by ar as in derebar /dɛrəbar/ ‘driver,’ or by or as in nombor /nɔmbɔr/ ‘number.’
2. **Diphthongs**

Malay has 3 diphthongs by which to render 8 English diphthongs (see diagram 2 on p. 108). English diphthongs /ai/ and /au/ found also in Malay, are substituted directly. The majority of the diphthongs without equivalents in Malay are replaced by pure vowels. The diphthong /ia/, however, is replaced, as well by vowel sequences. This seems to be a compromise between directly adopting the diphthong and substituting a pure vowel from Malay for it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MALAY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phonemic Notation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Orthographic Notation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phonemic Notation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ai/</td>
<td>a, ai, ea</td>
<td>/ai/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/ai/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/ai/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The occurrence of 2 or more vowels consecutively, when each vowel is syllabic, is called a vowel sequence. There are 6 possibilities of vowel sequence in Malay:

1. /ia/ e.g. biar /bi-ar/ 'to permib'
2. /iv/ e.g. piutang /pi-utang/ 'debt'
3. /ai/ e.g. main /ma-in/ 'to play'
4. /au/ e.g. laut /la-ut/ 'sea'
5. /ui/ e.g. juita /dju-it/ 'pretty'
6. /ua/ e.g. buang /bu-ang/ 'to throw'

2. Also pronounced as /rai/.

3. The only exception noted in the data is lesen /lesen/ 'licence'.

4. The English *i* in words such as *isometric*, *ling* *dichotomy*, *iodine*, etc., pronounced as /ai/ is usually pronounced as such by English-educated speakers, but among others it is usually pronounced as /I/. The latter pronunciation is due to the influence of spelling, most Malay-speakers are accustomed to phonemic spelling and, therefore, orthographic *i* is expected to have phonological value /I/ as in Malay.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MALAY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phonetic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Orthographic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phonetic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notation</td>
<td>Notation</td>
<td>Notation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. /ɔi/</strong></td>
<td>oi, oy</td>
<td>→ /ɔi/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. /ʌu/</strong></td>
<td>o, oa, ou</td>
<td>→ /ʌ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. /au/</strong></td>
<td>ou, ow</td>
<td>→ /au/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. /ɪə/</strong></td>
<td><em>e</em>, <em>e</em>, <em>i</em></td>
<td>→ /ɪə/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. /æʊ/</strong></td>
<td>are, ear, ae</td>
<td>→ /e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. /ʊ/</strong></td>
<td>00, 0u, ur, uer</td>
<td>→ /ʊ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Also written as ide and pronounced /zde/.
2. One exception noted is bereng /bereng/ (‘bearing’).
3. The exception in the data is *bure* /bɪə/ (‘bureau’), where /ɪ/ is substituted for /ʊ/.

Note: The phonetic notation uses international phonetic symbols, where * indicates a schwa sound.
The results of the detailed examination of vowel assimilation can be summarized in a series of predictive rules which operate for the majority of loanwords. Again it must be stressed that total ability to predict is unlikely for the reasons given at the beginning of this section (see pp.103ff). The influence of spelling must always be borne in mind.

Rules:

| Rule | English | | Bengali |
|------|---------|----------------|
| (i)  | Eng. /I, i:/ | ———> B.M. /I/ |
| (ii) | Eng. /e, æ, ei, ea/ | ———> B.M. /e/ |
| (iii) | Eng. /o, œ, iœ/ | ———> B.M. /œ/ |
| (iv) | Eng. /ɑ, ə, o, œ/ | ———> B.M. /ɑ/ |
| (v)  | Eng. /ʌ, u, ʊ, o, œ, ou/ | ———> B.M. /o/ |
| (vi) | Eng. /u, u/, vœ/ | ———> B.M. /v/ |
| (vii) | Eng. /ai/ | ———> B.M. /ai/ |
| (viii) | Eng. /au/ | ———> B.M. /au/ |
| (ix) | Eng. /œ/ | ———> B.M. /œ, o/ |
### Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MALAY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phonemic Notation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Orthographical Notation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phonemic Notation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>P → P</td>
<td>/polis/ polis police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>b → b</td>
<td>/bom/ bom bomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>t, tt → t</td>
<td>/taktik/ taktik tactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>d, dd → d</td>
<td>/dans/ dansa dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>k, c, cc, ch, cch, q</td>
<td>/kés/ kés case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>g, gg → g</td>
<td>/geran/ geran grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ts/</td>
<td>ch, tch → c</td>
<td>/carta/ carta chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/dz/</td>
<td>j, dg, ge → j</td>
<td>/dʒeɪtɪ/ jetty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This is inconsistent with the phonological value of g in Bahasa Malaysia alphabet where it is pronounced as /g/. Monolinguals may, however, pronounce g as /ʒ/ in loanwords where it represent the sound /dz/. | Orthographical Transcription of English Loanwords in Malay | Malay | English |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/dʒ/</td>
<td>/dʒeɪtɪ/ jetty</td>
<td>jam</td>
<td>geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>MALAY</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic Notation</td>
<td>Orthographical Notation</td>
<td>Phonemic Notation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. /s/</td>
<td>s, ss, c, sc</td>
<td>→ /s/</td>
<td>/satelit/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. /h/</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>→ /h/</td>
<td>/hotel/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. /m/</td>
<td>m, mm, mb, mn</td>
<td>→ /m/</td>
<td>/moden/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. /n/</td>
<td>n, nn</td>
<td>→ /n/</td>
<td>/notis/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. /g/</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>→ /n/</td>
<td>/lingwistik/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. /l/</td>
<td>l, ll</td>
<td>→ /l/</td>
<td>/lodzi/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. /r/</td>
<td>r, rr, rh</td>
<td>→ /r/</td>
<td>/retoz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. /w/</td>
<td>w, wh</td>
<td>→ /w/</td>
<td>/wiski/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. /j/</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>→ /j/</td>
<td>/jangki/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Also pronounced as /kota/.
Malay has no consonants which correspond to the following English fricatives: /f, v, θ, ε, z, s, ʃ/ (see Table I on p. 107). As a rule, other Malay consonants are substituted for them, as shown below. However, with the exception of /θ, ʃ/, there has been an increasing tendency to pronounce these fricatives in English loanwords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MALAY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic Notation</td>
<td>Orthographical Notation</td>
<td>Phonemic Transcription of English Loanwords in Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. /f/</td>
<td>f, ff, ph</td>
<td>/p/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>p'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. /v/</td>
<td>v, f, ph</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/p/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(word-final)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. /θ/</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>/t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. /z/</td>
<td>s, ss, z</td>
<td>/s/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s'</td>
<td>s'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>z, zz</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Confinned to spelling of established loanwords.
2. Also spelt as plem.
3. Also spelt as zing, zink.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MALAY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic Notation</td>
<td>Orthographical Notation</td>
<td>Phonemic Transcription of English Loanwords in Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. /θ/</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>/θmə/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>th</td>
<td>/θdəm/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. /ʃ/</td>
<td>s, ss, ch</td>
<td>/ʃmən/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-si, -si', -ci-</td>
<td>-si', -si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>/ʃempu/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sch, -sci-, -ce-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. /ʒ/</td>
<td>-je</td>
<td>/ʒeʃ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-si</td>
<td>/ʒiʃ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s, z, u</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/ʒiʃ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 -si is the modified (or Malaysianized) form of the suffix -tion, -sion (/ʃn/), (/ʒn/). E.g.: aksi /aksi/ 'action', misi /misi/ 'mission', abrasi /abrasi/ 'abrasion'.


From the examination of the treatment of phonemes in English loanwords a number of observations can be made.

Generally, English phonemes without equivalents in Malay are usually adapted to the Malay phoneme or phonemes that have at least some features in common. Thus English voiced consonants tend to be replaced by voiced consonants (the exception being /z/ which in monolingual speech is replaced by the unvoiced alveolar /s/); and unvoiced English consonants by unvoiced Malay consonants. However, the phonemic substitution that occurs does not necessarily involve sounds of the same class. For instance, the voiced labiodental fricative /v/ in English loanwords becomes /b/, a voiced bilabial plosive.

Generally speaking, spelling is adjusted to reflect pronunciation. Thus y is replaced by i, ch when pronounced as /k/ is replaced by k.

Other spelling modifications are:

(a) The elimination of letters and letter sequences. Thus final e in English loanwords such as 'grease', 'cake', etc. is dropped and necessary changes are made in the remaining vowels. Thus: gris, kek.

(b) The reduction of doubled consonant letters to single consonant letters, e.g. bil 'bil', tenis 'tennis'.

(c) Letter-sequences are transposed:

(i) -re is replaced by -er, e.g. meter 'metre'.
(ii) -le is replaced by -el, e.g. dubel 'double'.

In some cases, the discrepancy between the spelling and pronunciation in English loanwords has been deliberately retained in order to maintain visual resemblance between the Malay form and the English original. Thus, g in words such as geometri, psikologi has been retained though the phonological value /dʒ/ attached to it is inconsistent with the phonological value of g, as /g/, in Malay. The effects of this departure from normal spelling-pronunciation practices in Malay are examined in a later section.

Etymological reasons are also responsible for the acceptance of a number of letter-sequences found in English loanwords but not in
Malay. These are: aa, ea, ei, eo, eu, ie, io, ue, up. But as a rule letter-sequences not found in Malay are adapted to Malay spelling though this does not necessarily result in complete conformity with the Malay system. For instance: ph is represented by f (as in fasa 'phase'); sch is represented by sk (as in skema 'scheme'). The replacements, however, are innovations in Malay orthography; f (representing /f/) is a new letter and the consonant letter-sequence sk represents a consonant cluster (/sk/).

5.3.1.4 Consonant Letter-Sequences

Native Malay words do not have consonant clusters in syllable initial or final position (see Appendix 1.1 for a description of Malay phonological structure). There are no clusters as in the English words: act (VCC), strand (CCCVCC), task (CVCC).

A few initial clusters can be found, but they are mostly Sanskrit words, e.g.: /trimurtI/ trimurti, and the recent prefixes borrowed from Sanskrit /dwI-/ dwi- and /pra-/ pra-.

The influx of English loanwords has introduced into the language a large number of words with initial and final consonant clusters. In the spelling systems prior to 1972, consonant letter-sequences representing these clusters were reduced by one or the other of the two methods below:

(i) by eliminating one or more of the components in the sequence so that only one consonant letter remained, e.g.: waran, saman, from the English 'warrant', 'summons'.

(ii) by inserting a vowel letter between the components of the sequence. In word initial and medial position, the vowel that separates the components of the sequence is the letter a (/a/), e.g.: peroses, setor, from the English 'process', 'store'. In final position, the sequence may be separated by e (/e/) or a (/a/), e.g.: pilen, pilam, from the English 'film'.

The Dewan, recognising the problem posed by the large number of consonant letter-sequences that have entered Bahasa Malaysia, especially through the specialised terms from English, has attempted to systematize their assimilation, by prescribing rules as to how they should be spelled. The rules for the spelling of consonant letter-sequences in English loanwords as set out in the Dewan guide
to spelling, the Pedoman Umum Ejaan Bahasa Malaysia, (hereafter PUEBM) are summarized below:

1. Consonant letter-sequences in word-initial and medial position are retained.

2. Consonant letter-sequences in word-final position are spelled in one of the following three ways:

   (i) The sequences are retained if they belong to one of the patterns below:

   Example

   (a) \[
   \begin{align*}
   \{l\} + \{d\} & \quad \text{alomorf 'allomorph'} \\
   \{l\} + \{f\} & \quad \text{Mars 'Mars (planet)'} \\
   \{l\} + \{s\} & \quad \text{eksport 'export'}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   (b) \[
   \begin{align*}
   \{n\} + \{k\} & \quad \text{bank 'bank'} \\
   \{n\} + \{s\} & \quad \text{sains 'science'}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   (c) \[
   \begin{align*}
   \{k\} + \{s\} & \quad \text{kompleks 'complex'}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   (ii) The sequences are modified by the addition of a to the end of the sequences. These are from the following patterns:

   Example

   (a) \[
   \begin{align*}
   \{p\} + \{k\} & \quad \text{pulpa 'pulp'} \\
   \{p\} + \{m\} & \quad \text{kalka 'calc'} \\
   \{p\} + \{t\} & \quad \text{sperma 'sperm'} \\
   \{p\} + \{z\} & \quad \text{kuarza 'quartz'}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   (b) \[
   \begin{align*}
   \{m\} + \{p\} & \quad \text{metabolisma 'metabolism'} \\
   \{m\} + \{k\} & \quad \text{kuspa 'cusp'} \\
   \{m\} + \{l\} & \quad \text{moluska 'mollusc'} \\
   \{m\} + \{z\} & \quad \text{logaritma 'logarithm'}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   (c) \[
   \begin{align*}
   \{l\} + \{f\} & \quad \text{klampa 'clamp'} \\
   \{l\} + \{t\} & \quad \text{limfa 'lymph'}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   (e) \[
   \begin{align*}
   \{k\} + \{t\} & \quad \text{akta 'act'}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   (iii) The sequences are eliminated by dropping the final component if they belong to the following patterns:

---

1. This is subjected to certain modifications: e.g. English ph (representing /ʃ/) becomes Malay f; English x (representing /ks/) becomes Malay ks.
2. From the sequence -tz, t is omitted.
3. From the sequence -thm, h is dropped.
(a) From this pattern, \( t \) is omitted:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ks} \\
\text{n} \\
\{f \} + t \\
\text{s} \\
\text{p} \\
\text{k}
\end{array}
\]

konteks 'context'
konsonan 'consonant'
draf 'draft'

novelis 'novelist'
konsep 'concept'

projek 'project'

(b) From this (orthographic) pattern, \( b \) is omitted:

\[ m + \text{b} \]

bom 'bomb'

(c) From this pattern, \( d \) is omitted:

\[ n + \text{d} \]

bon 'bond'

(iv) The Dewan has given a separate treatment to the consonant letter-sequence -sm as found in the suffix -ism/-Izam/ in words such as 'communism', 'capitalism', etc. This sequence has been modified by the addition of a vowel \( e \) /ə/ at the end of the sequence, giving rise to -isme /-Ismə/, producing such words as komunisme, kapitalisme, etc. This modification, as mentioned, is due to the influence of Bahasa Indonesia.

Although the Dewan has attempted to systematize the spelling of consonant letter-sequences in loanwords by the above rules, this has not been entirely successful. One example is the treatment of the sequence -nd. This has been represented variously as \(-n\), \(-nda\) and \(-nd\). In the loan bergschrand the sequence is retained. However, in glanda 'gland', the sequence has been modified by the addition of \( a \) to the end. And in the loanword bon 'bond', the sequence has eliminated by dropping the last component \( d \).

The above inconsistencies are a reflection of the conflict between orthographical and phonological considerations on the one hand, and etymological considerations on the other, which attends the adaptation of loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia. In the adaptation of bon 'bond', priority has been given
to orthographical and phonological considerations. The letter d is dropped from the sequence, as it represents the voiced plosive /d/ which does not appear finally in Malay phonological system. However, in the loanwords glanda 'gland' and bergschrund, priority seems to have been given to etymological considerations as the consonant letter-sequence -nd has been retained. Of the three spellings of -nd, -nda seems to be the best way of treating the sequence (unless it occurs in proper names which are left unmodified in any case). This is because it preserves the etymology of the word and yet does not violate Malay orthography or phonology as a, representing /a/, appears in word-final position in many native Malay words.

At the present time, there exist (or co-exist) in the language many cases of spellings and pronunciations for the same English word where a consonant letter-sequence occurs. Some examples of words with variant spellings - and pronunciations - one with the sequence retained and another with the sequence eliminated are:

klinik /klinik/, kelinik /kelinik/ for English 'clinic';
front /front/, fron /fron/ for English '(political) front'.

Except in the case of the established loanwords, such as waran, saman, it is not yet clear which of the variant spellings or pronunciations are likely to become the ultimate one and no general prediction seems possible at this date. However, given the varying degree of familiarity with English among Malaysians, it is likely that many loanwords will continue to have variant spellings and pronunciations for a long time to come. This is, of course, the universal tendency in loanword assimilation. As Haugen points out, unless a loanword has become established, that is, socially accepted, "each borrower may achieve his own compromise replica, with more or less fidelity to the model according to his wishes or his ability."1

5.3.1.5 Derivative Elements

English loanwords have brought with them many distinctive endings. As the volume of borrowings from English increased, efforts were made by the Dewan to regulate the spelling of these affixes in English loanwords.

In the early '60s, when terminological work was at its early stages, the practice was to replace English affixes with

Malay or near Malay equivalents. For instance, the suffix -ation /-eɪʃn/, as in 'standardization', was replaced by the Malay pe-yan, giving rise to penstandardan.

In the late '60s, the Dewan decided to replace some of the suffixes in English loanwords with Indonesian suffixes which Bahasa Indonesia has itself borrowed and adapted from Dutch. The most well-known example is -isasi /-si which has its origins in the Dutch -atie. This affix, as was the case with the affixes borrowed from Bahasa Indonesia, has taken a long time to be accepted by the Malaysian public. The main reason for the lack of enthusiasm for these affixes was the public's familiarity with English. Thus, attempts to change the form of such well-known English loanwords as talivisyen to talibisi never caught on.

The Dewan, however, has had more success with its attempts to modify the spelling of English affixes in scientific and technical vocabulary. Prefixes are merely re-spelled in accordance with the Bahasa Malaysia alphabet. Suffixes, however, have not only been re-spelled, but in a number of cases have been replaced by Indonesian-Dutch derived endings.

English loanwords with the following suffixes have been re-spelled with the corresponding Bahasa Malaysia endings derived from Indonesian-Dutch, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Malay</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ation, -ion</td>
<td>-isasi, -si</td>
<td>organisasi 'organisation'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ical</td>
<td>-is</td>
<td>logis 'logical'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ics</td>
<td>-ika</td>
<td>fisika 'physics'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ism</td>
<td>-isme</td>
<td>komunisme 'communism'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1.6 Effects of Importation on the Phonology and Orthography of Bahasa Malaysia

The main effects of the importation of English loanwords on Bahasa Malaysia phonological and orthographical systems are outlined below:

1. The increasing use of the fricatives /f,v,z,j,3/ and the letters representing them.

   With the exception of /v/ which was introduced into Bahasa Malaysia exclusively through English loanwords, fricatives first
entered the language through Arabic loanwords. The Arabic-derived fricatives, however, existed only as phonemic variants in the language for they were nearly always replaced by native Malay phonemes. This is reflected in variant spellings for Arabic loanwords such as: **pikir/fikir** 'to think'; **jaman/zaman**.

The fricatives /f, z, s, j, v/ are common phonemes in English and the presence of large numbers of English loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia has increased their potential for becoming genuine, albeit adopted, phonemes in modern, spoken Malay.

This tendency is most noticeable in the phonemes /f/ and /v/. It has become more common for /f/ and /v/ to be pronounced and not replaced by the bilabial plosives /p/ and /b/, respectively, as was the practice in the past. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly, the influx of English loanwords has increased the frequency of occurrence of these two phonemes in the language so that they have become familiar to most Malay-speakers (this, of course, is the case with most Arabic-derived fricatives as well). Secondly, English loanwords have given the pronunciation of /f/ and /v/ a social value because of the fact that English is a 'prestige' language. Thus the use of /f/ and /v/ rather than /p/ and /b/ is a way of letting others know that the speaker is educated and knows the foreign pronunciation, just as some English people will say /ˈɛnvaləp/ rather than /ˈenvaˌləp/ 'envelope'.

The Dewan, recognising the increased occurrence of /f/ and /v/ in the language as a result of borrowing large numbers of English loanwords, has accepted them as phonemes in Malay and ruled that the letters representing them, that is, **f** and **v** should be retained in the spelling of loanwords. Etymological considerations have also prompted the Dewan to advocate - for representing the phoneme /z/ in English - the use of the letters **z** and **x** (in initial position, e.g. as in **Xenon** /ˈzɛnən/) in English loanwords. A separate treatment is given to /ʃ/ sh which has been re-spelled as **sy**.

However, it may be pointed out that the mere official recognition of a sound alone does not ensure that it is used in speech, and among people who are strictly monolingual, /p/ and /b/ will continue to be used in place of /f/ and /v/. The use of /f/ and /v/ has been encouraged not so much by official recognition of
their phonemic status as by the increasing exposure of Malay-speakers to the English language through it being taught in schools.

Bloomfield (1933) said that, "Where phonetic substitution has occurred increased familiarity with a foreign language may lead to a newer more correct version of a foreign form." This is certainly true of the /f/ and /v/ sounds in Malay.

2. Native Malay phonemes are used in new positions.
The influx of English loanwords has resulted in Malay phonemes being used in new phonological environments. This includes:

(i) the use in word-final position of
   a. the unvoiced velar plosive /k/, e.g.; /bank/ 'bank';
   b. the voiced plosives /b,d,g/ e.g.; /wad/ 'ward';
   c. the palato-alveolar affricates /tʃ, dʒ/ e.g.; /matʃ/
      Mac 'March', /imedʒ/ imej 'image'.
(ii) the use of the vowel /a/ in closed final syllables, e.g.
     /talivijan/ talivisyen 'télévision', /fejan/ fesyen 'fashion'.

3. The introduction of new syllable structures.
The acceptance of consonant clusters in English loanwords has added many more syllable structures to the basic four (i.e. V, VC CV, CVC) in Bahasa Malaysia. The new syllable structures introduced from English are:

(i) CVCC /teks/ 'text'
(ii) VCC /abstrak/ 'abstract'
(iii) CCVC /prinsip/ 'principle'
(iv) CCV /glykos/ 'glucose'
(v) CCVC /kompleks 'complex'
(vi) CCCV /strategi/ 'strategy'
(vii) CCCVC /struktur/ 'structure'

4. Increased number of words with three and more syllables.
As mentioned before, Malay is essentially a disyllabic language.
The influx of English loanwords, however, has resulted in increasing greatly the number of words with three and more syllables in Malay vocabulary, e.g; /graviti/ 'gravity', /provokativ/ 'provocative',
/imaginas/ 'imagination', etc.

2. /k,b,d/ also occur in a small number of Arabic loanwords as well, e.g. /talak/ 'divorce', /bab/ 'chapter', /had/ 'limit'. But it is mainly in English loanwords that these phonemes are used in final position.
So far the effects of importation have been looked at only in terms of new features introduced into the phonological and orthographical systems of Bahasa Malaysia. In the remainder of this section some of the adverse effects that importation has had on Bahasa Malaysia, particularly with regard to its orthographical system, are considered.

It would be quite true to say that the main effect that English loanwords has had on Bahasa Malaysia is to show confusion in its spelling. The adjustments to the spelling of loanwords that have been outlined are not always used nor consistently applied. The main reasons are the great flow of unusual and complex English words coming into the language, and different approaches - conformist versus innovatory - taken in adapting them.

This has given rise to

1. Variant spellings for the same word.

   This is due to the following reasons:
   
   (i) Different degrees of familiarity with English.

   In spelling, as in pronunciation, the person who is familiar with English is likely to give the English loanword the English, or close-to-English spelling. On the other hand, the person who is unfamiliar with English will pronounce the loanword according to Malay pronunciation and will tend to spell it in the Malay manner. This difference in familiarity with English has given rise to many cases of variant spellings for the same English loanword. Examples are: talipon/telefon, pilem/filem, nobel/novel, dosen/dozen, etc.

   (ii) Different treatments of consonant letter-sequences.

   As noted, there have been at least four ways of spelling consonant letter sequences:

   (a) By interpolating a vowel e /ə/ between the components of the sequence in initial and medial position,

   (b) By omitting one or more component of the sequence occurring in word-final position,

   (c) By adding vowels a /a/ and e /ə/ (the latter applies only to the sequence -sm in the suffix -ism) to the end of final sequences,

   (d) By retaining the sequence without modification.

   Given these possibilities of spelling consonant letter-sequences, it is not surprising that variant spellings should arise, e.g: belok/blok 'block'; moden/modern 'modern'; fron/fronda/frond 'frond'.
(iii) Different representations of the schwa /a/.

Another source of variant spellings is the uncertainty in the treatment of the schwa /a/ e before a final consonant. This distribution of the schwa, as observed earlier, is alien to Bahasa Malaysia phonology. In the old spelling systems, it was replaced by other vowels. There was no rule for determining the choice of the vowel to be substituted. Thus e was replaced by i in the word sistim 'system', and by a in komputar 'computer'. It was left to the individual to decide which of the vowels was closest to e /a/ in particular words.

The new spelling system of 1972 has accepted e /a/ in closed final syllables. This, however, has not eliminated such forms as sistim, komputar which still appears together with the re-spelled forms, sistem, komputer.

(iv) Alternative word endings in loanwords.

Though the Dewan has drawn up rules for converting English affixes, these rules are not always adhered to. This is especially true of the Indonesian-Dutch derived suffixes: -isasi/-si (-ation/-ion), -is (-ical), -ika (-ics), -isme (-ism).

These affixes have yet to be fully accepted, and in the non-specialised vocabulary words with these endings are still vying with words in which the English endings are retained in a Malaysianized form. For example: aksi/aksyen 'action', romantis/romantik 'romantic', matematika/matematik 'mathematics', kapitalisme/kapitalism 'capitalism', etc.

The English adjectival ending -ive till recently alternated quite freely in Bahasa Malaysia spelling between -ip and -if, e.g.: negatif/negatif, progresif/progresif. The new spelling system has decided on -if to replace -ive. But -ip still crops up in the spelling of the earlier borrowings such as those cited.

Mainly because of etymological considerations English loanwords are not spelt in accordance with the rules governing the spelling of native Malay words. The irregularities (or 'de-standardization') introduced into the system are as follows:

2. Rules for representing the vowel letter in closed final syllables are not applied to loanwords.

In Malay spelling there are rules which regulate the vowel letter to be used in final closed syllables. The choice of the vowel letter
depends on the vowel letter in the preceding syllable (see Appendix 1.1.5.1, p.306). These rules are not applied to loanwords in order not to obscure the origins of these words. Thus 'atom' is spelled atom, not atum, and 'rector', is spelled as rektor, not 'rekter'.

The large number of words borrowed from English to which the above-mentioned rules are not applied creates a source of irregularity in the spelling system of Bahasa Malaysia and also undermines the strength of these rules.

3. There is inconsistency in the spelling of loanwords to which is attached the verbal prefix me- or the nominal prefix pe-.

In native Malay words with initial /p, t, k, s/, represented in spelling by p, t, k, s, respectively, these initial consonants are replaced by the corresponding homorganic nasal after me- and pe-. These nasals are /m, n, ng, ny/, represented in spelling by m, n, ng, ny. (See Appendix 1.2.2.1 (2) p.309).

The above-mentioned rules are hardly ever applied to English loanwords. In the data these rules have been applied only to a few established loanwords such as: setor 'store' → menyetor 'to store'; telefon 'telephone' → menelefon; sain 'sign' → menyain.

This differential treatment of loanwords in affixation - as in other areas such as rules regulating the use of vowel letters - indicates that a 'sprachgefühl' or feeling for what is, and what is not quite Malay does exist among Malay-speakers. The exemption of loanwords from Bahasa Malaysia spelling rules reflects a tendency to 'draw away', as it
were, from according the words full recognition as Malay words by treating them in normal Malay fashion.

On the practical level, it is easy enough to see why the normal spelling rules are not observed in the majority of loanwords. Firstly, many of these loanwords begin with consonant clusters and eliminating the initial consonant would make the word both phonetically and orthographically unrecognisable and unacceptable, especially to Malay-English bilinguals, familiar with the shape of the English words. Thus, menytabilkan and penyabilkan would be unacceptable whereas menstabilkan and penstabilan for 'to stabilise' and 'stability' respectively, are generally acceptable.

Secondly, as so many of the loanwords are specialised terms, the Dewan has decided to keep as far as possible the basic visual and phonological shape of the words when they are used with affixes. This would enable them to be recognised as part of the international scientific vocabulary. And it would make easier the reading of English journals, textbooks, and other reference materials in English by Malay students and scientists.

However, many Malay writers, perceiving that the spelling is odd when affixes are added to loanwords, and disliking the cluster of consonants that often results from affixation, tend to use the meng- form of the verbal prefix and then to use an e /ə/ before the initial consonant of the loanword. Thus for example: mengeblok rather than memblok 'to block' mengebom rather than membom 'to bomb' pengeboman rather than pemboman 'bombing'.

This seems only to be adding an extra complication to an already confused situation.

4. Letters given a sound value which they do not have in Bahasa Malaysia.

The emphasis on visual resemblance of loanwords to their English originals (from 1972 onwards), has resulted in letters being given sound values inconsistent with their usage in Bahasa Malaysia. For example:

(a) The letter q is given the sound value [dʒ] as in English (and not [k] as is the case in Bahasa Malaysia) in such words as geometri 'geometry', agenda 'agenda', teknologi 'technology'.

(b) The letter *i* is given the sound value [ai] as in English, and not [I] as in Bahasa Malaysia. For instance, in such words as *krisis* 'crisis', *minoriti* 'minority', *isometrik* ', 'isometric'.

As spelling in Bahasa Malaysia is phonemic or near-phonemic, the retention of spelled forms that do not reflect their pronunciation is a drastic departure from the rules of the language. As the number of loanwords showing discrepancy between spelling and pronunciation is so large this is going to make Bahasa Malaysia spelling much less phonemic.

The Dewan has ruled that speakers should pronounce English loanwords the way they are spelt in Bahasa Malaysia and disregard their actual pronunciation in English. In a few cases concord between spelling and pronunciation has indeed been achieved by taking the spelling as the pattern for the pronunciation. Examples of such spelling pronunciations are:


Spelling pronunciations such as these, however, have yet to pass beyond the 'variant' stage.

There are two obstacles that prevent this automatic adjustment of pronunciation according to spelling from taking place. First of all, since knowledge of English is widespread in Malaysia, the 'alienness' of the pronunciation based on spelling in Malay is unacceptable to speakers familiar with the pronunciation of the word concerned in English. Secondly, since English is a 'prestige' language, speakers sought to enhance their status by adopting the anglicized pronunciation (which often reflects a lack of concord between spelling and pronunciation) rather than a 'spelling pronunciation'.

To sum up the discussion in this section, it would be true to say that the phonological and orthographical integration of English loanwords is still fraught with problems. As Stene (1945) observes: "any individual language needs a specially developed technique for borrowing extensively from any one particular source."¹ Such a

technique for borrowing from English has yet to be perfected for Bahasa Malaysia. The main obstacle to this is the conflict between adapting loanwords in conformity with Bahasa Malaysia phonological and orthographical characteristics and in making sure that orthographic resemblance with the English original is closely maintained. This, as noted, has given rise to many inconsistencies in the adaptation of loanwords.

From the above discussion, it is clear that the major changes in Bahasa Malaysia phonological and orthographical systems have been brought about by loanwords. They have enriched Bahasa Malaysia by introducing new phonemes and letters. But they have also introduced many irregularities into Bahasa Malaysia, particularly into its orthographical system. The most serious of these is the introduction of discrepancies between spelling and pronunciation into Bahasa Malaysia which has made its spelling no longer as phonemic as in the past.

5.3.2 Grammatical Integration

The grammatical integration of English loanwords in written Bahasa Malaysia,\(^1\) generally, does not present any real problem. They are subjected to the same grammatical processes as native Malay words.

5.3.2.1 Loanwords Used with Native System of Affixes

The ease with which loanwords are integrated into the grammatical system may be seen particularly in the way they are used with the native system of affixes.

Bahasa Malaysia has a well developed system of affixes (see Appendix 1.2.2.1 on affixation in Bahasa Malaysia). The affixes used commonly with English loanwords are as follows:

1. Loanwords used with me- (mem-, men-, meng-, meny-).

   This is an active verbal prefix and it may be used in conjunction with the verbal suffix -kan.

   The prefix me- and its allomorphs (mem-, men-, meng-, meny-)

---

1. In speech, speakers tend to omit the affixes except in formal situations (e.g. speech-making, lecturing, etc.).
can be affixed to nouns (e.g.: memonopoli 'to monopolise'), adjectives (e.g.: menormalkan 'to normalise'), or verbs (e.g.: mengeksploit 'to exploit').

As far as the verbal affix is concerned in the assimilation of English words there appear to be two possibilities. The loanwords are
(i) used with both the verbal prefix me- and suffix -kan.
(ii) used with verbal prefix me- alone.

With the majority of nouns, (ii) is the usual procedure.
For example: pos becomes mengapos.

Nouns ending in -asi/-si, however, may be subjected to either procedure (i) or (ii).

For example:
(i) demonstrasi becomes mendemonstrasikan
(ii) diskusi becomes mendiskusi.

There is, however, a need to standardise the formation of verbs from English words by affixation with me-. Variant forms of verbs have been formed by different forms of English words chosen for affixation. For instance: menstabilisekan, menstabilkan, menstabilisasikan. Here the root words are a verb 'stabilise', an adjective 'stabil', and a noun 'stabilisasi'.

It is easy to understand why the official ruling that verbs should be derived from nouns as far as possible has been ignored. Nouns ending in -asi tend to be very long and cumbersome. But unless some order is imposed more and more redundant forms will be created which are not only unnecessary but make for unnecessary complication.

2. Loanwords used with di-

In Bahasa Malaysia a verb is made passive by prefixing di- to its simple form, for example: memotong - dipotong; mengambil - diambil.

The verbal suffix -kan may be retained or dropped, e.g.: mengirinkan - dikirim or dikirinkan.

The passive prefix di- is used to render the passive form of English-derived words readily. For example: diadaptasi, disentralisasikan.

3. Loanwords used with pe- (per-, pen-, peng-).

This is mainly a noun-form prefix but words formed with it also have verbal and adjectival functions. It is nearly always used in conjunction with the suffix -an.
(a) It is used to form general collective nouns.
For example:
    - hotel = an hotel, but perhotelan = the hotel business.
    - lesen = a license, but perlesenan = the licensing system.

(b) It is used to form nouns that have a function similar to the English verbal nouns.
For example:
    - demokrasi = democracy, but pendemokrasian = democratization.
    - kelas = class, but pengelasan = classification.

(c) Nouns so formed can often be used adjectivally.
For example:
    - industri pertekstilan 'textile industry'.
    - serangan pemboman 'bombing attack'.

(d) At times the noun formed with these prefixes has no appreciable difference in meaning from the root noun,
    e.g. perekonomian 'economy', pengintegrasi 'integration',
    pemuzikan 'music'.

4. Loanwords used with pe-, peng-.

   This is an agent prefix and is used without the suffix -an.
   This serves to distinguish it from the noun suffix pe- above.
   For example: pemuzik 'musician', pengeksport 'exporter', pengimport 'importer'.

5. Loanwords used with ke-an.

   Ke- is a noun forming prefix. It is used in conjunction with the noun suffix -an.
   (a) Its main use is to form nouns from adjectives.
       For example: kenormalan 'normality', keneralan 'neutrality'
   (b) It forms abstract nouns from nouns.
       For example: kediktatoran 'dictatorship', kepresidanan 'presidency'.
   (c) Many of these nouns have an adjectival function.
       For example: bidang kedoktoran 'medical field', sfera keteknikan 'technical sphere'.

6. Loanwords used with **ber-**.
   This is a verbal prefix - it has other functions, viz., possessive and adjectival.

   (a) Verbal function. For example: **fungsi** = function, berfungsi 'to function'; **piknik** = picnic, berpiknik 'to picnic'.

   (b) Possessive function. This also has adjectival overtones. For example: **Orang yang bermoral** 'People with morals'; **Pengarang yang berstatus** 'A writer with status'.

   (c) Adjectival function. For example: **atlit beralibar** 'a calibred athlete', i.e., 'an athlete of calibre'; **respon beremosi** 'emotional response'.

8. Loanwords used with **ter-**.

   The prefix **ter-** indicates unintentional action and the superlative degree. It is most often used with loanwords with the latter function. For example: **termodern** 'most modern'; **terprogresif** 'most progressive'.

9. Loanwords used with the enclitic **nya-**.

   Its most common use with loanwords is together with the prefix **se-** plus reduplication of the root, e.g.: **seefisien-sefisienny** 'as efficiently as possible'; **seefektif-sefektifnya** 'as effectively as possible'.

5.3.2.2 Loanwords Subjected to Reduplication.

   In loanwords, as in native words, reduplication of the root may indicate.

   (i) repeated action, e.g: **lobi-melobi** 'to lobby repeatedly',

   (ii) indefinite plural, e.g: **bersegmen-segmen** 'with many segments', or **intrig-intrigan** 'intrigues in general'
       (reduplication of root **intrig** + nominal suffix -an).

5.3.2.3 Adverbial Usage of Loanwords.

   (a) English loanwords used as adverbs, usually conform to adverbial usage in Bahasa Malaysia and do not undergo morphological changes.

   In Bahasa Malaysia there are no adjective/adverb contrasts of the form rapid/rapidly, or pretty/pretily. To render the equivalent
of English adverbs secara is used with English adjectives to give the -ly adverb form. Thus: secara formal 'formally', secara universal 'universally'.

(b) English loanwords are used in phrases on the pattern pada umumnya 'generally'.

Bahasa Malaysia has a group of phrases constructed with 'pada'. The commonest of these are: pada umumnya 'generally', pada hakikatnya 'truly speaking', pada dasarnya 'fundamentally'.

Two of the most common English words used in such phrases are: pada prinsipnya 'principally' and pada praktiknya 'practically speaking'.

5.3.2.4 English Loanwords Used to Derive New Words with Sanskrit Affixes pra-(pre-); -wan (nominal agentive suffix).

These affixes borrowed from Sanskrit have been used increasingly in recent years not only with native words, e.g: pra-sejarah 'prehistory', hartawan 'millionaire', but also with a number of English words. Some examples are: pra-klasik 'pre-classical', pra-universiti 'pre-university', dramawan 'dramatist', industriawan 'industrialist'.

5.3.2.5 Compound Loanwords Conform to Malay Word Order

As a rule the elements of a compound loanword are adapted to Bahasa Malaysia word order, i.e. Head-Modifier.

For example: the elements of credit card have been recomposed to give rise to kad kredit (see Section 5.1.6: Analysed Compounds for further examples).

In the loanblend, the imported element precedes the Malay element if it is modified by the latter (giving rise to a 'nuclear' compound loanblend) e.g: bek-tengah 'half-back'; the imported element follows the Malay element if it modifies the latter (giving rise to a 'marginal' compound loanblend) e.g: jurang generasi 'generation gap'.

There are, however, two types of loanwords in which the English word order may be retained in Bahasa Malaysia. These loan-

words are:

(a) official titles, e.g: Naib-Canselor 'Vice-Chancellor',
(b) scientific terms, particularly chemistry terms e.g: ferus oksida 'ferrous oxide' (in terms with 'acid' as a component, however, the Malay word order is observed, e.g: asid amino 'amino acid').

Summing up, the detailed examination of the grammatical treatment of English loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia seems to bear out Bloomfield's statement that: "Grammatically, the borrowed form is subjected to the system of the borrowing language, both as to syntax... and as to the indispensable inflections.... and the fully current, 'living' constructions of composition.... and word-formation."¹

The effect of loanwords as such (leaving aside for the moment other kinds of borrowings such as loan translations and semantic loans²) on Malay grammatical system has, in general, been slight. For instance, they have not succeeded in introducing any new grammatical categories such as tense and number, obligatory in English, into Bahasa Malaysia.³ Tense and plural markers in loanwords are dispensed with when taken into Malay. Rather, the loanwords are made to conform to the Malay grammatical system entering into the "indispensable inflections" and word-formation processes of the language. Through the process of affixation, almost any part of speech can be borrowed and then be nominalised, verbalized or adjectivised according to the needs of the language.

2. These are examined in Chapter 6: The Process of Substitution.
3. Among the English-educated, however, there is a tendency to indicate tense and number in writing Bahasa Malaysia. Tense is indicated, by the use of adverbs of aspect such as sudah/telah to indicate past time, masih to indicate present time, esok or akan to indicate future time. Plurality is indicated by reduplicating the noun. See Asmah Haji Omar, 1977 "The Malaysian National Language in Academic Discourse", paper presented at the Fourth Conference of the Asian Conference on National Language, Kuala Lumpur, 1977, for a fuller discussion.

Weinreich (1953) notes several examples of situations in which, as the result of contact with a language B, the speakers of a language A came to feel the need for formal distinctions they had previously managed without (Languages in Contact, p.39 ff).
5.3.3 **Lexico-Semantic Integration**

Words seldom pass from one language into another without some change or adjustment of meaning. This is true of many of the English words borrowed and used in Bahasa Malaysia.

Below, we examine some of the ways English loanwords are semantically modified in Bahasa Malaysia.

5.3.3.1 **Semantic Widening**

Some loanwords widen or extend their meaning in Bahasa Malaysia. Some examples are:

- **Sexy** (or 'seksi')
  - This often merely means 'well-dressed' or 'pretty'.

- **Banglo** (Eng. bungalow)
  - As used in English, 'bungalow' means a one-storeyed house. In Bahasa Malaysia banglo refers to a detached residence whether one or two-storeyed.

- **Seling** (Eng. shilling)
  - In Bahasa Malaysia this refers to coins (as opposed to banknotes) of any denomination.

- **Frust** (Eng. frustrated)
  - This is used in a general sense to mean 'fed-up' or 'exasperated'.

- **Handikap** (Eng. handicap)
  - A common word used in general contexts often merely with the sense of 'difficulty'.

- **Motor**
  - This refers to any motorised vehicle, e.g.: motor-car, motor cycle, lorry, or even engine.

- **Veteran**
  - This is used in a general sense to mean 'experienced', thus: *penyanyi veteran* 'a veteran singer'.

- **Wayar**
  - Used, as sometimes in English, to mean a telegram.

Semantic widening is also illustrated by numerous cases of brand names which have gained acceptance as generic terms. Usually the trade name of the product first introduced in the country becomes the generic term for subsequent products of the same kind but of a different brand. Some examples are:

- **Dettol**
  - Antiseptic

- **Kuteks** (Cutex)
  - Nail Varnish

- **Klineks** (Kleenex)
  - Tissue Paper

- **Tupperware**
  - Plastic containers

- **Haks** (Hacks)
  - Throat lozenges
5.3.3.2 Semantic Restriction

It is unusual for a word to be borrowed with the same range of meaning that it has in the original language. The sense in which the word is borrowed depends on the specific domain of contact between the speakers of the two languages. Thus the words *apil 'appeal', kes 'case', saman 'summons*' are used only in the legal sense in Malay as these loans were made in the domain of law. However, it is possible that as the contact between the two languages increases, the range of meaning in the word borrowed will be extended. This is the case with the word *kelas 'class'.* In the past it was used only in the sense of 'a class in school'. Now it is used as well to refer to social class, class of goods, etc.

In semantic narrowing, it is often the case that the 'narrow' or more particular meaning of a word which is known, while its other and more general senses in English remain unknown. This is particularly noticeable where the word has a specialised or technical meaning and it is only in this specialised sense that the word has been introduced into Malay. For instance, *brai 'try' is used only in the context of rugby, skel/skala to refer to salary scale, kad 'card' used only in the sense of playing cards, daiman 'diamonds' refers to the card suite (the Malay word *berlian* is used to refer to diamond in the sense of a precious stone), karan 'current' refers only to 'electric current'.

Semantic narrowing may also take the form of collocational restriction. For instance, the loanword *hot* in Bahasa Malaysia collocates only with pop music and not with any other collocation in English such as weather, water, food, temper, and so on. Or, the word *rugged* which collocates only with fashion (pertaining to clothes) and not with any other, such as terrain, in English.

For example: "...seluar yang di cipta dengan fesyen baru yang rugged dan menarik...."2

(Jelita, February 1977 p.12)

1. 'Case'in the sense of 'grammatical case' is represented by the Latin loan *kasus.*
2. That is ".... trousers created in the new fashion which are rugged and attractive...."
Semantic restriction is, of course, a deliberate policy in the area of terminology formation. This is because one of the requirements of specialised terms is that they should be monosemantic. Thus terminological committees when borrowing English words have usually limited their range of meanings to one specific one.

The majority of English loanwords, especially those recently borrowed, are semantically restricted in one or another of the ways described above. In fact, semantic restriction is the most common method of semantic modification affecting loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia. This is because the bulk of the borrowings from English has been fairly recent and, generally, loanwords have to be in use for a considerable time before they extend the range of their meaning. Most of the words cited in the last section which have undergone semantic widening are established loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia.

5.3.3.3 Semantic Specialization

Loanwords do not always serve to fill 'gaps' in the existing vocabulary of the borrowing language. Sometimes a word is borrowed even though there is already a native equivalent or near-equivalent (homoiconym) in the language.

There is often functional differentiation or semantic specialization, such that the loanword and the native equivalent are used in different contexts. For instance, dansa 'dance' is used to refer to Western-type of dancing while the Malay equivalent tarian is used to refer to traditional Malay dancing. Gaun 'gown' refers to Western-style dress while baju refers to Malay dress. Another example is kek 'cake' which is used only to refer to Western-type confectionaries while kueh is used for traditional Malay products.

As the above examples may have shown, the specialization in the meaning of the loanwords is such that they serve to denote cultural novelties that are introduced by the West and their use serves to delineate these novelties from the area of indigenous Malay culture.
5.3.3.4 Productive Loanwords

When English loanwords have been integrated into the Malay language to such a degree that they have become a part of the life and thinking of the Malay-speakers, they often become 'productive' that is, provide the bases for new idioms, proverbs, collocations and slang. Some examples of such 'productive' loanwords are described below.

- **Atap seng.** This translates into 'zinc roof'. It means 'to have grey or white hair'.
- **Kaki botol.** This translates into 'bottle leg/foot'. It refers to a person who is alcoholic.
- **Kaki bola.** This translates into 'ball leg/foot'. That is, a person who is crazy about football.
- **kena baisikal.** This translates roughly into 'to be ridden upon (as a bicycle)'. It means to be hen-pecked.¹
- **Loyar keledek.** This translates literally into 'sweet potato lawyer'. It described a lawyer who works for trivial fees and is not too particular about the cases he takes up.²
- **Loyar buruk.** This translates into 'inferior lawyer'. It refers to a person who is boastful or fond of his own voice.
- **Nombor satu.** This translates into 'number one'. This is very common in speech. Anything that is good or excellent (e.g. food) is 'nombor satu'.

5.3.3.5 Transferance and Metaphor

Transference is the use of a term in a field of reference different from its usual one, and metaphor is an underlying comparison. These two are discussed together because it is sometimes difficult to tell which one is actually operating. Some examples of English words used metaphorically in Bahasa Malaysia are given on the following page.

---

2. Ibid.
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Arena. This word is used often in political and sport context. For example, arena perang 'war arena'
arena sukan 'sport arena'.

Hostess. This is used to mean a bar-girl.

Koboi. (Cowboy). This is more common in ordinary speech. It is used in a derogatory sense to mean 'rough,
uncouth, uncultured'.

Sensor. (Eng. censor). This is used to refer to a person or body invested with authority in a particular
area, e.g. "... mahkamah shariah atau sensor ugama...
(... religious court or the censor of religion...).

5.3.3.6 Loss of Meaning

This occurs very rarely. There are very few instances indeed of loanwords which have been taken arbitrarily and applied to a new concept with no regard for its former meaning. There is always some connection or association between the old meaning and the new. In the data, there are only a couple of examples of loanwords that have lost their regular meaning in English and acquired an almost altogether new one in Bahasa Malaysia. One is boi 'boy' which is used in Bahasa Malaysia to mean 'man-servant' of any age; another is lastik 'elastic', used to denote 'catapult'.

5.3.3.7 Effects of Importation on the Lexico-Semantic Structure of Bahasa Malaysia

As Weinreich (1953) observes, "Only the most concrete loanwords, such as designations for newly invented or import objects, can be thought of as mere additions to the vocabulary". He points out that "the consequences of a word transfer or a word reproduction on the miniature semantic system (or "field") of which the new word becomes a member are as much a part of the interference as the transfer or reproduction themselves".¹

The importation of English loanwords has certainly affected the existing vocabulary of Bahasa Malaysia. Some of the ways in which English loanwords has affected Bahasa Malaysia vocabulary are described on the following page.

1. **Homonymy**

The borrowing of English words has increased the incidence of homonymy in Bahasa Malaysia. This has come about mainly in two ways:

(a) English loanwords may, because of the process of adapting them to native phonological or orthographical patterns, become homonyms, although originally not.

For example: **motive** and **motif** both become **motif** in Bahasa Malaysia. 
**coffee** and **copy** both become **kopi** in Bahasa Malaysia. 
**comma** and **coma** both become **koma** in Bahasa Malaysia. 
**heroine** and **heroin** both become **heroin** in Bahasa Malaysia. 
**coat** and **court** both become **kot** in Bahasa Malaysia.

(b) The English word after having been adapted to the phonological patterns of Bahasa Malaysia may be homonymous with a native word.

For example: **pak** 'pack' is homonymous with Bahasa Malaysia pak 'father'.
**wap** 'wharf' is homonymous with Bahasa Malaysia wap 'steam, vapour'.
**dok** 'dock' is homonymous with Bahasa Malaysia dok 'to sit, to reside'.
**jus** 'juice' is homonymous with Arabic-derived jus 'chapter in the koran'.

Homonymy has often been cited as one of the deterrents to borrowing. In Bahasa Malaysia, however, homonymy is of little account as a deterrent to borrowing from English. This is mainly because the homonyms formed by borrowing are on the whole widely separated in context and would be unlikely to be confused.

2. **The Formation of Doublets**

Sometimes when words are borrowed from different languages at different times, two or more words which originate from the same root word can come into a language with different forms and meanings.

A few of these doublets exist in Bahasa Malaysia as a result of borrowing from Portuguese, Dutch and English which share many cognate words.
For example: Tangki (Port.) 'water tank' and tank (Eng.) 'armoured vehicle'.
Ronda (Port.) and rau (Eng.) 'rounds (military, police)'.
Soldadu or Seradu (Port.) and sojar (Eng.) 'soldier'.
Partai (Dutch) 'political party' and parti (Eng.) 'political party, social gathering'.

3. Formation of Synonyms

Contrary to Jespersen's assumption that "there is generally nothing to induce one to use words from foreign languages for things that one has just as well at home" there are many words from English which have been borrowed though there are equivalents or near-equivalents in Bahasa Malaysia. Some examples are:

- Cili 'chilly' and Bahasa Malaysia cabai
- Sigaret 'cigarette' and Bahasa Malaysia rokok
- Beranda 'verandah' and Bahasa Malaysia serambi
- Esei 'essay' and Bahasa Malaysia karangan
- Konsetebel 'police) constable' and Bahasa Malaysia mata-mata
- Sojar 'soldier' and the older Arabic-derived askar and Portuguese soldadu
- You and Bahasa Malaysia awak, engkau, kamu

The above synonyms are, generally speaking, interchangeable. However, there can be some functional differentiation. For instance, sigaret usually refers to the Western-type of cigarettes while rokok is used for the Malay type of cigarette which is rolled by the smoker himself. But even here there is no hard and fast rule about the usage of these synonyms, it is often just a matter of individual preference.

The nature of the speech situation in many cases does influence the choice of synonyms. This is particularly noticeable in the use of the pronoun you borrowed from English and the Malay synonyms awak, engkau, kamu. You is most often used by young people in the towns among themselves, and by older (bilingual) speakers in informal situations. The use of the English pronoun among the latter group of speakers could be due to the intricate social implications.

underlying the use of the Malay pronouns awak, engkau and kamu (in formal situations and in speaking to superiors, the common practice is to use the name or title of the person addressed instead of the second person pronoun). Thus, the English you is used because it is considered more 'neutral'.

Competition between native and synonymous or near-synonymous forms from English is usual. Frequently, there is a continuous struggle for survival between the rival forms. In the end one of them may succeed in replacing the other or the two may undergo semantic specialization to such an extent that they are no longer really synonymous. These two outcomes, lexical replacement and semantic specialization are examined below.

4. **Lexical Replacement**

In this study, "lexical replacement" includes only those cases in which the foreign (that is, English) item has replaced the native equivalent (the reverse becomes synchronically a matter of translation and not replacement).

It must be pointed out that it is not often easy to establish whether a native word has been replaced or merely restricted in usage. But there is no doubt that some loanwords make such inroads in the frequency of occurrence of parallel native words that they succeed in pushing the latter into near-obsolescence or obsolescence altogether.

The process by which English words have replaced equivalents in Bahasa Malaysia usually takes place in this manner. Some English cultural artifacts have initially been denoted by semantic extensions of Malay words or compound words (usually simple brief descriptions of the novelties introduced). Later on due to increased familiarity with English, the corresponding English word has been borrowed. These English words and their Malay equivalents then co-exist for a time as synonyms before the Malay terms eventually give way to the English terms. Below are some examples of Malay equivalents which have been replaced or are in the process of being replaced by English loanwords.

- **Rumah sakit** 'house of the sick' by **hospital**
- **Rumah penginapan** 'house for spending the night' by **hotel**
- **Kereta sewa** 'hired vehicle' by **teksi 'taxi'**
- **Kereta lengan** 'vehicle with rounded brim' by **baisikal 'bicycle'**
- **Panggung wayang** 'show stage' by **sinema 'cinema'**
In the area of terminology, there are many cases of terms that have been coined in an attempt to match terms in English. These coinages, however, met with such stiff competition from (Malaysianized) English forms that they failed to gain currency. Some well-known examples are the terms maging (a portmanteau word from makan 'eat' + daging 'meat'), and maun (from makan 'eat' + daun 'leaf') which have been replaced by the adapted English forms omnivoron 'omnivorous' and herbivoron 'herbivorous' respectively.

5. Semantic Specialization

This has already been described under the semantic modification of loanwords in the previous section (p.141). Here it is only necessary to stress that when words are borrowed where equivalent terms already exist in the borrowing language, then both the words borrowed as well as their native equivalents undergo semantic specialization. The result is functional differentiation such that the synonyms come to refer to different aspects of the same phenomenon. And as mentioned, the semantic field can be so rigidly divided between the rival terms that they can no longer be considered synonymous. This is the case with the English loanword lo 'law', which is used to refer to Western law, and the Arabic-derived syariat, which is used to refer to Islamic law.

5.4 Summary of Chapter

This chapter has considered the importation of English lexical items into Bahasa Malaysia. As defined, the process of importation includes not only the transfer of the lexical items but also their integration into the system(s) of Bahasa Malaysia.

The imported items, loanwords, fall into two main categories: pure loanwords (with no morphemic substitution) and loanblends (with morphemic substitution). These are described, classified, and subclassified on the basis of their formal structure in Bahasa Malaysia.

The integration of English loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia has been examined on the phonological, orthographical, grammatical and lexico-semantic levels. On the phonological and orthographical level it was noted that the conflict is between adaptation of the loanwords in accordance with the phonological and orthographical characteristics of Bahasa Malaysia and the maintenance of some resemblance with the
original forms and that this conflict has given rise to inconsistencies in the adaptation process. Grammatical integration is less problematical as English loanwords are subjected to Malay morphological processes, such as affixation, just like Malay words. On the lexico-semantic level it was found that some English loanwords have undergone semantic widening and some semantic specialization, but the majority of loanwords have undergone semantic restriction. It was also noted that some English words have become 'productive' in Malay by providing the bases for idioms, and that others are used in a metaphorical manner.

In addition, the effects that the importation of English loanwords have had on Malay on the phonological/orthographical, grammatical, and lexico-semantic levels were examined. The examination indicates that Bahasa Malaysia orthography has been most affected by English loanwords. The confusion in the spelling of these loanwords has increased the incidence of variant spellings for the same word in the language. The attempt to maintain the visual form of English loanwords has resulted in Bahasa Malaysia spelling rules being ignored, and in discrepancies between spelling and pronunciation found in English being transferred to Bahasa Malaysia, thus making the spelling system less phonemic. Phonology is another area which has been affected considerably by English loanwords. The loanwords have introduced a new phoneme /v/ into the sound system, new distributions in native Malay phonemes, and through consonant clusters, new syllable structures into the language. Through English loanwords too, there has been an increase in the usage of the loan fricatives, viz., /f, j, z, 3/. In the case of one of these variants, /f/, the large number of English loanwords has been responsible for its acceptance as a phoneme in the language. On the lexico-semantic level, English loanwords have increased the number of synonyms, doublets in the language and have caused a number of native words to be replaced or to undergo semantic specialization. Their effects on Bahasa Malaysia (unlike loanshifts discussed in the following chapter) have been slight. They have introduced no innovation from English, such as tense or number distinctions. Rather, the loanwords are made to conform to the morphological system of Bahasa Malaysia.
In this chapter, English influence is considered in its most direct form, that is, the borrowing of lexical items that represent new morphemes in the language. In the next chapter, a more subtle form of English influence is examined, namely, substitution. In this process, English influence is not expressed in the introduction of new morphemes but in new patterns of arrangement and usage of Malay words.
CHAPTER 6

THE PROCESS OF SUBSTITUTION

6.0 Introduction

Some scholars have considered it axiomatic that when a foreign cultural item (material or non-material) is borrowed, the designation for it is simultaneously borrowed as well. Thus, Jespersen (1956) declares that "in many ways the study of language brings home to us the fact that when a nation produces something its neighbours think worthy of imitation, these will take over not only the thing but also the name," and that this is "a general rule." 1

But in its contact with English, Bahasa Malaysia provides evidence that it is not necessarily the case that the transfer of a cultural item should be simultaneous with the transfer of the linguistic form that represents it. The volume of English loanwords borrowed into Bahasa Malaysia has indeed been tremendous. From this, however, it does not follow that a loanword always represents a concept for which there was no indigenous counterpart. There is another alternative other than importation to meeting the demand for lexical items required to designate innovations. That is, to adapt the language itself to meet the situation via the process of Substitution. 2 This can be done by means of two types of indirect borrowing, namely, loan translation and semantic extension, collectively referred to as Loanshifts. Loanshifts in Bahasa Malaysia are examined in Section 6.1.

Section 6.2 examines a different form of substitution, namely, the process of Apt Equivalent Substitution. 3 As apt equivalent substitution does not involve the use of an English model, it is not bor-

2. We have already seen this process at work even in the importation of English loanwords when a Malay element was substituted for part of the English item, giving rise to loanblends. In this chapter, we see the process of substitution applied to a given loan as a whole and not just its constituents.
3. The term is borrowed from B. Ikara who used it in his dissertation, English as a Factor in Language Modernisation, Leeds University, 1974. But the term is used in a slightly different way in this study.
rowing as the term is defined, though it is a contact phenomenon. Apt

equivalent substitution is considered because it is one of the forms of

response by Bahasa Malaysia to English lexical impact, of which bor-

rowing (via importation and substitution proper) and native creation
are the others.

In the following discussion, the different types of substitution

outlined above are examined in more detail as well as the quantitative

aspect of their relationship to the rest of the corpus.

6.1 Loanshifts

The process which gives rise to loanshifts, namely, substitution,
involves the use of Malay words to designate new concepts expressed in

English on the basis of models of English items. The term "shift" is

used to describe the products of this process because these loans appear

in the borrowing language only as functional shifts of native morphemes. In

loanshifts, there is "morphemic substitution without importation," that is,

the morphemes involved are all native. In the first type of

loanshift, namely, loan translations, the native terms appear in a new

arrangement; in the second type, semantic extensions, the meanings of

native words have been extended. Both types of change are based on the

model of a lexical item in a foreign language.

The importance of loanshifts can be seen by the fact that they
account for 32% (2398 items) of the corpus, and 39% of all the items
borrowed from English.

6.1.1 Loan Translations

In loan translation, the form and meaning of the English word,

instead of being carried over into Bahasa Malaysia as a unit, is

merely employed as a model for a native formation. In other words,

only the structural arrangement of the English model is 'copied' (hence

the other name by which loan translation is known, namely, 'calque'),


1. The definition of borrowing being "the attempted reproduction in one
language of patterns previously found in another", given by Einar
Haugen (1950) in "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing", reprinted
in The Ecology of Language, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University
Press, 1972, p.81.
2. Ibid, p. 85.
3. Ibid.
its components being replaced by native Malay items.

For the loan translation to be possible, the English model must be both morphologically complex and semantically transparent, and the process consists in substituting for each of its morphemes the semantically closest morpheme in Bahasa Malaysia and combining these according to its own native rules of word-formation. Thus, while the choice of constituent morphemes and the overall meaning of the new construct will be modelled on the English original, the constituent elements themselves and the rules governing their combination will be native.

Loan translations which appear in glossaries of technical and scientific terms are straightforward translations of the English terms which appear alongside the items in question. Other than these, the identification of loan translations can be very difficult as none of the new words violates the native rules of word-formation and they have no formal properties that would distinguish them from genuine native words. In most cases, it is the relative arbitrariness of the images conveyed by the loan translations (e.g. pencakar langit 'skyscraper' from pencakar 'raker' + langit 'sky') which makes it possible to identify them as loan translations with some degree of certainly. Also, our knowledge of clichés of these forms in English is a help. Where the image is a more 'natural' one, however, it becomes much more difficult to be sure that one is not dealing with parallel but independent formations.

Loan translations accounts for about 32% (1559 items) of all borrowed items from English. This makes them the second largest category of borrowings after pure loanwords (45%). It is likely that loan translations are slightly under-represented given the difficulties mentioned above in identifying them and the actual figure might be more like 35%. More than two-thirds of the loan translations collected in this study are from the planned area of lexical innovation. This is not surprising in view of the emphasis given to the use of Malay words in scientific and technical terminologies. Borrowing from English via loan translation is obviously the most convenient means of achieving this end. (The differences between planned and spontaneous lexical innovation
are discussed in detail in Chapter 9).

Loan translations in this study have been divided into Literal Loan Translations, Loan Renditions, and Syntactic Calques. The first two categories are translations of derivatives or compounds; they differ in the degree of approximation to the English model. The third category, syntactic calques involve whole phrases. Each of these types of formations is now considered in turn.

6.1.1.1 Literal Loan Translations

Weinreich (1953:51) refers to these as "loan translations proper." It is easy to see why - the model is reproduced element by element in the borrowing language. This process is seen most clearly when it involves derivatives, as in the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Model</th>
<th>Malay Replica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monolingual</td>
<td>ekbahasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biconvex</td>
<td>dwicembung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decolourise</td>
<td>(m)nyahwarna (kan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In compound words, however, though there is still an element by element replacement of the English model, the word order of the English item is reversed to fit the normal pattern in Bahasa Malaysia. This is the usual practice except when the compounds are scientific terms, in which case the word order is often deliberately left unaltered.

---

1. The term derivative describes a word consisting of one stem plus an affix; the term compound is used here not only to refer to real compounds words but also phrases (of not more than two items) which are borrowed as fixed collocations in Bahasa Malaysia.

2. In Haugen, "The Analysis of Borrowing", they are referred to as syntactic substitutions: "Substitution may equally well extend to complete phrases, whose parts are reproduced as native words; we may call these SYNTACTIC SUBSTITUTIONS, and include such expressions as AnPort. responder para tras 'to talk back'. (p. 92).

Below are some examples of literal loan translations: ¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Model</th>
<th>Malay Replica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) plane angle</td>
<td>sudut satah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) iron curtain</td>
<td>tirai besi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) cold war</td>
<td>perang dingin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although, in general, the word-order of English terms is reversed, there are a number of cases, usually official titles, where the word-order is maintained. For instance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Model</th>
<th>Malay Replica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Prime Minister</td>
<td>Perdana Menteri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Former Chairman</td>
<td>Bekas Pengerusi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Deputy Director</td>
<td>Timbalan Pengarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above examples show, in the process of loan translation, the influence of English is manifested in forcing new combinations and association of Malay words in an attempt to reproduce the pattern and meaning of the English elements. This results in superficially indigenous-looking terms whose composition from native morphemes would otherwise be remote or unlikely.

Among loan translations, one may also distinguish "evolving" and "enriching" loan translations. ² In evolving loan translations, "the components appear with their familiar semantemes, only the particular combination of them being due to another language". ³ In enriching loan translations, on the other hand, "one or more of the components is involved in a semantic extension". ⁴ An example of an evolving loan translation is: example (i) in the first set of examples

1. This kind of loan translation is also found in many other language contact situations. For instance, the English expression 'accomplished fact' is the French 'fait accompli'; the French 'gratte-ciel' is English 'sky-scraper'.
2. Mentioned by Weinreich, 1953, as originating from Betz, p. 51, Fn.47.
4. Ibid.
above, where the components of the items appear with their ordinary meanings, only the combination being unusual. The other examples in the set are enriching loan translations for the components in the items have been semantically extended. For instance, tirai in the loan translation tirai besi 'iron curtain' has been extended from its ordinary meaning of 'suspended cloth used as screen' to its figurative sense of a political barrier.

Many of the loan translations must at first have sounded rather contrived and even bizarre, but those which have survived (like the examples above) are now in no way felt to be unnatural by the bilingual Malay-speaker. However, for many monolingual speakers, loan translations can often be a source of misapprehension and confusion with regard to their 'signifiés', unfamiliar as they are with the conceptual framework of English. For instance, the Malay word for 'cold' dingin does not have the sense of 'hostile' as does its equivalent in English, cold. Hence, the juxtaposition of dingin with war in the loan translation perang dingin 'cold war' must make the term rather incomprehensible to the monolingual Malay.

Literal loan translations are the largest category of loan translations. They account for 70% (1366 items) of all loan translations in the corpus.

6.1.1.2 Loan Renditions

In loan renditions, "the model compound only furnishes a general hint for the reproduction". Examples of loan renditions from Bahasa Malaysia are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Model</th>
<th>Malay Loan Rendition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>black market</td>
<td>pasar gelap (dark market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guided missile</td>
<td>peluru berpandu (guided bullet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot and mouth disease</td>
<td>sakit mulut dan kuku (mouth and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>claw disease)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loan renditions account for 13% (252 items) of all loan translations in the corpus, thus making them the smallest category of loan translations.

1. Ibid.
6.1.1.3 Syntactic Calques

Syntactic calques, or syntactic substitutions, consist of phrases which are direct translations of fixed expressions in English. These may be based on English prepositional phrases, stylistic or idiomatic expressions. Calques based on prepositional phrases are used extensively in official correspondence giving it that peculiar phraseology that is associated with this form of writing in Bahasa Malaysia. Syntactic calques are also prevalent in writing of an academic or journalistic nature.

Some examples of syntactic calques which have become an integral part of written and formal Malay are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bahasa Malaysia Calque</th>
<th>English Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>berhubung(an) dengan</td>
<td>in connection with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bekenaan dengan</td>
<td>with regard to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sebagai akibat dari</td>
<td>as a result of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memain peranan dalam</td>
<td>to play a role in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada kemungkinan bahwa</td>
<td>There is a possibility that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidak dapat dinafikan bahwa</td>
<td>It cannot be denied that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syntactic calques account for 17.4% (341 items) of loan translations considered in this study. It may be pointed out that though the number of separate items among syntactic calques may be smaller than that of literal loan translations, they have, on the whole, a much higher frequency of occurrence. Their effects on Bahasa Malaysia syntax and style are also more considerable as shall be seen when the effects of loanshifts are considered in Section 6.1.3.

6.1.2 Semantic Extensions

In this group of loanshifts, the "shift of context" here refers to a shift in the semantic field of the native morpheme. This semantic, and often collocational, shift is the result of the application of an existing Malay term to cover the semantic dimension(s) of an English item. The dominant process involved is semantic extension in which the
word acquires a new meaning while retaining its original one.\footnote{One could conceivable of a native word that has two designative functions, one of which it loses as a result of the influence of a foreign model; this would be a case of 'semantic restriction', which is the opposite of 'semantic extension'. It can also happen that the borrowed sense will simply supersede the old one; this would be a 'loss of meaning' (thus Fr. parlement which originally meant 'speaking', acquired at a later date under the influence of English parliament, its modern sense of 'legislative assembly', the only meaning in which it is at present used. Cf. Stephen Ullmann, Semantics, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1977, p.165). But the literature indicates that semantic restriction and loss of meaning are far less common than semantic extension as a process by which a foreign language brings about changes in the meaning of words in another. (Cf. Ullmann, 1977, p.165, p.228-229).}

The necessary condition for this kind of borrowing to take place is partial semantic similarity between the Malay term and the English term which functions as its model. For instance, before borrowing, the Malay word arus 'current' shared with the English model current the designative function of reference to the flow of a stream of water. After the contact, a shift in the designative function of the Malay word occurred to include a new designative function, that is, reference to a movement of electricity. This extension is illustrated by the appearance of this Malay word in such expressions as arus elektrik 'electric current'. Thus the partial semantic similarity between the Malay replica and the English model is the starting point for the extension of meaning, the function of the extension being to bring the designative function of the replica up to a higher degree of congruence with that of the model.

According to Haugen (1953), a word may undergo semantic extension either through its semantic or phonetic similarity to some word in the foreign language.\footnote{Haugen, 1953, The Norwegian Language in America, Vol.2, Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, p.390.} In fact, he makes use of this loan-synonymy and loan-hyponymy dichotomy to classify semantic borrowings. Thus, if the borrowing resembles the model only semantically, it is a synonymous loanshift extension; if it resembles the model only phonetically, it is a homophonous loanshift extension; and if it resembles the model both phonetically and semantically, it is a homologous loanshift extension.\footnote{Ibid., p.400.}

In this study, Haugen's three-fold classification of loanshift extensions (or semantic extensions) into homophonous, synonymous and
homologous loanshifts extensions has not been retained. The reason
for this is that as English and Malay are non-cognate languages
(unlike Norwegian and English upon which Haugen based his classification),
loanshift extensions tend overwhelmingly to be in the synonymous
category. It makes sense, therefore, to dispense with Haugen's
classification and establish one that is more relevant to the
English-Malay contact situation. In this study, therefore, semantic
extensions have been classified into nominal, verbal and ajectival
semantic extensions.

Haugen also classified loanshift extensions broadly into semantic
confusions and semantic displacements. In semantic confusions
"native distinctions are obliterated through the influence of partial
interlingual synonymity" (e.g. AmPort. livraria 'bookshop' used to
mean 'library' under the influence of English). In semantic dis-
placements, "native terms are applied to novel cultural phenomena
that are roughly similar to something in the old culture" (e.g. AmPort
peso (Sp. peso) used to mean 'dollar'). This division of semantic
extensions into semantic confusions and semantic displacements has not
been maintained in this study. Semantic extensions in Bahasa Malaysia
are almost all of the second type, that is, semantic displacements.
In semantic displacements Malay terms are applied to novel cultural
phenomena (introduced via the medium of English) which are roughly
similar to something in the old Malay culture. As examples, we may
mention bendahari (from Hindi 'treasury official') extended to mean
'bursar'; kereta (carriage, wagon, cart) extended to mean 'motor-car'.

Semantic extensions account for 7.1% (439 items) of borrow-
ings from English. As in the case of loan translations, there is also

Ecology of Language, 1973, p.91. From this example and other
examples given (such as AmItal. fattoria 'farm' used to mean
'factory'), it would seem that both semantic and phonetic
similarity are involved in semantic confusions. These again
would be far more likely to occur in cognate languages where
the incidence of words which are phonetically as well as seman-
tically similar is much higher.

2. Ibid.
a problem of identification here. It is often extremely difficult to decide whether the extension in meaning of a Malay term is due to indigenous shift or due to the influence of an English model. Here it is appropriate to note T.E. Hope's observation that "a semantic borrowing forestalls or by-passes a change of meaning which could equally well have occurred in the receiving language itself, given the right conditions".\(^1\) But, generally, when there is a possibility that the extension of meaning in a Malay word is due to indigenous shift, the item in question is not regarded as a borrowing from English.

6.1.2.1 Form Classes of Semantic Extensions

Malay substantives are by far the most affected by semantic extension. Nominal extensions accounts for 68% (297 items) of all semantic extensions.

This predominance of nouns is reflected not only in semantic borrowings but also all the other types of borrowing from English.\(^2\) It is also reflected in other studies of borrowings such as those by Haugen (1950) of American Norwegian and American Swedish borrowings from English.\(^3\) This is largely because the cultural contact between English and Malay (as indeed in other situations where borrowing has been studied) involves predominantly material innovations.

Verbal semantic extensions are the second largest category accounting for about 25% (108 items) of the total number of semantic extensions considered in this study. Adjectival semantic extensions are the smallest category. They account for only 7.5% of the total number of semantic extensions.\(^4\)

6.1.2.2 Types of Semantic Change

The following are the ways in which Malay words have become

---

2. Nouns account for 79% of pure loanwords, 90% of loanblends, and 91% of loan translations.
3. Haugen, 1950, p. 97 (American Norwegian: 75.5%; American Swedish: 72.2%).
4. It would appear that there is a tendency to import English adjectives directly rather than substitute semantically extended Malay adjectives for them. The number of adjectival loanwords 517, accounts for 90.5% of all adjectival borrowings from English; the number of adjectival loanshifts is 54, which accounts for Only 9.5% of such borrowings.
semantically extended. It may be pointed out that the types of semantic change described below are not mutually exclusive for in some cases more than one may have been at work. The full range of semantic change may be seen to operate most freely among nouns. The types of semantic change which occur most frequently with verbs are (2), (3), (6) and (7). Among adjectives, the types of semantic extension which are most common are (2), (3) and (7).

1. Semantic Extension based on Similar Appearance and/or Function

This type of semantic extension takes the form of a perceptual similarity established between the appearance and/or function of the innovation with a familiar native item. The following are some examples:

(a) Extension through perception of similarity in appearance and function.
   kereta 'carriage' extended to mean motor-car.
   Ladang 'clearing' extended to mean plantation.
   Kandang 'a pen, stall for animals' extended to include dock 'enclosure in criminal court for prisoner'.

(b) Extension through perception of similarity in appearance only, without reference to function.
   Piring 'saucer' (in piring hitam 'black saucer') extended to mean gramophone record.
   Kuman 'a very small louse' extended to mean bacteria.
   Kisi 'lattice-work' extended to mean electrical network.

(c) Extension through perception of similarity in function only, without reference to appearance.
   Perenggan 'fence' extended to mean paragraph.
   Injap 'inturning spikes of a basket-trap which prevent the escape of fish caught', extended to mean valve.
   Kilang 'mill' extended to mean gland.
2. Semantic Extension through Progression from Concrete to Abstract.

The way in which new concepts are interpreted in terms of natural and material phenomena may be seen in the examples of nominal semantic extensions below:

*Cerakin(an) 'traditional Malay medicinal chest with small compartments for storing herbs'. This has been extended to mean analysis.

The structure of the concrete referents - a chest made up of small compartments - suggests in a very striking manner what is involved in the process of analysis, that is, "the separating of a thing into its elements or component parts". ¹

*Kesan 'footprint of an animal' extended to cover the abstract idea of impression on the mind.

*Rangka 'framework of house' extended to mean the framework, outline of anything (e.g. discussion).

Verbs which denote physical action or activity have also been semantically extended by being used to describe abstract acts. For example:

*Bangun 'to get up, rise' extended to cover the abstract idea of 'to develop (country, land, etc.)'.

*Hurai 'to untie' extended to cover the abstract sense of 'to clarify'.

*Tapis 'to strain, filter' extended to mean 'to censor'.

*Hidang 'to serve up food' extended to include 'to present (radio or television programme)'.

Adjectives may also be semantically extended by acquiring an abstract meaning in addition to their original concrete meaning. This can be seen in the following examples:

*kabur 'dim (of sight)'; indistinct (of distant scene) has been extended to ambiguous in meaning.

*(ber)kemas 'tidy, neat' has been extended to mean lucid.

3. **Semantic Extension through Literal Translation of English Terms**

The extension in meaning here results from attempts to substitute Malay words for English words with which they correspond only in the literal meaning. In the process these Malay words acquire the secondary meaning (e.g. *plant* 'factory' as opposed to its primary meaning of 'vegetation') or metaphorical meaning (e.g. *eye* of a needle) of the English word.

The following are examples of Malay nouns which have acquired these additional meanings as a result of being used to translate English words literally.

- *Kerusi* 'chair' which is a literal translation of English *seat* used in its secondary meaning of 'political constituency'.
- *Sayap* 'wing of a bird' used to translate English *wing* in the political sense, as in the phrases 'left wing' and 'right wing'.
- *Lorong* 'lane' used to translate *track* in the technical sense of 'sound-track' or 'speed-track'.
- *Cawangan* 'branch of a tree' used to translate English *branch* when used in the sense of 'a part of an organisation'.

As in the case of nouns, Malay verbs which correspond only in literal meaning to English verbs have been used to translate the latter when they are used in their secondary or metaphorical meanings. As a result, these Malay verbs have acquired the secondary or metaphorical meanings of the English verbs as well. Some examples are:

- *Beri* 'to give' used to translate English 'to give' when used in such phrases as 'to give an opinion, statement, report, explanation, etc.'
- *Faham* 'to understand' used to translate English 'to understand' in its secondary meaning of 'to believe', as in "I understand that he is a distant relation".
- *Ambil* 'to take' used to translate English 'to take' used in such phrases as "to take a decision, the initiative, an examination, time (e.g. it will take 20 minutes), etc.".

---

1. In a dictionary, the primary meaning of a word is the one that is listed first, and the secondary meaning(s) after it.
Literal translation of English words has not only brought about changes in meaning of Malay words but also changes in parts of speech in Malay. Many nouns in Malay have acquired a new usage as verbs (with the appropriate affixes) through being used to translate English nouns used in their verbal forms. Some examples of Malay nouns which have been verbalised in this manner are given below:

- **Menyuarakan** (suara 'voice') to translate 'to voice' in such phrases as 'to voice an opinion', 'to voice a complaint'.
- **Membintangi** (bintang 'star') to translate 'to star (in films)'.
- **Mementaskan** (pentas 'stage, platform') to translate 'to stage (a play)'.

A large number of adjectives have also been semantically extended through being used as direct literal translations of English words. Some examples are:

- **Mundur** 'backward' has been extended to mean 'lacking in ability' through being used to translate such phrases as 'the backward students' murid-murid yang mundur.
- **Berat** 'heavy' has been extended to mean 'serious, dull' on the model of the English heavy as applied to books. Thus, novel yang benar-benar berat 'a really heavy novel'.
- **Ringan** 'light' extended to mean 'easy to read' through being used to translate English light. Thus, novel yang relatif ringan 'a novel that is relatively light'.
- **kiri** 'right' and **kanan** 'left' used to translate English right and left when used to describe political tendencies and sympathies.
- **merah** 'red' used to translate English red in the sense of 'communist'.

As the examples above show, many of the adjectives (as indeed nouns and verbs as well) through being literally translated from English, have come to acquire a figurative sense or a metaphorical meaning on the model of the English items.

4. **Semantic Extension through Syntagmatic Relationship**

Semantic extension can also occur through syntagmatic modification of a general Malay word. In this process, a word with a general meaning is used in association with several other words which act
as specifiers to indicate more particular senses. Though syntagmatically modified in this manner, the word in question acquires an enlarged semantic boundary. Some unconscious linguistic economy is often achieved as a single word with the appropriate differentiating elements, can suggest a multitude of things.

Some examples of Malay words which have been semantically extended by being used to form various syntagms are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malay Word</th>
<th>Syntagmatic Modifying Component</th>
<th>Corresponding Term in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SURAT (letter)</td>
<td>kebenaran (permission) kausa (power) naik kapal (board ship) pekeliling (circulated) sumpah (oath) tegah (prohibition)</td>
<td>warrant letter of administration embarkation slip circular statutory declaration patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAK (truth)</td>
<td>negara (state) cipta (invent) milek (own)</td>
<td>nationalisation copyright ownership, title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHAN (material)</td>
<td>api (fire) mentah (raw, uncooked)</td>
<td>fuel raw materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REKA (invention)</td>
<td>cipta (creation) bentuk (form)</td>
<td>composition (literary) design; graphic art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Semantic Extension through Insufficient Differentiation of English Near-synonyms.**

The impact of the English language on Malay vocabulary is so rapid and intense that it is not possible always to think out consistently applicable native equivalents for English lexical items. As a result, any near-synonyms in English automatically become synonymous in Malay and are designated by one and the same Malay lexical item. The result is proliferation of meaning in the Malay word used to cover the different senses of the English near-synonyms. Some examples
of the way a single Malay word is utilised to refer to a number of different 'signifieds' or senses in English are:

- **Penyata** report, statement, return (such as income tax return).
- **Kelebihan** extra, excess, superfluity, majority.
- **Tipu** deception, fraud, counterfeit, cheating.
- **Tambah** increase, addition, supplement, extra.
- **Tara** level, standard, variance.
- **Bidang** sphere, field (of knowledge), profession.

In general, the kind of semantic extension which can be observed in the examples given above (which show an intimate fusion of functions within a single lexical item), indicates the cultural impact of a sophisticated and highly differentiated society on a developing society. The flow of information is so intense that language planners do not have the time to search for equivalents for each and every one of the English lexical items in which the information is encoded. The extension of the meaning of particular Malay words so that they cover a wide range of similarly functioning English words is a practical way of overcoming, to some extent, the problem of translatable between the two languages. Furthermore, this enables the language to resist importing even more English loanwords.

6. **Semantic Extension through Specialisation of Meaning**

Semantic specialisation in native Malay words usually occurs when the use of a single Malay word in place of a number of English words is likely to lead to ambiguity. In such instances, a search has to be made for approximate native equivalents (some of them 'naturalised' foreign elements of long standing, notably Arabic and Sanskrit) which are then used consistently in place of the English terms so that they eventually assume a specialised meaning. Many examples of nouns which have become semantically specialised abound in the political and legal vocabulary of modern Malay.
Semantic Specialisation in Malay Nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Term</th>
<th>Malay Specialised Substitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Perentah (ordinary meaning: command, order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft (legal documents)</td>
<td>Rang (ordinary meaning: draft of letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article of Constitution</td>
<td>Perkara (ordinary meaning: matter, affair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>Fasal (ordinary meaning: reason, cause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights (of property)</td>
<td>Hak (ordinary meaning: truth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Anggaran (ordinary meaning: calculation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Dasar (ordinary meaning: materials of construction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistency in the use of the above examples within the specific contexts in which they operate makes them specialised in a manner that is different from their ordinary senses. However, the process of semantic specialisation is often haphazard and inhibited by the lack of Malay lexicological resources in some domains such as would enable the semantic gradations between say, a judgement, a decree, a sentence, a penalty to be realised in Malay; all four are hukum in Malay.

Semantic specialisation can also occur by assigning specific meanings to native Malay words which overlap in meaning. The lexical pressure on Bahasa Malaysia has been such that Malay synonyms or near synonyms, where they are found, are made to specialise automatically and the minor semantic distinctions between them brought home to the Malay-speaker. For instance, to obtain the Malay equivalents for the chemistry and physics terms absorb and adsorb, two synonymous Malay verbs serap and jerap were made to specialise, so that the former refers to absorb and the latter to adsorb. In the same way, the Malay synonyms tenaga, kuasa and daya have been assigned specific meanings in order to give the equivalents of energy, power and force in English scientific terminology.
7. **Generalisation of Meaning**

Generalisation is the converse process to specialisation in semantic change.\(^1\) Words which were previously 'area-specific', that is, restricted to a particular context acquired a more general meaning and thus new collocations. This type of semantic extension is particularly common among verbs. Many of these extensions involve words traditionally used in a religious context. Some examples are given below:

- **Rujuk** used to mean only 'to take back a divorced wife after the first or second "talak" (pronouncement of divorce)'. It is now extended to mean **to refer** (to any matter, issue, person or authority).

- **Kaji** used to be confined to 'to study the Koran'; it is now used in the general sense of 'to study (a subject, problem, matter, etc)'\(^2\).

- **Tafsir** used to mean only 'to interpret, comment on the Koran'; it is now used generally to mean 'to interpret, explain (a matter, text, etc.)'\(^3\).

Generalisation involving words used previously only in a religious context also occurs among adjectives. Some examples are:

- **Wajib** 'obligatory (by religion)' which is now used in a general sense.

- **Haram** 'unlawful, forbidden by religious law' is now used in the general sense of 'illegal'.

Through being semantically extended in the ways described above, Malay words particularly verbs and adjectives, have also extended their collocational range. For instance, the verb **terbit** 'to rise' was used mainly to collocate with **matahari** 'sun', as in the phrase **matahari terbit di waktu pagi** 'the sun rises in the morning'. In its extended sense of 'to publish', **terbit** now collocates with books, magazines, newspapers and other kinds of printed material.

The verbs have also acquired additional collocations because of the large numbers of English loanwords in the language. These

---

2. It also occurs as a nominal extension, **kajian** 'a study'.
3. This also occurs as a nominal extension, **tafsiran** 'interpretation, explanation'.
loanwords nearly always occur with Malay verbs which correspond in literal meaning to the verbs with which they occur in English. For instance, the loanwords foto 'photograph', bas 'bus', initiatif 'initiative', oder 'order' occur as a rule with ambil, the literal translation of the English verb 'to take.' In this way, ambil and other Malay verbs have extended their collocational range considerably.

All these types of loanshift extensions, nominal, verbal and adjectival extensions, lead ultimately to polysemy in Malay words. For in almost all the cases, the indigenous word retains its original meanings(s) in addition to the new. (The effects of polysemy are discussed in more detail in Section 6.1.3: Effects of Loanshifts on Bahasa Malaysia Structure).

It may be noted here that the semantic extension of Malay words, and the semantic adjustment which this process imposes on the lexico-semantic structure of Malay, is contact-induced by the English language. Wherever direct importation is resisted and native substitution by semantic extension takes place, some form of semantic and collocational adjustment is bound to follow. Although this process does not result in the appearance of new morphemes in the language—as is the case with importation—it is still linguistic change which is externally induced. This contrasts with the kind of linguistic change which is internal to the language and which is more gradual and systematic.

Finally, we may note further that the expansion of the semantic boundary of the words that has been examined has a sociological dimension as well. This is because the process is related to the various social, economic, legal and political changes that have taken place in Malay society. Hence, the semantically extended terms suggest a correlation between linguistic change and socio-economic-political change. As new ideas, institutions and techniques become implanted in the traditional conceptual system of the Malays, familiar words with referents which bear (or suggest) some semantic similarity with the new phenomena are made to expand their role. Semantic extensions such as ladang 'plantation', harga 'quotation',

1. However, if a Malay equivalent is used in place of an English loan-word to denote a novelty introduced, the verb associated with it often reflects the way the novelty is perceived in the Malay mind. For example, when gambar 'picture' is used in place of foto, the verb associated with it is tangkap 'to catch'. Thus, the phrase 'to take a photograph' would be rendered as 'to catch a picture'.
'commission', anggaran 'budget', pindaan 'amendment', tanggungan 'liability' are clearly associated with specific institutional practices in the fields of business, government and legal procedure in Western societies. The introduction of these institutions and procedures (implying ideas and concepts as well) into Malay society have made it necessary to widen the range of meaning of words which traditionally were associated with sense(s) which were clearly circumscribed by the condition and state of evolution of the society. In this process of semantic adjustment, it is natural that Malay should have used English as its model for it is through the medium of the English language that these new institutions and procedures are introduced into Malay society.

6.1.3 Effects of Loanshifts on Bahasa Malaysia Structure

The effects are divided into those which affect Bahasa Malaysia grammatical structure and style, and those which affect its lexico-semantic structure.

6.1.3.1 Effects on Grammar and Style

1. Increase in Abstract Nouns

The growth of abstract nouns is one of the most striking features in the development of modern Malay. These abstract nouns have come into the language through the loan translation of similar nouns in English.

In English abstract nouns are formed with suffixes such as: -ty; -ation; -age; -ment; -ship; etc.

Malay has the noun-forming prefix and suffix, viz., ke-an, pe-an. These are attached to Malay stems to derive abstract nouns on the model of English nouns. For instance: ke-bangsa-an (bangsa 'people, race, nation') for 'nationality'; pen-didik-an (didik 'to nurture, to foster') for 'education'.

Even more striking is the increase in negative abstract nouns. This type of noun was unknown before contact with English. The process
of formation involves (i) the substitution of the negative particle tidak (or tak) 'no, not' for the English negative prefix (dis-, im-, in-, or un-), and (ii) the substitution of the noun-forming prefix and suffix ke-an for the English suffix (e.g. -ty, -ment, -ation, etc.). For instance,

adil (just) → tidak adil (not just, i.e. unjust) → ke-tidakadil-an (injustice);
mungkin (possible) → tidak mungkin (not possible, i.e. impossible) → ke-tidakmungkin-an (impossibility).

2. Extended Use of Malay Prepositions

A number of Malay prepositions have become extended in use through being used to substitute for various English prepositions in syntactic calques. Some examples are: dalam, dengan, dari, (di)samping, kearah, which are used to translate the English in, with, from, besides, towards, respectively.

These English prepositions were used primarily to express purely spatial relationships and this is still their main use in the language. In the course of time, however, these prepositions came to be used in a non-spatial and/or figurative sense. Thus, we say, 'in the house', and also 'in this connection'. This extension of use of prepositions has also occurred in Malay.

Indeed, this change in the use of prepositions was noted by Marsden as far back as 1811. He said, "such is the manner of employing prepositions in their plain significations directed to material or sensible objects; but in the progress of language they seem to have been transferred from thence and applied by analogy to verbs and other subjects of the understanding, to which an ideal locality is thereby attributed".

He gives these examples:

"Berhenti daripada berperang." (To cease from fighting)
"Antara ada dan tiada." (Between existing and not). ¹

This extension in the use of prepositions has continued and increased mainly as a result of their being used as substitutes for English prepositions in syntactic calques such as: dalam hubungan ini (in this connection), dengan maksud (with the intention of), terdiri dari (consisting of), etc.

3. Extended Use of the Me- Forms

Me- is a verbal prefix which denotes the subject as the initiator of the action, e.g. membaca 'to read', menyanyi 'to sing', etc.

In recent years, the me- forms have acquired a prepositional usage through direct translation of fixed expressions in English, that is, to derive syntactic calques.

The use of verbal forms in a prepositional sense is common in English. For example, regarding as in the phrase "regarding the matter above...". This has been translated into Malay as mengenai (me- form of kena 'to contact, to touch, to experience') in such phrases as "mengenai perkara tersebut..."

The main me- forms used in a prepositional sense besides mengenai are:

- melalui (lalu 'to pass') through, via, by means of
- menurut (turut 'to follow') according to
- meningat (ingat 'to remember') considering, bearing in mind
- menyambung (sambung 'to connect') referring to
- menimbang (timbang 'to weigh') considering
- merujuk (rujuk 'to revert') referring to, in reference to

4. Increased Use of Substantival Constructions

The increasing use of the substantival or nominal construction is, like the increasing use of abstract nouns, part of the general trend towards abstraction in Bahasa Malaysia.

It is likely that the use of syntactic calques translated from prepositional phrases in English has helped to increase the use of the substantival construction.
For phrases such as: berhubungan dengan... (in connection with), berkenaan dengan... (with regard to), bergantung pada... (depending on), sebagai akibat dari... (as a result of), are followed by a substantive or its equivalent.

For instance, in the sentence “Sebagai akibat dari masalah kekurangan gula...” (As a result of the problem of a shortage of sugar...), the phrase sebagai akibat dari leads on to the use of the substantive construction "masalah kekurangan gula" (the problem of a shortage of sugar).

Thus the mere fact of the inclusion of syntactic calques such as this in a Malay sentence will determine the structure of the remainder of the sentence.

5. Increased Use of Subordinate Clauses leading to Complex Sentences

The use of subordinate clauses as pointed out by Asmah (1977)\(^1\), was not common in classical Malay. It is largely through the influence of English that the use of subordinate clauses as well as the conjunctions that are used in their formation have increased so much in recent years.

It is the syntactic calques that in particular have encouraged the increased use of subordinate clauses, especially of the object clause introduced by 'bahawa'.\(^2\)

For instance: Ada kemungkinan bahawa... (There is a possibility that), Tidaklah dapat dinafikan bahawa... (It cannot be denied that), Dengan pengertian bahawa... (with the understanding that), Dengan akibat bahawa... (with the result that), etc.

The object clause constructed with 'bahawa' is a frequently occurring subordinate clause and often leads to long complex sentences such as the one below.

---

2. 'Bahawa' is a Sanskrit word and was used in classical Malay in the term 'bahwasanya' which translates broadly into: 'the facts are thus', 'the truth is this', 'verily'. In modern Malay, however, 'bahawa' is used almost entirely as a conjunction in the sense of English 'that'.
"Tidak dapat dinafikan lagi bahawa tindakan EEC umumnya membahayakan ekonomi Malaysia, juga kerana adanya diskriminasi terhadap hasil bumi Malaysia yang dieksport ke negara-negara EEC." (Utusan Malaysia 27.2.77) (It can no longer be denied that the action of the EEC will endanger the Malaysian economy because there is discrimination towards Malaysian produce which is exported to the EEC countries).

Here we have an un-Malay, English style sentence opening followed by three subordinate clauses.1

6. Increased Use of Figurative Language

Malay is basically not a language which makes a wide and varied use of figurative language.

Marsden, writing in 1812 said, "It may be said that the Malayan style is never metaphorical; the imagery employed in poetic comparison being kept distinct from the subject, in the manner of simile, and not figuratively interwoven with the texture of the sentence".2

A metaphor is defined as "a comparison in one word of two things from different fields of experience".3 A metaphor is said to have three factors in its make-up. They are the "tenor" (that is, what we are talking about); the "vehicle" (That is, the thing to which we compare it); and the "ground" (that is, the characteristics they have in common).4 There are other figurative uses of language, for instance, simile, but metaphor is the most common.

The native Malay metaphors and similes are simple and the "vehicles" and comparisons used are mostly natural phenomena such as fire, water, sun, moon, and the flora and fauna of the country. This simple use of figurative language is found in the kiasan (metaphorical allusions, e.g.: Seperti aur dengan tebing "Like the bamboo and the river bank"5), pepatah (maxims, e.g.: Ada gula, ada semut 'Where there is sugar there are ants'), and perumpamaan (proverbs, e.g.: Tepuk ayer di dulang, terpecik muka sendiri "Strike water

1. Gullick J.M., 1953, "Style & Translation in the Malay Press" in JMBRAS, 26 (1) noted one sentence which was made up of 8 clauses containing a total of 87 words.
5. Suggesting a mutually beneficial relationship: the bamboo keeps the bank intact and the bank in turn nourishes the bamboo.
in a tray and it will splash onto your face').

The influence of English on the figurative use of language in Bahasa Malaysia has been to extend and widen the use of figurative language by supplying new comparisons for similes and new "vehicles" for metaphors.

This influence is shown in the following ways:

1. By the use of English loanwords in figurative language.
   For example: "Pemuda UMNO tidak boleh menjadi keretapi yang hanya mempunyai gerabak, tetapi tidak ada lokomotif". (Utusan Malaysia 30.6.80) (UMNO Youth cannot be like a train with only coaches but no locomotive, that is, UMNO Youth cannot merely have members but not a leader).

2. By the use of loan translations and semantic extensions in figurative language.
   (a) Some examples of metaphorical loan translations are:
      mendapat lampu hijau (to obtain the green light)
      memberi gambaran yang salah (to give the wrong picture)
      berpindah tangan (to change hands)
      pembuka jalan ('trail-blazer')

   (b) Some examples of words which have undergone metaphorical extension are:
      saluran (channels, as used in phrases like 'through diplomatic channels' which in Malay is, 'Melalui saluran diplomatik')
      sumber (sources, as used in phrases such as 'political sources, military sources, etc., which in Malay are 'sumber politik', 'sumber tentera')
      cermin (mirror, and is frequently used in both noun 'pencehminan' and verbal 'pencehminkan' forms to translate 'reflection, to reflect', in their metaphorical senses.

The increase in the use of figurative language is particularly noticeable in the newspapers on the subjects of politics, sports, the

---

1. Suggesting that family quarrels should not be made public for not only will it bring shame to the individuals concerned but to the whole family.
2. The youth branch of the political party, the United Malay National Organisation (UMNO).
arts and social life. In fact, Marsden’s observation that "the Malayan style is never metaphorical" can no longer be applied to modern Malay. As the example in (1) above shows, the imagery employed in the comparison far from being kept distinct from the subject, is figuratively interwoven with the texture of the sentence. This change has come about through the influence of English style on Malay writers, particularly journalists, and through the enriching of the vocabulary with lexical items borrowed from English which serve as additional 'vehicles' of metaphor. This influence has also had adverse effects on the language. It has given rise at times to a lack of clarity and directness of expression due to the unskilful and indiscriminate use of unfamiliar figurative elements, especially the 'vehicles' of metaphor. The obscurity which may result as well as the often humorous images that are conjured up may be seen in the following example:

"Bila membuat sesuatu komposisi ia harus meletakkan stetoskop pada pembuatnya supaya dapat mendengarkan suara-suara batin yang misti sebagai saranan pembimbing ke arah originaliti". (Berita Minggu, 3.6.79, p.1).

Literally this reads: When he (the choreographer) has produced a composition, he must place a stethoscope to his production so that he can hear the inner (or spiritual) voices which are necessary as guiding suggestions towards originality.

Furthermore, English idiomatic expressions are often translated literally and used without any regard for their suitability in the context of Malaysian society. For instance, the following expression angkat topi kepada, translated from English 'to take one's hat off to', was used though it would have made little sense to the monolingual Malay unfamiliar with the social significance of this particular gesture in Western society.

6.1.3.2 Effects on Lexico-Semantic Structure

Loanshifts, in particular, "enriching" loan translations (in which the meaning of one or more of the components is extended) and all the types of semantic extensions (nominal, verbal, adjectival) which have been discussed lead ultimately to polysemy. This is because in
almost all the cases, the Malay word retains its original meaning(s) in addition to the new.

The ways in which polysemy has come about in Malay under the influence of English may be summarised in three general categories. They are:

1. By shifts in application
This would include most of the ways we have described by which words are semantically extended. Thus, luas 'wide' is applied to pengalaman 'experience' to give pengalaman luas 'wide experience'. It used only to have a spatial sense.

2. By the figurative use of a word
Thus, gelap 'dark' is used metaphorically to mean 'illegal', as in pasar gelap 'black market'.

3. By a word being used in a number of specialised senses.
Semantic specialisation is a frequent cause of restriction of meaning by reducing the range of a word as a whole (e.g. deer once meant a 'beast'\(^1\)). But it can often give rise to polysemy as well when the same word is given a number of specialised senses only one of which will be applicable in a given sphere. For instance, through English influence, kertas 'paper' can refer not only to the material in general, but to a variety of other things: legal or official documents (e.g. kertas putih 'White Paper'), a set of examination questions (e.g. Kertas Bahasa Inggeris 'The English Language Paper'), a communication read or sent to a learned society (e.g. Kertas Kerja 'Working Paper').

Admittedly, it is sometimes difficult to say which one of the above has been at work in giving rise to polysemy. In particular, (1) and (2) are difficult to separate and, in fact, often occur together. But all cases of polysemy have in common the fact that a Malay word has undergone a functional "shift" based on usage in an English item.

---

Polysemy has often been denounced as a defect of language and as a major obstacle to communication and clear thinking. Aristotle, for instance, was highly critical of polysemy. "Words of ambiguous meaning", he claimed, "are chiefly useful to enable the sophist to mislead his hearers". 1

But others, like Ullmann, think otherwise. "Far from being a defect of language", Ullmann points out, "polysemy is an essential condition of its efficiency. If it were not possible to attach several senses to one word, this would mean a crushing burden on our memory: we would have to possess separate terms for every conceivable subject we might wish to talk about". He stresses: "Polysemy is an invaluable factor of economy and flexibility in language". 2

In assessing English motivated polysemy in Bahasa Malaysia, one would agree with Ullmann that the polysemy has not had a detrimental effect on the language. Semantic extension is indeed an economical method of encoding the innumerable concepts that have been introduced into Bahasa Malaysia via the English language. The alternatives would be to create new words altogether or import the English words which denote the concepts; these would increase the number of new morphemes in the language which have to be learned by the Malay-speaker. In fact, it would not be inaccurate to say that semantic extension, and the polysemy it gives rise to, can often make the concept expressed in the new meaning more accessible to the native-speaker. This is because the innovation is designated by being identified with a previously known referent having more or less the same appearance and/or function. For instance, the semantic extension of talayer which originally meant only a 'runnel' to 'irrigation canal', gives the speaker an idea of the function and appearance of the innovation.

Though a large number of Malay words have acquired additional senses as a result of the contact with English, this has not led to the ambiguity and confusion that has often been claimed. This is because the context makes clear which of the senses of the polysemic word

2. Ullmann, ibid, p. 168.
is to apply in a given situation. For instance, *tanur* has both the meaning of 'oven' and 'kiln' - the latter meaning, a semantic extension to match the technical term 'kiln' in English. However, the contexts in which the two senses are used - one domestic, the other technical - are so different that there is little likelihood of their being confused in actual usage. Furthermore, in its borrowed meaning, the extended word tends to collocate with certain words only and this reduces further the possibility of ambiguity and confusion further. For example, the verb *edar* (originally, 'to revolve') in its new sense of 'to circulate' borrowed from English, collocates with newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, and other types of printed material only.

Ullmann has pointed out that "Modern languages carry a much heavier semantic load than ancient ones". In English it is usual to find large numbers of words which have an ordinary meaning and also a scientific or technical meaning, for example, energy, force, etc. Thus it is an inevitable result of the modernisation of the Malay language that polysemy should increase as the language attempts to carry this greater semantic load demanded of it by its modernisation. In this English has played a major role because English lexical items serve as the model upon which Malay words extend their meaning.

5.2 Apt Equivalent Substitutes

As mentioned in the introduction to the chapter, apt equivalent substitutes are not borrowings as defined, for they are not modelled on lexical items from English. However, they are considered as part of the substitution process because they are substituted for English words which otherwise would have been directly imported into the language. As such, equivalent substitutes are part of the response of Malay to the lexical impact of English.

The simplest form in which one language influences another is, indeed, through direct importation of loanwords. But there are other forms of influence which are more subtle. One of the more subtle forms of English influence on Bahasa Malaysia has already been described, that is, loanshifts which are in fact borrowings in the guise of native words, or as Prof. Orr calls them, "invisible exports". But one language may influence another merely by acting as a stimulus to the other so that it (a) exploits more fully and systematically existing lexical resources both within itself, and in other languages, and (b) creates new lexical forms to match designations in the influencing language. The first of these possibilities (a), is considered under apt equivalent substitutes which are examined in this part of the chapter; the second, (b), is examined in the following chapter.

Apt equivalent substitutes are either direct or indirect. A direct apt equivalent substitute is an indigenous word or expression used as it is (that is, with no semantic extension or new arrangement of component morphemes) to substitute for an English word. An indirect apt equivalent substitute is a loanword, usually 'naturalised', from another language, notably Arabic and to a lesser extent, Sanskrit, used in place of the English word.

Apt equivalent substitutes account for 5% (364 items) of the total number of items considered in this study.

6.2.1 Direct Equivalent Substitutes

The process of equivalent substitution presupposes a high degree of intention, an act of deliberate matching and, therefore, a strongly developed feeling for the languages involved on the part of the bilingual who initiates this process. Malay words are consciously compared with their English counterparts and, if perceived by the bilingual to be similar in meaning, are substituted for the English ones.

It must be stressed, however, that the application of the equivalent substitution method is but an attempt to relate the concept embodied in the English term to something similar already existing in Malay culture. It is seldom the case that there is perfect congruity between the concept borne by the English term and the Malay 'equivalent'. This method is most successfully applied when the referents relate to the cultural and physical environment of Malay society. Some examples of Malay words which have been elevated to the status of technical terms in an attempt to provide translation-equivalents for English terms are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English term</th>
<th>Malay equivalent substitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metal</td>
<td>logam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat</td>
<td>haba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furnace</td>
<td>relau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alum</td>
<td>tawas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valley</td>
<td>lembah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fen</td>
<td>tanah paya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sediment</td>
<td>mendak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promontory</td>
<td>tanjung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bay</td>
<td>teluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estuary</td>
<td>kuala</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometimes, economy of expression is achieved by the method of equivalent substitution when a phrase or compound word in English is substituted for by a simple word in Malay. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English term</th>
<th>Malay equivalent substitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>salt lick</td>
<td>jenut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mountain range</td>
<td>pergunungan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padi bug</td>
<td>pianggang; cenangau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mouse deer</td>
<td>pelanduk; kancil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collard scope owl</td>
<td>jampuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-land</td>
<td>panah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overflow</td>
<td>limpah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blow-fly</td>
<td>langau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is often the case as well that there is more than one Malay equivalent for an English term. This is because certain phenomena are differentiated to a higher degree in Malay than they are in English through differences in the socio-ecological-cultural environments. For instance, the central importance of rice cultivation to Malay society is reflected in the high degree of differentiation for rice. There are different terms for rice depending on the type of terrain it is cultivated in (e.g. *huma*, *pulut*), whether husked (*beras*) or unhusked (*padi*), and the way it is cooked (*nasi*, *bubur*).¹ In English, these would all be lumped together under the term 'rice'. Here the problem of equivalent substitution is, paradoxically, to find a Malay term that is equivalently under-differentiated as the English term.

The use of direct equivalent substitution is most prevalent in terminology formation. However, very noticeable, too, is the use of certain Malay idiomatic expressions in place of English words and expressions, which in their choice and application indicate a high degree of linguistic awareness and sensitivity on the part of the bilingual translator. By consciously comparing the meanings of both the English and Malay expressions the bilingual unconsciously keeps at bay potential English importations which could, also, otherwise, be literally translated or paraphrased. Some examples of Malay equivalent expressions used in place of English words and expressions are given on the following page.

---
¹ This phenomenon, of course, occurs as well in other contact situations. For instance, Benjamin Whorf reported that the Eskimos have a number of different terms for the single English word 'snow'.

**Malay Idiomatic Equivalent Substitutes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English word/expression</th>
<th>Malay equivalent substitute</th>
<th>Literal meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anarchy</td>
<td>kucar-kacir</td>
<td>in disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to interfere</td>
<td>campur-tangan</td>
<td>to add a hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluctuation</td>
<td>turun-naik</td>
<td>up and down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediator</td>
<td>orang tengah</td>
<td>middle man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unanimously</td>
<td>sa-bulat suara</td>
<td>as with one voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in detail</td>
<td>panjang lebar</td>
<td>long and wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rumour</td>
<td>khabar angin</td>
<td>wind news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to take the law into one's own hand</td>
<td>bermaharajarela</td>
<td>to act like Maharaja Rela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to live from hand to mouth</td>
<td>kias pagi, makan pagi</td>
<td>(like a hen), scratch in the morning, eat in the morning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equivalent substitution may also involve the exploitation of the resources of traditional Malay proverbial lore from which apt equivalent substitutes are found to substitute for English proverbs and sayings. By an 'apt equivalent Malay proverb' is meant one whose reference, social, physical, etc., may differ from that of the English one, but whose intended (hidden) meaning and functional utility are felt to be the same. Below are some examples of Malay sayings which have been used as equivalents for the corresponding English ones, found in the material examined for this study. The English translation of the proverbs is given in brackets.

1. English proverb: Half a loaf is better than none.  
   Malay equivalent: Tiada rotan akar pun berguna.  
   (If you cannot get rattan even a root will be useful)

2. English proverb: Birds of a feather flock together.  
   Malay equivalent: Enggang sama enggang. Pipit sama pipit.  
   (The hornbill pairs with the hornbill. The sparrow pairs with the sparrow).

3. English proverb: Blood is thicker than water.  
   Malay equivalent: Air dicincang takkan putus.  
   (Water slashed separates only momentarily).

---

1. Maharaja Rela was a chief in the state of Perak who, for political reasons, murdered the British Resident, James Birch, in 1875.
The alternative to such equivalent substitutes is the literal translation of the English proverb or saying into Malay. This does happen sometimes. A particularly popular English saying which has been literally translated into Malay is "Stand on your own feet". The Malay translation of this is "Berdiri di atas kaki sendiri".\footnote{1} It is possible that with greater textual contact with English via materials requiring urgent translation into Malay, there will be an increasing tendency towards translating English proverbs and idiomatic expressions. If and when this happens, Malay monolinguals will be at an increasing disadvantage as to the full effect and meaning of such proverbs and sayings, except, of course, where the sense of the translated English proverb co-relates exactly with Malay experience. To understand proverbs implies a knowledge of the socio-historical framework of values and institutions of a society, as proverbs and traditional sayings originate from the socio-cultural setting associated with them. There is therefore, much to be said indeed in favour of providing Malay equivalents of these proverbs and sayings which make use of objects and phenomena familiar to the Malays to convey their meaning, instead of literally translating the English ones. However, with proverbs as with other types of equivalent substitutes, certain specific factors, sociolinguistic in nature (e.g. the prestige of English) often favoured the adoption of an English term where a native one would have sufficed. In fact, at times, the use of a Malay equivalent in place of a popular English loanword can sound pedantic and even 'unnatural'. For example, 

dermaga instead of the more usual 

\textit{wap} 'wharf' or 

\textit{jeti}'jetty'.

Sometimes, direct equivalent substitution is achieved via a conscious process of what may be described as 'lexical rejuvenation'.\footnote{2} By this process, traditional words which are no longer current in modern Malay idiom, or are on the verge of disappearance, are consciously re-activated and put to work. The word 

\textit{setinggan} was recently revived by the newspaper 

\textit{Berita Harian} to refer to squatter. Another archaic word 

\textit{mergastua} was also brought back into use and is now quickly replacing the loan translation from English 

\textit{hidup liar} 'wild-life'.

\footnote{1} This has also been made into a blend or portmanteau word 

\textit{berdikari} 'self-reliance'.

In terminology formation when direct equivalent substitutes for English terms cannot be found in the standard language itself, they are sometimes looked for in the dialects of Malay. The dialects of Malay include not only those spoken in Malaysia, but also the variety of Malay spoken in Indonesia, that is, Bahasa Indonesia. The number of direct equivalent substitutes for English words, taken from the Malay dialects spoken in Malaysia is very small indeed as the majority of the scientific, technical and academic concepts expressed by the English words are as alien to the dialects as to the standard language. One of the few examples of a dialectal word used as an equivalent for an English term is sut from the Kedah dialect. Sut means 'reaching the margin or border' and has been taken by economists as equivalent to 'marginal' as used in such collocations as kos sut 'marginal cost'.

Dialectal borrowing is more common between Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia. But since Bahasa Indonesia itself is borrowing extensively from English, especially in the scientific and technical fields, the words these two dialects borrow from each other are more often than not English words, Malaysised or Indonesianised as the case may be. Most of the 'true' borrowings from Bahasa Indonesia in Bahasa Malaysia are lexical inventions (blends/portmanteau words, hybrid creations, etc) mostly from the political field, for example, the group of hybrid creations based on Sanskrit swa 'self'; swatantra 'autonomy' which alternates in use with the adapted English word autonomi; swapraja 'autonomous state'; swasambada 'self sufficiency'; swadesi 'independence movement'.

The number of direct equivalent substitutes collected in this study is quite small, only 125. They are also a smaller category than indirect equivalent substitutes for they account for only 34.3% of the total number of equivalent substitutes.

2. There have been many cases of English words borrowed in Bahasa Malaysia which have been subsequently modified in the Indonesian manner, e.g. by replacing -syen (-tion) with -si.
6.2.2 **Indirect Equivalent Substitutes**

Indirect equivalent substitution has also been used as an alternative to borrowing from English. Here the English item is substituted for not by a Malay word but by a lexical item from a related language (e.g. Javanese, Iban) or a non-related language (usually Arabic, Sanskrit and to a lesser extent, Dutch).

Faced with the choice of importing words directly from English or forcibly exploiting the resources of his own language (that is, through loanshifting), the Malay writer may turn to another language as a compromise. It may be a related language like the Iban language of Sarawak. For example, sabak 'dirge' which was borrowed by Malaysian anthropologists (the concept 'dirge' conveyed by sabak had no equivalent in the Malay language prior to this borrowing probably because the Malays, being Muslims, are forbidden by their religion to indulge in such a practice).

But the bulk of indirect equivalent substitutes are taken from non-related languages, in particular Arabic though Sanskrit is also a popular source. In discussing indirect Arabic and Sanskrit substitutes for English words in Malay, a distinction should be made between those which have been used consciously and those which have been used unconsciously. In the latter case, the user is usually unaware of the origin of the word being Arabic or Sanskrit. The word has become 'naturalised' in Malay and used by generations of Malay speakers such that in some instances even the etymologist or comparative linguist, let alone the Malay speaker, cannot identify its Arabic or Sanskrit origins without difficulty. Where this happens - and there are hundreds of such fully integrated Arabic and Sanskrit words in Malay, it is to be assumed that the user is simply employing a Malay word 'sui generis'.

But it is the conscious process of word substitution via Arabic or Sanskrit with which we are most concerned with here. In this process the user is deliberately and consciously employing an Arabic or Sanskrit equivalent for the English word. This can sometimes take the form of deliberately reviving archaic forms in these languages. Examples of archaic forms which have been resurrected to play a role
in the realm of conceptualisation and terminology are the Sanskrit sapta 'seven' as in the term saptapada 'heptameter', and panca 'multiple, varied' as in pancalogam 'alloy'.

It is undeniably Arabic that is the most popular source of borrowings after English. This is partly because of its earlier influence on Malay, and partly because of its symbolic influence as the language of Muslim law and religion. In practice, however, Arabic in Malaysia is limited in its written usage and practically non-existent as a spoken language. Except for the teachers of religious (Islamic) subjects, the imams and a very small proportion of students attending Arabic medium schools, the majority of Malays only learn the relevant and necessary recitals for worship. Word substitution via Arabic occurs most often when English terms are translated by script writers (radio, television), news editors and journalists. These translators usually have some knowledge of Arabic words but are, in the main, conscious and studious dictionary users. By their attitude and style, they appear to fall into two groups. First, there are those who merely use those Arabic words which are equivalent to English terms because they are already commonly used in Malay. Examples of these 'established' Arabic equivalents used in place of English ones are given in the first set of examples on the following page. The second group consists of those who wish to emphasize the grip of Islamic culture and language upon Malay societal consciousness; deliberate 'Arabicisms' therefore become an end in itself. Some such deliberate 'Arabicisms' are provided in the second set of examples given on the following page.

In the first set of examples which follows, the Arabic equivalents already exist in Malay.

1. These students may subsequently be trained as teachers of religious subjects or teachers in the Arabic medium schools at the Islamic Faculty (formerly Muslim College) of the National University of Malaysia.
Arabic Substitutes for English Words in Malay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>Arabic Substitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>magazine</td>
<td>majallah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>council</td>
<td>majlis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative</td>
<td>wakil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>register</td>
<td>daftar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedule</td>
<td>jadual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forecast (weather)</td>
<td>ramalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>court</td>
<td>makhah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copy (of book, magazine etc)</td>
<td>naskah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these words have in fact undergone semantic extension in Malay and acquire fresh meanings which are perhaps unknown in the Arab world. For instance, ramalan 'forecast' originally meant 'soothsaying, horoscopic calculations'. They may also be morphologically adapted, as in ramalan to which the Malay noun-forming suffix -an has been added.

In the second category, the deliberate "Arabicisms" could have been avoided by using Malay words, adapted English loanwords which already have some currency in the language, established Sanskrit loanwords or even fully integrated Arabic loanwords known to the majority of Malay-speakers. As to be expected, these 'Arabicisms' may be known only to the translators and serious scholars of the Arabic language. Some examples of these Arabicisms collected in this study are given below:

Arabicisms Used as Substitutes for English Words in Malay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>Substituting Arabicism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>republic</td>
<td>jumhuriyet (instead of 'republik')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority</td>
<td>wibawa (instead of 'kekuasann dan hak memberi perentah' or 'autoriti')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>masdar (instead of 'infinitif')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contest</td>
<td>musabaquah (instead of 'peraduan')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Used interchangeably with the adapted English loanword kot 'court'.
2. It is becoming increasingly less used because of competition from the adapted English loanword kopi 'copy'. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>Substituting Arabicism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peninsula</td>
<td>jazirah (instead of 'semenanjung')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorrowful</td>
<td>mashgul (instead of 'sedeh')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best</td>
<td>afdzal (instead of 'terbaik')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result</td>
<td>natijah (instead of the older Arabic loanword 'akibat')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address</td>
<td>karenah (instead of established Arabic loanword 'alamat')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of these 'Arabicisms', when and where used appropriately, convey the intended meaning to those familiar with the Arabic language - but to a great majority of people they have practically no communicative value whatever, apart from reminding them of the Arabic language. Yet they cannot be dismissed outright as mere innovations of pedants or extremists since their symbolic significance to Malays cannot be denied. It is unlikely, however, that Arabic will oust English as the primary source of lexical influence on the Malay language in the foreseeable future.¹ For the moment it is sufficient to stress that it is the contact with English which calls into play in Malay the learned vocabulary of the Arabic language which hitherto was known only to a small number of scholars of Arabic.

Indirect apt equivalent substitutes accounts for 3.2 (239 items) of the total number of items (7507) examined in this study. They are quite negligible, therefore, when compared to the volume of items that are borrowed from English. However, they account for two-thirds of all apt equivalent substitutes used in place of English words.

6.3 Summary of Chapter

In this chapter another aspect of English influence on the lexical development of Bahasa Malaysia has been considered, namely, in the combination of Malay morphemes in novel ways and in the extension of meaning and usage of Malay words.

---

¹. Though Arabic influence will probably continue to be dominant in the fields of religion, moral and social matters as it has always been.
In loan translations, English influence is responsible for bringing about new combinations of Malay morphemes on the model of English lexical items. It has been shown how this can be done with different degrees of approximation to the English model, giving rise to literal loan translations as against loan renditions. Loan translation, however, includes not only derivatives and compounds but also whole phrases, leading to syntactic calques.

In semantic extensions, English influence is seen in the use of Malay words in new and extended meanings. Nouns are the most affected by semantic extension and in them we can see the full range of ways by which the meaning of Malay words are extended. Particularly striking is the way Malay words have been given metaphorical meanings which are not usually the natural development of their previous usage in Malay; they acquire these new meanings because the English word which corresponds in literal meaning is also used in English in the extended sense now borrowed.

The examination of the effects of loanshifts on Bahasa Malaysia structure, suggests that though they are not as numerous as loanwords, they probably have as great, if not greater effect on the development of Bahasa Malaysia as the latter type of borrowing. It has been shown how loan translations have affected the grammatical structure and style of Bahasa Malaysia. Abstract nouns, and particularly negative abstract nouns, have increased because of the attempts to translate similar nouns from English. Prepositions in Bahasa Malaysia are now increasingly used in a nonspatial sense because of their use in abstract prepositional phrases and idiomatic expressions translated from English. The me-forms which were (and still are) primarily verbal forms before the contact with English, has now acquired a prepositional usage because of their use in translating fixed expressions in English. Sentence structure in Bahasa Malaysia has also been affected by the extensive use of syntactic calques which have led to the increase in the use of substantival

1. Loanwords account for 61%, and loanshifts 39% of borrowings from English.
constructions and subordinate clauses, the latter giving rise to long complex sentences.

Style in Bahasa Malaysia has also been further affected by English in the form of increased use of figurative language. Not only are English loanwords used as metaphors, but metaphorical loan translations and words with metaphorical meaning borrowed from English are used as well.

Loanshifts have also affected the lexico-semantic structure of Bahasa Malaysia. There has been an increase in the incidence of polysemy in Malay words as new meanings borrowed from English are used alongside the old ones. Though generally, this has not led to ambiguity and confusion as the contexts in which the old and new meanings of the extended word are used tend to be quite far apart.

Finally, we have also looked at another alternative to direct borrowing from English, that is, apt equivalent substitutes. In direct apt equivalent substitution, English has acted as a stimulus in encouraging Malay lexical resources to be exploited more fully and systematically. The desire to counteract English influence on one hand, and the desire to enhance further Islamic influence on Malay society on the part of some Malays is mainly responsible for indirect apt equivalent substitution. Here Arabic equivalents are substituted for English words which could otherwise be used. But the efforts to replace English words with Arabic equivalent substitutes are not quantitatively significant, though in the field of religion and social problems it is recognised that Arabic words are more predominant. In other fields, the majority of the 'Arabicisms' have not passed beyond the 'variant', stage, that is, they mainly only provide Malay speakers with alternate shapes for certain morphemes.

This chapter, therefore, has examined more subtle forms of English influence than the direct importation of loanwords discussed in Chapter 5. In the next chapter, an even more subtle form of English influence is examined, that is, in stimulating the creation of new lexical forms in Bahasa Malaysia.
CHAPTER 7

THE PROCESS OF NATIVE CREATION

7.0 Introduction

Chapters 5 and 6 have been concerned primarily with the examination of English influence as expressed in the form of borrowing. It was found that over 80% of the lexical items under consideration in this study are borrowings from English. This indicates quite clearly that borrowing is the most extensively used process for expanding the lexicon in Bahasa Malaysia.

However, this by no means indicates a failure to utilise processes of word-formation other than borrowing. This chapter hopes to show that there have been vigorous and concerted attempts to create terms through morphological processes which are inherent in the Malay language. These "native creations" are not strictly cases of borrowing as they did not come into being as direct imitations of an English model, but were secondarily created within Bahasa Malaysia itself. Even so, these native creations owe their existence primarily to the stimuli provided by English, that is, to the need to express concepts embodied in English terms. This, of course, reflects the desire to achieve intertranslatability with English which is a basic goal in the modernisation of Bahasa Malaysia.

Therefore, native creations cannot be excluded from a study of language contact. For their existence is ultimately due to contact with a second culture and its language. On the continuum of influence, loanwords occupy one extreme end of the scale and native creations the other; loanwords being the most obvious manifestation of the influence of one language on another, creations the 'hidden' aspect of that influence. Native creation in Bahasa Malaysia is therefore as much a

1. The term "native creation" is first used by Einar Haugen in The Norwegian Language in America, 1953, p. 403.
part of the response to the lexical impact of English, as are importation and substitution.

Before proceeding to examine the native creations, it may be pointed out that here, as in the case of borrowings, there is also a problem of identification. This is because it is not easy to set the inherent and foreign (via borrowing) means of word-formation strictly apart. Loan translations and semantic loans are borderline cases because the formal shapes of the new lexical items are indigenous while the pattern and meaning are of foreign origin. However, the guiding principle which has been followed in deciding whether a lexical item is a borrowing for a creation is the presence or absence of a model for the item in question in the foreign language.

Items identified as native creations account for 13% (982 items) of the total number of items (7507) considered in this study. Native Creations are either Hybrid Creations or Induced Creations.

7.1 Hybrid Creations

As its name implies, the hybrid creation is a lexical form in which is combined both native and imported elements. Hybrid creations involve a kind of "reverse substitution", in which loan morphemes are filled into native models. Such formations are sometimes confused with loanblends, since they resemble the latter in being composed of both borrowed and native material. But hybrid creations should be distinguished from loanblends since they did not come into being as imitations of foreign models and, therefore, are not part of the borrowing process.

According to Haugen, hybrid creations "give evidence of an intimate fusion into the language of the borrowed material, since it has become productive in the new language". Thus the loan morpheme in the hybrid creation tends to be an established loanword which has become an integral part of the vocabulary of the speaker of the recipient language. It is no longer regarded as foreign and so participates freely in the derivational processes of the language, combining with native affixes or words to give rise to new lexical forms in the language.

1. Ibid., p. 404
2. Ibid., p. 405
In Bahasa Malaysia, hybrid creations which make use of established English loanwords are found mainly in the daily language of the community. Some examples are given below:

- doktor gigi 'dentist' (from the loanword doktor 'doctor' + gigi 'teeth'). Also doktor belah (belah 'to split') 'surgeon'.
- kaki gelas 'place mat for glasses' from (kaki 'foot' + the loanword gelas 'glass').
- kalar lengan 'cuff' (from the loanword kalar 'collar' + lengan 'arm').
- kertas ditto 'stencil' (from kertas 'paper' + the loanword ditto).
- minyak gas 'kerosene' (from minyak 'oil' + the loanword gas).
- duit syiling 'coins' (from duit 'money' + the loanword syiling 'shilling').

In coining scientific and technical terms, English loanwords used in hybrid creations are not necessarily established loans. Any English word, established or not, can be used to combine with native Malay morphemes as long as it is semantically appropriate. Some examples are given below:

- hampagas 'vacuum' (from hampa 'empty' + the loanword gas).
- sel pulihan 'accumulator' (from the loanword sel 'cell' + pulihan 'restoration').
- kajifosil 'palaeontology' (from kaji 'study' + the loanword fosil 'fossil').
- kajitugasorgan 'physiology' (from kaji 'study' + tugas 'duty' + the loanword organ).

Haugen found in his American Norwegian material that "most hybrid creations are of the type in which loanword morphemes have been imported in the nucleus, while the marginal parts (the affixes) are native."¹ This is also the case with Bahasa Malaysia. But there is some evidence to support Bloomfield's contention that "when an affix occurs in enough foreign words it may be extended to new formations with native materials."² Loan affixes from English which have become productive in Bahasa Malaysia are -is (-ist), pro-, anti- and mini-.

1. Ibid.
3. -is is also the adapted form of the English adjectival suffixes -ical (e.g. antropologis 'anthropological') and -ic (e.g. dinamis 'dynamic').
These affixes are used freely with Malay words and, in some cases, with English words in combinations which are not based on models of items in English. Some examples of hybrid creations which make use of these affixes are given below:

- cerpenis 'short story writer' (from cerpen 'short story' + -is).
- pro-agama 'sympathetic to religion' (from pro- + agama 'religion').
- anti-sorok 'anti-hoarding' (from anti- + sorok 'to conceal').
- mini-komen 'opinion column in a newspaper' (from two loanwords mini- + komen 'commentary').
- mini-hero 'a hero of minor status in film, play, story' (from two loanwords mini- + hero).

A small number of hybrid creations have also been formed by attaching loan affixes from other foreign languages, usually Sanskrit, to English as well as Malay words. The following are some examples:

- dramawan 'dramatist'. This hybrid creation combines the English loanword drama with the Sanskrit suffix -wan.
- seniwati 'actress'. Here the Sanskrit suffix -wati (an allomorph of -wan, indicating femininity) is attached to a Malay word seni 'fine, delicate.
- angkasawan 'astronaut'. The constituents of this hybrid creation are both Sanskrit in origin. The word angkasa 'the heavens', a very old Sanskrit borrowing, is combined with the recently acquired suffix -wan.
- duniawi 'secular'. This hybrid creation also makes use of an old and a new borrowing from the same language, in this case, Arabic. The word dunia 'world', an established loanword, is used in conjunction with the recently borrowed adjectival suffix -wi.

Hybrid creations in Bahasa Malaysia are also found in the area of idiomatic expressions. Some examples are given below:

- kelas kambing 'low-class' (from kelas 'class + kambing 'goat').
- loyar buruk 'a boastful person' or 'a person who is fond of his own voice' (from loyar 'lawyer' + buruk 'ugly').
- poket kosong 'to be broke' (from poket 'pocket' + kosong 'empty').

It would seem that hybrid creation is a very limited process of word-formation in Bahasa Malaysia. They formed a very much smaller category than induced creations accounting for only 8% (79 items) of

---

1. Further examples are given in Chapter 5, p. 142 "Productive Loanwords".
the total number of native creations (982) considered in this study.

7.2 Induced Creation

Unlike hybrid creations, induced creations are formed entirely from native word material. Induced creations comprise over 90% (903 items) of the total number of native creations found in this study. Because of their size, they are examined under the various processes by which they are created, namely, affixation, compounding, blending, reduplication and circumlocution. This is not only a convenient way of classifying the induced creations, but also enables us to establish which of these processes are more productive than others.

7.2.1 Affixation

Terms created by affixation accounts for 36% (322 items) of induced creations. This makes affixation the second most productive method of word creation after compounding.

It is not surprising that affixation should have been so extensively used as a method of word-formation. The formation of new words or derivatives by affixation is a unique quality of the Malay language that has long been recognised. Indeed, Alisjahbana (1976)'s observation that the use of affixes is the "core" of Indonesian grammar applies equally to Bahasa Malaysia as to Bahasa Indonesia which are both varieties of Malay.

In Bahasa Malaysia, a large number of new words have been created by attaching a prefix, infix, suffix or a combination of prefix-suffix to a root word. The changes thus effected by affixation can be very varied indeed. A word may be changed from a noun to a verb, from an adjective to a noun, from an adjective to a verb, from a concrete noun

to an abstract noun, from a transitive to an intransitive form, from an active to passive form, and so on. Through affixation too, the meaning of the root word may be refined or even modified.

Below are examples of terms created by the different types of affixation.

7.2.1.1 Prefixation

The most common prefixes used to create new words are me-, ber-, pe-.

Examples: memusat 'centripetal'. The verbal (transitive) prefix me- is attached to a noun pusat 'centre'. There has been a noticeable increase in the use of this prefix in recent years indicating "the tendency towards an active or casual use of language".1 This, as pointed out by Alisjahbana, is part of "the process of individualisation and dynamisation" which has taken place in Malay culture under the influence of its contact with modern, western culture.2 berkadar 'proportional'. The prefix ber- is mainly used with intransitive verbs used. In this example, it has been used to derive a "verbal adjective" from a noun kadar 'rate' with the sense of 'having' or 'being endowed with'. This adjectival function of ber- has become prominent in recent years because of the need to provide equivalents for English adjectival suffixes such as -al. pembuluh 'vein'. The noun forming (agentive) prefix pe- (in its phonological variant pen-) is attached to buluh 'bamboo', modifying the meaning of the word in the process.

7.2.1.2 Suffixation

A large number of new words have been formed by the use of the nominal suffix -an which usually indicates the result of an act.

Examples: rintangan 'resistance (engineering)'. Here a noun has been formed from the verb rintang 'to bar'.

---

3. Alisjahbana has also noted that while the use of me- has increased, there has been a corresponding decrease in the use of di- "which carries a more passive connotation and tends to make an event less directly dependent on a person - performing - an-act" (Alisjahbana, 1964, p. 414).
lebihan 'surplus (economics)'. The noun here is derived from an adjective lebih 'more'.

The suffix -an, however, is used more often in conjunction with the prefixes pe- and ke- as described below.

7.2.1.3 Prefixation + Suffixation

The most common pairs of prefix-suffix which have been used to form new words are: pe-an, ke-an which give rise to abstract nouns indicating 'process' and 'state/condition' respectively; and me-kan which is usually used to form transitive verbs.

Examples: pencemaran 'pollution'. The prefix pe- (in its phonological variant pen-) and the suffix -an is attached to a noun cemar 'dirt'.

kelebapan 'humidity'. Here the pair of prefix-suffix ke-an is used to form a scientific concept from the adjective lembap 'moist, damp'.

menyelaraskan 'to co-ordinate'. Here a transitive verb has been derived by attaching me-kan to an adjective selaras 'concordant'.

7.2.1.4 Infixation

Infixation is one of the two obsolete morphological processes revived in recent years to create terms (the other is reduplication of the first syllable of a word discussed in Section 7.2.4). Infixation involved the insertion of an infix after the first phoneme of the root word. The infixes in Bahasa Malaysia are limited to -en-, -el-, -em-.

Infixation is the least productive of the different types of affixation.

Some specialised terms formed by infixation are:

tenusu 'diary' from tusu, the obsolete equivalent of susu 'milk' and the infix -en-.

tenusu 'diary' from tusu, the obsolete equivalent of susu 'milk' and the infix -en-.

gerigi 'serrated', from gigi 'tooth' and the infix -er-.

7.2.1.5 Affixation + Other Processes of Word-Formation

Affixation has also been used in conjunction with other processes of word-formation to create new words.
(1) **Affixation + Reduplication**

Affixes are attached to words which have been reduplicated. Some examples are:

- **kebarat-baratan** 'Western-like'. The prefix **ke-** and suffix **-an** are attached to the word **barat** 'West' which has been reduplicated.
- **tumbuh-tumbuhan** 'plants'. The suffix **-an** is attached to the reduplicated verb **tumbuh** 'to grow'.

Words formed from both affixation and compounding, however, are quite limited.

(2) **Affixation + Compounding**

This method of word-formation whereby new words are derived by attaching appropriate affixes to words which have been first formed by compounding is common. About 15% of the affixal forms considered in this study showed both affixation and compounding. Some examples are:

- **penyalahgunaan** 'abuse'. Here the nominal prefix and suffix **pe-** and **-an** are attached to the compound word **salahguna** 'misuse'.
- **perekabentuk** 'designer'. This is formed by attaching the nominal prefix **pe-** to the compound **rekabentuk** 'design'.

In the area of word-formation by affixation (as indeed in other areas of word-formation), it would be accurate to say that it is the contact with the English language that is responsible for activating or bringing into use lexical forms that have previously existed only as potential formations in the language. The existence of affixes means that it is possible to draw up derivational paradigms for words. Prior to the contact, most of these derivatives existed only as potential forms because there was no role for them in the system of ideas prevailing in Malay society at the time. As a result of the contact with Western culture and its language, many new concepts were introduced which have to be given expression in Malay. Consequently, the lexical capacity of Malay has to be utilised as fully as possible and thus the potential forms in the derivational paradigms have been actualised and brought into use to meet the demands for terms. The table below gives a list of previously potential forms (marked with an asterisk) which are now in use.
(1) lembaga
*perlembagaan
*berperlembagaan

original form; embryo
Constitution
in a constitutional manner

(2) kilang
*pekilang
*perkilangan

mill; factory
manufacturer
manufacturing

(3) antara
*mengantara
*pengantara
*perantaraan

between
mediate
mediator
mediation

(4) didik
*pendidikan
*pendidik
*berpendidikan

nurturing; rearing
education
educator
educated

(5) satu
*kesatuan
*bersatu
*menyatukan
*penyatuan
*persatuan
*satuan

one
union
united
to unite
unification
unity
unit

There is no doubt that affixation is an extremely productive method of word-formation in Bahasa Malaysia. However, there are problems associated with its application. First of all, the inventory of affixes in Bahasa Malaysia is very small (16) compared to those which exist in English (about 330)\(^1\). Consequently, many affixes in English have no equivalents in Bahasa Malaysia, for example: -able, -ate, -ical, -icle, -ance, etc. Such affixes denote particular properties in the words with which they are used. The absence of equivalent Malay affixes has meant an increase in the functional load of existing affixes in the language. Affixes such as ber- for example, have been given new uses. Ber- is now used in functions as those performed by the affixes -ed (e.g. berpengalaman 'experienced'), -able (e.g. beruntung 'profitable'), -ly (e.g. berturut-turut 'successively'), -ous (e.g. berterusan 'continuous'). This can give rise to ambiguity as it is not always easy to know which of these meanings ber- is intended to convey. However, attempts have been made to increase the stock of affixes in Bahasa Malaysia. This

---

1. This comparison is provided by Lim Chin Lam in his paper "Aspek-aspek penggunaan Bahasa Malaysia dalam sains dan teknologi", presented at the Workshop on the Implementation of Bahasa Malaysia, held at the Universiti Sains Malaysia from 7-8 January 1977, p.13.
is mainly by borrowing affixes from other languages such as Sanskrit (e.g. -wan, -wati, -man), Arabic (e.g. -wi) and English (e.g. -is '-ist').

Another problem associated with the use of affixation to create terms to match those in English has to do with congruity of concept between the created term and the English equivalent. On the whole, affixation is capable of forming terms congruent in concept with English terms, though such affixal forms need to be given strict definitions to indicate the precise concept. But there are many instances when the term formed by affixation fails to convey accurately the sense(s) of the English term which the creation is supposed to be the equivalent. This is mainly due to the fact that many of the concepts that need to be given expression are alien to the traditional system of ideas and concepts in Malay society. This lack of congruity can be seen in some examples taken from glossaries published by the Dewan on literature and education terminologies given below.

SOURCE: ISTILAH KESUSAERTAAN
(LITERATURE TERMINOLOGY), 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Word</th>
<th>Derived Word</th>
<th>Sense Obtained</th>
<th>Sense Intended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>biasa (usual)</td>
<td>takbiaisa</td>
<td>unusual</td>
<td>irregular (as in irregular ode)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lerai (to pacify)</td>
<td>peleraian</td>
<td>pacification</td>
<td>denouement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tegang (stiff; taut)</td>
<td>ketegangan</td>
<td>stiffness; tautness</td>
<td>suspense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dendang (to drone in chorus to a Malay quatrain)</td>
<td>pendendang</td>
<td>singer in a chorus</td>
<td>minstrel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: ISTILAH PENDIDEKAN
(EDUCATION TERMINOLOGY), 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Word</th>
<th>Derived Word</th>
<th>Sense Obtained</th>
<th>Sense Intended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manfaat (profit; gain)</td>
<td>kemanfaatan</td>
<td>profitability</td>
<td>utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desak (to press; to harass)</td>
<td>desakan</td>
<td>strong pressure</td>
<td>aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salur (channel; gully)</td>
<td>menyalur</td>
<td>to channel</td>
<td>sublimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>megah (famous; renowned)</td>
<td>kemenegahan</td>
<td>fame; renown</td>
<td>positiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tabah (bold; determined)</td>
<td>ketabahan</td>
<td>boldness; determination</td>
<td>perseverance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.2 Compounding

Compounding is by far the most productive of the processes used to create terms. This is indicated in this study by the fact that it accounts for 47% (422 items) of the total number of induced creations (903 items) in the corpus.

Words created by compounding are overwhelmingly nouns (as is the case with words created by the other methods of word-formation). Noun compounds comprise 95%, whereas adjective and verb compounds comprise only 3% and 2% respectively of compounds in the data.

It is not easy to define exactly what a compound is. This difficulty is reflected in some of the definitions attempted. "There is no easy answer, covering all possible cases, to the question 'what is a compound'... any attributive-head noun group is potentially a compound". 1 "Compounds are bits of potted syntax". 2 "A compound is a unit consisting of two or more bases... There is no formal criterion that can be used for a general definition of compounds in English". 3 As a working definition, the definition by Jespersen is most precise and useful: "A compound may perhaps be provisionally defined as a combination of two or more words so as to function as one word, as a unit". 4 Jespersen also stresses that it is semantic criteria, not formal criteria, that are to be used in defining a compound: "We may say that we have a compound if the meaning of the whole cannot logically be deduced from the meaning of the elements separately..." 5

The difficulties attendant in defining a compound reflect the complicated underlying relationships between the elements of any given compound. This is true of compounds in Bahasa Malaysia as in English. As the methods of compound formation in Bahasa Malaysia are, therefore, very varied, no single method of analysis and classification of compounds is likely to be completely satisfactory.

5. Ibid., p. 137.
It was found from the data, however, that compounds created fall into two broad categories. In the first category are compounds which are formed with only root-words as constituents. In the second category are compounds with one or more derived words as constituents.

The compounds can be further classified on the basis of their component parts of speech and their mode of combination. The latter refers to whether the words formed have constituents which are arranged syntactically (that is, in accordance with the Malay syntactic pattern: Head + Modifier), or asyntactically (that is, not in accordance with Malay syntactic pattern: Modifier & Head). As in English compounds, the constituents in Bahasa Malaysia compounds may be written unseparated, or separated by a space or hyphen.

The two main types of compound formation are outlined below.

7.2.2.1 Compounding based on root-words as constituents

The combination of two root-words is by far the most common method of compound formation. This accounts for over 70% of the compounds in the data. As the examples below show, any part of speech can be combined with another. Though asyntactic combinations occur, they are far less common than syntactic combinations. Unless otherwise indicated, the combinations below are syntactic.

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>flat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rumah</td>
<td></td>
<td>pangsa</td>
<td>(segment of fruit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(house)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>submarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapal</td>
<td></td>
<td>selam</td>
<td>(to dive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>ventilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ganti</td>
<td></td>
<td>udara</td>
<td>(air)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(to change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>gravity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaya</td>
<td></td>
<td>berat</td>
<td>(heavy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(force)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Noun (Asyntactic)</td>
<td>to enforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuat</td>
<td></td>
<td>kuasa</td>
<td>(power)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(strong)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In compound formation with root-words, two further sub-types may be distinguished. One involves the use of bound morphemes as the first constituent in the compound; the other the use of certain specific words as the first constituent in the compound.

1. **Compounds with bound morphemes as the first constituent**

The majority of the bound morphemes used in this type of compound formation are words borrowed from Sanskrit. The most common are: maha, tata, eka, dwi, panca, pra.

Example: maha + guru (big) (teacher) professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maha</th>
<th>Guru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(big) (teacher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: tata + bahasa (order) (language) grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tata</th>
<th>Bahasa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(order) (language)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: eka + pada (one) (according) monomer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eka</th>
<th>Pada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(one) (according)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: dwi + bahasa (two) (language) bi-lingual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwi</th>
<th>Bahasa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(two) (language)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: panca + logam (multiple) (metal) alloy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panca</th>
<th>Logam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(multiple) (metal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: pra + sangka (before) (suspicion) prejudice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pra</th>
<th>Sangka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(before) (suspicion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Compounds with specific words as first constituent**

This type of compound formation involves the use of a small group of words which have been given a specialised meaning so
that they now function as word-formative elements providing the bases from which a whole series of words can be derived.

This is best illustrated with an example. The word juru used to mean only 'a skilled workman'. It has now been given the meaning of 'a specialist in a particular field' in an attempt to provide an equivalent in Bahasa Malaysia for the English nominal suffix -or or -er (personal nouns as in translator, interpreter). Juru has accordingly been used to derive a whole series of terms designating specialists in different fields and professions. Some examples are:

- Juru + terbang (to fly) - pilot
- Juru + tulis (to write) - clerk
- Juru + bahasa (language) - interpreter
- Juru + solek (fashion; style) - beautician
- Juru + ulas (to cover, wrap) - commentator
- Juru + berita (news) - newsreader

Other specific words used in this way are: ahli (e.g. ahli tarikh 'histotian'), kaji (e.g. kajicuaca 'meteorology'), seni (e.g. senibina 'architecture'), alat (e.g. alatubah 'transformer'), boleh (e.g. bolehgalak 'inducible'), bukan (e.g. bukanbenda 'non-material'), tanpa (e.g. tanpahadir 'absent'), tidak/tak (e.g. tidakpadan 'incongruous'), nyah (e.g. nyahair 'dehydrate').

As in the case of juru, these specific words are made to perform the functions of affixes in English which do not have equivalents in Malay. Thus, ahli performs the function that is performed in English by such suffixes as -ian, -ist; kaji the function performed by -logy; tidak/tak the functions performed by the negative prefixes such as in-, un-, dis--; nyah performs the function of the reversative prefix de--; and so on.

English influence on the use of the morphological process of compounding is undoubtedly most apparent in this type of compound formation where specific Malay words have been
given new functions (or properties) which are similar to those found in English affixes. These specific words are, to all intent and purposes, new word formative elements in Bahasa Malaysia.

Mention must be made of the compounds formed with the negative tidak/tak as a constituent. These are frequently used with the noun forming prefix and suffix ke-an to form negative abstract nouns, for example: ketidakpadanan 'incongruity', ketidakimbangan 'imbalance'. As mentioned in Chapter 6.1.3.1, until the contact with English, negative abstract nouns such as these did not exist in the Malay language. The impetus for the creation of such forms came from the attempts to translate negative abstract nouns from English into Bahasa Malaysia (e.g. ketidaksempurnaan 'imperfection'. Here tidak translates the negative prefix im-, sempurna translates 'perfect' and ke-an the nominal suffix -ion). This process originating from loan translation subsequently became productive and was used to create negative abstract nouns independent of models in English.

7.2.2.2 Compounding based on derived words or a derived word and root-word as constituents.

Compounds which have one or more derived forms as their constituents account for about 25% of the compounds in our data.

The majority of these compounds are formed with a derived word and a root-word as constituents. The number of compounds formed entirely of derived words is much smaller. The derived words used in this type of compounding are mainly nouns. Some examples are given below:

(1) Root-Word + Derived Word
kilang + penapis (factory) (that which filters) refinery

(2) Derived Word + Root Word
pungutan + suara (gathering) (voice) referendum

(3) Derived Word + Derived Word
sukatan + pelajaran (measurement) (learning) curriculum
The foregoing account has attempted to describe the major techniques that are used in compound formation in Bahasa Malaysia. As can be seen, the modes of compound formation are very varied indeed. Though compounding has been used very extensively in recent years to create new lexical forms, this method of word-formation has been well established prior to contact with English. This is attested by such idiomatic compound formation as matahari 'sun' (from mata 'eye' + hari 'day'), air muka 'expression of the face' (from air 'water' + muka 'face'), buta huruf 'illiterate' (from buta 'blind' + huruf 'letters of the alphabet') which are an integral part of the daily language of the community. The fact that such formations already existed in the language before contact with English meant that new forms could be created by analogy.

In the area of compounding, as in affixation, the contact with English has been instrumental in extending the use of the process and bringing into use forms that previously were only potential forms in the language. The reasons for extending compound formation are basically the same as those obtaining for affixation, that is, to effect a higher degree of intertranslability with English by creating equivalent terms for those which exist in English. But also, in the process of doing so, to utilise as fully as possible the existing mechanisms of word-formation in the Malay language. Though the lexical items thus created are independent formations (that is, not borrowed), English terms served as the basis of reference for their creation.

7.2.3 Blending

Blending is a new morphological process that has been introduced into Bahasa Malaysia to create words to match those in English especially in the scientific and technical fields.

Blending is a type of word-formation in which two or more words are combined to form a new word which incorporated all the meanings of its constituents. Examples of blends (or alternatively portmanteau words) from English are: brunch from breakfast and lunch, smog from smoke and fog.
In Bahasa Malaysia, the starting point of the blend is a compound or phrase which describes an innovation or concept introduced via the medium of the English language. This means that not one, but a series of words (constituting a descriptive compound or circumlocution) is utilised to convey the salient features of the innovation or concept. The words thus collectively used to designate the new concept or innovation are then amalgamated into a single form.

The types of blending in Bahasa Malaysia are very varied. Any segment of the constituent words may be selected to form the blend. The only consistency observed is that the first segment or syllable of the first word in the expression which forms the basis of the blend is retained as the initial syllable in the blend. There are basically five types of blending used in Bahasa Malaysia:

1. Combination of the first syllables of the words in an expression.
   Examples: cerpen 'short story' (from cerita 'story' + pendek 'short'),
   pawagam 'cinema' (from panggung 'stage' + wayang 'show' + gambar 'picture').

2. Combination of the first syllable of the first word with the last syllable of the second word.
   Examples: hakis 'to erode' (from habis 'complete' + kikis 'to scrape'),
   maging 'carnivorous' (from makan 'to eat' + daging 'meat').

3. Combination of the first syllable of the first word with one complete word.
   Examples: purata 'average' (from pukul 'to hit' + rata 'level'),
   cereka 'fiction' (from cerita 'story' + reka 'to invent').

4. Combination of the first word in its entirety with the first or last syllable of the second word.

---

1. Hence the decision not to use the term 'acronymisation' which is often used collectively to refer to different types of blending. The true acronym is formed from the initial letters (or larger parts) of words that make up a descriptive phrase or a proper name.
Examples: taridra 'dance-drama (from tari 'dance + drama).
limausam 'lime' (from limau 'citrus fruit' + masam 'sour').

(5) Assimilation of identical phonemes or syllables in the constituent words. By this method, two words are amalgamated into one, on one of the following conditions:

(a) The final phoneme of the first word is identical with the first phoneme of the second word. This is phoneme assimilation.

Examples: gambar rajah gambarajah (diagram) (figure)
benda alir bendalir (fluid)

(b) The final syllable of the first word is identical with the first syllable of the second word. This is syllable assimilation.

Examples: debu bunga debunga (pollen)
        (dust) (flower)
        angka kali angkali (coefficient)
        (number) (time)

As the above examples show, the starting point of many blends is a descriptive compound which is then contracted in various ways. In fact, the technique of blending is not unlike that of compound formation. The difference being that in blending, segments of words make up the blend while in compounding, entire words make up the constituents of the compound.

A number of blends in Bahasa Malaysia are also formed by translating the constituents which made up English blends. For example: asbut from asap 'smoke' and kabut 'fog' is an imitation of the English smog. From translation efforts such as this, the process was extended and new blends formed which are independent of models in English. A number of blends are also formed from loan translations of English compound forms which were subsequently contracted. For example: kerangin 'air-dry' was originally a loan translation of the English term air-dry, the components kering 'dry' and angin 'air' subsequently amalgamated by method (3) above.
In the '60's, blending was very popular as a technique for terminology formation and large numbers of blends were formed. However, terms formed in this manner proved to be unpopular with specialists in the various fields of study and only a few have gained currency. The main objection to such forms is that it is very difficult to recognise the component words which make up the blends because they have been mutilated to such an extent and in such varied ways. This makes the terms which result unanalysable. Also the fact that the types of blending are so varied means that terms are not derived in a consistent and regular manner.

Blending, however, is used far less than any other method of word-formation except reduplication. They account for only 4% of the total number of induced creations.

7.2.4 Reduplication

Reduplication refers to "a particular type of grammatical formation whereby a part or the whole root form is repeated in the same word". The reduplication discussed here is of the first type and consists of the repetition of the first syllable of the root word with or without a change in the vowel quality of the repeating syllable.

Only words with the three vowels /a/, /a/ and /u/ in the first syllables are involved in this type of reduplication in Malay. The central vowel /a/ does not undergo any change in quality in the reduplicated syllable. But the vowels /a/ and /u/ become the central vowel /a/ in the reduplicated syllable.

This type of reduplication applies mainly to the noun class.

The three main semantic functions of this type of reduplication are as follows:

(1) to extend the meaning of a word

Examples: pejal 'firm' ——> pepejal 'a solid'
cair 'watery' ——> cecair 'liquid'

to indicate similarity
Examples:
- lembing 'spear' → leleming 'spear-like, lanceolate'
- leceng 'bell' → leloceng 'bell-shaped, campanulate'

(3) to indicate dimunitiveness
Examples:
- rambut 'hair' → rerambut 'capillary'
- benang 'thread' → bebenang 'filament'

Both reduplication of the first syllable of a word and infixation are the two methods of word-formation which were revived after 1956 when the Dewan began developing terminologies for Bahasa Malaysia.

Previous to this, these methods of word-formation were no longer productive. Attestation to their one-time existence as morphological mechanisms in Malay was a handful of words such as lelaki 'male' and kekura 'tortoise' (reduplication of the first syllable) and gemuruh 'roll of thunder' and geletar 'to shiver' (infixation).

Reduplication is least used as a method of word-formation. It accounts for less than 1% of the total number of induced creations considered in this study.

7.2.5 Circumlocution
Bloomfield says that, "If there is no closely equivalent native term, one may yet describe the foreign object in native words".1

The same observation can be made with regard to Bahasa Malaysia. When equivalents are not available to match terms in English, a common technique used to overcome this problem is by circumlocution. The circumlocution or the descriptive periphrasis tends to describe the new cultural item usually in terms of its appearance or functional utility literally.

Viewing them in time depth, it can safely be concluded that many of these terms are temporary working substitutes for more succinct and manipulable units. And as such, they are worthy of study as a special type of term which appears to characterise rapid lexical expansion.

Some examples of circumlocutions which have acquired an institutionalised sense are given below:

- *lapisan pembawa air* 'water carrying layer' for *aquifuge*
- *serangga pembawa penyakit* 'insect carrier of disease' for *vector*
- *kekurangan zat makanan* 'deficiency of nutritious food' for *malnutrition*
- *batang besi pencegah-goncang* 'metal rod for prevention of rocking' for *suspension* (car).

However clumsy such terms are, they are functional and meaningful. Yet it is not hard to conclude that a single-word expression, once promulgated would readily displace such circumlocutions.

Circumlocution is undoubtedly an important device used in Bahasa Malaysia to cope with the demand for vocabulary items to match those available in English. Its importance can be attested by the fact that it is the third most productive method for deriving induced creations, accounting for 13% of the items listed as such in this study.

7.3 Summary of Chapter

This chapter has attempted to show how English has stimulated and influenced native creation in Bahasa Malaysia.

Hybrid creation has first been looked at. Here English loans are used with Malay words to form lexical items which are not based on models in English. The number of such formations, however, is limited; hybrid creations account for less than 10% of the native creations in this study.

The other type of native creation, induced creation, is by far the more important. Induced creations account for more than 90% of the total number of native creations in the study. There are basically five methods for forming induced creations. The most productive of these are compounding and affixation which together account for over 80% of the induced creations. Circumlocution is the third most productive method, accounting for over 10% of induced creations. Blending and reduplication are far less important; the former accounts for about 4% and the latter less than 1% of the induced creations examined in this study.
The most obvious point which has emerged from this examination of native creation in Bahasa Malaysia is that determined efforts have indeed been made to utilise mechanisms of word-formation other than borrowing. In other words, there is evidence of an 'internal' response in Bahasa Malaysia to the lexical impact of English. The pressure from English has stimulated attempts to increase the lexical capacity of Bahasa Malaysia. Firstly, by extending the use of the processes of word-formation, inherent in the Malay language, namely, affixation and compounding. With regard to the former process, affixation, English has also been responsible for new uses for Malay affixes strict in the frequency of the use of certain affixes, and for the fact that certain Malay words have now become word-formative elements. It has also been pointed out that there is a need to standardise the affixes and words used as word-formative elements and this will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Secondly, the lexical impact of English has been responsible for the revival of word-formation processes in Malay which had become obsolete, namely, infixation and reduplication of the first syllable of the word.

Thirdly, English has also been responsible for the introduction of a new method of word-formation into Bahasa Malaysia, namely, blending. However, blending has limited value as a method of word-formation. Very few of the terms created by blending have been accepted by the public, mainly because of the objection that the terms thus created are unanalysable forms.

Finally, it has also been noted how circumlocution has been resorted to when no single-word or compound expression is available to designate an innovation or concept embodied in an English term. Circumlocutions are lexical units and should be taken into consideration when studying vocabulary formation. But it is recognised that the circumlocution is a working substitute for a more succinct and manipulable unit which has yet to be derived.
The examination of the processes of word-formation in Bahasa Malaysia has now been completed. The next part of the dissertation is concerned mainly with the use and distribution of these processes among the various bodies in the planned and spontaneous areas of lexical innovation, and also how this is affected by different attitudes to and perception of the role of English in Bahasa Malaysia lexical expansion.
PART THREE

ENGLISH AS A SOURCE OF LEXICAL INNOVATION: POLICY, OPINION AND PRACTICE
CHAPTER 8

THE STANDARDISATION AND MODERNISATION OF BAHASA MALAYSIA

8.0 Introduction

Part II has examined the various processes by which the vocabulary of Bahasa Malaysia is expanded in both the planned and spontaneous areas of lexical innovation.

In this chapter, the focus is on the first of these two areas, that is, on the planned lexical development of Bahasa Malaysia as carried out by the Dewan and other planning agencies in the country.

Lexical planning involves, of course, both modernisation as well as standardisation processes. Before looking at lexical modernisation and standardisation, however, the standardisation of the spelling system and grammar of Bahasa Malaysia is first considered in Section 8.1. This is important because lexical standardisation, or more specifically, terminological standardisation, entails the standardisation of the spelling system, the standardisation of the grammar as well as the standardisation of the rules and procedures of terminology preparation.

In considering the standardisation and modernisation of Bahasa Malaysia, specific attention is given to the manner in which English has influenced various aspects of these developmental processes. Rubin and Jernudd (1971) have defined language planning as "decision-making about language".1 This chapter will thus be looking at the role English has played in decision-making in the development of Bahasa Malaysia.

8.1 **Standardisation**

As pointed out by Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971), standardisation efforts can be directed towards (i) a speech variety in its entirety (establishing this variety as a supradialectal norm) and (ii) towards aspects of a variety (for example, terminological standardisation).^1

The standardisation of Bahasa Malaysia can, therefore, be discussed under the two aspects outlined above, that is, (i) promotion of a dialect of Malay as the supradialectal norm, and (ii) standardisation of aspects of this norm in the areas of orthography, grammar and terminology.

Legislation has been the chief means by which the Malay language has been established as the most important language in the country: the Constitution guarantees its status as the National Language; the Education Ordinances of 1957 and 1961 pave the way for it becoming the main medium of instruction; and the Language Act of 1967 makes it compulsory to use Malay for all official purposes. But since the type of Malay taught in schools and used in government administration is based on the Johore-Riau dialect, Malaysians have come to associate the Malay language referred to in the legislative acts above with this particular dialect. In this way, legislation has indirectly promoted the Johore-Riau dialect as the supradialectal norm.

The mass media have also played a major part in establishing the Johore-Riau dialect as the supradialectal norm. As the newsreaders of Radio and Television Malaysia have consistently based their pronunciation on this dialect, the public has come to associate it with Standard Malay, or Bahasa Malaysia. Through the better newspapers in the country, such as the Utusan Malaysia and Berita Harian, and the publications of the Dewan itself, for example, the Dewan Masyarakat and the Dewan Bahasa, the written form of this variety of Malay is being crystallised.

---

In the rest of this section, the standardisation of the orthography and grammar of Bahasa Malaysia is examined. The standardisation of terminology is treated in the following section (8.2), for lexical modernisation and standardisation are interrelated.

8.1.1 Orthography

One of the most successful aspects of language development in Malaysia is the standardisation of Bahasa Malaysia spelling. This section will first give a brief historical survey of the spelling systems used in Bahasa Malaysia. This is followed by an outline of the main differences between the various systems. Finally, the standard system now in use is examined to show how English has been a decisive factor in determining the major aspects of this system.

8.1.1.1 Historical Background

The first system of spelling formulated for the Rumi script was the Wilkinson System, named after R.J. Wilkinson, chairman of the special committee on spelling appointed by the Government of the Federated Malay States in 1904. In 1924, this system was revised by the Malay scholar, Zainal Abidin bin Ahmad, better known as Za'ba; the revised system came to be known as the Za'ba System. During the Japanese Occupation between 1942-1945, another system of spelling was introduced. This was the Ejaan Fajar Asia (The Spelling System of the Dawn of Asia). This system was never used extensively; its usage being confined to a group of writers called the Angkatan Sasterawan 50 (The Literary Artists of the Fifties).

The next spelling system to appear was the Ejaan Kongres (The Congress Spelling System). This was one of the outcomes of the Third Congress on Malay Language and Literature (hence its name) held in Singapore in 1956. At this Congress too, a resolution was passed which stated that Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia were one and the same language and that efforts should be made to arrive at a common spelling. This marked the beginning of international co-operation in the standardisation of the spelling system.
The first attempt at co-operation in spelling standardisation emerged from the Treaty of Friendship signed by the Malaysian and Indonesian governments in 1959, this being the Ejaan Malindo 'Malindo Spelling' (Malindo being a contraction of Malaya and Indonesia). This system was never implemented, however, because relations between the two countries deteriorated as a result of President Sukarno's policy of 'konfrontasi'. Diplomatic relations were broken off in 1963.

Interest in a common spelling system for the two countries revived after the resumption of diplomatic relations in 1966. Joint meetings were held between representatives from the language planning agencies of the two countries. In 1967, a new system was agreed upon and called simply Ejaan Baru (The New Spelling). However, it had to be shelved following opposition from the Indonesian public over certain of its rules.

Meanwhile, the Malaysian public had grown impatient waiting for the long promised standard spelling system. Institutions started to formulate their own systems based on existing ones. The Director of the Dewan himself formulated a new system for the use of the Dewan based on the system agreed with Indonesia in 1967, this was the Ejaan Cadangan (The Proposed Spelling). This system became the basis of yet another system developed by the University of Malaya, known as the Ejaan Universiti Malaya (University of Malaya Spelling) of 1971. All these systems co-existed till 1972 making spelling in Bahasa Malaysia very chaotic indeed.

The standard system for Malaysia and Indonesia was finally declared by the two governments in August 1972. In Malaysia, this system was known as Sistem Ejaan Rumi Baharu Bahasa Malaysia (The New Rumi Spelling System for Bahasa Malaysia), while in Indonesia it was known as the Pedoman Edjaan Bahasa Indonesia Jang Disempurnakan (Guide to the Perfected Spelling System for Bahasa Indonesia). Between 1972-1975, the new system underwent slight modifications. Subsequently, 1975, each country issued another guide book incorporating the changes made. In Malaysia, the revised version is known as
Ejaan Rumi Bara Bahasa Malaysia (The New Rumi Spelling for Bahasa Malaysia, in Indonesia it is Edjaan Baru Bahasa Indonesia (The New Spelling for Bahasa Indonesia). To avoid confusion, the spelling system revised in 1975 will be referred to as the Common Spelling System.

The similarities and differences between all the spelling systems outlined above are described in the following section.

8.1.1.2 The Graphemes in the Various Spelling Systems

Table 1 on the following page shows the graphemes which represent the consonant phonemes in Bahasa Malaysia in the various spelling systems.
The Consonants and their Graphemes in the Spelling Systems
1904 - 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Wilkinson, Zaba, Fajar Asia, Cadangan University of Malaya</th>
<th>Kongres, Malindo Systems</th>
<th>Common Indonesian-Malaysian System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>tj</td>
<td>tj</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>dz</td>
<td>dz</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>r (in final position only)</td>
<td>k (in final position only)</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>sy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>v (not included in Wilkinson, Zaba)</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table shows, the Kongres and Malindo Spelling Systems introduced phonetic symbols for certain consonants which have combinations of letters as graphemes in the older spelling systems. The symbols introduced are: tj*, J*, jt, rj; these have been traditionally represented as ch, sh, ny, ng. Needless to say, this would have been very difficult to implement for practical reasons alone (new typewriters, printing equipments, etc.). Even here there is inconsistency, for other consonants, namely, /x/, /δ/, /γ/, were not given phonetic symbols even though they like /tʃ/, /ʃ/, /ɲ/, /ŋ/, have to be represented by combinations of letters. Both the Kongres and Malindo Spelling Systems were, of course, never officially implemented, though the former was used for a while in the publications of the Angkatan Sasterawan 50 (even then, it was only partially implemented for the phonetic symbols were replaced by the more conventional graphemes used in the older systems).

The various spelling systems were alike in using the letter e for representing the two vowel phonemes /e/ and /a/. However, they differ from each other in that some systems differentiated between these two vowels by the use of diacritics while others did not. The differences between the various systems with respect to this are summarised in the table below:

Table 2: The Vowels and Their Graphemes in the Spelling Systems 1904-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Wilkinson, Za'ba</th>
<th>Kongress, Malindo, Fajar Asia</th>
<th>Cadangan, Univ. of Malaya, Common System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έ</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>é</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ο</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above table shows, with the exceptions of the later systems, namely, the Cadangan, University of Malaya, and Common Spelling System, all the other systems differentiated between the /e/ and /a/.
vowels by using a diacritic. In the Wilkinson and Za'ba systems, it is the /a/ vowel that is marked by a diacritic; in the Kongres and Malindo systems, it is /e/ that is marked. The later systems dispensed with the diacritic in order to simplify spelling. This, however, gives rise to homographs, for example: semak can mean 'undergrowth' /semak/, as well as 'to check or revise' /semak/.

The three diphthongs in Malay /ai/, /oi/ and /au/ are spelt as ai, oi and au respectively in all systems except the Kongres. In the latter, the diphthongs are spelt: ay, aw and oy respectively.

Of all the systems, the Cadangan and University of Malaya systems, are closest to the one that is used at the present period, that is, the Common Spelling System of 1975. The Wilkinson and Za'ba systems only differ from each other in choosing among e, i, u and o to appear in final closed syllables of words; the former system is closer to the Common Spelling System in this.

The Fajar Asia, Kongres and Malindo as well as the Common Spelling System followed the Soewandi System used previously in Indonesia in writing grammatical units, for example, affixes are written attached to words without any space or hyphen in between.

8.1.1.3 English Influences on the Standardisation of the Spelling System

This section considers the part played by English in determining certain aspects of the Common spelling system agreed between Malaysia and Indonesia in 1975.

A. The Alphabet

In their negotiations for a standard spelling system with Indonesia, the Malaysian planners decided to differ from the Indonesians by retaining the English way of reciting the letters of the alphabet. Their decision was motivated by socio-linguistic considerations for the planning committee knew that the public would resist any attempt to change over to the Indonesian way of pronouncing the letters of the alphabet based on Dutch. Besides the public's orientation towards English, another reason for rejecting the Indonesian way of pronouncing the letters of the alphabet was the fact that English is
taught as a second language in the country. If the Indonesian way has been adopted for the Bahasa Malaysia alphabet, school-children would have to learn two different ways of reciting the alphabet, one for the English alphabet and another for the Bahasa Malaysia alphabet based on Dutch.

In this area of the spelling system, therefore, standardisation could not be achieved with Indonesia.

B. The Consonant letters

The Common Spelling System introduced two innovations, namely, the graphemes c and sy for the phonemes /tʃ/ and /ʃ/, represented in the old systems by ch and sh respectively. These two new graphemes were decided upon as a compromise with the Indonesians who had traditionally used tj and sj for /tʃ/ and /ʃ/.

These two new graphemes c and sy were introduced with a great deal of difficulty. The Malaysian public, particularly the English educated sector, were reluctant to accept these graphemes as no precedence could be found for them in the language of reference, English. They have traditionally associated the letter c with the phonemes /k/ or /s/ as in English and not with /tʃ/. As for the grapheme sy, it was a combination of letters that was not found in English (nor in Dutch for that matter); this was another departure from English-based tradition that the public found difficult to accept.

The Common Spelling System, however, did settle an issue which has long been a problem in standardising Bahasa Malaysia spelling. This problem concerns the representation of the loan phonemes /z/, /f/, /ʒ/, /s/, /x/, /v/. For a long time, the position of these loan phonemes in the Malay phonological and orthographical systems was uncertain. For instance, the Za'ba system endorsed all the Arabic derived phonemes and assigned each a grapheme. However, it did not assign a letter for the /v/ phoneme from English. In the later spelling systems, /f/ and /v/ were treated as variants of the phonemes /p/ and /b/ and so the letter p was used to represent /f/ and the letter b to represent /v/.

Consequently, variant spellings for the same word were
common occurrences, for example: filem, pilem, vitamin, bitamin.

With respect to /v/, there was a further complication when it occurs in word final position, for it could be replaced by either f or b, thus giving rise to variant spellings as, for example: positif, positib 'positive'. The Common Spelling System ended the confusion by assigning separate graphemes to all the loan phonemes above and thus variant spellings for the same word were reduced.

In assigning separate graphemes to the loan phonemes, the planning committee was also endorsing them as distinct phonemes in Bahasa Malaysia phonological system. As spelling is phonemic in Bahasa Malaysia, its standardisation is dependent on what is recognised as constituting the phonological system of Bahasa Malaysia. Or, as Asmah (1974) puts it: "It is not possible to work towards a standardised spelling system without first reaching an agreement on the acceptables and the non-acceptables in a phonological system of a language".

The decision of the language planners to accord phonemic status to the loan phonemes mentioned above stemmed from the massive influx of English loanwords, especially in the scientific and technical fields into the lexicon of Bahasa Malaysia. In the past loanwords with these phonemes were spelt with letters representing the Malay phonemes substituted for them. This practice could alter the visual form of the loanword very drastically, e.g. probokatip 'provocative'. This kind of orthographical distortion was considered very undesirable especially in preparing terminologies where it has been recognised that it is important that terms should be internationally recognisable.

C. The Vowel Letters

As mentioned, in the Common Spelling System, there are five graphemes to six vowels; the letter e representing both the phonemes /e/ and /a/. Instead of using diacritics to differentiate between these two vowels, as was the practice in the older systems, the Common

---

System introduced rules for regulating the vowel letter in final closed syllables. According to these rules, the vowel in the penultimate syllable determines the choice of the vowel letter in final closed syllables:

(i) Vowel letters i or u are used in closed syllables if the preceding syllable contained the vowel /I, a, ə, or u/.

(ii) Vowel letters o or e are used in closed final syllables if the preceding syllable contained the vowel /o/ or /e/.

According to the above rules, therefore, the letter e in penultimate syllables is to be interpreted as follows:

(i) the letter e stands for /e/ when it occurs with o or e in final syllables.

(ii) the letter e stands for /ə/ when it occurs with i or u in final syllables.

These rules, as noted, give rise to homographs. Nevertheless, they have succeeded to a large extent in reducing the confusion and inconsistencies found in the older systems with respect to the symbolisation of the front and back vowels in final closed syllables.

The above-mentioned rules, however, do not apply to loanwords. This decision was taken by the spelling standardisation committee again in order to preserve the visual form of technical and scientific terms borrowed from English. Thus, 'atom' is spelt as atom and not atum, 'carbon' as karbon and not karbun. But the volume of English loanwords being so large (and increasing all the time), their exemption from these rules has the effect of weakening them by introducing too many exceptions.

The Common Spelling System has also endorsed two new distributional features for the schwa vowel /ə/. In the old spelling systems, the grapheme e, representing this vowel, was not permitted in two positions, namely, before silence (-ə#), and before a final consonant (-əC#).

The acceptance of the final schwa as symbolised by e was mainly due to the compromise reached with Indonesia over the representation of the suffix -ism / -izam/ in English loanwords such as 'communism'. The compromise form was -isme / -isma/. Before the introduction of this spelling for the suffix -ism, English loanwords with -ism have been
spelt in various ways: for example komunizam, komunisma, faham komunis, as well as komunisme for 'communism'.

The distribution of the schwa before silence is not entirely a foreign innovation because the schwa does occur in this position in certain dialects. However, the distribution of the schwa before a final consonant is an innovation which has been introduced into Bahasa Malaysia mainly by loanwords from English. The refusal to represent the schwa before a final consonant in a word in the old spelling systems had caused great difficulties in the borrowing of technical and scientific terms from English. In these old systems, i or a was substituted for e (representing /ə/) when it occurs before a final consonant letter, for example: sistim, komputar, instead of sistem, komputer, as in the Common Spelling System. There was no rule for determining the substitute vowel letter; it was left to the individual to decide which of the two vowel letters, i or a, should represent the schwa in particular words. This inevitably gave rise to variant spellings for the same loanword in many instances. The decision to represent the schwa by e before a final consonant letter, consequently, has contributed to the standardisation of the spelling of English loanwords in Bahasa Malaysia by reducing the number of variant spellings.

D. Consonant Letter-Sequences

The old spelling systems, with the exception of the Cadangan and University of Malay systems, sought to eliminate all consonant letter-sequences from English loanwords. These sequences were eliminated in the two following ways:

(1) By dropping one of the components in the sequence, e.g. moden 'modern'

(2) By inserting a vowel letter between the components of the sequence. This vowel letter was e in word initial and medial position, e.g: peroses 'process'; and e or a in word final position, e.g: filem, filam 'film'.

In the Common Spelling System, all consonant letter-sequences are accepted regardless of their positions of occurrence with one exception. This exception being word-final sequences which have a final consonant letter representing a stop phoneme. In such sequences, the final consonant

letter - representing the stop phoneme - is dropped off, for example: presiden 'president'.

In the Common Spelling System, monosyllabic words with final sequences have an a appended to the end of the sequence, for example: firma 'firm'. This is not so much to eliminate the consonant letter-sequence as to change a monosyllabic into a disyllabic word as Malay is basically a disyllabic language.

The acceptance of consonant letter-sequences in Bahasa Malaysia orthographic system by Malaysian language planners is another of the steps taken to facilitate the borrowing and adaptation of English loanwords, especially in the scientific and technical fields. The spelling committee recognised that the practice of eliminating all consonant letter-sequences in loan terms in the old spelling systems had distorted these terms so much that their relation to other internationally used terms could not be discerned.

From the above examination of the standardisation of the spelling system, it is clear that English has been a major factor in the decisions that were made. All the major innovations introduced in the Common Spelling System, such as letters representing loan consonant phonemes, consonant letter-sequences, as well as the relaxation of rules for determining the vowel letter in final closed syllables, were motivated by the need to facilitate the borrowing and adaptation of English loanwords, particularly in the scientific and technical fields.

8.1.2 The Standardisation of Grammar

It would be accurate to say that grammar has received least attention in the standardisation process of Bahasa Malaysia. In order to understand why grammar has been neglected, it is necessary to look at the historical background.

8.1.2.1 Historical Background

A number of reasons may be cited for the neglect of grammatical standardisation.

First, the Dewan, the official agency entrusted with the development of Bahasa Malaysia, was preoccupied with what it saw as more
important tasks, especially, lexical modernisation. Other priorities were the production of textbooks, promotion campaigns for the National Language. Another reason for the lack of attention given to grammatical standardisation was the lack of local scholars in the Malay language in the early decades of language development, the '50's and '60's. At that period, scholarship of the Malay language was still confined to that carried out by ex-colonial officers, such as R.J. Wilkinson and R.O. Winstedt, and the Malay Studies Department of the University of Malaya was still in its infancy.

Another reason for the lack of interest in grammatical standardisation was that the concept of a standard language had not yet seeped into the consciousness of the native speakers of Malay. Until the achievement of independence English was the language of the elite and Malay was not a dominant factor in the acquisition of status and prestige. Even after independence, affiliations to regional dialects have been strong among the Malays, and even now most speakers speak their respective dialects except in situations where speakers from other dialect areas are present, or on occasions which call for the use of Standard Malay, for example, when speaking or writing through the mass media or in official and academic environments. This lack of emphasis on the use of Standard Malay extended even to the education system, as observed by Alisjahbana (1967) when discussing the standardisation of Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Malaysia, he writes: "... the teaching of a standardised Malay language, especially of the Malay grammar, did not require enough attention in schools".1

A further reason for the insufficient attention given to grammar especially with regards to research was the attitude of prominent Malay linguists themselves. They did not see the need to standardise grammar because they believed that there was already a sufficient degree of standardisation. For instance, Asmah (1974) claims that "the written Malay reflects a high degree of standardisation where the grammar is concerned" and that "the syntax of written Malay is already codified".2

8.1.2.2 Need for Standardisation of Contact Induced Changes in Grammar

In the last few years, however, the need to standardise Bahasa Malaysia grammar has been increasingly recognised by Malay linguists, including Asmah in her later papers. This is mainly because through contact with English, new grammatical features have been introduced into Bahasa Malaysia. For example, the increasing use of the copula (the copula is not used in Old Malay), the increasing use of adverbs of aspect such as sudah, belum, sedang, to indicate tense (tense is not, of course, an obligatory category in Malay). The influence of English has also resulted in a decrease in the use of numeral classifiers. Instead of tiga ekor burung 'three tails of birds', more and more people tend to dispense with the numeral classifier 'ekor', and say/write simply, tiga burung 'three birds'. In scientific writing, the practice is to dispense with numeral classifiers altogether. This is because of the difficulties in deciding which of these is appropriate to use with new lexical items such as sel 'cell', virus, etc. All these contact-induced changes in Bahasa Malaysia grammar mentioned above have yet to be standardised.

The need to standardise Bahasa Malaysia grammar is particularly urgent in the area of terminology preparation. In particular, there is a need to devise a standard set of rules for handling the grammatical aspects of borrowing of loan terms from English. First of all, the functions of the affixes in Bahasa Malaysia have to be defined more precisely so that English terms can be translated or adapted in a systematic and precise manner. The use of certain affixes in Malay can vary from dialect to dialect. For instance, the Kedah dialect uses the affix per- to derive transitive verbs (e.g. perangkat) whereas the southern dialects prefer the suffix -kan (e.g. hangatkan 'to heat'). Not only are there variations in the choice of affixes among the Malay dialects, there are also variations in the choice of affixes to translate affixes in English. In chapter 7, p.199 it has been observed how

certain affixes in Malay (e.g. ber-) have been given new functions to match functions performed by different affixes in English which have no equivalents in Malay. There is an urgent need to define precisely both the old as well as the new functions of these affixes so that English affixes can be translated and new terms derived in a systematic manner. Variant forms have been created by differences in opinion over the correct Malay affix to be used. For instance, a terminology committee for engineering decided that the term 'fluidised bed' should be translated as bed pembadaliran; a later committee changed it to bed terbandalir because they argued that the past participle -ed in English has as its equivalent in Malay the affix ter-, and not the joint affixes pe-an.

There is also a need to standardise with regards to the use or non-use of affixes in adapting English loan terms. At the moment, it is common to find different sets of terms, one in which affixes have been used to adapt the English terms; while in the other affixes are dispensed with. This lack of standardisation is illustrated in the following sets of terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Terms</th>
<th>Malay Versions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set 1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) isotope</td>
<td>isotop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) isotope mass</td>
<td>jisim isotop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) isotopy</td>
<td>keisotopan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) allotrope</td>
<td>alotrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) allotropic form</td>
<td>bentuk alotrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) allotropy</td>
<td>alotropi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above examples, it can be seen that the first two items for each of the sets have been adapted in a similar way. However, there is inconsistency with respect to the third item in the sets. In Set 1 the nominal prefix and suffix ke-an have been used to derive an abstract noun which corresponds to 'isotopy', that is, keisotopan. In Set 2, however, the English term 'allotropy' is adopted with slight orthographical adaptation, giving alotropi. There is no reason why kealotropan could not have been derived on the pattern of keisotopan in Set 1.

The use of English terms with Malay affixes has given rise to another problem. This has to do with the prefixes me- and pe-. As has been explained in Chapter 5, p.130, these prefixes have phonological variants determined by the initial letter or phoneme of the root word which, in certain contexts, is dropped. However, as noted, with many English loanwords this morphophonemic spelling rule does not apply or is not consistently applied (e.g. menstor, menyetor 'to store').

In the field of terminology preparation, there was a conflict between the requirement that loan terms conform to the grammatical system of Bahasa Malaysia (and therefore, consonants/p, t, k, s/should be ellipsed in the same way as Malay words when used with the prefixes me- and pe-) and the desire to preserve the international origins of the terms by keeping them as intact as possible. It was finally decided by the planning committee responsible for formulating rules for terminology development that terms borrowed from English should retain their consonants when used with the prefixes above. That is, the word polimer 'polymer' becomes pempolimeran 'polymerisation' when pe-an is affixed to it, and not pemolimeran. This treatment of English words is, of course, motivated by etymological considerations. Though it has helped in stabilising and standardising the affixation of me- and pe- with English words, this has been at the expense of 'de-standardising' the grammatical system as a whole by endorsing irregularities in the process of affixation.

Another area of grammar which has been 'de-standardised' as a result of borrowing technical and scientific terms from English is word-order. As has been observed, in Malay the word-order is more or less rigid, that is, the pattern: Head-Modifier. In translating technical or scientific terms from English, the practice is to reverse the word order in compounds and phrases such that the Malay pattern, Head-Modifier, is observed. Thus, direct current is translated as arus terus, where arus 'current' is the head and terus 'direct' is the modifier.

However, in many cases the English word-order is retained in the Bahasa Malaysia translation or adaptation of the English terms. Most of the terms with 'irregular' word-order are to be found in chemistry.
Thus, sodium chloride is natrium klorid and not klorid natrium; ferrous oxide is ferus oksida and not oksida ferus; etc. The word-order in English is retained in the Bahasa Malaysia versions because it reflects the way chemical formulae are written.  

From the above, it may be seen that in the standardisation of Bahasa Malaysia grammar, English is likely to play a very important part. This is mainly because most of the innovations have been introduced as a result of the contact with English, for example, the copula, tense distinctions, omission of the numeral classifiers, etc. Decisions have to be taken as to whether these innovations should be accepted as constituting a regular part of Bahasa Malaysia grammar. Contact with English has made it imperative that the functions of grammatical elements such as affixes be re-assessed and re-stated so that English affixes can be replaced in a precise and consistent manner when preparing terminologies.

8.2 Modernisation

As Ferguson (1968) points out, "the process of modernisation has two aspects: (a) the expansion of the lexicon of the language by new words and expressions and (b) the development of new styles and forms of discourse". This study is concerned primarily with the first dimension, that is, lexical expansion or lexical modernisation.

In Malaysia, the creation of new terms and new patterns of word-formation in scientific, technical and educational fields is a major component of the developmental process of modernisation of Bahasa Malaysia and is the focus of much language planning activity. As Ferguson (1977) points out, "A large part of this lexical planning in the less developed nations and languages is concerned with the creation of terms and word formations as counterparts or translation equivalents  

1. However, when the term contains the component 'acid', the word-order is reversed. For example: deoxyribonucleic acid is translated as asid deoksiribonukleik; acid anhydride is translated as anhidrid asid.

2. In the more recent books on Malay grammar, the copula is accepted as a regular part of the language. See for example, Abdullah Hassan's Morphology of Malay, 1974, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, p. 22.

to terminology already in use in nations and language technologically more advances".¹ This "intertranslatability goal" dominates lexical planning in Malaysia as well with respect to Bahasa Malaysia. Due to historical and socio-political factors, the language of reference for Bahasa Malaysia is, of course, English.

The discussion which follows examines how this "intertranslatability goal" has been handled by the various agencies in the country involved in preparing terminologies for Bahasa Malaysia. The examination concentrates, in particular, on the conflicts that have arisen and the compromises that have been made between these planning agencies due to differences in approach to terminology development which are due to a large extent to differences in attitude towards English. The agencies in question are the Dewan (the official language planning agency) on the one hand, and the Universities in the country, on the other.

Three different phases may be discerned in the terminological development of Bahasa Malaysia, marked by differences in the attitude and approach of the Dewan. These different phases are examined below.

8.2.1 The First Phase of Terminological Development (1957-1966)

As mentioned, the Constitution has made Malay the national and official language of the country, while the Education Ordinance of 1960 has made it the main medium of instruction. However, the implementation of these legislative measures depended on the extent to which Malay could be used as an effective language of administration and education in place of English. In other words, it became necessary to be able to say and write in Malay all of those things that had been sayable and writeable in English and with the same ease and precision possible in the latter. This is, of course, the "intertranslatability goal" mentioned earlier.

Apart from the problem of acceptance by the non-Malay population of the country, the implementation of language policy with regard to the

use of Malay was made more difficult by the fact that the language was deficient in terminological or lexical specialisation. This was due to the inferior position that it was relegated to vis-a-vis English in the colonial period. Cut off from developments in the industrial nations, the vocabulary of Malay failed to keep up with the advances in science and technology in the 19th and 20th centuries. The Government was aware that the Malay language had to be brought up-to-date before it could function adequately in its new roles as national and official language and medium of instruction. This meant that it had to enlarge its vocabulary and acquire an adequate scientific and technical vocabulary. This responsibility was entrusted to the Dewan set up in 1956. This responsibility is spelt out in the terms of reference of the Dewan in the following words: "To standardise the spelling and pronunciation and to coin appropriate terminologies in the National Language".¹

Within the Dewan, the task of expanding the lexicon of Bahasa Malaysia was given to a special department, the Terminology Division (Bahagian Istilah). Set up in 1957, this department functions through a system of terminology committees whose members at this initial stage were mainly secondary school Malay teachers and old Malay writers. The Terminological Division calls the meetings of the committees and appoints officials to act as secretary at these meetings. It is also responsible for co-ordinating the work of the various committees, for documentation of the terms created as well as for their dissemination.

This first phase of terminological development from 1957-1967 was characterised by intense linguistic conservatism and an obsessive concern with "language purity". The Dewan's Director (at this period, Syed Nasir), its officials and consequently, the people appointed to prepare terminologies in the various committees, were linguistically conservative and wholly intent on preserving what they termed as the 'purity' of the Malay language. Anything that did not conform to Malay linguistic characteristics was looked upon as a 'corruption'. However, there were inconsistencies, for Arabic and Sanskrit elements were

accepted. It was, in effect, innovations that originated from the English language that the battle to preserve the purity of the Malay language was waged against.\footnote{In this period too, Indonesian linguistic influences were rejected for the Dewan looked upon Bahasa Indonesia as a corrupt mixture of Malay and Javanese. From 1963-1966, when President Sukarno pursued his policy of political 'konfrontasi' against the newly formed federation of Malaysia, anti-Indonesian feelings were so intense that the Dewan even embarked on a campaign to 'cleanse' Bahasa Malaysia of any Indonesian linguistic elements.}

The various committees charged by the Dewan with the task of creating new technical terms were instructed to use Malay words as much as possible. This was done in a number of ways:

a) By looking for an exact or almost exact equivalent in Malay.
b) By resorting to loan translation or semantic extension (i.e. loanshifting).
c) By inventing a new word.

Foreign words, that is, English words, were accepted only as a last resort. Even when the Dewan used an English word, it had first to be adapted in such a way that it sounded fully Malay. This meant that certain phonemes which did not occur in Malay, for example /f/ and /v/ were replaced by other phonemes; consonant clusters were also eliminated. All these practices changed the appearance of the loan terms so much that they were unrecognisable as originating from English.

This emphasis given to deriving fully Malay terminologies is reflected in the data (see Table 3 on p.249). Not surprisingly, equivalent Malay substitutes for English terms were rarely found (less than 3% of the terms created by the Dewan were equivalent substitutes), for the concepts the latter embodied were alien to a scientifically and technologically backward society, such as Malay society. Faced with this reality, the Dewan resorted to the next best alternative, that is, indirect borrowing or substitution. Thus loan translations and semantic extensions account for the greatest number of terms created, over 56% in the data. Native creation or invention of new words was often resorted to, blends of all kinds being particularly popular during this period; created words account for about 15% of the items in the data. Loanwords as mentioned, were the last resort. Even so, they comprise 27% of the terms in the data but all had been adapted to such an extent that they appear like new words altogether.
(e.g. sepiar 'sphere', sabersip 'subversive').

The heavy emphasis placed on indigeneity and conformity to Malay linguistic characteristics had the effect of making the Malay term quite different from the international term accepted in most other languages. It also made the Dewan's task more difficult, since instead of merely adapting the international term to Bahasa Malaysia spelling system in accordance with certain well-defined rules (for example, replacing the letter c by k or s, and the endings -ist, -ism, -ation by -is, -isma, -asi, etc., as was the practice with the Universities), it was necessary to have each new word considered individually by the terminology committee concerned. The fact that experts in linguistics were rarely consulted often led to inconsistencies. Thus the Dewan's committee on biology, forestry and agriculture translated the term 'tuberculin-tested milk' as susu tiada tibi (that is, 'milk free of tuberculosis'), but gave no indication as to how to translate 'this milk has been tuberculin-tested by the health department' or 'tuberculin-testing is universal in this country'.1 Moreover, different committees sometimes translated the same term in different ways. For example, the Dewan's committee on engineering terminology translated 'atmosphere' as udarakasa (a blend or portmanteau word made up of udara 'air' + angkasa 'space'), the geography committee chose udara and lapisan udara (literally, 'air layer'), while the physics committee plumped for udara, angkasa and udarakasa. Nor did any of the committees indicate which, if any, of these coinages was to be used with the sense of 'unit of pressure' commonly employed in physics.

The rejection of English influence during this period (at least in its most obvious form, loanwords) was not only due to the innate linguistic conservatism of the Dewan officials alone. Malaysia (or Malay at that time) had just gained her independence from Britain and the rejection of English linguistic influence was just one of the symbolic acts by which the new nation attempted to make explicit the fact of her freedom from British domination. The "linguistic chauvinism"

1. See D.J. Prentice's article "The Best Chosen Language", in Hemisphere, Vol. 22 (4), 1979, p.31, for this and other examples of inconsistencies.
displayed by the Dewan during this period has its parallel among terminological committees of other newly independent nations as observed by Le Page (1964): "... in the flush of national independence they may like the French Academy, embark on a policy of linguistic chauvinism based on a misguided concept of 'language purity'. And like many of these nations, Malaysia was to become less concerned about the 'purity' of its national language once it came to feel that its nationhood and national independence had been established beyond any shadow of doubt.

Added to these historical circumstances for the rejection of English linguistic influence was also the fear that Bahasa Malaysia might not be able to withstand the competition from English. The Dewan was responsible for promoting the acceptance and use of the national language (which it attempted to do through publicity campaigns such as National Language Week/Month, debates, essay-writing competitions, etc). But its task was far from easy as English continued to be very dominant during the period under consideration. The Constitution of 1957 though proclaiming Malay to be the national language, nevertheless allowed the use of English for official purposes till 1967 (by which time it was expected that Bahasa Malaysia would be sufficiently developed to take over) and also to be used as the language of court proceedings and, similarly, until 1967 "and thereafter until Parliament otherwise provides", the authoritative text of all Federal legislation was to be the English-language text. In view of this still entrenched position of English, Dewan officials, understandably, felt that by accepting English linguistic elements they would only bring attention to the deficiencies of Bahasa Malaysia and undermine public confidence in it as a viable national language. The Dewan and its officials thus failed to see that the battle for Malay to be the national language of Malaysia bears little relation to, or

2. The phenomenon of "linguistic nationalism" is not just confined to newly independent nations. It is very widespread in the contemporary world, manifesting itself in France, for instance, in the form of the vigorous attack on "Franglaise" pursued by Etiemble (see Etiemble, 1973, Parlez-vous Franqlaise, Paris: Gallimard).
that it cannot serve as the main guiding principle for the development of specialised terminologies. To many in the Dewan, both these tasks involved counteracting English influence.

In a booklet published in 1967, the Dewan made the proud claim that it had established over 70,000 terms in the decade since 1956. It is rather difficult to evaluate the significance of such claims. Firstly, because there are many duplications such as those exemplified above. Secondly, as the Dewan had no power (then as now) to enforce the use of the terms it created, a large number was either never put into use at all, or used only for a brief period before being supplanted by terms coined by other institutions. Examples of terms which had never gained currency with specialist users are blends such as mangk 'carnivorous' (from makan 'to eat' and daging 'meat'), and its even more dubious companion maun 'herbivorous' (from makan and daun 'leaf'). Examples of terms used only briefly are jerayun and riwayat hidup which were rejected in favour of amplitud and biografi.

8.2.2 The Second Phase of Terminological Development (1967-1974)

Though the Dewan has been given the authority and main responsibility for developing technical terminologies for Bahasa Malaysia, it had not and still has not been able to meet the demands for terminologies in the various fields of study. There are two major reasons for this. Firstly, it could not, in the initial period of terminological development especially, recruit sufficient numbers of specialists to prepare terminologies and thus many fields of study were uncatered for. Secondly, as mentioned, despite its impressive output of terms (over 70,000 in ten years), only a very small number had been accepted and put into use.

The general dissatisfaction with the terms produced by the Dewan, and pressure from the Government to make use of Bahasa Malaysia compelled many institutions and organisations in the country to embark on terminology work of their own. The most important of these were the Universities who were required to replace English with Bahasa

Malaysia as the main medium of instruction (by 1983 all first year courses are to be taught in Bahasa Malaysia). The University of Malaya, being the oldest and most established university in the country was the first to set up committees to create terms for the various disciplines in 1971 (though some departments had begun preparing terminologies before this date). The Science University, established in 1969, soon followed, as did the National University established in 1970. These were the three universities which were most involved in terminological work. The other two universities established later, in 1971 and 1972, the Agricultural University and Technological University, were largely dependent on the older Universities and the Dewan.

In the University of Malaya, National University and Science University, terminology work was systematically organised. Departmental committees prepared the terminologies required in their respective fields of study. These terminologies were subsequently screened by faculty and university level committees to see that terms used in more than one field were standardised. In a few subjects, such as Mathematics, there was inter-university co-ordination through a committee made up of representatives from the various universities which co-ordinated terminological work and standardised the terms to be used. In two universities, the University of Malaya and the Science University, terminological officers with linguistic training were appointed to advise the subject specialists in the various committees on the linguistic aspect of preparing terminologies.

In their approach to terminological development, the Universities had been guided from the start by a principle that is different to the Dewan's. The latter, as noted, stressed indigeneity. In creating terminologies, the Dewan emphasised that Malay words should be used as much as possible and foreign words only adopted as a last resort. The Universities, on the other hand, stressed international terms in order to enable Malaysian scientists to follow scientific and technological progress in other parts of the world. They feared that the Dewan's over-emphasis on indigeneity of term-
Inology which had resulted in the creation of terms that were different from those used internationally, would result in Malaysian scientists being isolated from the international scientific community.

The scientists and other specialists in the Universities believed that the only way to make sure that Bahasa Malaysia terminologies are in line with those used internationally is to make sure that they are anchored firmly to terminologies in English for not only is English a technologically advanced language but is also a language of wider communication. There was, therefore, clearly a conflict between the Universities who opted for international recognisability and the Dewan who opted for indigeneity in terminology. This conflict led to the creation of numerous terminological doublets in many fields. For instance, the Dewan rather fancifully created for 'nitrogen' the term zat lemas from zat 'essence' and lemas 'asphyxiated', where the Universities borrowed the term direct, nitrogen.

Members of terminology committees from the Universities did agree that the lexical resources of Malay should be utilised as much as possible but they stressed that this must not be at the expense of clarity and precision, or as one person phrased it, it is more important to express meanings exactly than to use native words. Even when a Malay term equivalent in meaning is available, it may be rejected if it is not as concise as the English term. For this reason, linguists in the Universities rejected penglelangitkerasan 'palatalisation' and adopted the adapted English term palatalisasi though the former is equivalent in meaning to the English term. There is, therefore, an essential difference between the Universities and the Dewan in the use of Malay words as specialised terms. The Dewan was ready to use a Malay word if one could be found (or invented), the Universities would only accept it if there was a utilitarian reason for doing so.

Another difference in approach was that the Universities looked beyond the term in formulating terminologies, whereas the Dewan looked merely at the term per se. This meant, first of all, that the Universities, unlike the Dewan, would only accept a term if it could be

1. In addition, most of the lecturers and professionals in the country at that period were English educated and this is another reason for the preference for English rather than another European language as the language of reference in preparing terminologies in Malay.
used in different phrasal contexts without giving rise to clumsiness or ambiguity. For instance, the Universities have unanimously opted for geografi instead of the Dewan's creation ilmu alam for 'geography' because of the awkwardness of the latter when used in such phrases as 'geographical setting' and 'geographical evidence'. For the first phrase the translation would be latar belakang ilmu alam; this is far too long and cumbersome to be acceptable as a technical term. With geografi, the term geografis¹, 'geographical' could be derived, and the two phrases in question could be rendered unambiguously as latar belakang geografis 'geographical setting' and economically as bukti-bukti geografis 'geographical evidence'.²

By looking beyond the word, the Universities were able to perceive the implications of a term for deriving other related terms. Hence, they often prefer to adopt an English term directly, simply because it enables other terms to be derived more easily and systematically. The terminologies created by the Dewan often lacked systematicity because of its tendency to concentrate on each individual word instead of looking at it in terms of a set of terms related by form and meaning. This had given rise to inconsistencies as those illustrated in the set of terms below prescribed by the Dewan to replace the English terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Terms</th>
<th>Bahasa Malaysia Versions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>microscopic</td>
<td>seni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microspore</td>
<td>sepora seni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>micro-organism</td>
<td>hidupan seni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microbe</td>
<td>mikercb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>micrometer</td>
<td>jangkahalus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microscope</td>
<td>teropong hama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the six Malay terms, the first three are derived in a consistent manner, around the Malay root word seni 'fine, thin'. However, the last three words are non-consistent and non-predictable in relation to seni, and the possibilities of further systematisation of related terms have been lost.

1. The suffix -is '-ical' is an adaptation of the Dutch -isch borrowed via Indonesian.
Compare the treatment of the same set of English terms by the University of Malaya below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Term</th>
<th>Malay Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>microscopic</td>
<td>mikrospik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microspore</td>
<td>mikrospora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>micro-organism</td>
<td>organisma mikro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microbe</td>
<td>mikrob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>micrometer</td>
<td>mikrometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microscope</td>
<td>mikroskop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six Malay terms on the right are English terms adopted after being orthographically adapted. The adaptation was consistently done and the relation of the terms to each other on the basis of the word mikro- is clear. The systematicity thus obtained is invaluable for terms such as mikro- obtained a precise and unified meaning in different spheres of activity (in this case, biology, biochemistry, and physics).

In the adaptation of the English terms, the University of Malaya (as is the practice with other universities), was concerned not to obscure the English origins of the Malay terms. Thus in the examples above, though both the University of Malaya and the Dewan had used a loanword for 'microbe', they had adapted it differently. The linguistically conservative Dewan adapted it to mikero; the consonant cluster had been eliminated by the insertion of the letter e. The University of Malaya, on the other hand, had made sure that visual resemblance with the English model is maintained by retaining the consonant cluster in mikrob.

Though the Universities, unlike the Dewan, did not urge the use of Malay words for their own sake in preparing terminologies, they had still managed to create a large number of terms using Malay word material alone. This is indicated in the sample of terms (391 items) obtained from terminology lists prepared by the Universities between 1971-1974 (see Table 3 on p.249). Though loanwords account for 45% of the terms created by the Universities, another 40% of the terms are accounted for by loan translation and semantic extension. On the other hand, the greater emphasis given by the Dewan to indigeneity of terminology is indicated by the fact that in the sample of terms obtained from its terminology lists prepared
during this period, the preparation of loan translations and semantic extensions is very significantly higher than that of loanwords, 53% and 31% respectively. The proportion of terms based on created words is 10% for the Universities and 13% for the Dewan. Though this does not seem to be a great difference, it must be pointed out that the Universities avoided blending of any type and restricted the creation of new words mainly to affixation and compounding. The Dewan, on the other hand, made far more use of blending and circumlocution than did the Universities.

However, though the Dewan has continued to stress indigeneity in developing terminologies even up to the present, there was a gradual relaxation of the rigid attitude taken against foreign linguistic influences towards the end of the '60s. A number of reasons were responsible for this gradual change in attitude. First, there was the realisation by the Dewan that a very large number of the terms that it had created in the last ten years had failed to be accepted by the users for whom the terms were destined for. It has been noted how the over-emphasis on indigeneity has led to the invention of new words by blending when native Malay words could not be found. Also, how the insistence on conformity to Malay linguistic characteristics had resulted in such a drastic adaptation of the orthographic form of loan terms that they appeared like new words altogether. Both the blends and the orthographically distorted loan terms proved to be universally unpopular. Faced with this lack of success, the Dewan began to realise that a new approach to preparing terminologies was required.

The second reason for the change in attitude towards foreign, in particular, English, innovations was that by 1967 the fear that English would threaten the position of Malay as the major language in the country was receding. The Language Bill of 1967 had decreed that Malay was to be the sole official language from that year hence. This act of legislation plus the consistent policy pursued by the Government regarding the increasing use of Bahasa Malaysia in administration and education over the last ten years had made clear to the
non-Malay population that they had no choice but to accept Bahasa Malaysia as the first language of the country. In this atmosphere of increasing compliance towards the National Language, the Dewan undoubtedly felt that it could now afford to be more tolerant of English and thus became more willing to accept English linguistic elements into Bahasa Malaysia.

The third reason for the beginning of a more liberal attitude towards foreign influence was the ending of the political confrontation with Indonesia which Sukarno initiated in 1963 on the formation of Malaysia. In 1967 diplomatic relations were resumed between Malaysia and Indonesia. One of the areas in which the two countries agreed that cooperation was desirable was language. This, as noted earlier, was to lead to an agreement on a common spelling system between the two countries in 1972. The establishment of the National University in 1970 led to large numbers of lecturers being recruited from Indonesia. This was because the National University used Bahasa Malaysia as its sole medium of instruction and during this period (the early 1970's) there were few lecturers in Malaysia who could lecture proficiently in this language. The Indonesian lecturers were responsible for an increasing number of terms adopted from Indonesia.

The Indonesian language planners have always been far more liberal and tolerant of foreign linguistic influences than the Malaysian planners. They had borrowed large numbers of technical terms from Dutch but were borrowing increasingly from English. The readiness of the Indonesians to accept English linguistic elements in Bahasa Malaysia also helped to make their Malaysian counterparts more amenable to accepting English linguistic elements in Bahasa Malaysia.

As has been noted, in the early '70's, the Dewan worked actively with the Indonesians to arrive at a common spelling system for the two countries. The result was the New Spelling system proclaimed in 1972. Spurred on by the outstanding success of this exercise in cooperation and aided by the emergence of more enlightened and internationally minded policies at the Dewan, the Malaysian and Indonesian

1. After the racial clashes in 1969, the Sedition Act was passed which forbids public discussion on 'seditious issues', among which is the national language issue.
governments began endeavouring to eliminate the confusion caused by the differing scientific terminologies. The implementation of the joint spelling has probably made this task even more urgent, as works written in one country would now be more easily and more widely read in the other.

Between 1972-1975, a team of Malaysian planners met with a team of Indonesian planners to formulate a standard set of rules to be followed in preparing technical terminologies in the two countries. The common set of rules that finally emerged from these meetings was officially launched by their publication in the Pedoman Umum Pembentukan Istilah Bahasa Malaysia (A Common Guide to the Formation of Terminology for Bahasa Malaysia, hereafter called PUPIBM). The PUPIBM and the rules it contained signalled the beginning of a new phase in terminological development in Malaysia.

8.2.3 The Third Phase of Terminological Development (1975 - )

The year 1975 is very significant for it marks the beginning of a new phase in terminological development with the publication of the PUPIBM and a new set of rules which reflect a very different approach to terminology preparation from that which had been followed by the Dewan in the past. Terminology development in the Universities, however, continued to operate pretty much along the same lines as in the second phase even after the publication of the PUPIBM. This was because rules and procedures for terminology formation set out in the PUPIBM reflect those of the Universities.

This can be seen in the rules for adapting the spelling of loan technical terms. The rules state very clearly that in orthographical adaptation the emphasis should be on maintaining visual resemblance with the term in the source language. Consequently, consonant letter-sequences were no longer to be indiscriminately eliminated but were to be retained when appearing in initial and medial position of a word. Consonant letter-sequences in word-final position were either retained or modified according to specified rules (see Chapter 5, p.121ff, for a summary of these rules). These new rules on orthographical adaptation
put an end to the orthographical distortion of loan terms and therefore the creation of such terms as perotopelazam 'protoplasm' and haiderojen 'hydrogen' which users have universally rejected.

The new rules also reflect the adoption of a practical and flexible approach to future terminological development. For instance, the rules state that when borrowing loan technical terms, either the root form or the derived form of the word may be borrowed depending on the context of use or on suitability for deriving other related terms. In the past, the Dewan had stipulated that only the root form of the word should be borrowed and derivatives obtained by the use of Malay affixes. This had created a lot of difficulties mainly because there are many affixes in English which have no equivalents in Malay. The Dewan now follows the practice of the Universities by borrowing the derived form that is perceived as being more practical and then adapting the affix according to specific rules.

However, the PUPTBM emphasises that indigenous sources should be thoroughly explored before resorting to borrowing. Thus, it prescribes an elaborate procedure for terminology committees to follow in selecting a term. In this scheme the main sources for terminological innovation, namely, (a) Malay, (b) Malay dialects and related languages, and (c) foreign languages, are hierarchically ordered and the selection of a term from these sources are based on a number of conditions. This scheme is given in the following page.
**Figure 2: Procedure for Formulation of Terminology**

1. **Concept**
   - **Step 1:** Words currently in use in Bahasa Malaysia
   - **Step 2:** Archaic & uncommon words in Bahasa Malaysia
   - **Step 3:** Words currently in use in related languages
   - **Step 4:** Archaic & uncommon words in related languages
   - **Step 5:** Words from English
   - **Step 6:** Words from other foreign languages
   - **Step 7:** Choose the best from Terms 1-6

2. **Conditions**
   - (1) Concise → Term 1
   - (2) Parallel meaning → Term 2
   - (3) Free from undesirable connotations → Term 3
   - (4) Euphonic → Term 4

3. **Terms**
   - **Term 5:**
     - a. Foreign term more precise
     - b. Foreign term more concise
     - c. Foreign term facilitates international exchange
     - d. Foreign term enables agreement to be reached

   - **Term 6:**
     - a. Foreign term with general meaning translated with general meaning
     - b. Related foreign terms translated systematically

---

The above procedure prescribed for selecting the linguistic source for a term is obviously very laborious and time-consuming. Furthermore, it demands a high level of linguistic competence from members of terminology committees. Not only do they have to be familiar with Malay and its dialects, but also with languages related to Malay (such as Javanese, Tagalog, etc), as well as with English and other foreign languages. It is not surprising therefore, that this procedure for selecting a term laid down by the PUPJBM has more often than not been ignored. Members of terminology committees pointed out that looking for suitable equivalents within Bahasa Malaysia itself, or its dialects, or related languages is usually a waste of time as well as futile as the majority of the scientific and technical concepts embodied in the English terms are alien to Malay as well as other Austronesian cultures. Consequently, terminology committees, especially those preparing scientific and technical terminologies, in practice have dispensed with the elaborate scheme prescribed in the PUPJBM and simply borrowed the English term either in the form of a loanword or in the form of a loan translation. In other words, decision-making in terminology committees has been more concerned with the form that borrowing takes rather than with the source language from which the term is to be taken.

The data indicates that in a greater proportion of the terms in the arts subjects and social sciences, for example, education, history, geography, the influence of English takes the form of loan translations. Terminology committees in the science subjects, particularly those preparing terminologies for mathematics, chemistry, physics, and engineering, show a clear preference for adopting the English term directly. The Chairman of the University of Malaya Terminology

1. This problem is not confined to the contact situation in which one of the languages involved is technologically more advanced than the other. This problem of finding 'equivalents' between languages is highlighted in the following extract taken from a UNESCO monograph on scientific and technical translating:

...it is only rarely and by chance that a word has a true 'equivalent' in another language...

To look for similarity between linguistic contexts in two different languages is often to discover they do not exist, for the simple reason that the system of ideas or things to which they appertain in the one language has no existence in the other. In fact, wholly exact equivalence is never attainable, because the mental imagery of people using different languages (or even the same language) in different countries is a function of the background against which their daily lives are lived.

Committee for Engineering who was interviewed for this study explained this preference for direct borrowings by saying that loanwords are 'stable' in meaning whereas loan translations and Malay equivalents are 'unstable' because they lend themselves to arguments over semantic appropriateness. He gave as an example the term 'acceleration' in engineering for which different Malay equivalents were offered by the University of Malaya and the National University's Engineering Committees. The former proposed cepatan (from cepat 'quick' and the nominal suffix -an), whereas the latter proposed pecutan (from pecut 'to whip on' and the suffix -an). To settle arguments over the semantic appropriateness of the two terms, it was decided to use the adapted English term accelerasi. Semantic appropriateness is, in fact, the major source of disagreement among committee members in practically every field of study. The disagreement is usually settled by adopting the English term directly.

In the past, the Dewan had stipulated that borrowings should be in the form of loan translation as far as possible. In the PUPIBM, however, no such preference is indicated. It merely outlines the principal linguistic procedures for creating terminologies using both native and borrowed lexical items. These are:

(i) adopting a root word
(ii) affixation
(iii) compounding
(iv) reduplication
(v) blending of the type involving assimilation of similar phonemes or syllables
(vi) analogy

The decision to restrict the formation of blends to those which involve the assimilation of similar phonemes and syllables (see Chapter 7 p.208) was taken because blends formed in other ways have proved to be unacceptable to users.

In assessing the impact of the PUPIBM and its rules on terminological development after 1975, it would be accurate to say that it
is the Dewan itself which has been most affected. Most of the rules are, in fact, adopted from those observed by the Universities, for instance, those emphasising visual resemblance with the model term in orthographical adaptation, practicality and systematicity in deriving terminologies, restriction of blending. These rules are directed against past practices of the Dewan and the effect has been to bring the Dewan more in line with the Universities in terminological development.

With the publication of the PUPIBM in 1975, therefore, the Dewan had to change its system of preparing terminologies. This means as well that the majority of the terminology lists and glossaries it had published could no longer be used as they would contradict many of the rules laid down in the PUPIBM.

The change in the Dewan's approach to terminology preparation is reflected in the data. When samples of terms from the three phases of terminological development were compared, it was found that the proportion of terms imported from English in the third phase is significantly higher than those in the two earlier phases. This is indicated in the table below which shows the use of the different lexical processes during the three phases of terminological development by the Dewan and the Universities.

**Table 3:**

Frequency & Percentage Distributions of Terms Derived by Planning Agencies from Different Lexical Processes in the Three Phases of Terminological Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period/Planning Agencies</th>
<th>Importation</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Apt Equivalent Substitution</th>
<th>Native Creation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957-1966 Dewan</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.5 %</td>
<td>56.1 %</td>
<td>2.5 %</td>
<td>14.9 %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1974 Dewan Universities</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.8 %</td>
<td>53.3 %</td>
<td>3.2 %</td>
<td>12.7 %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1980 Dewan Universities</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.7 %</td>
<td>47.7 %</td>
<td>2.9 %</td>
<td>9.7 %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.9 %</td>
<td>38.1 %</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
<td>8.0 %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table above indicates, though substitution remains the most extensively used process by the Dewan after 1975, accounting for about 48% of the terms established, there is a significant increase in the importation of terms from English. Importation now accounts for about 40% of the new terms and this is a significant increase over importation in the two earlier phases of terminological development.

The Universities, as observed earlier, were relatively unaffected by the change of policy after 1975. They continued to prepare terminologies very much along the same lines as in the past. This is borne out when the two samples of terms collected from glossaries prepared by the Universities between 1967-1979 and between 1975-1979 were compared. It was established that there is no statistically significant difference in the extent of use of the different processes of lexical expansion in the two phases. Importation accounts for around 45% and substitution about 40% of the terms established in both phases.

While direct importation of English terms by the Dewan has increased significantly after 1975 the derivation of terms through native creation has significantly decreased. In the third phase the proportion of terms based on created words is only about one third of that in the first and second phases. And like the Universities, the Dewan in the later phase has restricted the creation of words mainly to affixal forms and compounds; blending is no longer as extensively used as in the past, indicated by the fact that only one blend was found in the sample from terms established by the Dewan after 1975. The Universities have a significantly higher proportion of terms based on equivalent Malay words, 7% compared to about 3% for the Dewan. These direct equivalent substitutes, however, are mainly confined to the arts subjects such as geography, where many Malay terms can be found for English terms designating topographical features that are found in this part of the world (e.g. paya bakau 'mangrove swamp', beting 'mud-flat'), and anthropology where terms relating to common cultural practices and phenomena already exist (e.g. pantang 'taboo', emas kahwin 'dowry', adat-resam 'custom').
8.2.4 Co-ordination and Standardisation of Terminology

With the publication of the PUPIBM, a standard set of rules and procedures was provided to terminology committees engaged in preparing terminologies in the country.

Besides providing a standard set of rules, Malaysian planners have also attempted to standardise terminologies by setting up committees to screen the terms created to see that they conform to the rules in the PUPIBM.

At the national level is a committee called the Jawatankuasa Tetap Bahasa Malaysia (the Permanent Committee for Bahasa Malaysia, hereafter called JKTBM). This committee was set up by the Minister of Education in 1972 to represent Malaysia in negotiations with Indonesia over standardisation of scientific terminologies in the two countries. The chairman of the JKTBM is the Director of the Dewan and he has this agency as his secretariat. The JKTBM is a ministerial committee in the sense that all its 8-10 members are appointed by the Minister of Education and they are responsible to him. The members of the JKTBM are predominantly Malay linguists from the institutions of higher learning in the country. Subject specialists in the various fields of study are co-opted when discussions involved their respective disciplines.

The JKTBM is concerned primarily with formulating principles and rules for terminological work. From 1972-1975 the JKTBM and its counterpart in Indonesia, the Panitia Perkembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa Indonesia (the Committee for the Propagation and Development of Bahasa Indonesia, hereafter the PPPBI) worked together to draw up a standard set of rules to be used in preparing terminologies in the two countries. These rules were subsequently published in PUPIBM in 1975. The joint committee formed when the JKTBM meets with the PPPBI is called the Majlis Bahasa Indonesia-Bahasa Malaysia (the Council for Bahasa Indonesia-Bahasa Malaysia, hereafter called MBIBM).

The MBIBM meets twice a year to standardise terminologies used in various fields of study in Malaysia and Indonesia. At these discussions, subject specialists are invited to give their views regarding the standardisation of the terminology in their respective fields of
study. These specialists also advise the MBIBM in drawing up supplementary rules to be used in conjunction with the PUPIBM in preparing terminologies for their field.

At the MBIBM discussions, terms in the various fields of study used in both countries are grouped into one of three categories. These are as follows:

(i) Agree to be the same
(ii) Agree to disagree
(iii) Agree to postpone decision as to (i) or (ii).

The different colonial history of Indonesia and Malaysia has often created practical difficulties for the standardisation of terms. As the Indonesians were for centuries under the Dutch, they had naturally used the Dutch language as the point of reference for deriving technical terms. The Malaysians, on the other hand, were under the British and therefore, for them the language of reference has been English. There are numerous cases when for the same concept, the Indonesians had borrowed a Dutch term and the Malaysians an English term, many of these terms being cognates. In such cases, the practice has been to group these terms under the category of 'agree to disagree'. The Malaysian planners know too well that the public would resist any attempt to replace an English derived term with a Dutch derived one due to their greater familiarity with English as well as the greater prestige of English.

The only really important Dutch derived elements that have been accepted into Malay - and only after a great deal of opposition from the public - are the two suffixes: -asi/-si 'ation/(Dutch -atie), and -is '-ic' (from Dutch -isch). As mentioned in Chapter 5, p.129, forms with these suffixes alternate with forms having the English derived suffixes -sven '-sion' and -ik '-ic', for example: seksi, seksyen 'section'; romantik, romantik 'romantic'.

In the standardisation of terminologies, therefore, social-linguistic considerations such as the public's familiarity with English as well as the prestige of the English language itself, have been respon-
sible for many decisions to differ from Indonesia rather than opt for standardisation by adopting terms used in Indonesia derived from Dutch. It would be true to say that in the area of supranational standardisation of terminologies, the sociolinguistic impact of English has often been an obstacle in the attempt to standardise the terminologies of Malaysia and Indonesia. However, since the '60's, English has increasingly been replacing Dutch as the main source of influence on Bahasa Indonesia.1 This is particularly so in the scientific and technical fields where borrowings from English have been far more numerous than borrowings from Dutch. Because of this growing influence of English on Bahasa Indonesia, it is likely that standardisation of terminologies between the two countries will be made easier in the future as Bahasa Indonesia as well as Bahasa Malaysia will have English as their language of reference.

At the time of writing, there are three types of terminology committee in the country. These are: (a) the Dewan committees (27, of which 15 were meeting regularly), (b) the JKTBM committees, and (c) the Universities' committees. The members of the Dewan committees as well as the members of the JKTBM committees are drawn from the Universities, government and quasi-government departments where experts in various fields are available. Since 1975, the Dewan has endeavoured to make the composition of its committees as representative as possible by appointing at least one specialist in the relevant field from each of the Universities and other major institutions in the country to sit on its committees. This is to ensure that the terms created are in line with the requirements of these institutions and to facilitate the task of disseminating the terms created. This emphasis on representative membership of committees is an attempt to bridge the gap in communication between the producers and users of terminologies which has hampered terminological development in the past. By selecting members of its committees for their understanding of professional needs, rather than

ideology (as was the practice in the past), the Dewan has attempted to check the conflict between 'linguistically conservative' producers and 'linguistically liberal' users of terminologies by internal administrative means.

With three separate groups of committees creating terminologies, there is, inevitably, a considerable degree of duplication. This situation has to be accepted by the Dewan for it has realised that it cannot hope to meet the demands for terminologies on its own. Attempts, however, are made to standardise the terms created by these different committees. This is done first through a committee called the Jawatankuasa Penyelerasan Istilah (the Committee for the Co-ordination of Terminology, hereafter called the JPI). This committee is made up of the chairmen of the various Dewan committees as well as the chairmen of the JKTBM committees. Their task is to standardise the terms which are used in more than one field. Having passed through the JPI, the terms are then screened by the JKTBM to see that they conform to the rules laid down in the PUPIBM.

The system of co-ordination and standardisation is depicted graphically on the following page.
Figure 2: System of Co-ordination and Standardisation of Terminology at the National Level
The system of terminology co-ordination and standardisation outlined above affects mainly the committees preparing terminologies for the Dewan and the JKTEM. The Universities have their own system for co-ordinating and standardising the terminologies they create as already described on p. 238.

Besides sending lists of terms approved either at faculty or University level to the Terminological Division of the Dewan, the Universities work independently on their own with little control or guidance from the Dewan. Whatever influence the Dewan exerts is indirect, that is, via the lecturers from the various departments in the Universities appointed to sit on its terminology committees. The hope of the Dewan - not always realised - is that these lecturers will encourage their departmental terminology committees to follow the guidelines laid down by the Dewan as well as help to disseminate the terms which the Dewan committees have produced. The Dewan also sends out periodically lists of approved terms (by the JKTEM or MBTEM) to the Universities. However, it cannot be sure that these terms will be used as it has no power to enforce their use. In fact, it is often the case that departmental heads to whom the lists are sent do not take the trouble to circulate these lists among their staff. It is only at the school level that the Dewan can be certain that only the terms which it has approved are in use. This is because of its connection with the Ministry of Education and also because it is the prime supplier of textbooks in the National Language. Through these textbooks especially, the Dewan puts into use the terminologies that it has approved.

There is a need to re-assess the Dewan's role interterminological development. Quite a few of the Dewan officials interviewed for this study have expressed the view that the actual task of terminology preparation should be left to the Universities and professional organisations in the country. During a symposium on the standardisation of scientific and mathematical terms in 1979, the Secretary of the Terminological Division of the Dewan himself suggested that the task of creating terminologies should be divided among the institutions of higher learning and that the Dewan should merely act as a liaison office.
for the various agencies involved in terminological work and be responsible for co-ordination. He told the symposium that if the present Dewan system of organising terminological work continued unchanged, it would only be able to provide about 25% of the terms required by the Universities and other institutions of higher learning by 1983, the year by which the National Education Policy requires that all courses should be taught in Bahasa Malaysia. There are, therefore, sound reasons for encouraging even more intensive participation by agencies outside the Dewan, provided, of course, that there is agreement on the general principles of vocabulary admissibility. The Dewan should then concentrate instead on stimulating vocabulary creation and on obtaining agreement on principles of terminological preparation as well as on offering advisory and 'clear-house' services.

8.3 Summary of Chapter

In this chapter, the role played by English in the standardisation and modernisation of Bahasa Malaysia has been examined.

English, as a major factor in decision-making with regard to the standardisation of the spelling system, was first looked at. Spelling standardisation has centred around questions relating to the acceptance or non-acceptance of linguistic features from English such as loan phonemes. The acceptance of these contact-induced innovations in the Common spelling System has been to facilitate the borrowing and adaptation of English terms, especially in the scientific and technical areas.

In the standardisation of terminology, English has also been an important factor. Since the bulk of the terms are borrowings from English, either direct or indirect, it is inevitable that the standardisation of terminology should be concerned to a large extent with the procedures of borrowing, such as for example, the form in which the word should be borrowed, the adaptation of the borrowed terms, and so on.

1. Ismail bin Dahaman "Garis-garis panduan dalam penetapan istilah Bahasa Malaysia", paper presented at the Symposium on the Use of Bahasa Malaysia in Science and Mathematics, 1979, Perang.
When standardisation on the supranational level, with Indonesia, was examined, it was noted how socio-linguistic considerations centering on the public's preference for English as well as the prestige of the English language itself, have been responsible for decisions to differ from Bahasa Indonesia, in certain aspects of spelling and terminology usage.

The lexical modernisation of Bahasa Malaysia has been characterised by attitudinal changes on the part of the Dewan. The conflict has been between indigeneity and international recognisability of terminology. The first phase of terminological development (1957-1966) may be called the 'puristic' period, marked as it was by an over-emphasis on indigeneity and a rejection of foreign linguistic elements, particularly from English. Dissatisfaction with this approach (and the terms it gave rise to), led to other agencies, in particular, the Universities, embarking on terminological work. During this second phase (1967-1974), these agencies created terms that reflect priorities different from the Dewan's, namely, international recognisability, practicality and systematicity in terminology preparation. The terminologies created, therefore, were anchored firmly to terminologies in English. However, during this phase too, a more linguistically liberal attitude was beginning to be adopted by the Dewan for a number of reasons examined. This change in attitude culminated in the adoption of a new set of procedures for terminology preparation set out in the PUPTBM of 1975. These procedures based largely on procedures followed by the Universities have the effect of bringing the Dewan more in line with the former in terminological development.

The conflict between indigeneity and international recognisability however, has not been entirely resolved. The Dewan and the planning committee (the JKTEM) still urge as a general principle that lexical resources in Malay as well as in related languages be exploited as fully as possible before borrowing from English. However, in selecting
the linguistic sources for terminological innovation, the Universities continue to place practical considerations above everything else. Since borrowing from English is the most convenient in terms of availability, international recognisability, and systematicity of terminology, these institutions are likely to continue to look to English as their primary source for terminological innovation.
Planned and Spontaneous Lexical Innovation

9.0 Introduction

The lexicon of Bahasa Malaysia is being expanded, not only officially, through the activities of the planning agencies (i.e. the Dewan and the Universities), but also, unofficially, through the activities of various individuals such as journalists, writers, broadcasters, advertisers, etc. Whereas the activities of the planning agencies have been, and are still, mostly carried out according to a planned programme, the individual activities are sporadic and spontaneous. In the discussion which follows, the first type of activities will be referred to as planned and the second as spontaneous lexical innovation.

In the first part of this chapter, an attempt is made to compare and contrast planned and spontaneous lexical innovation in quantitative terms. The comparison is based on the following four aspects: (1) the processes of lexical expansion, (2) the types of lexical innovations derived from these processes, (3) the form classes, and (4) the semantic domains to which these lexical innovations belonged. Sociolinguistic explanations for the differences are offered where appropriate and relevant. Generally, only differences which have been established by statistical tests to be significant at the 5% confidence level are considered and discussed.

The comparison was based on two sets of data. The first representing the planned area, comprised 3454 lexical items obtained by systematic sampling from glossaries, word-lists and from the Ramus Dewan, the official dictionary of the Dewan. The second set, representing the spontaneous area, contained 4053 items.

1. See Appendix 4 for the system of classification in terms of semantic domains.
2. The tests used are the chi-square for goodness-of-fit and for contingency tables and the binomial, using the normal approximation. Details of these tests are given in Appendix 5.
collected from newspapers, magazines, broadcasting and advertising from 1978 to 1980.

In the second part of the chapter, a corpus of written texts with a total number of 15,750 running words is analysed to establish if the differences noted in the comparison of planned and spontaneous lexical innovation in the first part of the chapter are reflected in language in use. The corpus of texts was selected on a random basis from three sources: publications of the Dewan, newspapers, and popular magazines. From the Dewan publications 19 texts were selected on 6 subject areas, namely, politics, economics, education, science, the arts, and social issues. From the newspapers 22 texts were selected on the same 6 subject areas plus an additional one, sport. From the popular magazines, 6 texts were selected on 2 subject areas, entertainment and fashion. Each subject area is represented by 3 or 4 texts totalling approximately 1050 running words. The corpus of texts was analysed using a computer package CONCORD (see Chapter 1.3.1). Before the texts were subjected to analysis, new lexical items had first to be identified by the writer and this was done by attaching numeric suffixes to the items. Details of the computer package, an example of a coded text as well as the coding index used are given in Appendix 3. Two measures, the type-token ratio and the count for hapax legomena, were also used. The type-token ratio gives a valuable check on the volume of innovations by indicating if a high value has been gained by a large-scale repetition of a limited number of specific items. The count for hapax legomena indicates the frequency of occurrence of lexical types, by isolating the proportion of those used only once. The formulae for these two measures are given on the next page.

---

1. Details of the texts and their sources are given in Appendix 3.
2. Lexical items are considered new if they are listed as 'modern' or not listed at all, in R.J. Wilkinson's Malay-English Dictionary (Romanised), revised and enlarged by A.E. Coope, 7th edition, London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd, 1955.
3. Lexical types are different lexical items as opposed to lexical tokens which are occurrences of lexical items.
Type-token ratio (lexical variation) = \( \frac{\text{No. of types}}{\text{No. of tokens}} \times 100 \)

\% of hapax legomena = \( \frac{\text{No. of types used once}}{\text{No. of types}} \times 100 \)

The statistical tests used to establish if differences are significant are the same as those used in the first part of the chapter.

9.1 Comparison of Planned and Spontaneous Lexical Innovation

Table 1 below shows the different degree of emphasis given to the various lexical processes in the two areas in terms of frequencies and percentages of items formed by these processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS/TYPe OF LEXICAL INNOVATION</th>
<th>PLANNED AREA</th>
<th>SPONTANEOUS AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Loanwords</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loanblends</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>2379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTITUTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Translations</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Extensions</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT EQUIVALENT SUBSTITUTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Substitutes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Substitutes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE CREATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Creations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced Creations</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3454</td>
<td>4053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Tables on the frequency and percentage distributions of subcategories of types of lexical innovations are given in Appendix 6.
From the table it may be seen that the planning agencies as a whole are far more committed to utilising indigenous lexical resources in vocabulary development, shown by the greater emphasis placed on the processes of substitution, native creation and direct apt equivalent substitution. Lexical innovation in the spontaneous sector is influenced more by considerations of speed, expediency, fashion and impact on audience. The sociolinguistic situation in Malaysia (see Chapter 4: The Contact Situation), is such that these demands are more likely to be met by exploiting the resources of English rather than of Bahasa Malaysia. Hence, the heavy reliance placed on importation from English in this sector.

In the sub-sections which follow, a more detailed explanation is provided for the differential use of the various lexical processes in the planned and spontaneous areas.

9.1.1 Borrowing: Importation vs. Substitution

Though borrowing is undoubtedly the most extensively used process for expanding the vocabulary of Bahasa Malaysia, the form of borrowing preferred is different in the planned and in the spontaneous sectors. While the spontaneous sector relies mainly on importation, the planned sector makes use of substitution wherever possible. This greater emphasis on indirect borrowing in the planned sector is reflected in the data for about twice as many items are derived from substitution in this sector (41.7%) as compared with in the spontaneous sector (23.7%).

The emphasis on the use of substitutions in the planned sector is expressed mainly in the formation of loan translations. As Table 2 on p. 264 shows, loan translations formed the largest category of lexical innovations in all semantic domains except the

1. In Chapter 8, it was pointed out that among the planning agencies, there is a greater preference for importation among the Universities when compared to the Dewan. However, even when the sample of items from the Universities is taken alone, the proportion of items derived from substitution is still significantly higher than that derived from the same process in the spontaneous area (38.2% as against 23.7%). It is clear, therefore, that over the planned area as a whole substitution as a process of lexical expansion is used more extensively.
Table 2: Frequency & Percentage Distributions of Lexical Innovations among Semantic Domains in Planned and Spontaneous Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Lexical Innovation</th>
<th>Semantic Domains</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Loanword</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loanblend</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Translation</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Extension</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Equivalent Substitut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Equivalent Substitut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Creation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced Creation</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3454</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scientific and social where pure loanwords are more dominant. With the exception of these domains, between 36-69% of the total number of lexical innovations in each domain are loan translations.

This trend is in marked contrast to that in the spontaneous sector where importations, mainly as pure loanwords, formed the largest category of innovations in all but one (the general) of the semantic domains. The proportion of pure loanwords is between 44-63% except in the political and economic domains where pure loanwords are less dominant because of the greater emphasis placed on the formation of loan translations. The proportion of these two types of innovations are relatively similar indicating that it is in these two domains, the economic and the political, that vocabulary formation in the spontaneous sector is most in line with that in the planned sector.

The sharpest contrast between the spontaneous and the planned sectors in the formation of vocabulary is to be seen in the sport domain. In this domain the spontaneous sector has the highest proportion of pure loanwords, almost 63%.¹ In the planned sector, the sport domain has one of the highest concentrations of loan translations, almost 60% (59.8%). Pure loanwords are even less common than induced creations in this domain in the planned sector, indicated by the larger proportion of the latter (15.9%) over the former (10.3%). The different word-formation methods emphasized by the two sectors in the sport domain has resulted in many competing forms. For instance: handikap vs. kecacatan, tackle vs. rebut, hattrick vs. tiga berturut, dribel vs. bawa kelecek, etc., the first in each pair being used in the spontaneous area and the second in each pair advocated by the Dewan.²

1. The influence of English on the language of sport is as pervasive in Malaysia as in other parts of the world. This is evident from a cursory examination of the sport page of a Malay newspaper or a few minutes listening to sport commentary on radio or television. The range of terms is extensive including not only words used in connection with various games (e.g: prikik 'free kick', servis 'service', joki 'jockey', trai 'try' (in rugby), but also with organisation (e.g: turname 'tournament', siri 'series', interzone, kontingen 'contingent'), and even the conduct and performance of players (e.g: agresif, defensif, taktikal, sportif 'sporting', steady).
2. Given the very strong preference of the public for pure loanwords in the sport domain, the Dewan (whose terminology committee is responsible for the creation of sport terminology in the planned sector) should consider whether it is advisable to force such a high degree of indigeneity in this domain. More so than the terminologies in other domains, the terms formed in the sport domain are destined for the use of the general public rather than a small group of Specialist users. Hence the preference of the general public must be taken into account.
It is appropriate at this point to look at some of the factors behind the massive importation of English words in the spontaneous sector. The preference of the 'innovations' in the spontaneous sector, especially of the journalists, for importation over substitution seems to have been established only in the last twenty years. For Gullick, writing in 1953, observes that "the borrowing of English words in lieu of translation is not common except in the case of proper nouns and some technical terms". This change in preference reflects first of all the great mass of information flooding the country via the medium of English in the last twenty years. Consequently, translation can no longer cope with the demand for new terms. Furthermore, it is no longer the case that borrowing from English is confined to "proper nouns and some technical terms". The variety and range of fields from which borrowing is made is very much wider now than twenty years ago. The degree of skill and specialized knowledge of the field required to translate competently is correspondingly much greater now than in the past. Under these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the importation of English words has increased so extensively.

Another factor which explains the preference for importation over substitution by modern-day journalists is the change in socio-cultural orientation. Whereas Malay journalists in the past had tended to look to Moslem countries such as Egypt and Turkey for ideas as well as the terms which expressed them, modern Malay journalists now look to the Western World, in particular, Anglo-American culture, for their inspiration. Therefore, while a profusion of Arabic words and stylistic expressions marked Malay journalistic writing in the past, a profusion of English words and phrases is typical of Malay journalistic writing of the present.

2. The force of pan-Islamism was strong at the turn of the century. Cairo, Beirut and Mecca were locked upon as centres of higher learning and Turkey was looked upon as the leader of the Moslem world. See: W.L. Holland, 1953, Asian Nationalism and the West, New York, p.284; R.J. Wilkinson, 1907, Papers on Malay Subjects, Vol.1, pp.62-64; Za'ba's article, "Malay Journalism in Malaya," in JMBRAS, Vol.19, 1941, p.244 for the influence of Egypt and the Arabic language on Malay journalists.
T.E. Hope (1962) has referred to socio-cultural factors affecting borrowing as the "social climate of borrowing."\(^1\)

According to Hope,

"words which at first sight appear trivial or affected may be borrowed out of a genuine regard for a foreign culture, either advisedly, or, as is more likely, unconsciously and incidentally, as part of a package deal (so to speak) by which foreign influences are imported with all their incidentals and trappings."\(^2\)

In Malaysia, the prestige of Anglo-American culture has always been high. For the majority of people the modernization of Malaysian society is inseparable from Westernization on the Anglo-American model. The only difference between the past and the present is that while cultural currents from the West affected the isolated elite only in the past, in recent times these currents have begun to affect the general population. This is due mainly to the spread of literacy and the mass media. The newspapers, magazines, radio and television all have played a vital role in disseminating new trends and ideas from the West and the vocabulary connected with them. However, the importation and dissemination of Western cultural trends and novelties has not been done in a discriminating and selective manner - it is more in the form of a "cultural package deal" as postulated by Hope. This being so, "the tendency is for extraneous material to be fed to the public without discrimination, hastily botched into the most convenient acceptable form."\(^3\)

Consequently many English words and expressions are borrowed when there are already adequate Malay equivalents (or established loans from another language, for instance, Arabic). It is common to find appearing together in the same paragraph in a newspaper an English word and its Malay equivalent. Some occurrences of this in the data are: council/majlis (established Arabic loan); talent/bakat; flat/rumah pangsa; prejudice/prasangka; mediator/orang tengah.

2. Ibid, p.33.
3. Ibid, p.34.
It is clear, therefore, that the importation of English words is not always determined by the lack of known Malay equivalents. Purists in the country have long condemned this "unnecessary" borrowing from English in the newspapers calling it "pencemaran Bahasa Malaysia" (the pollution of Bahasa Malaysia). This view is, of course, based on the traditional division of foreign importations into "necessary loans" and "luxury or unnecessary loans". But as Prof. Gray observes, "each and every word is taken over for a reason which seems good and sufficient for the borrower". As long as Western (Anglo-American) society continues to be the reference community for the majority of Malaysians no amount of condemnation is likely to discourage the Malay press from borrowing overtly from English in the form of importation. It may be pointed out here that it is importation from English against which the purists direct their attack, mainly because it is more obvious. Little attention is paid to substitution though it is a more insidious form of influence by virtue of the fact that it is far less detectable, besides which it is more likely than importation to affect the structure of the language in the long run.

But there are also differences between the planned and spontaneous areas in the use of importation itself, seen most obviously in the different importance attached to adapting loanwords. In the spontaneous area the items imported are mainly pure loanwords with little or no adaptation. In the planned area loanwords are seldom adopted without some attempt at adaptation. This difference may be seen when we compare the proportion of unassimilated pure loanwords in the two areas. They comprise 57.3% of pure loanwords in the spontaneous area but only 13% in the planned area. The latter area, however, has a higher proportion of every type of adapted loanwords (as can be seen from Table 1A in Appendix 6). The very high proportion of unassimilated pure loanwords in the spontaneous sector indicates the lack of inhibition in borrowing from English by the media. Probably many of these items are 'ephemerals' or transient innovations and may not be retained in the language. But the fact that over half of the

1. This was made the theme of a seminar organised by the Persatuan Bahasa Malaysia of the Science University held on 17 February 1979.
Loanwords are unadapted in any way testifies to the massive influx of English words in the media which makes it possible for a large proportion to escape attempts to adapt them, no matter how superficially.

Even when loanwords are adapted in the spontaneous area, it is not quite the same as adaptation carried out in the planned area. This is most obvious in orthographical adaptation even though it is the most common type of adaptation in both areas. In the spontaneous area it tends to be a very haphazard and idiosyncratic affair despite the rules laid down by the Dewan (in the spelling guide PUEBM). It is quite usual to find the same loanword adapted in different ways even in the same publication. For example, the word 'issue' has appeared as isu, isyu, isue, issu, isiu in the same newspaper (Berita Harian) on different occasions. In the planned area, though adaptation is not without inconsistencies (mainly because of the difficulties of reconciling orthographical and etymological considerations), it is, comparatively, much more systematically and consistently performed adhering closely to the rules set out in the spelling guide.

In grammatical adaptation too there are differences between the planned and spontaneous sectors. For instance, word-order in English compound forms is retained only for a specific purpose such as to indicate the relationship between the components of chemical terms. In the spontaneous area word order is treated much more flexibly. The planning agencies are also far more consistent in the use of Malay affixes with English loanwords. In the spontaneous area, especially in the newspapers and magazines, affixation is often ignored. Furthermore, the parts of speech to which loanwords belonged in English are ignored as well and thus nouns may be used as adjectives, as verbs, etc. For instance

(1) mencerminkan sesuatu yang non-reality (reflecting something that is non-reality).
(2) suatu hal yang surprise (a surprise happening).
(3) Datuk Hamzah hampir menjadi nostalgia (Datuk Hamzah nearly became nostalgia).

In the above examples, the English words should have been adapted either by using the appropriate Malay affixes (which in (2) would be ber-, bersurprise 'surprising'), or by using the appropriate
derived forms in English after changing the spelling of the English affixes (which in (1) would be non-realistik, and in (3) nostalgik).

Adaptation by morphemic substitution is also more common in the planned than in the spontaneous sector as the practice here is to adapt as much as possible. Thus the importations that are loanblends (loanwords which have been subjected to morphemic substitution) is about twice as high in the planned (40.5%) as in the spontaneous (19%) area. Even in those semantic domains where massive importations cannot be avoided, a kind of 'compromise' is achieved by using more loanblends than pure loanwords. This may be seen in the technical and economic domains where over 60% of the importations are loanblends.

Differences may also be noted in the use of substitution which is the second most important process after importation in the spontaneous area. Semantic extensions are formed more extensively in this area than in the planned area where the vast majority of substitutions tend to be loan translations. Thus 26.8% of substitutions in the spontaneous area are semantic extensions compared to only 12.7% in the planned area. An explanation may be offered for the more restricted formation of semantic extensions in the planned area. It has been mentioned that one of the most important requirements for a technical term is that it should be monosemantic. In semantic extension, however, an ordinary Malay word is made to bear a new and additional meaning imported from the English model (it is seldom the case that the original meaning of the word is replaced by the new one). The result is polysemy with its potential for confusion in understanding and in usage. Another reason why semantic extension is not favoured for creating terminologies is that words have connotations which may be carried forward even when the words are used in a new way and these connotations may be detrimental to their value as specialised terms. Semantic extension is used more extensively in the spontaneous area because here the demands for precision are far less rigid; the context in which the semantic extension is used is depended upon to bring out the meaning intended.

In the formation of loan translations, too, the two areas do not show the same emphasis with regard to the sub-categories (see
Table 1C in Appendix 6). In the planned area, the emphasis is mainly on literal loan translations, 72.7% of loan translations being of this type. The formation of syntactic calques, is relatively restricted as only 13.3% of loan translations are of this type compared to 24.8% in the spontaneous area. This is hardly surprising as these are translations of (stylistic) and idiomatic expressions in English and so are more prominent in the spontaneous area where there is greater concern for style and expression and, more often than not, language is manipulated for expressive rather than for denotative purposes.

9.1.2 Native Creation

The different priorities observed in the planned and spontaneous areas are also reflected in the use of the remaining processes, native creation and apt equivalent substitution. The greater importance attached to the use of indigenous lexical resources in the planned sector is reflected not only in the more extensive use of substitution but also of native creations, which is discussed in this section, and direct apt equivalent substitution discussed in the subsequent section.

Native creation provides almost 15% of the items obtained in the planned area and 11.5% in the spontaneous area. However, it is only in induced creation that the difference lies for hybrid creation is equally limited in both areas (the proportion of items derived from hybrid creation being around 1% in both areas). The primary methods for forming induced creations are the same, namely, compounding, affixation and circumlocution. The first two methods are used to greater extent in the planned area because of the greater emphasis on word creation as a whole.

The greater emphasis that the planned area places on induced creation is reflected in all domains but one, the scientific, where the spontaneous area was found to have a significantly higher proportion. It also has a higher proportion of these items in the technical domain though this has not been established as statistically significant. In fact, in these two domains in the spontaneous area, induced creations are the second longest category of items after pure loanwords.
It is necessary to say a few words regarding the kind of induced creations found in the technical and scientific domains in the spontaneous area. A large proportion of induced creations in the technical domain are, in fact, coined for manufacturers for different types of products and devices. For example: penguat suara 'amplifier' (literally, 'strengthener of voice'), pembancuh 'blender' (from nominal prefix pen- + bancuh 'to mix, knead'), jangkahitung 'calculator' (jangka 'callipers' + hitung 'to count'). The induced creations in the scientific domain designate products and processes of a semi-scientific nature pertaining to daily life especially in medicine and health, for example: ubat tenteram 'tranquillisers' (from ubat 'medicine' + tenteram 'peaceful'), uraibina 'metabolism' (urai 'loose' + bina 'to build'), asingrembes 'dialysis' (asing 'to separate' + rembes 'to trickle'). A large proportion of the induced creations in both domains are circumlocutions which are very descriptive in nature, for example: daya kebal badan kepada jangkitan 'body resistance' (literally, 'the invulnerability of the body to infection'), perasaan berahi emak 'Oedipus complex' (literally, 'lustful emotions for mother'), penyapu air tingkap 'windscreen wiper' (literally, 'broom for water on window'). Interestingly enough, there is also a large proportion of blends among induced creations. Blending is a popular method in the spontaneous area, though it is avoided, especially in the scientific and technical domains, in the planned area. For journalists are less troubled than scientists by such questions as the semantic appropriateness of components that make up blends, systematicity of derivation, international recognisability of terms, and so on. Blends are popular with journalists (and the general public) because they are concise and 'catchy'. In fact, many of the blends formed by the Dewan during the puristic period and which have been subsequently rejected still appear in newspapers and magazines (e.g: maun, maging and maserba).

9.1.3 Apt Equivalent Substitution

In the planned area, only direct apt equivalent substitution is of any importance as indirect equivalent substitution accounts for less than 1% (0.6%) of the total number of items obtained from this area. The scarcity of indirect substitutes is accounted for by the
fact that English is the major language of reference and it has
dependency over all other foreign languages when it comes to the
borrowing of specialized terms. Most of the direct Malay substitutes
for English terms are concentrated in the political, economic,
scholarly and scientific domains. Even in these domains, however,
they comprise a very small proportion, not more than 4%. The main
reason why direct substitution is restricted in the planned sector
is because of the difficulties of finding exact equivalents for
English terms in Malay as so many of the concepts that the English
terms expressed are alien to Malay society.

Even less emphasis is given to the use of direct equivalent
substitution in the spontaneous area where direct equivalent substitutes
for English terms comprise only about 1% of the total number of items.
However, indirect equivalent substitution is more prevalent in this
area.

These indirect substitutes are found mainly in the social,
scholarly and political domains where they constitute between 4-8%.
The overwhelming majority are of Arabic origin. This is hardly
surprising as there has been a long established tradition of borrowing
from Arabic in these domains. Through its association with Islam,
Arabic culture and language has influenced Malay society greatly.
This helps to explain the large number of Arabic terms in the social
domain, relating to the daily life of the community and particularly
prevalent in the area of 'qualities, attributes, and skills' (e.g:
mahir 'skilled', adab 'courtesy', arif 'wise/wisdom', akhlak 'moral'
etc.). The influence of Arabic on Malay literature goes back many
centuries and it is most obvious in the Malay classical works, the
'hikayats' (the term 'hikayat' is itself an Arabic loan and means
'tale, or romance'). This accounts for the presence of Arabic
literary terms in the scholarly domain (e.g: naskah 'manuscript',
syair 'poetry', bab 'chapter', etc.). It must be stressed, however,
that it is English, not Arabic, which is the major source of literary

---

1. Direct equivalent substitutes in the spontaneous area are
identified as such only if the word is used in place of an
English specialized term. As a rule terms considered as direct
equivalent substitutes have been classified as 'istilah' in the
Kamus Dewan or listed in glossaries and terminology lists.
and other innovations in modern Malay - the Arabic element exists in a semi-fossilized stated in religious and classical works. Arabic equivalents in the political domain are mainly legal terms (e.g.: makhamah 'court', hakim 'judge', adil 'just', etc.). Before contact with the west and the adoption of the English legal system, there was only Muslim law (syariat) and legal terminology was strictly Arabic in origin. The historical precedent thus helps to explain why Arabic equivalents have been used to substitute for English terms when the concepts involved are parallel.

The use of Arabic substitutes in the spontaneous sector is confined mainly to the three above mentioned domains. They are hardly ever resorted to in the other domains where there has not been established a precedent for borrowing from Arabic (e.g.: sport, scientific, technical, economic).

9.1.4 Form Classes

The only significant difference found between the two areas in the distribution of lexical innovations among the form classes was in borrowings. No significant differences were found in the distribution of native creations and apt equivalent substitutes among the different form classes.

In the planned area the vast majority of the lexical items borrowed are nouns. This area borrows a significantly higher proportion of nouns in all four categories of borrowings, viz., pure loanwords, loanblends, loan translations, and semantic extensions (see Table 3 on p 275).

Nouns are also predominant among borrowings in the spontaneous area of innovation, but to a lesser extent. Significantly higher proportions of items are borrowed from the verbal and adjectival classes than in the planned area.

The predominance of nouns is partly explained by the proportion of each form class in the language as a whole and, since nouns form the longest class, their dominance would be reflected as well in lexical expansion. through borrowing or other means. However, the greater emphasis placed on the formation of noun forms in the planned area is also due to the fact that vocabulary development here is
### Table 3: Frequency & Percentage Distributions of Lexical Innovations among Form Classes in Planned and Spontaneous Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form Class</th>
<th>TYPE OF LEXICAL INNOVATION</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Loanword</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loanblend</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loan Translation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semantic Extension</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Equi. Substitute</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Equi. Substitute</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid Creation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Induced Creation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Area</td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Area</td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planned Area:
- **Noun**: 727 entries with 88.2% Pure Loanword, 94.5% Loanblend, 93.2% Loan Translation, 75.8% Semantic Extension, 58.8% Direct Equivalents, 60.8% Indirect Equivalents, 42.5% Hybrid Creation, and 88.2% Induced Creation.
- **Verb**: 3 entries with 0.4% Pure Loanword, 41% Loanblend, 33% Loan Translation, 23% Semantic Extension, 23.7% Direct Equivalents, 0% Indirect Equivalents, 6.7% Hybrid Creation, and 6.7% Induced Creation.
- **Adjective**: 85 entries with 10.3% Pure Loanword, 14% Loanblend, 11% Loan Translation, 0% Semantic Extension, 15% Direct Equivalents, 15.5% Indirect Equivalents, 4% Hybrid Creation, and 0% Induced Creation.
- **Adverb**: 0 entries.
- **Others**: 9 entries.

Total Planned Area:
- Total entries: 824 with percentages: Pure Loanword 100.0%, Loanblend 90.0%, Loan Translation 93.2%, Semantic Extension 75.8%, Direct Equivalents 60.8%, Indirect Equivalents 23%, Hybrid Creation 42.5%, and Induced Creation 88.2%.

Spontaneous Area:
- **Noun**: 1456 entries with 75.5% Pure Loanword, 82.0% Loanblend, 83.4% Loan Translation, 61.9% Semantic Extension, 34% Direct Equivalents, 72.4% Indirect Equivalents, 38% Hybrid Creation, and 3150% Induced Creation.
- **Verb**: 54 entries with 28.9% Pure Loanword, 60% Loanblend, 13.3% Loan Translation, 34.9% Semantic Extension, 29.2% Direct Equivalents, 28.6% Indirect Equivalents, 14% Hybrid Creation, and 342% Induced Creation.
- **Adjective**: 403 entries with 20.9% Pure Loanword, 21% Loanblend, 14.7% Loan Translation, 8.9% Semantic Extension, 25% Direct Equivalents, 36% Indirect Equivalents, 18% Hybrid Creation, and 525% Induced Creation.
- **Adverb**: 9 entries with 0.5% Pure Loanword, 6% Loanblend, 0% Loan Translation, 0% Semantic Extension, 1% Direct Equivalents, 1.2% Indirect Equivalents, 0.2% Hybrid Creation, and 18% Induced Creation.
- **Others**: 6 entries.

Total Spontaneous Area:
- Total entries: 1928 with percentages: Pure Loanword 100.0%, Loanblend 100.0%, Loan Translation 90.0%, Semantic Extension 100.0%, Direct Equivalents 97.9%, Indirect Equivalents 100.0%, Hybrid Creation 100.0%, and Induced Creation 100.0%.
concerned almost exclusively with providing designations for innovations, techniques, discoveries of one kind or another, concepts, processes - all of which, to an overwhelming degree, need to be designated by nouns. Borrowing from English, therefore, is strictly for practical and utilitarian purposes and this is reflected in the heavy emphasis on nominal designations from English.

The motives behind lexical innovation in the spontaneous area are much more varied, and this is reflected in the great attention paid to the formation of lexical items in other form classes besides nouns. Though the provision of designations for innovations of a concrete, material kind - as denoted by nouns - is a primary concern, a large number of items are also needed to meet the expressive needs of language use, e.g. to describe appearances, ways of behaviour, to suggest attitudes, to give emphasis - which are designated by adjectives, verbs, adverbs and so on. Consequently, borrowings from English are not confined to what Guilbert calls 'denotative' borrowings from specialist fields and occupations, which account for the vast majority of borrowings in the planned area, but also include a substantial proportion of 'connotative' borrowings to convey a sense of local colour, to create an image, for snob appeal, or to suggest attitudes, behaviour, qualities associated with a much admired and sought after western (Anglo-American) way of life.

The importance attached to 'connotative' borrowings is reflected in the significant higher proportion of adjective and verb borrowings. Adjective loanwords describing qualities and attitudes are particularly common e.g. rasional, idealistik, praktikal, kreatif, sinis (cynical), sofistikated, realistik, progresif, moden, and so on.

In both planned and spontaneous areas, however, when adjectival forms are borrowed, they are more likely to be pure loanwords than any other type of loans. On the other hand, when verbal forms are borrowed in both areas, they tend to be borrowed in the form of loanblends, loan translations and especially, semantic extensions.

1. The terms 'denotative' and 'connotative' borrowings are used as by Guilbert, L., 1975, La Créativité Lexicale, Paris, p.91.
9.1.5 **Summary of Findings**

The comparison of planned and spontaneous lexical innovation reveals different priorities being observed in the two sectors. In the planned sector overall there is greater concern for utilising indigenous lexical resources reflected in the more extensive use of substitution, native creation and direct apt equivalent substitution. In the spontaneous sector, other priorities such as immediacy expediency, fashion and 'impact' are primary. This helps to explain the heavy reliance on importation from English as it is the lexical process best able to meet these demands in the Malaysian setting.

In borrowing from English, the planned sector clearly prefers the indirect form, the spontaneous sector, the direct. Thus in the majority of semantic domains, the planned sector has a larger proportion of loan translations than any other type of item; the spontaneous area, on the other hand, has a larger proportion of pure loanwords than any other type of item in almost every one of the domains.

In the adaptation of loanwords, that carried out in the spontaneous area tends to be both superficial and unsystematic. In the planned sector, loanwords are adapted more systematically and also more extensively. The latter is indicated by the greater proportion of loanblends formed.

The emphasis in borrowing from English is confined mainly to 'denotative' borrowings in the planned area, where the vast majority of the items are nouns. In the spontaneous sector, 'connotative' borrowings in the form of adjectives and verbs reached sizeable proportions, significantly higher than those in the planned area.

9.2 **Analysis of Running Texts**

Planned and spontaneous lexical innovation has been compared and the major differences as well as the factors which caused them examined. The analysis of a corpus of written texts, the findings of which are discussed in this section has been carried out to establish if the differences noted are reflected in the way new lexical items are used in publications of the Dewan and the media.
No other study conducted along the same lines in relation to Bahasa Malaysia has come to the writer's attention. Neither has there been any study which attempts to determine the frequency of loans - English or otherwise - in Malay newspapers or any of the publications examined here.¹

9.2.1 Borrowing in Dewan Publications and in Newspapers

In the first part of the analysis, texts from the Dewan publications and from the newspapers on the same six subject areas, namely, politics, economics, education, science, the arts, social issues, were compared to determine if there are significant differences in the volume and form of borrowing used. A lower proportion was expected in the Dewan texts on the same subject because of the strict rules laid down by the Dewan to limit borrowings. A greater volume of loan translations was expected to be used in the Dewan texts while in the newspaper texts a greater volume of pure loanwords was expected, as the first has been found to be emphasized by the planned sector and the second by the spontaneous sector in vocabulary expansion. The results are summarized in Table 4 on p.279.

In view of the Dewan's rules to restrict borrowing and its frequent condemnations of the newspapers for indulging in 'unnecessary' borrowings, it is rather surprising to find that only in one set of the Dewan texts is there a significantly lower proportion of borrowings. This sole exception is the texts on social issues where it was found that about twice as many more borrowings are used by the newspapers (7.3% as against 3.6% in the Dewan texts), mainly in the form of pure loanwords.

On the basis of the comparison, therefore, there is little evidence to suggest that the publications of the Dewan are following a more restrictive policy with regard to the use of borrowings from English. Even in the 'social issues' texts, it is likely that the lower

¹ There is one instructive study by A. Demoz (1963) about loanwords in an Amharic newspaper, another by M. Ronen, et al. (1977) about loanwords in Hebrew newspapers. See:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject/Type of Publication</th>
<th>Importations</th>
<th>Substitutions</th>
<th>Borrowings</th>
<th>Native Creations</th>
<th>Apt Equivalent Substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure Loanwords</td>
<td>Loanblends</td>
<td>Loan Translations</td>
<td>Semantic Extensions</td>
<td>No. of Occ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Politics</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economics</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Science</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Arts</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Issues</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sport</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Entertainment</td>
<td>Pop Magazine</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fashion</td>
<td>Pop Magazine</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Issues</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Entertainment</td>
<td>Pop Magazine</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sport</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Education</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Social Issues</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Fashion</td>
<td>Pop Magazine</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
proportion in the Dewan texts is caused less by difference in type of publications as by difference in subject matter, as will be discussed later.

Neither did the comparison reveal any major difference between the Dewan publications and the newspapers in the form and types of borrowing preferred. The preference of the Dewan terminology committees for indirect borrowing, specifically loan translations, is not reflected in the borrowings used in the Dewan texts. In none of the 6 sets of texts is the proportion of loan translations used greater than that of pure loanwords. In fact, in 4 of these texts, namely, on education, science, the arts, and social issues, the proportion of pure loanwords used is significantly higher than loan translations. Therefore, in the use of lexical items the Dewan's own writers are emphasizing a different type of borrowing from that emphasized by its terminology committees and instead, are reflecting the emphasis of the innovators in the spontaneous sector.

Furthermore, when the type-token ratios and percentages of hapax legomena in both groups of texts were compared, it was found that these tend to be higher in the Dewan texts, indicating that, on the whole, there is greater lexical variety among borrowings used in these texts. This is important for if a text contains 20 occurrences of the same foreign word (20 tokens), it does not represent the same degree of borrowing as a text containing 20 foreign words each occurring once (20 types). Furthermore, from the reader's point of view the difference between the two situations is a difference in the 'texture' or density of borrowing, the first making far fewer demands on him than the second.

For example despite similar proportions of borrowings, borrowing in the science and arts texts from the newspapers is actually more restricted qualitatively, as shown by the lower type-token ratio and percentage of hapax obtained. This trend is repeated when types of borrowings are considered. For though both types of publications use a similar proportion of pure loanwords in the arts texts and a similar proportion of loan translations in the educational texts, there is greater lexical variety in the Dewan texts, indicated
by higher type-token ratios. Even in those cases where the newspaper texts are found to use a higher proportion of borrowings, this tends to be counteracted or 'neutralized' by a lower type-token ratio and/or percentage of hapax. This is the case, for instance, with the pure loanwords used in the scientific texts and the semantic extensions used in the economic texts from the newspapers. In both, a higher proportion of items is accompanied by a lower type-token ratio, indicating that the higher value has been gained by repetition of a limited number of specific loan items.

9.2.2 Borrowing in Different Subject Areas

The only really important determinant of both the volume and form of borrowing is found to be subject matter. There are certain subjects, particularly scientific or technical, sport, and entertainment which demand a higher than usual proportion of borrowings. And texts dealing with these subjects will tend to use similar proportions of borrowings whether they are from the 'linguistically conservative' Dewan publications or the 'linguistically liberal' newspapers. Thus when the proportion of borrowings in the different subject areas was compared, it was found that the pattern was similar in the Dewan and in the newspaper texts. In both groups of texts, the highest proportion of borrowings is found in the same three subject areas, namely, science, the arts, and economics. These three sets of texts, do not differ significantly from each other, using an average proportion of 15%. In both the Dewan and newspaper texts, too, they are followed by the texts on politics and on education with an average of 12% and 10% respectively. The subject area which has the lowest proportion of borrowings is also the same in both types of publication, that is, social issues, though as noted, the proportion used in newspaper texts is relatively higher. Even here the difference in proportion of borrowings is likely to be caused by difference in content, as topics classified as 'social issues' are very varied in

---

1. In spoken language it is recognised that other factors besides subject matter dictate the level and form of borrowing. W.H. Whiteley identifies three major factors: "The occurrence or non-occurrence of loans in any given situation is dictated largely by one or more of three factors: (1) the subject of discourse, (2) the nature of the social context, and (3) the education and outlook of the speaker ("Loanwords in Linguistic Description: A Case Study from Tanzania, East Africa", Approaches in Linguistic Methodology (eds) I. Rauch & C.T. Scott, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967, p.128)."
nature (e.g: the boat people, jealousy, attitudes of adolescents) each demanding its own set of vocabulary items as well as a different number of borrowings. In the other subject areas, the topics dealt with in each tend to draw upon a common core of vocabulary items (e.g: in economics, the terms sistem, ekonomi projek, perindustrian, kredit, input, taraf socio-ekonomi).

The form and type of borrowing is also constrained by subject matter. We have seen how, despite the strong preference for indirect borrowing in the planned sector, there are some domains particularly, the scientific and the technical, where massive importations cannot be avoided. We have also noted that despite the very obvious preference for importations in the spontaneous sector, two domains, the political and economic, stand out by having a much greater proportion of loan translations than any of the others. These findings are reflected very strongly in the analysis of written texts. Of all the Dewan texts, the scientific texts have the highest proportion of importations, almost 80%. The newspapers too reflect the emphasis of the spontaneous sector on the use of loan translations in the political and economic domains by having a greater proportion of these items in these two subject areas than in any of the others. Similarly, in the Dewan texts, loan translations are most dominant in the political and economic texts. This consistency in the emphasis given to the formation and use of loan translations in the political and economic domains in both sectors suggests that, perhaps, the "limits of translatability" are not quite so formidable as in other domains. But the fact that the newspapers make such relatively extensive use of loan translations is indicative of the more established tradition of translation in these areas, particularly in the political area.

1. This loanword has the highest frequency of occurrence of all the borrowings, appearing a total of 37 times in the corpus.
The comparison between the Dewan and newspaper texts was extended to include three additional sets of texts, one from the newspaper on sport and two others from the popular magazines. The findings emphasized further that it is subject matter which is the main factor to consider when comparing levels and form of borrowings. By extending the comparison of borrowing between subject areas in the newspapers with the inclusion of sport, it is made very obvious that great variations in the proportion of borrowings as well as types of borrowing preferred can exist in different sections of the same newspaper. It was found that the sport texts have the highest proportion of borrowings (18.5%) as well as the highest proportion of pure loanwords (15.1%) of all the newspaper (and Dewan) texts. By comparison, the total proportion of borrowings in the social texts is only 7.3%, the proportion of loanwords less than 4%, showing the great range of variation that is to be found in different sections of the newspaper.!

Even in the popular magazines where literary restraint in borrowing least exists, the proportion of borrowings used can vary greatly with different sections of the publication. Thus it was found that the proportion of borrowings as well as of pure loanwords in the fashion texts was significantly lower than that in the entertainment texts. The emphasis on the different types of borrowing may vary as is seen by the almost exclusive use of pure loanwords in the fashion texts compared to the entertainment texts where rather more loan translations and semantic extensions are used.

9.2.3 Native Creations

The use of native creations in the three groups of texts was also examined. Few differences were found between the Dewan texts and the newspaper texts on similar subject areas. The greatest contrast in the use of native creations is in the scientific texts where the highest proportion from the Dewan texts (3.5%) and the lowest proportion from the newspaper texts (1.5%) are to be found.

1. Different degrees of literary restraint as well as subject matter decide the level of borrowings in the different sections of the newspapers, thus in the editorials an average of about 6% was found whereas in the news pages an average of 13% was found.
In both the Dewan and newspaper texts, the economic and educational texts used a relatively high proportion of native creations, between 3-4%. In the educational texts, however, those from the newspapers have a very low type-token ratio (37.2%) indicating that only a very limited number of specific items is involved. Only in the entertainment texts do the popular magazines use native creations to any extent (2%).

A check reveals that a substantial proportion of the English loanwords that we observed have newly created Malay equivalents. How then can the phenomenon of borrowing be explained? One hypothesis is that the newer Malay words have not yet been adopted comfortably by writers in general. Another possible explanation pertains more to the readers than to the writers and relates to the status associated with knowledge of English. As it is directly associated with education and socio-economic status, writers aiming at the more sophisticated audience (the most likely to read Dewan journals and feature articles in newspapers) have little compunction in employing English freely. As English is associated with being trendy and up-to-date (the latter term a highly popular borrowing), writers appealing to the young and fashion-conscious women (the readership of the popular magazines), use English words and expressions liberally, often merely for 'effect', and at times subordinating intelligibility in the process.¹

Furthermore, writers, irrespective of the type of publication they are associated with, when using native creations are using them as 'stylistic alternants' rather than replacements for English loanwords (as intended by the Dewan). Native creations and the English words they are meant to replace have been found in the same article, even in the same paragraph. Some examples of native creations used

¹. The use of foreign loanwords mainly to create an image (modern, exotic, etc.) is well attested. See, e.g: Quakenbush, E.M., 1974, "How Japanese Borrows English Words", Linguistics: An International Review, The Hague: Mouton, pp.59-75. Quakenbush observes: "People who write articles and advertising copy for women's magazines, special interests, and the like often subordinate intelligibility to other concerns and consciously employ numerous words and expressions from foreign languages, particularly English, in the full knowledge that these words will be totally strange to their readers". He also reports that this has given rise to "clubs formed solely for the purpose of studying the foreign words in magazines devoted to fashions, childrearings, etc.".
interchangeably with English loanwords in the texts analyzed are:

kerjaya (a blend from kerja 'work' + jaya 'successful')
appears together with karear/karier 'career',
dayautama (a compound from daya 'force' + utama 'first')
with initiatif 'initiative',
jantina (a blend from jantan 'male' + betina 'female')
with seks 'sex'
pawagam (a blend from panggung 'stage' + wayang 'show'
+ gambar 'picture') with sinema 'cinema'.
 alat solek (a compound from alat 'equipment' + solek 'to
dress up') with nekap 'make-up'.

No special effort was discerned of Dewan writers to substitute
native creations for English loanwords wherever possible. One
would expect this group of writers - because of their
association with the Dewan - to promote the lexical products of the
LPA and help these to become an established part of the language by
using them consistently in place of the English terms.

9.2.4 Apt Equivalent Substitutes (Indirect)

The proportion of indirect apt equivalent substitutes used
in the texts, whether from the Dewan publications, newspapers or
popular magazines, is under 2%; in the majority of the texts, it is,
in fact, under 1%. The higher proportion is used in the Dewan texts
on education (1.9%) and on social issues (1.6%). In both, it is made
up of a few Arabic words repeated a number of times.

The Arabic element is very noticeable in texts on moral and
social problems, and on religion, whether in the Dewan publications
or in the newspapers. But the vast majority of the Arabic words are
very old borrowings in the language, few new items being found in the
texts analyzed.

9.2.5 Form Classes

As to the form classes represented by English borrowings, in
all 3 groups of texts the most important are nouns, adjectives and
verbs. This is shown in Table 5 on p286. A small number of
prepositional phrases in the form of syntactic calques is also used
and these tend to have high frequency of occurrence within and
between texts. As was noted in vocabulary formation in Section 9.1.4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT/TYPe OF PUBLICATION</th>
<th>NO. OF LOANS</th>
<th>F R O M C L A S S</th>
<th>NOUN</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>ADJECT</th>
<th>ADVERB</th>
<th>PREP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Politics</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economics</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Science</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Arts</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Issues</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sport</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Entertainment</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Pop. Magazine</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fashion</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Pop. Magazine</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there is the same tendency to borrow adjective forms as pure loanwords, verbal forms more as semantic extensions, loanblends and loan translations.

It was also noted when discussing borrowing that the word lists drawn up by the planned sector concentrate almost wholly on nouns. However, the Dewan texts show a greater variety of borrowings in terms of form classes, and a similar degree of emphasis on nouns is to be found in only a few of the texts examined. These are, not unexpectedly, the scientific texts (both Dewan and newspaper), the Dewan social texts, the sport and fashion texts (see Table 5). In these texts between 88-95% of the borrowings are nouns. In the other texts, including those from the Dewan publications, rather more emphasis is given to the use of adjectival and verbal borrowings than would be apparent from examining borrowing by the planning agencies. In most texts (except those with very high concentrations of nouns), about 11% of borrowings are adjectives and about 7% are verbs. The higher proportion of adjectival borrowings (19.3%) is used in the arts texts and the highest proportion of verbal borrowings (13.5%) in the education texts, both from the Dewan publications.

It would seem, therefore, that in spite of the efforts of planning agencies to limit borrowing to 'denotative' borrowings, the more varied demands of language usage make it necessary for writers everywhere to draw on borrowings from a greater number of form classes.

Native creations used in the texts are almost wholly nouns. Slightly more adjectival than verbal creations are used though not more than 4 in any text.

The small number of apt equivalent substitutes used in the texts is almost all nouns. Among the 6 apt equivalent substitutes used in the entertainment texts is the word (or phrase) ala (classified under 'Prepositions') which occurs a total of 5 times. This is derived from the French 'à la' via Bahasa Indonesia and occurs in such phrases as 'tarian ala disko' (disco style dancing).
9.2.6 Implications of Findings

The analysis on the previous page is based on an admittedly small corpus of texts and can only claim to be exploratory. Nevertheless, it has been able to point out subject matter as the real determinant of borrowing both in terms of volume, form and types of borrowing. Secondly, it has indicated certain discrepancies between official (Dewan) planning policy and usage. It has been shown that even in its own publications the Dewan has not been able to restrict the volume of borrowing nor dictate the form of borrowing it prefers. There are few differences between its writers and writers elsewhere in the use of borrowings. In fact, as the type-token ratios and hapax percentages in its text seem to indicate, there is greater variety among the borrowings used in the Dewan publications than in the newspapers where there are many more repetitions.

The lack of differences between Dewan writers and journalists is not only due to the constraints imposed by subject matter but also to the fact that the priorities are similar: immediacy, expediency, variety, impact.

The consistency between lexical innovation and usage in the spontaneous area, undoubtedly, is due to a large extent to the fact that innovators and users tend to be the same people. The Dewan has not this advantage for the terms created by its terminology committees are meant not for the use of the members alone. Unlike the innovators in the spontaneous area, therefore, the Dewan has to face the problem of acceptability in terminology formulation. This problem has been overcome to a certain extent in the more specialized areas of terminology formulation by policy changes after 1975 as we have seen in Chapter 8.2.3. In the more general area of vocabulary formation and usage this problem has yet to be resolved, since the public, even more so than the higher institutions in the century, has

1. The Dewan is able, however, to put into use the terms established by its terminology in the textbooks it published. Writers commissioned to write textbooks are provided with glossaries of terms to be used for their subjects. In the past, (less so now) because of the different approaches between the Dewan and the Universities in terminology formulation the terminologies used in school textbooks were quite different from those used in textbooks in the Universities.
very different attitudes from the Dewan planners over the question of borrowing and on the question of language usage itself. The refusal of the planners to take into consideration the attitudes and preferences of the public, and especially, the media, has been the main factor for the glaring discrepancies between planning and usage, and the reason why so many of the terms it has produced have not gained currency.

This is not to say that the Dewan should bow to inclinations of the public on the question of language usage (one knows how capricious public opinion and taste can be), for any responsible LPA should be able to set standards of language use especially when it concerns a 'developing' language like Bahasa Malaysia. But a balance has to be struck between authority and sensitivity. It is especially unfortunate that Malaysian planners should have a very negative attitude towards that very important group of people in language usage, that is, the journalists, reporters, broadcasters, advertisers, in fact, the mass media in general.

Rather than attempt to seek the co-operation of these individuals and the bodies they represent in the media the Dewan has preferred to censor and condemn what it looks upon as their 'misuses' of the language. But it is a fact that though the Dewan can advocate or, as freely, condemn, it is the media, and especially the press, which is more influential in deciding just what it is that should or should not become a part of the language. The following observation made by Gullick in 1953 still applies:

....in a community which has few books the press confers the orthodoxy of the printed word on the expression which it uses. Thus the expressions which it borrows and repeats are as significant as those which it invents.

1. An official is specially appointed in the Dewan to scrutinise publications, such as newspapers, magazines, etc., advertisements, billboards, shop signs, in fact all forms of public use of language, for 'misuses' of language. These are then brought to the attention of the culprits with a request for the offending item to be removed (usually English words), or if it is a grammatical or spelling mistake, for it to be corrected.

There are really only two alternatives open to the Dewan to bring lexical planning and usage more in line with each other. The first is for it to be provided with legal powers so that it is able to enforce the use of the terms that it advocates or invents and to penalise those who 'misuse' or 'corrupt' the language by unnecessary borrowings.\(^1\) This step is not only objectionable but very difficult to implement. The second alternative, and the more practical one, is for the Dewan to seek the co-operation of the media and at the same time make evaluation a part of its planning procedures. The various bodies in the media, newspapers, radio, television, publishing companies, advertising firms, must be made to feel that they have equal responsibility with the Dewan in setting standards of language use. They should be persuaded to exercise stricter editorial control over their own material. This is particularly needed in the orthographical adaptation of loanwords which is extremely chaotic. Concerted efforts should also be made to persuade the media (the press especially) to help in the dissemination of the lexical products of the Dewan, particularly the native creations and equivalent substitutes. Provided these innovations are disseminated widely and consistently over a long period, there is no reason why they should not be assimilated and become an established part of the language. From the small proportion of terms which have gained currency out of the thousands of terms formed by the Dewan since 1957 should have been learned the important lesson that it is one thing to tell people what they should say, another to be able to effectively persuade them to say it. The dissemination aspects of vocabulary development have as yet received little attention; even more lacking, is recognition of the crucial role played by the media in this area.\(^2\)

---

1. In his paper 'Perkembangan dan Sistem Pelaksanaan Bahasa Malaysia serta kaitannya dengan Masalah Pencemaran Bahasa Malaysia', presented at the Seminar Pencemaran Bahasa Malaysia held in Penang, February 1974, the Director of the Dewan, Datuk Hassan Ahmad indicated that this step has been considered but he personally did not approve of the idea. He suggested instead that legal powers to penalise misuse of language should be given instead to other bodies such as Town or City Councils, the Registrar of Companies, the Registrar of Business and so on.

But these efforts to persuade the media to co-operate must be accompanied at the same time by evaluation of the lexical items formed by the Dewan. Evaluative measures should be instituted so that information can be obtained on what lexical items are acceptable or non-acceptable, why and to whom. This feedback is vital to provide a sound basis upon which to work. Unfortunately, awareness of the central importance of evaluation in lexical (or any type of language) planning is still lacking among Malaysian planners.

If no steps are taken, then the discrepancies between planning policy and usage will continue. This means not only a waste of resources and planning efforts but, in the long run, a further undermining of public confidence in the Dewan and its effectiveness and authority on language issues.
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CHAPTER 10

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Specific conclusions concerning English influence have been set out at the end of different sections and chapters. In this chapter, the attention of the reader is drawn to certain general conclusions that have emerged from the analysis as a whole.

1. The Forms of Lexical Influence

The inquiry into English lexical influence on Bahasa Malaysia has shown that the study of lexical influence cannot be confined to the transfer of loanwords alone, though this is the simplest and most obvious form of influence. As this study has shown, there are other forms of influence to consider. These include the use of native morphemes in new combinations or meanings based on models of English lexical items, through the process of substitution. English influence has also taken the form of stimulating native creation as new words have come into being in response to available models in English, but without formal imitation of these. Finally, the contact with English has also given rise to the process of apt equivalent substitution, in which attempts are made to replace an English borrowing by a native Malay word or a word from another foreign language with equivalent meaning, giving rise to direct and indirect equivalent substitution respectively.

2. Planned and Spontaneous Lexical Innovation

In a theoretical and practical inquiry into lexical expansion, both spontaneous and planned (when this exists) expansion must be taken into consideration. The different features of vocabulary growth and trends in the two areas must be stated and accounted for to give a complete and balanced picture of lexical expansion in the language concerned. Among other things, this study has shown that whereas the
frequency of use of lexical processes tends to reflect prevailing social trends in the spontaneous area, in the planned area the balance between the principal means of word formation can be deliberately altered. Thus the modernisation of Bahasa Malaysia lexicon by the LPA, the Dewan, was subordinated to ideology and the relative proportion of the use of these different methods of word-formation also changed (pp.232ff). The existence of competing lexical forms and variant forms of loans has to be accounted for, and in the case of Bahasa Malaysia, was shown to be attributed to the different emphases and priorities of planning agencies, and innovators in the spontaneous area.

3. The Role of Extra-Linguistic Factors

Extra-linguistic considerations are an essential part of an inquiry into lexical expansion and lexical influence. As is obvious from this study, extra-linguistic or socio-cultural factors intervene at practically every stage of the discussion. Whether one is dealing with the causes of lexical expansion/borrowing, the extent of borrowing, the form of borrowing, the resistance to borrowing, the adaptation of loans, etc., explanation often has to be given in extra-linguistic terms.

The preference for different forms of borrowing - loan translation in the planned sector, pure loanword in the spontaneous area - could only be explained in socio-cultural, and not structural, terms (pp.263ff). In studying the adaption of loanwords, a knowledge of the differences in the structure of the participating languages enables one to predict the form of adaptation that is likely, but again it is extra-linguistic factors which decide whether the adaptation does in fact take place (among bilinguals) as well as the extent of that adaptation. The intervention of extra-linguistic factors, therefore, makes it impossible to postulate rules with absolute predictive reliability.

1. This supports Weinreich's observation: "The unequal degrees of resistance to transfers and the preference for loan translation over transfers are a result of complex socio-cultural factors which are not describable in linguistic terms alone" (Languages in Contact, 1953, New York, p.62).
To Haugen's "basic question of whether structural or social forces are more important" in borrowing, the findings of this study suggests strongly that it is the latter. From the findings it seems that provided the social incentives for borrowing are strong enough, even the most commonly recognised structural restraints cease to apply. Social factors, for instance, account for the popularity of the loan pronoun 'you', an item from the "closed" class (p. 145.) Homonymy, often cited as a deterrent to borrowing because of its potential for ambiguity has not proved to be a barrier in borrowing from English. Thus the adaptation of loanwords has resulted in a large number of homonyms in Bahasa Malaysia (p. 144). Many writers over-emphasize the potential of homonyms for ambiguity because of their failure to consider the vital function of context in communication.

A careful delineation of the socio-cultural setting of the contact situation - the historical, political, economic, social, educational factors involved (such as outlined in Chapters 3 and 4) - is an essential part of a study of lexical influence. It is also apparent that the orientation this implies places the study of lexical expansion and lexical influence as an area of study within the domain of socio-linguistics.

4. Classification and Description of Lexical Innovations

This study has shown Haugen's theoretical framework for classifying and describing borrowings to be a useful one. Nevertheless, it was necessary to point out several times the difficulty or impossibility of reaching an unambiguous interpretation. The most difficult types of loan material to handle in terms of identification, classification or description are undoubtedly, the loanshifts, particularly, semantic extensions. Haugen's tripartite sub-classification of semantic extensions into homophonic, synonymous and homologous extensions is impractical for the type of contact situation under study, involving as it does non-cognate languages; no example of extension that was phonetically motivated (homophonic extension) or phonetically - semantically

motivated (homologous extension) was found in the data. As extensions in Bahasa Malaysia are semantically motivated (synonymous extensions), an alternative sub-classification was applied based on form class.

This study also extends the description of semantic extensions further by identifying the types of semantic motivation behind the extension of meaning (pp.159ff). It emerges too that Haugen's scheme needs to be modified by the inclusion of new sub-categories of loanwords (e.g. truncated loanwords, tautological compounds), and the application of orthographic criteria in sub-classifying pure loanwords.

One value in a classification such as Haugen's (and also Weinreich's) is that it enables comparisons to be made, as in this study, between borrowing in the planned and spontaneous areas (Chapter 9) and between borrowing in different periods (Chapter 8.2.1-3). Such a classification also provides an opportunity to compare different contact situations, e.g. between English and Bahasa Malaysia on the one hand, and between English and Comanche (as described in the study by Casagrande) on the other.1

Supplementary classifications by form class and semantic domains were also found to be useful in this study, providing valuable additional information. For instance, the classification of borrowings into form classes indicates the different motivation behind borrowing in the planned and spontaneous areas. The fact that nearly all borrowings in the former area were nouns points to the strictly material motivation in this area; in the latter, more frequent borrowings made from the adjectival, verbal, adverbial, and other classes (besides nouns) indicates the affective motivation that lies behind much of borrowing.

Classification into semantic domains indicates the extensive nature of English influence; substantial borrowings occur in practically every domain2 (the only area which English influence is not felt is

---


2. Compare this with the relatively more restricted nature of borrowing from English into Japanese which is limited in the political, economic, and scholarly domains (see: Ozawa, K., 1976, An investigation of the Influence of the English Language on the Japanese Language through Lexical Innovation from 1955-1972, Ph.D dissertation, Ohio University.)
religion, for obvious reasons). The same classification also enables us to establish the word-formation methods favoured in vocabulary formation in different subject areas (e.g. Chapter 9.2.2), as well as indicating the fields in which the planned and spontaneous differ most because of divergent practices, e.g. in the sport domain where the former emphasize loan translation, the latter pure loanwords (p.265).

5. Linguistic Integration of Loanwords

The ease with which English loanwords are integrated at the phonological, grammatical and lexico-semantic levels, reflects not only the flexibility of the Malay language but - more to the point - the willingness of Malay-speakers to tolerate loan elements in their language. Vocablolo (1938) divides languages into homogeneous, amalgamate, and heterogeneous types, with receptivity to transferred words greatest in the latter. To judge by Vocablolo's definition (p.70), Bahasa Malaysia would belong to the heterogeneous, or most receptive type.

On the phonological level, in common with most languages in which borrowing has been studied, phonemic substitution is the most usual type of adaptation. In the case of Bahasa Malaysia, however, spelling has been shown to play a very important role in determining the phonological shape of many loanwords. And in common with most languages where borrowing is still an on-going process, a whole spectrum of integrational stages may be found as indicated by the sub-classification of pure loanwords into unassimilated, partially assimilated, and wholly assimilated loanwords.

In loanword integration, grammatical integration was found to be the least problematical at all - in agreement with the observation by most linguists. The only area of uncertainty concerns the form of the English loanword used to derive verbs (see p.134), but this is more a standardization than a structural problem.

2. Spelling has also been an important factor in the phonological integration of English loanwords in Arabic (see Sa'id, M.F., 1964, Lexical Innovation Through Borrowing in Modern Standard Arabic, Ph.D dissertation, Princeton University, pp.40 ff.
3. See, for example: Bloomfield, L., 1933, Language, London: George Allen & Unwin, p.453: "Grammatically, the borrowed form is subjected to the system of the borrowing language...", or Weinreich, 1953, p.44: "By far the most usual procedure is the grammatical adaptation of loanwords".
On the lexico-semantic level, semantic restriction was the most common way in which loanwords are modified. The majority of the loanwords correspond to only one facet of the meaning of the word in English. The restriction of the range of meanings of the loanword in the recipient language has been observed in most studies of borrowing (see p. 29) and seems to be another of the 'universals' or 'laws' of borrowing. Though it has been observed in Bahasa Malaysia as well as with other languages, the other meanings of the loanword in the source language may be taken over in the course of time.

Orthographical integration has been relatively more problematic, in as far as consistency of adaptation is concerned. The discrepancies and inconsistencies in the orthographical adaptation of loanwords has been shown to result from two conflicting priorities: conformity to phonological/orthographical characteristics of Bahasa Malaysia and preservation of the etymology of loanwords.

6. **Effects of Borrowing**

The impact of borrowed innovations on the structure of the recipient language is an integral part of an inquiry into lexical influence. The results of lexical innovation, like the results of cultural transmission in general, should not merely be treated as the acquisition of additional elements, for they bring in their wake a whole chain of effects.

The present study has shown that through borrowing the influence of English has pervaded all linguistic levels of Bahasa Malaysia. We find its effects on phonology (new phoneme, new distributions for phonemes, new syllable structures), on grammar (increased frequency of use of certain affixes, occurrence of abstract nouns, extended usage of prepositions and 'me-forms', etc.), on semantic structure (increased incidence of homonymy, polysemy, caused lexical replacement and semantic specialization in native words, etc.), and most striking of all, on orthography (new letters, variant spellings, introduced discrepancies between spelling and pronunciation, etc.).

Most studies have concentrated on the effects of loanwords and neglected to treat those resulting from loanshifts. But as this study has shown, the consequences of such innovations on the structure of the
recipient language can be very serious. Loan translations, especially the syntactic calques, have brought about drastic changes in Malay syntactic structure, as shown in the increased use of substantival constructions and subordination. The long, complex sentences in Bahasa Malaysia, the consequence of extensive use of loan translation, are in sharp contrast to the short, terse, antithetic sentences of classical Malay (See Appendix 1, p.315). Loan translation of metaphorical expressions in English has also affected style by increasing the use of figurative language (See Chapter 6.1.3.1(6)).

7. Lexical Planning

From investigating lexical planning in Bahasa Malaysia it is quite apparent that the area least amenable to planning and over which planners have least control, is the reception of lexical products by potential users. Acceptability is the key issue in the establishment of terminology and, ultimately, the means by which the success of planning efforts is measured. The failure of the Dewan to recognise this, or at least come to terms with it, has been responsible for the small proportion of its terms to gain currency. To establish what is acceptable or non-acceptable to users, systematic and regular evaluation is necessary to ensure that planners are realistic in their assessment of users' needs and preferences. There is a need for reliable evaluative techniques in the field of lexical planning which can only be met by further research.

The dissemination of lexical products is another dimension of lexical planning which has been neglected. Terminology development is usually considered over when lists of terms are drawn up. In the dissemination of terms established, planners are limited in what they can do and the co-operation of writers, lecturers, journalists and other personnel in the media is essential. In Chapter 9.2, it was shown that even in the 'channels' over which the Dewan has most control, its own publications, the Dewan could not ensure that its terms were properly and consistently disseminated. In any case, the new terms must go through a process of slow crystallization as regards their use and meaning and their circulation and exposure in the media is essential in this process. It is clear, therefore, that in terminological development, planners need to give much more attention to the dissemination of the
lexical products and the evaluation of the reception of these products by target populations.

8. Quantification of Borrowing

A preliminary requirement in an inquiry into lexical influence is the establishment of a glossary of items systematically collected from both primary and secondary sources. Answers have to be provided to such questions as the extent of the influence, the relative importance of the different forms of influence, the form classes and semantic domains affected, and so on. The research worker requires quantitative information in order to answer such questions with some degree of objectivity and precision. Furthermore, by stating findings in quantitative terms, comparisons may be made between lexical influence in the planned and spontaneous sectors of vocabulary development, as has been done in this study, as well as with other studies of language contact.

The traditional 'loanword counts' do not indicate the real extent of borrowing. As this study has shown, so much of borrowing is 'hidden' (especially in the planned area of expansion), in the form of loanblends and especially, loan translations and semantic extensions. To have excluded these loans in the measurement of borrowing from English would have seriously underestimated the extent of the borrowing.

In running text analysis, it is essential to look at both the total volume of borrowings as well as the frequency of occurrence of borrowed items. As the comparative analysis of publications in this study has shown, though similar proportions of borrowings may be used, the degree of borrowing may differ, in that one proportion may be made up of repetitions of a limited number of items. It is necessary, therefore, to introduce measures which indicate the degree of lexical variety in borrowing, such as the type-token ratio and percentage of hapax used in this study.
Concluding Remarks

From the findings of this study, it is clear that Sapir's comment that "there is nothing to show that [English] is anywhere entering into the lexical heart of other languages" \(^1\) is no longer true. English has indeed entered into the "lexical heart" of Bahasa Malaysia. Numerically, the body of English loans in Bahasa Malaysia is very impressive. In the material from the spontaneous area alone, there are 3339 different loan items which is high by any standard; the majority of the lists of borrowings that have been drawn up do not exceed 1000 items. \(^2\) If we look at running text, the average percentage of borrowing is over 10% (excluding texts on religious and moral issues); this is very high, for in the majority of analyses on running texts that have been carried out, the percentage of borrowing is under 5%. \(^3\)

The evaluation of our findings involves a choice between what may be called the 'symbolic' as against the 'instrumental' value of a language. If the first has priority, then there is certainly cause for alarm as the heavy intrusion of English elements into Bahasa Malaysia cannot but make it lose credibility in the public's eye as the 'symbol of national identity'. However, if the instrumental value of language is emphasized, one would find satisfaction that Bahasa Malaysia is being

---

2. As noted by E. Haugen, 1958, "Languages in Contact", Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists, p.785.
3. Ibid. In the studies that the writer has personally examined, the percentage is under 2%. Thus for Hebrew, Ronen et.al found the percentage of borrowing to be 1.5%; for Amharic, Demoz found a percentage of 0.3% (631 loanwords out of 210,000 running words); for Arabic, Issawi found 0.5%. The studies mentioned have probably underestimated the real extent of borrowing, as only loanwords were considered. But even if we consider loanwords alone, the rate of borrowing in running text for Bahasa Malaysia is still very much higher, approximately 8%.
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Anglicized, thus, guaranteeing its non-parochial development at a time when European languages in general, and the English language in particular, are associated with major political, economic, and technological trends all over the world, and when Malaysians are seeking to participate in these trends as actively as possible.

Because this influence of English on Bahasa Malaysia is not a thing of the past, but is still going on and possibly will increase, this study is not a harmonious survey of an influence all complete. To quote Stene (1945), "it is more like a snapshot of a thing in motion". It is hoped that in this study of English lexical impact on Bahasa Malaysia, the aspect of language that is brought out is its "dynamic character, as part of a continuously changing social and cultural order with its anomalies and conflicting tendencies".

Development is so rapid that the linguistic situation described here may be materially altered in a few years' time. It is hoped therefore, that the ongoing process of growth and evolution in Bahasa Malaysia will continue to be investigated by scholars and students, so that when one day the full history of modern Malay comes to be written, it can be fully documented.

There is much scope for further study. In the course of the discussion, a number of areas that need investigation has been pointed out, for instance, a fuller description of loanword phonology, analysis of English influence on Malay syntax, reception of lexical products of planning agencies among various target populations, and so on. Studies parallel to this one would be interesting for comparison. The groundwork has been laid by this study as a sizeable corpus of loans and other lexical innovations has been accumulated, schemes for coding, classifying, and analysing these innovations have been evolved, and the general features and trends in vocabulary expansion abstracted.

APPENDIX 1

RELEVANT ASPECTS OF BAHASA MALAYSIA STRUCTURE

1.0 Introduction

This appendix gives a brief outline of Bahasa Malaysia structure. Its aim is mainly to provide a sufficient outline of Malay phonology, morphology, and syntax for the understanding of the basic chapters of the dissertation.

1.1 Phonology and Orthography

The following outline of Malay phonology is based on Yunus Maris' Malay Sound System (1963).

1.1.1 Vowel Phonemes

Malay has 6 pure vowels and 3 diphongs.

Malay Vowels

Front  Central  Back

\[ \text{I} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{ar} \quad \text{au} \]

1.1.2 Consonant Phonemes

In the chart below, the 19 unbracketed symbols represent the basic consonant phonemes in Malay. The 9 bracketed symbols represent the secondary or loan phonemes which are all fricatives. With the exception of /v/ which was introduced through English loanwords, the rest came into the language through Arabic loanwords.

---

1. The phonemic notation used, however, is based on that used for English by A.C. Gimson, in his revision of Daniel Jones' English-Pronouncing Dictionary (14th Edition), London: Dent & Sons Ltd., 1977, p.xii-xiv.
Most of these loan phonemes have yet to pass beyond the 'variant' state.

### Malay Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labio-dental</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palato-alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Plosive</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Plosive</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Affricate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tʃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Affricate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dʒ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Fricative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s (f)</td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(x) h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Fricative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>(z)</td>
<td>(3) (ɔ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ɾ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Vowel</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3 **Syllable Structures**

Malay words are formed from the following syllable structures:

1. (v) e.g. a-nak /anaʔ/ 'child'
2. (v) e.g. in-dah /Indah/ 'beautiful'
3. (v) e.g. i-bu /ibu/ 'mother'
4. (v) e.g. pin-tu /pintu/ 'door'

From the list of syllable structures above, it may be seen that the Malay language does not have consonant clusters either in its pronunciation or spelling.

1.1.4 **Word Structures**

Words in Malay are of two types: simple and composite. Simple words are made up of single free morphemes; composite words of two or more morphemes.
1.1.4.1 Simple Word Structure

Most simple Malay words are disyllabic having the structure
(C)VC(C)V(C)
where C is a consonant unit and V a vowel unit.

The initial C unit may be any consonant in the inventory. Some roots have vowel initial forms in variation with forms having initial /ʔ/ (e.g. /amaʔ/, /ʔamaʔ/ enak 'mother') the latter form occurring usually in highly formal pronunciation or under conditions of stress. In medial position either single consonants or two-consonant clusters may occur; the medial clusters are the only type of consonant clusters in Malay and they are always a nasal followed by a homorganic plosive (-nt, -nd-, -mb-, -mp- etc.). The final C unit may be any of the consonants in the inventory other than

(a) a voiced plosive¹
(b) the voiceless plosive /k/¹
(c) a fricative other than /s/ and /h/¹
(d) an affricate¹
(e) the nasal /ɲ/.

The final V unit may be any vowel in the inventory other than

(a) the front vowel /e/ in open syllables²
(b) the central vowel /a/ in closed syllables
(c) the back vowel /o/ in open syllables
(d) a diphthong in closed syllables³

There are a few monosyllabic words in Malay with the structure:
CV(C)
For example, /ja/ ia 'yes': CV; /lap/ lap 'to mop' : CV/C

There is a small number of words with three syllables (e.g- /paraŋkap/perangkap 'trap': CV/CVC/CVC), and an even smaller number of words with four syllables (e.g: /səmantara/ semantara 'temporary':CV/CVC/CVC/CV). No simple words have more than four syllables.

1. Arabic loanwords do contain these excepted consonants but are seldom realised except in highly formal environments.
2. There is one exception /tempe/ 'a cake made from fermented beans', probably of Javanese origin.
3. The diphthong /oI/ is restricted to open syllables in word final position; none of the 3 diphthongs occurs in word initial position.
1.1.4.2 Composite Word Structure

Composite words may have more than four syllables. Composite words are of three types: complex, reduplicated and compound, which are derived from affixation, reduplication and compounding respectively (see Section 1.2). Each of these is exemplified below:

/mempelihatkan/mempelihatkan 'caused to be seen': CVC/CVC/CV/CVC/CVC
/kupukupu/kupu-kupu 'butterfly': CV/CV/CV/CV
/anakanakat/anakanakat 'adopted child': V/CVC/VC/CVC

1.1.5 Orthography

Two spelling systems are used in Malay: the Jawi based on the Arabic script and the Rumi based on the Latin alphabet. The Rumi system is the official spelling system, chosen because of its greater efficiency. For instance, the Jawi system provides only for 3 vowels: /i, a, u/ whereas, as noted, Malay has 6 vowels. There is therefore, a great deal of homography when Malay is written in Jawi, making it very difficult to read.

The Rumi system, introduced by R.J. Wilkinson in 1904, had gone through many revisions. The one in use at the present time is the Common Malaysia-Indonesian system decreed in 1972 and subsequently modified in 1975. Spelling in Malay is very much more phonemic than in English. Details of the Common Malaysia-Indonesian Spelling are given below.¹

1.1.5.1 The Vowel System

(1) The 6 vowel phonemes are represented as follows:
/a/ = a, /i/ = i, /u/ = u, /e/ and /o/ = e, and /o/ = o.

In Malay orthography there are rules which determine the vowel letter to be used to represent the vowel in final closed syllables. The last vowel letter is determined by the vowel letter in the penultimate syllable as follows:

(i) Vowel letters i or u are used in final closed syllables if the preceding syllables consist of vowel letters 1, a, e, u, representing vowels /I, a, 3, u/ respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penultimate Position</th>
<th>Final Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e = /3/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples: sisik 'scale', pikul 'to shoulder', balik 'to return', ajuk 'to imitate', lebih 'extra', ketuk 'to strike', putih 'white', pucuk 'shoot'.

(ii) Vowel letters o or e are used if the preceding syllables contain vowel letters o and e representing vowels /o/ and /e/ respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penultimate Position</th>
<th>Final Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples: bodoh 'stupid', boleh 'able', tempoh 'time lapse', gelek 'to roll over'.

The above-mentioned rules, however, do not apply to loanwords. The rationale and implications of this exemption are discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

(2) The 3 diphthongs in Malay: /ai, av, oI/ are spelled as ai, au, and oi respectively.

Examples: pakai 'to wear, pulau 'island', amboi 'exclamation'.

1.1.5.2 The Consonant System

The Common Spelling System recognised 24 consonant phonemes in Malay and these are represented as follows:

/b/ = b, /t / = c, /d/ = d, /f/ = f, /g/ = g, /g/ = gh, /h/ = h,
/dʒ/ = j, /k/ and /ʔ/ = k, /x/ = kh, /l/ = l, /m/ = m, /n/ = n,
/p/ = ny, /ŋ/ = ng, /p/ = p, /ʔ/ = q, /r/ = r, /s/ = s, /ʃ/ = sy,
/t/ = t, /v/ = v, /w/ = w, /j/ = y, /z/ = z.

As mentioned previously, there are no consonant clusters in Malay words. The Common Malaysia-Indonesian Spelling system, however, has allowed consonant clusters to be retained in loanwords.

1.2 Morphology

1.2.1 Units of Malay Morphology

(1) Morphemes

The morpheme is defined as the minimal grammatical unit. Morphemes in Malay are classified in two ways according to their freedom of occurrence and their distribution in words. Firstly, morphemes in Malay may be free or bound. A free morpheme is one that may occur alone as a word (e.g. rumah which is a word made up of a single morpheme). A morpheme which cannot occur alone as a word is a bound morpheme (e.g. in pelukis 'artist', pe- 'nominal agentive prefix' is bound, lukis 'to draw' is free; in anai-anai 'termite' anai is bound, because it cannot occur alone but must be reduplicated).

Secondly, morphemes are either roots or affixes. A root morpheme is that part of the word which remains after all affix morphemes have been removed. For example, the word kesenangan 'ease' is made up of three morphemes: two affixes ke-, -an and a root morpheme senang 'easy'. The affixes are those morphemes which are attached to a root (or base) in the process of affixation. Most root morphemes are free though there are some that are bound (as anai in the example above); all affix morphemes, however, are bound.

(2) Words

The word in Malay may be defined as the "minimum free form" and it must consist of at least one free morpheme. The Malay word may be simple (e.g. api 'fire'), complex (e.g. berapi 'fiery'), reduplicated (e.g. api-api 'a mangrove tree'), or compound (e.g. kayu api 'firewood'). The morphological processes from which the last

1. Only in Arabic loanwords, e.g. Quran, Tariq.
three types are derived, viz affixation, reduplication, and compounding respectively, are described below.

1.2.2 Morphological Processes

The three main morphological processes in Malay are affixation, reduplication and compounding.

1.2.2.1 Affixation

Malay, like many other Austronesian languages, makes extensive use of affixation both to express grammatical relationships and to form new words. Affixation is a morphological process whereby a base may be extended by one or more affixes. A base is a form to which affixes are attached, or upon which reduplication operates. A base may be a free or bound root morpheme, or a complex, a reduplicated, or a compound form.

(1) System of Affixes

Malay affixes are classified as prefixes, suffixes and infixes which are positioned before, after and within the base respectively. Combinations of prefix and suffix, called by Hassan (1974) "circumfixes"\(^1\), may also be used. The affixes express a wide variety of semantic values and serve also to transfer words from one part of speech to another.

Prefixes in Malay are: \(m\alpha-, b\alpha-, t\alpha-, p\alpha-, k\alpha-, s\alpha-, p\alpha-, d\alpha-\)
Suffixes are: \(-\alpha n, -\alpha n-, -\alpha i\)
Infixes are: \(-\alpha m-, -\alpha l-, -\alpha r-\)

(2) Phonological Variations of Prefixes \(m\alpha-\) and \(p\alpha-

Among the Malay affixes, the prefix \(m\alpha-\) and \(p\alpha-\) have phonological variants determined by the initial letter or phoneme of the base or rootword which, in certain contexts, is dropped. The rules are as follows:

(a) When the rootword begins with a nasal, a semi-vowel, or with \(r\) and \(l\), then \(m\alpha-/p\alpha-\) is simply prefixed: \(m\alpha-\alpha nak/p\alpha-\alpha nak\)
(b) When the rootword begins with a vowel, \(h\), \(g\), \(k\), then \(m\alpha-\alpha n\alpha g/p\alpha-\alpha n\alpha g\) is prefixed and \(k\) is dropped: \(m\alpha-\alpha n\alpha t/p\alpha-\alpha n\alpha t\)

---

\(^1\) Abdullah Hassan, 1974, The Morphology of Malay, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, p.44.
pengutip (from kutip 'to collect').

(c) When the rootword begins with b and p, then ma+m/pa+m is prefixed and p is dropped: membaca/pembaca (from baca 'to read'); meminpin/peminpin (from pinpoint 'to guide').

(d) When the rootword begins with c, j, d, t, or sy, then ma+n/pa+n is prefixed and t is dropped: menarik/penarik (from tarik 'to pull').

(e) When the rootword begins with s, then ma+ny/pa+ny is prefixed and the s dropped: menyapu/penyapu (from sapu 'to sweep').

(3) Layers of Affixation

There can be as many as three layers of affixation. One-layer constructions (e.g. se+orang 'alone') and two-layer constructions (e.g. ke+seorang+an 'loneliness') are most common, three-layer constructions (e.g. ber+keseorang+an 'to suffer loneliness') are rare. No constructions exceed three layers of affixation.

1.2.2.2 Reduplication

In reduplication, the rootword or some part of the rootword is repeated; the repeated part is called the duplicate. There are three types of reduplication in Malay:

(1) Reduplication of the whole of the rootword: rumah-rumah 'houses'.

(2) Reduplication of the initial consonant of the rootword with the central vowel /a/ for its vowel: lalaki 'men' from laki 'man'.

(3) Reduplication with phonetic change or "rhyming and chiming."¹ In rhyming one syllable of the rootword is repeated in the duplicate, e.g: bukit-bukau 'hills' (from bukit 'hill'). In chiming all the consonants are repeated in the duplicate and only the vowels change, e.g: gunung-ganang 'mountains in general' (from gunung 'mountain').

Reduplication is used to express (a) indefinite plurality (with variety implied) - this is its most common semantic function - e.g: kueh-mueh 'all kinds of cakes', (b) intensity, e.g: jauh-jauh 'far far away', (c) repetition, frequency and continuity in action, e.g: melompat-lompat 'to keep on leaping', and (d) resemblance to object denoted by the rootword, e.g: layang 'fly', layang-layang 'kite'.

1.2.2.3 Compounding

In compounding two or more words are combined to form a new word. The constituents in a compound may either be a root or a derived form. Most frequently compounding involves the combination of two nouns (e.g: kaki langit 'horizon', from kaki 'foot' + langit 'sky'), but other parts of speech may also be combined (e.g: verb + noun : sapu tangan 'handkerchief', from sapu 'to sweep' + tangan 'hand'). In most cases the constituents of a compound are combined syntactically (i.e. following Malay word order: Head-Modifier), resulting in a syntactic compound (e.g: guru besar 'headmaster' from guru 'teacher' + besar 'big'). Otherwise, the result is an asyntactic compound (e.g: in mahasiswa 'student', from maha 'big' + siswa 'pupil', the modifier is Modifier-Head, contrary to usual Malay word-order). Compounds, like syntactic structures, may be endocentric or exocentric in construction.

(1) Endocentric Compounds

An endocentric compound has a similar function as one of its constituents which is the head of the construction, e.g: wayang kulit 'shadow play' (wayang 'show' is the head, kulit 'skin' is the modifier) merah tua 'dark red' (merah is the head, tua 'old' is the modifier).

(2) Exocentric Compounds

An exocentric compound does not belong to the same form class (or have the same syntactic function) as any of its constituents, thus

1. A survey carried out by Asmah Haji Omar reported that plurality is the most common semantic function of reduplication, accounting for 49.3% of the cases of reduplication. See: Asmah Haji Omar 1975, "Reduplication in Malay," in Essays in Malaysian Linguistics (by same author), Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, p.216.
all the constituents are obligatory in the sense that none of the constituents may function as the whole compound, e.g: *yang dipertuan 'ruler'* (from *yang 'who' + dipertuan 'is made lord').

Some compounds may be regarded as grammatically endocentric but semantically exocentric. This mainly involves idiomatic compounds such as: *muka tebal 'brazen'*(from *muka 'face' + tebal 'thick').

1.2.2.4 Mixed Constructions

The three morphological processes may also be combined in different ways to give rise to "mixed constructions". For example: *adik-beradik 'brothers and sisters'*(reduplication + affixation), *warganegara-warganegara 'citizens'*(compounding + reduplication), *persuratkhabaran* (compounding + affixation).

1.2.3 Form Classes (Parts of Speech)

Most traditional grammarians such as Marsden, Winstedt, Za'ba and Alisjahbana have classified Malay words into five or more classes. Some modern writers such as Payne and Abdullah Hassan have recognised a smaller number of classes. The classification adopted here is based on the traditional classification as it is more suitable for the purposes of this study.

It must be pointed out, however, that many Malay words cannot be assigned definitely to a particular part of speech. Windstedt (1927) has commented on the high incidence of "chameleon words" in Malay. For instance, the word *sakit* can be noun, adjective or verb as in

\[
\begin{align*}
sakit & \text{ itu } \text{ teruk} & \text{'that sickness is severe'} \\
orang & \text{ sakit} & \text{'a sick man'} \\
i & \text{ sakit} & \text{'he (is) sick'}
\end{align*}
\]

The following classification of Malay words has been adopted with this "essential versatility" of the Malay word in mind. For the practical purposes of this study, Malay words have been classified

---
1. The term is used by Hassan, 1974, p.47.
3. Ibid.
into six form classes or parts of speech. These are:

1. Nouns (proper or common nouns)
2. Verbs (transitive e.g. beli 'to sell' or intransitive e.g. tidur 'to sleep')
3. Adjectives
4. Pronouns

Pronouns are further classified into:

(a) Personal pronouns (e.g: aku 'I', kamu 'you', dia 'he/she' etc)
(b) Demonstrative pronouns (e.g: ini 'this', itu 'that')
(c) Possessive pronoun (viz. -nya)
(d) Relative pronoun (viz. yang 'which/who(m)'
(e) Interrogative pronouns (e.g: apa 'what', mana 'where', etc.)

Adverbs

Adverbs are further classified into:

(a) Adverbs of place (e.g: sini 'here', sana 'there', etc.)
(b) Adverbs of time (e.g: sekarang 'now', esok 'tomorrow' etc.)
(c) Adverbs of degree (e.g: lebih 'more', sangat 'very', etc.)
(d) Adverbs of manner (e.g: perlahan-lahan 'slowly' etc.)
(e) Adverbs of mood (e.g: patut 'should/ought', harus 'must, etc.)
(f) Adverbs of aspect (e.g: sedang 'still', telah 'already', etc.)

Many Malay adverbs really belong to other parts of speech (e.g: lampir which is a verb 'to approach' as well as adverb 'nearly'). They are also formed from different parts of speech by several devices (e.g: by reduplication of the rootword: hari-hari, 'daily'; by se + root + nya : sebenarnya 'truly'). Adverbial phrases may also be formed from a preposition and a derived word (e.g: dengan murahan 'cheaply'); phrases based on secara are now increasingly used e.g: secara kecilan 'in a small way'.

(6) Particles

Particles constitute a heterogeneous class comprising:

(a) Numerals (e.g: satu 'one', ribu 'thousand' etc.)
(b) Quantifiers (e.g: banyak 'many', sedikit 'few')
(c) Classifiers or numeral coefficients

1. William Marsden, among others, has pointed out, that there are "few instances in Malay in which their (adverb) derivation from verbs, adjectives, or nouns is not more or less apparent", in a Grammar of the Malayan Language, 1912, London: Longman.
Classifiers are qualifying words used to class concrete nouns according to some quality such as shape, texture, etc. (see 1.2.4).

(d) Prepositions (e.g: ke 'to', dari 'from', etc.)
(e) Conjunctions (e.g: dan 'and', jika 'if', etc.)

One of the interesting aspects of the Malay language is that 'function words' as much as articles, prepositions, and conjunctions are not required when the context of the sentence is logically clear. For instance, in phrases such as balik kampung 'return (to) (the) village', and lembu kambing 'cows (and) goats'.

1.2.4 Grammatical Categories

Most of the traditional (Indo-European) grammatical categories are not obligatory in Malay. Though the Malay word does not undergo inflection to denote tense, number, gender, mood or case, these may be shown by special words or devices when needed. For instance, to emphasize present time the word sekarang 'now' may be used; to emphasize future, esok 'tomorrow'; and for past time sudah 'completed'. Similarly, plurality may be shown by reduplicating the rootword, e.g: rumah-rumah or by a word such as banyak, e.g: banyak rumah 'many houses'.

In Malay, however, classifiers are obligatory when numerals are used with concrete nouns, these classifiers "in many cases descriptive of some obvious quality of the material object". They correspond to the English strand as in 'three strands of hair' and head as in 'five head of cattle'. Some common classifiers in Malay are: orang (for persons), ekor (for animals) buah (for houses, ships, fruits, etc.) batang (for poles, trees, etc.), biji (for eggs, coconuts etc.), keping (for bread, cakes, etc.), helai (for paper, cloth, etc.), kuntum (for flowers), and so on.

1.3 Syntax

Malay syntax, as a consequence of the lack of declension and conjugation, is dominated by word order. The normal word order is:

---

1. Winstedt, 1927, p.129
2. In keeping with the lexical emphasis of this study, only such features as are relevant to morphology are discussed. For this reason, only sentences of the declarative type are described.
subject + verb + object, as in English. Whether in sentences or in compound words, the rule is that the modifier follows the modified (or head word). Thus attributive constructions are different from those in English in that the noun precedes the attribute, as in rumah besar 'house big'.

There are two basic sentence structures in Malay: NP-NP and NP-VP (where NP may be realised as noun or pronoun, VP may be realised as verb, adjective or adverb). The copula is not necessary in Malay so that the simple sentence may consist of two words as in:

Ali guru 'Ali (is) teacher', Farida cantik 'Farida (is) beautiful', or dia sakit 'he (is) sick'.

The clauses in a sentence may be joined together by coordination (with or without conjunctions, but more often without), and, less often, by subordination. Basically, Malay (particularly spoken Malay) is 'paratactic' rather than 'hypotactic', that is, one would normally prefer to say: 'she was frightened (and) she screamed' (simply juxtaposing the two ideas) rather than use a conjunction to make a causal connection between the two ideas and say: 'she screamed because she was frightened'. Indeed, "antithesis marked by the balanced juxtaposition of words and clauses" is fundamental to Malay syntax and style as emphasized by Windstedt:

Balance is an elementary principle in the Malay simple sentence with its lack of a copula, and of the complex sentence with its frequent disdain of conjunctive words. It has brought much discredit on Malay literary style and caused it to be blamed for tedious repetition and trailing redundancies, when really it makes for lucidity and for emphasis.

1. The exceptions being numerals and quantifiers which come before the nouns they modify.
2. Asmah Haji Omar in her paper, "The Malaysian National Language in Academic Discourse", has pointed out that the increasing use of subordination as one of the forms of English syntactical influence on Bahasa Malaysia. This paper was presented at the Fourth Conference of the Asian Association of National Languages held in Kuala Lumpur, April 1977.
4. Ibid, p.168
There is some evidence that the whole idea of formal causal linking is of foreign origin. Skinner (1964) who put forth this theory offered as evidence the fact that most of the conjunctions in Malay are either adapted from other parts of speech (e.g: lalu 'to pass', baru 'new' - both used to express the idea 'then, after that'), or are borrowed from foreign languages, especially Sanskrit (e.g: sebab 'because', kalau 'if').

## APPENDIX 2

### SOURCES OF LEXICAL ITEMS PROCESSED BY 'REFER'

#### A. Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Berita Harian</td>
<td>127,000 (daily)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Berita Minggu (Sunday edition of Berita Harian)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Utusan Malaysia</td>
<td>176,000 (daily)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Utusan Minggu (Sunday edition of Utusan Malaysia)</td>
<td>305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bintang Timur</td>
<td>19,000 (daily)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Watan</td>
<td>56,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total No. of items taken from Source A: 2068

#### B. Dewan Periodicals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Dewan Masyarakat</td>
<td>50,000 (monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dewan Bahasa</td>
<td>5,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dewan Sastera</td>
<td>10,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Dewan Budaya</td>
<td>10,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dewan Pelajar</td>
<td>25,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total No. of items taken from Source B: 1048

#### C. Popular Magazines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mastika</td>
<td>30,000 (monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jelita</td>
<td>45,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Wanita</td>
<td>98,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Alam Wanita</td>
<td>35,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Utusan Filem &amp; Fesyen</td>
<td>23,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Utusan Radio &amp; TV</td>
<td>63,000 (fortnightly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Selecta</td>
<td>27,000 (monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mastika Filem</td>
<td>23,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Varia Filem</td>
<td>35,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Widuri</td>
<td>25,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Panorama</td>
<td>30,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Filem &amp; TV</td>
<td>25,000 (weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Varia Pop</td>
<td>75,000 (fortnightly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total No. of items taken from Source C: 810
D. Radio & Television Malaysia broadcasts

Total No. of items taken from Source D: 127

From sources A-D, a total of 4053 different lexical items were obtained altogether. This comprised the data from the spontaneous area of lexical innovation. The full list of items and their classifications are given in the Glossary in Appendix 7.

E. Dictionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionaries</th>
<th>Total No. of items</th>
<th>No. taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. R.J. Wilkinson, 1956, Malay-English Dictionary</td>
<td>23,000 (approx) 23,000</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kamus Dewan</td>
<td>28,000 (approx) 28,000</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Daftar kata-kata Pinjaman Umum Dalam Ejaan Rumi Baru Bahasa Malaysia

Total No. of items: 1,147 No. taken: 410

G. Lists of Terms Published in the Journal Dewan Bahasa (1957-1973)

1. Istilah Ilmu Ukur dan Algebra, Sept. 1957.
15. Istilah Galian, July 1959.

**Total No. of items : 1055 (approx)**

**H. Lists and Glossaries of Specialised Terms Issued by the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka between 1977-1980.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Daftar Asas Istilah Kesusaeteraan Abjad A-Z, 3.10.77 DBP/106/5 (97)</th>
<th>486</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Senarai Asas Istilah Kimia, 14.11.77, DBP/106/5 (115)</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Daftar Kuantiti Istilah Fizik, 31.1.78, DBP/106/6 kulit 6 (40)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Daftar Istilah Fizik, 31.1.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 6 (42)</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Daftar Istilah Asas (Ilmu) Matematik, 12.7.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 6 (44)</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Kejuruteraan Mekanik JKTBM, 18.8.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 7 (16)</td>
<td>609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Psikologi JKTBM, 4.8.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 7 (18)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Pengurusan JKTBM, 1.8.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 7 (22)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Komunikasi Am JKTBM, 18.8.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 7 (24)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Umum Perubatan-Kesihatan, 28.8.79, DBP/106/5 kulit 7 (28)</td>
<td>1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Umum Komunikasi Am, 28.8.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 7 (30)</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Fisiologi Perubatan-Kesihatan, 28.8.79, DBP/106/5 kulit 7 (32)</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Umum Pentadbiran dan Kewangan, 30.11.78, DBP/106.5 kulit 9 (36)</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Biologi JKTBM, 11.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (50)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Undang-Undang DBP, 11.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (52)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Sukun JKTBM, 11.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (56)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Perubatan JKTBM, 11.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (58)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Kesenian JKTBM, 11.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (60)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Kejuruteraan Mekanik JKTBM, 11.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (64)</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Undang-Undang DBP, 12.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (66)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Ekonomi JKTBM, 12.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (70)</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Kesenian DBP, 12.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (72)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Pendidikan JKTBM, 12.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (76)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Pertanian JKTBM, 12.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 9 (80)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Biologi KJTB, 12.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 10 (10)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Fizik-Matematik JKTBM, 12.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 10 (12)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Hasil JKI Kejuruteraan Mekanik JKTBM, 12.78, DBP/106/5 kulit 10 (16)</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Sukan Hasil Sidang 11 MBIM, 26.5.79, DBP/106.5 kulit 11 (12)</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Ekonomi Hasil Sidang MBIM, 14.6.79</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Daftar Asas Istilah Pendidikan MBIM, 21.3.79, DBP/106/3 kulit 5 (22)</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Psikologi Hasil Sidang 12 MBIM, 26.12.79, DBP/106/5 kulit 14 (14)</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Pengurusan Hasil Sidang 12 MBIM, 31.1.80, DBP/106/5 kulit 15 (2/1)</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Teknologi dan Sains Mineral Hasil Sidang 13 MBIM, 14.2.80, DBP/106/6 kulit 15 (12/1)</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Perubatan-Kesihatan (Anatom) Hasil Sidang 13 MBIM, 6.3.80, DBP/106/5 kulit 15 (16/1)</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Linguistik Hasil Sidang 7 MBIM, 25.3.80, DBP/106/5 (48/1)</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total No. of Items**: 17817
I. Dictionaries of Specialised Terms Published by the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Istilah Jawatan dan Jabatan, 1964</td>
<td>5992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Istilah Pentadbiran, 1962</td>
<td>5096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Istilah Ekonomi, 1965</td>
<td>3426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Istilah Pendidikan, 1966</td>
<td>4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Istilah Ilmu Alam 1967</td>
<td>3462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Istilah Fizik, Hisab &amp; Kimia, 1968</td>
<td>6734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Istilah Kajihayat, Perhutanan &amp; Pertanian, 1968</td>
<td>8694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Istilah Kejuteraan, 1970</td>
<td>15568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Istilah Undang-undang, 1970</td>
<td>6137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Istilah Pos, 1972</td>
<td>3008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Istilah Linguistik, 1975</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Istilah Kesusasteraan, 1972</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Istilah Sejarah, 1973</td>
<td>7614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Istilah Perdagangan, Perusahaan &amp; Ilmu Akaun, 1973</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Istilah Tadbir Rumah Tangga, 1973</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Istilah Seni Lukis, 1974</td>
<td>6348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Istilah Seni Muzik, 1974</td>
<td>4969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Istilah Pentadbiran &amp; Pengurusan, 1976</td>
<td>8559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Istilah Geografi, 1976</td>
<td>12122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Istilah Pendidikan Jasmani, 1976</td>
<td>1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Istilah Sosiologi-Anthropologi, 1977</td>
<td>11684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Istilah Percetakan, Penerbitan &amp; Komunikasi Komunikasi Massa, 1977</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Istilah Perpustakaan, 1977</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Istilah Senibena, Perancangan &amp; Ukur Kuantiti, 1978</td>
<td>4400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total No. of Items: 161537

Total population from Dewan Sources (G-H) 180,409 items. 1% selected by systematic sampling: 1804 items.

Of the 1804 items, 1126 are from the 1st phase (1957-1966), 338 are from the 2nd phase (1967-1974), and 340 are from the 3rd (1975-1980) phase of terminological development.

J. University of Malaya (Universiti Malaya)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Istilah Geologi, 1972</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Istilah Biologi, 1972</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Istilah Kimia, 1972</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Istilah Matematik, 1972</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Istilah Biokimia, 1972</td>
<td>2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Istilah Fizik, 1973</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Istilah Biologi, 1973</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Istilah Ekonomi, 1973</td>
<td>2390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Istilah Pentadbiran, 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Istilah Undang-Undang, 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Istilah Pendidikan, 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Istilah Geologi, 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Istilah Kejuruteraan, 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total No. of Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. Science University (Universiti Sains Malaysia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Istilah Biokimia, 1973</td>
<td></td>
<td>2112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Istilah Kimia, 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Istilah Biologi Am, 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Istilah Fizik, 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Istilah Biologi, 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Istilah Sosiologi &amp; Anthropologi, 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Istilah Psikologi Pendidikan, 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Istilah Ilmu Alam, 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>2193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Istilah Sains Kemasyarakatan, 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Istilah Biokimia, 1975-1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Istilah Sains Tanah, 1975-1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Istilah Statistika, 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Istilah Psikologi Pendidikan, 1975-1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Daftar Istilah Umum Komunikasi Am, 1975-1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Istilah Pendidikan, 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>5745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Istilah Matematik, 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Istilah Kejuruteraan, 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total No. of Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>32168</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L. National University (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Senarai Istilah-Istilah dari Jabatan dalam</td>
<td></td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fakulti Sains Kemasyarakatan &amp; Kemanusiaan,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1976-January 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Istilah Sains Kemasyarakatan &amp; Kemanusiaan,</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 1977-July 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Istilah Sains Sains Kemasyarakatan &amp; Kemanusiaan,</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 1977-February 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Istilah Geografi, 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Istilah Sains Abjad A-K</td>
<td></td>
<td>10060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total No. of Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10893</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M. Inter-University Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Istilah Ilmu Matematik Antara Universiti (JPMAU), 1978</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Istilah Ilmu Matematik (Bahagian Ilmu Statistik &amp; Sains Komputer) 1978</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total No. of Items</strong></td>
<td><strong>2260</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total population from Universities (J-M) : 87,598 items
1% selected by systematic sampling : 877 items

Of the 877 items, 391 are from 2nd phase (1967-1974) and 486 are from the 3rd phase (1975-1980) of terminological development.

The data representing the planned area of lexical innovation comprised the samples from Sources E (2) and G-M which gives a total of 3454 different lexical items.
APPENDIX 3

MATERIALS & SYSTEM OF ANALYSIS USED IN CHAPTER 9.2 (ANALYSIS OF RUNNING TEXTS)

I. Materials

(1) Texts from Newspapers

1. "Harga minyak: Keputusan diumumkan hari ini" (Berita Harian, 1.6.79, p.1).
2. "142, 500 ekar tanah untuk pertanian akan dibuka" (Berita Harian, 31.5.79, p.6).
3. "Kad kredit matawang kita dilancar" (Berita Harian, 31.5.79 p.4).
4. "Proyek parit dan talaiir yang kelima dilancar" (Utusan Malaysia, 19.2.79, p.5)

Political Texts

5. "Pengaruh radikal dalam Parti Buruh" (Utusan Malaysia, 21.2.79, p.4).
6. "Pres Sadat setuju sempadan dibuka" (Berita Harian, 29.5.79, p.2).
7. "China mara 18 batu" (Utusan Malaysia, 23.2.79, p.1)

Scientific Texts

8. "Aspirin: boleh menghalang penyakit jantung" (Berita Harian, 5.6.79, p.8).
9. "Pengembaran Voyager 11" (Berita Harian, 5.6.79, p.8).
10. "Mengawasi kelahiran dengan elektronik bahaya bagi ibu-anak" (Berita Harian, 8.12.79, p.11).

Educational Texts

11. "Kejayaan motif kepada usaha pelaksanaan..." (Berita Harian, 12.1.79, p.11).
12. "Perkara2 yang perlu diketahui uuntuk persediaan membaca" (Berita Harian, 25.5.79, p.8).
13. "Realiti mata pelajaran sejarah di sekolah2 sekarang" (Berita Harian, 3.6.79, p.6).

'Social Issues' Texts

13. "Kelainan sikap jadi daya penarik remaja" (Berita Harian, 7.1.79, p.4)
15. "Pendengki ialah pesakit emosi" (Berita Harian, 5.6.79, p.6).
Arts Texts
16. "Perkembangan teater: pertemubung an antara realistik dan absurb" (Berita Harian, 6.5.79, p.10).
17. "Kem muzik: ke arah bentuk orkestra simfoni kebangsaan" (Berita Harian, 4.12.78, p.14)
18. "Pereka tarian kita tak tahu apa yang dikemukakan?" (Berita Harian, 3.6.79, p.1)

Sports Texts
20. "Skuad B akan buktikan kemampuannya" (Berita Harian, 9.5.79, p.15).
21. "Malaysia pilih 11 peninju untuk kejohanan ASEAN" (Berita Harian, 30.5.79, p.15)

(2) Texts from Dewan Publications

Economic Texts
1. "Dilema Minyak di Asia" (Dewan Masyarakat, February 1979, p.34).

Political Texts

Scientific Texts

Educational Texts

'Social Issues' Texts

Arts Texts
17. "Pelukis Moden Malaysia" (Dewan Budaya, March 1979, p.56).

(3) Texts from Popular Magazines
Entertainment Texts
2. "TOSM" (Widuri, June 1979, p.21).
3. "Deman Disko" (Varia Filem, June 1979, p.43).

Fashion Texts
5. "Solekkan Bak Cantuman Perca" (Wanita, July 1979, p.5).

II. Coding Index
A. Type of Lexical Innovation

| Pure Loanword | 1 |
| Loanblend | 2 |
| Loan Translation | 3 |
| Semantic Extension | 4 |
| Native Creation | 5 |
| Apt Equivalent Substitute | 6 |

B. Form Class of Lexical Innovation

| Noun | 1 |
| Verb | 2 |
| Adjective | 3 |
| Adverb | 4 |
| Preposition & Prepositional Phrase | 5 |
| Others (Pronoun, exclamation, etc.) | 6 |
III. Example of a Coded Text & Analysis

The following is an example of a text which has been coded using the numeric classification system outlined in Section III above. The text below is an 'arts' texts, entitled "Peraduan menulis strip drama pentas" (Stage drama script writing competition), from the February 1979 issue of Dewan Masyarakat (p.7). An asterisk * indicates a compound or phrase.


Satu kelemahan41 yang paling besar ialah ramai penulis masih tidak membuat "persediaan41" yang sunguh-sungguh; persediaan41 bukan saja dalam erti kata11 mulai menci11 yang ditulisnya, menguasai teknik11 penulisan, menguasai stallinn31 serta dapat pula melihat kemungkinan-kemungkinan pementasannya 51, tetapi juga segi format11 skrip11 itu sendiri.

Ada skrip11 yang mengajukan ideall yang baik tetapi kerana kurang seria11 dalam menguasai ideall itu, skrip11 itu menjadi lemah31. Kegagalan menguasai satu-satu ideall menyebabkan karya41 itu tersekat-sekat, meleset dan kurang manjakkinkan. Terdapat bahagian-bahagian yang sebenaranya tidak relevan13, idea-ideall sampingan yang tidak terjalin dengan ideall asal, dialog11 yang tidak terkawal43, dan pada akhirnya skrip11 itu hilang * arah32 dan matlamatnya61.


Masalahnya ialah penulis guna mengatur persoalan-persoalan yang besar dan hebat umpamanya cuba meneroka42 persoalan metafisikal3 atau mengelamun dalam alam fantasil1. Soal-soal * kewujudan31 (eksistensialisme31) cukup ghairah63 digarap. Tetapi kerana tidak dapat menguasai sebenaranya apa yang dibicarakan, skrip11 itu jadi filosofika31, dialognyall jadi tidak natural13, terseret-seret di antara kecenderungan psudo-falsafah21 dan keteliran ideall, dan terjebak di antara pemilihan bahasa yang kurang berkesan43. Rumur11 jika ada, yang seharusnya witty31 dan intelektual3 sfatnya, jadi slapstick13 yang sudah tentu kurang sesuai kepada corak pengkarya51 yang demikian.

Total No. of words: 380

Total No. of English loans: 71
Types of loans:
- Pure loanwords: 48
- Loanblends: 2
- Loan translations: 4
- Semantic extensions: 17

Form Class of loans:
- Nouns: 47
- Verbs: 2
- Adjectives: 20
- Prepositions & Prepositional phrases: 2

Type-token ratio: 49.3%
Percentage of hapax legomena: 82.9%

Total No. of Native Creations: 7
Form Class of Native Creations: All nouns
Percentage of Native Creations: 1.8%
Type-token ratio: 100%
Percentage of hapax legomena: 100%

Total No. of apt equivalent substitutes: 3
Form class of apt equivalent substitutes: Nouns: 2; Adjectives: 1
Percentage of apt equivalent substitutes: 0.8%
Type-token ratio: 100%
Percentage of hapax legomena: 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word or Phrase</th>
<th>No. of times used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>skrip</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idea</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drama</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teknik</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dialog</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>format</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drama absurb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fantasi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eksistentialisme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humur</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serius</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstrak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absurb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superfisial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metafisika</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filosofikal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelektual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekstensif</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Loanblends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pseudofalsafah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titik koma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Loan translations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hilang arah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke arah</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soal-soal kewujudan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semantic extensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ber)mutu</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lemah</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persedian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karya</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jurang</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kelemahan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bidang</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terkawal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meneroka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>berkesan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Native creations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perangkaan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ertikata</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pementasan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daya penarik</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pengkaryaan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ketidaktelitian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penyuntingan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Apt equivalent substitutes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>matlamat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falsafah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghairah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4

CLASSIFICATION INTO SEMANTIC DOMAINS

For this thesis the writer adopted no previous system of classification. As the material was collected it was arranged into fields that were indicated by the material itself. A category called 'General' was added because it is virtually impossible to assign all the words to a field. For instance, it is easy to assign 'hoki' to sport, and 'dinamo' to the Technical domain. But where is a word like 'moden' or 'fakta' to be assigned? A word from this domain termed 'General' may appear in other fields.

The system of classification into semantic domains used is as follows:

I. Social
1. Household
2. Food & Drink
3. Clothes and materials
4. Religion
5. The arts & entertainment (films, plays, music, dance, painting, literature).
6. General Education
7. Travel, transport & communication
8. Profession & status terms
9. Measurements & weights
10. Qualities, skills, attitudes, feelings, social relationships
11. Plants & animals
12. Miscellaneous

II. Technical
1. Engineering
2. Industry
3. Electrical field
4. Electronics
5. Mechanical devices & instruments
III. Scientific (Natural sciences & mathematics)

1. Botany
2. Zoology
3. Biology
4. Geology
5. Medicine
6. Pharmaceutical science
7. Physics
8. Chemistry
9. Mathematics
10. Agriculture

IV. Scholarly

1. Philosophy
2. Psychology
3. Sociology & Anthropology
4. Humanities
5. Education psychology, philosophy, administration, etc.

V. Economic

Words connected with economic matters, commercial affairs & dealings, economic planning & organisation.

VI. Political

1. Government & administration
2. International relations & world politics
3. Political events, ideologies & propaganda
4. Legal terms

VII. Sport

1. Games (tennis, badminton, football, etc.).
2. Athletics
3. Organisation
4. Conduct & performance

VIII. General

This contains words which do not fit into any of the other fields or if they do, are also used widely in general contexts.
APPENDIX 5

STATISTICAL TESTS USED

I  The Chi-square test

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E} \]

where \( O \) = observed frequency
\( E \) = expected frequency

and the summation is over all classifications in the goodness-of-fit test and over all cells in the contingency table test.

The calculated \( \chi^2 \) is compared with the tabulated \( \chi^2 \) value for the appropriate number of degrees of freedom to obtain the significance level.

II  The Binomial test, using the Normal Approximation

\[ Z = \frac{P_1 - P_2}{\sqrt{\frac{P_1 q_1}{n_1} + \frac{P_2 q_2}{n_2}}} \]

where \( P_1, P_2 \) = observed proportions in samples 1 and 2
\( q_1 = (1 - P_1) \)
\( q_2 = (1 - P_2) \)
\( n_1, n_2 \) = sizes of samples 1 and 2

The calculated \( z \) is compared with the tabulated Normal integral to obtain the significance level.

Further details of these tests may be found in any good statistical textbook, for example:

## APPENDIX 6

### ADDITIONAL TABLES USED IN DISCUSSION IN CHAPTER 9.1

**Table 1A:** Frequency & Percentage Distributions of Sub-categories of Pure Loanwords in Planned and Spontaneous Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories of Pure Loanwords</th>
<th>PLANNED AREA</th>
<th></th>
<th>SPONTANEOUS AREA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% of Loanwords</td>
<td>% excluding unassim. words</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassimilated</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially assimilated</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly assimilated</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthographically assimilated</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fused Compound</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysed Compound</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truncated Loanword</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>824</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loanwords as % of Total Borrowings</td>
<td>2822</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1B:** Frequency & Percentage Distributions of Sub-categories of Loanblends in Planned and Spontaneous Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories of Loanblends</th>
<th>PLANNED AREA</th>
<th></th>
<th>SPONTANEOUS AREA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% of Loanblends</td>
<td>% of Borrowings</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>560</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I.C: Frequency & Percentage Distributions of Sub-categories of Loan Translations in Planned and Spontaneous Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories of Loan Translations</th>
<th>PLANNED AREA</th>
<th>SPONTANEOUS AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% of Loan Translations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal Loan Translation</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Rendition</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Calque</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I.D: Frequency & Percentage Distributions of Sub-categories of Semantic Extensions in Planned and Spontaneous Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories of Semantic Extensions</th>
<th>PLANNED AREA</th>
<th>SPONTANEOUS AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% of Sem. Ext.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectival</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I.E: Frequency & Percentage Distributions of Sub-categories of Induced Creations in Planned and Spontaneous Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories of Induced Creations (form)</th>
<th>PLANNED AREA</th>
<th>SPONTANEOUS AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% of Creations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affixation</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compounding</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blending</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduplication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX 7**

**GLOSSARY (PARTIAL) AND CODING INDEX**

**USED WITH 'REFER'**

In the glossary the lexical innovation in Bahasa Malaysia is entered on the right, the model/equivalent in English on the left. The coding index used to encode/decode the numeric classifications following each entry is given below.

**Coding Index**

I. **Source of item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Source/Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>University of Malaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Science University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Kamus Dewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>R.J. Wilkinson's A Malay-English Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Daftar Kata-Kata Pinjaman Umum.. (List of Common Loanwords..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Berita Harian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Utusan Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Bintang Timor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Watan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Mastika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Dewan Masyarakat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Dewan Sastera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Dewan Budaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Dewan Bahasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Dewan Pelajar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Jelita; Alam Wanita; Wanita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Selecta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Utusan Filem &amp; Fesyen; Utusan Radio &amp; TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Mastika Filem; Varia Filem; Widuri; Panorama; Varia Pop; Filem &amp; TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Radio &amp; TV Malaysia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. **Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pre - 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1901-1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1956-1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1967-1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1975-1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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III. Form Class
   41 Noun
   42 Verb
   43 Adjective
   44 Adverb
   45 Others

IV. Level of Formation
   51 Simple word
   52 Compound word
   53 Phrase

V. Semantic Domain
   60 () & 61 () Social
      601 Household
      602 Food & Drink
      603 Clothes and materials
      604 Religion
      605 General education
      606 Travel, transport & communication
      607 The arts & entertainment
      608 Profession & status terms
      609 General medicine & health
      610 Qualities, skills, attitudes, feelings, social relationships
      611 Measurements & weights
      612 Plants & animals
      613 Miscellaneous

   620 Technical
      621 Semi-technical
   630 Scientific
      631 Semi-scientific
   640 Scholarly
      641 Semi-scholarly
   650 Economic & Organisational
      651 Semi-economic & organisational
   660 Political
      661 Semi-political
   670 Sport & Recreation
   680 General

VI Lexical Process
   710 Importation
   720 Substitution
   721 Apt equivalent substitution
   730 Native creation

VII Type of Lexical Innovation
   810 Pure Loanword
      811 Unassimilated
      812 Partially assimilated
      813 Wholly assimilated
      814 Orthographically assimilated
      815 Fused compounds
      816 Analyzed compounds
      817 Truncated loanwords
820 Loanblend
821 Marginal
822 Nuclear
823 Compound (nuclear)
824 Compound (marginal)
830 Loan Translation
831 Literal loan translation
832 Loan rendition
833 Syntactic Calque
840 Semantic Extension
841 Nominal
842 Verbal
843 Adjectival
850 Apt Equivalent Substitute
851 Direct
852 Indirect
860 Hybrid Creation
861 Malay element + English/foreign element
862 English/foreign element + Malay element
863 English/foreign element + English/foreign element
870 Induced Creation
871 Affixation
872 Compounding
873 Affixation + Compounding
874 Reduplication
875 Blending
876 Circumlocution

VIII Loan Translation Used with other Lexical Processes
901 Loan translation + importation
902 Loan translation + semantic extension
903 Loan translation + native creation
904 Loan translation + importation + semantic extension
905 Loan translation + importation + native creation
906 Loan translation + semantic extension
907 Loan translation + importation + semantic extension + native creation

IX. Phonological Adaptation
111 Native phoneme substitution
112 Anaptyxis
113 Spelling pronunciation
114 Elision

X. Grammatical Adaptation
121 Loss of bi-/trimorphemic identity in compounds & phrases
122 Word order adapted to Malay pattern
123 Clipping (part represents whole)
124 Conversion or change of form class
125 Used with Malay inflectional affixes
126 Used as base for new word created on Malay derivational pattern (given Malay derivational affixes).
XI. Semantic Adaptation

131 Widening
132 Restriction and specialization
133 Transference & metaphor
134 Loss or change of meaning

XII. Orthographic Adaptation

141 Letters representing sounds absent in Malay pronunciation of word dropped
142 Word re-spelled to preserve etymology
143 Word re-spelled to reflect pronunciation in English
144 Affix modified according to Bahasa Malaysia spelling rules.
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GLOSSARY (PARTIAL)
pasaran barangan / commodity market
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 903, 122
pasaran kewangan jangka pendek / short-term monetary market
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pasaran sahaja / stock market
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pasaran tukar logas / metal exchange market
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pasaran meriam / gun crew
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pasukan maritim / naval forces
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pasukan tentera berjalan kaki / infantry
241, 35, 41, 52, 661, 720, 831, 122
pintar / internal pattern
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
patetik / pathetic
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
patologi / pathology
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
patologi / pathology
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pajau / parachute
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
peak cap / peak bap
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
peak hours / peak hours
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pecah / breakdown
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pecah / breakdown
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pecah / breakdown
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pembahagian veteran / veterans affairs
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pembangunan jangka panjang / long term development
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pembangunan mental / mental development
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pembinaan talent / talent
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pengaruh persepolis / perspolis expedition
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
pengekalan gading / bone surgery
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
penekunen memukul seks / sex change operation
241, 35, 41, 52, 651, 720, 831, 122
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