Book Reviews

- Soebardi, Poerwanto Danoesoegondo, Bahasa Indonesia for beginners. Sydney University Press, 1966, Book I, 160 pp.
- Soebardi, J.P. Sarumpaet, The structure of bahasa Indonesia. Department of Indonesian and Malayan Studies, University of Melbourne, 1966, 167 pp. Off-set Print.
- Soebardi, J.P. Sarumpaet, Introduction to Bahasa Indonesia. Melbourne University Press, 1967, 111 pp., J.A.C. Mackie (eds.)
- Soebardi, T.S. Lie, Introducing Indonesian. Sydney, Angus

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

BOEKBESPREKINGEN

1. T. S. LIE, *Introducing Indonesian*. Sydney, Angus and Robertson Ltd. Book I, 1965, 115 pp. Book II, 1966, 184 pp.
2. SARUMPAET, J. P. and MACKIE, J. A. C., *Introduction to Bahasa Indonesia*. Melbourne University Press, 1967, 111 pp.
3. SARUMPAET, J. P., *The Structure of Bahasa Indonesia*. Department of Indonesian and Malayan Studies, University of Melbourne, 1966, 167 pp. Off-set Print.
4. POERWANTO DANOESOEGONDO, *Bahasa Indonesia for Beginners*. Sydney University Press, 1966, Book I, 160 pp.

It is indeed gratifying to witness the publication at almost the same time of several Indonesian Language textbooks in English — by Mr T. S. Lie from the University of Sydney, Mr J. P. Sarumpaet from the University of Melbourne and Mr Poerwanto Danoesoegondo from Sydney — because these works will fill a need for Indonesian language textbooks that is deeply felt at present in Australia where there is a great and ever-increasing interest in the study of the language amongst University students, High School students and various other groups of people. This demand for Indonesian Language teaching textbooks, in English, is likewise felt in places outside Australia.

From the titles of the books it is clear that each author intends to provide an introductory text for the teaching of Indonesian as a foreign language to English speaking students. Each author endeavours to provide a basic knowledge of the phonemes of Indonesian; how the student should pronounce these sounds as they are pronounced by native speakers; and of the structure and basic patterns of the Indonesian language, so that the learner may understand the language he reads or hears from a native speaker, and also so that he may use the language to communicate with native speakers.

My intention is to discuss briefly several matters relating to the method adopted by each of the authors for presentation of the language. I feel that the success or failure of an introductory course to a foreign language depends first and foremost upon this. I am fully aware in suggesting this that in the field of teaching Indonesian as a foreign language we are still experimenting to find the most effective method, the one most likely to ensure the best results. Whether or not a method is sound depends, in my opinion, upon the soundness of the many different principles which form the basis of that method. Among these

principles are several which are essential and constitute an important condition for a method of presentation of a foreign language in the production of satisfactory results. The first principle is: the author's grammatical approach to the language being taught; second, the selection of grammatical structures — which are basic and productive, which are not; which are simple, which are complex; what must be studied first by the learner and what later. Third, the gradation of material in such a way as to ensure constant progress. Fourth, the comparison of the essential structural differences between the language being taught and the language of the learner. Fifth, the practice and exercise which gives learners the capacity to use the language they learn. In reviewing each of the books mentioned before, these five principles in particular will be used as a guide.

Mr Lie, in the first book, starts each chapter with a passage followed by a list of words and their English equivalents taken from the passage. He then gives a grammatical explanation and closes with exercises. In the second book each chapter follows the above pattern but adds an additional section containing conversation exercises and translations. If we examine the language material presented as reading matter in each chapter, we notice that it is selected to introduce a varied vocabulary related to the home, family, school and other centres of interest. I believe that learning vocabulary is important, but the choice of material for each chapter should also aim to present new grammatical structures systematically and phase by phase. Reading matter containing riddles (such as that found in chapter V of Book I) is, in my opinion, not suitable material for inclusion in an introductory text, because it contains sentences which are complex in structure and different from anything found in the preceding or following chapters. In the early stages the learner would find it difficult to understand the grammatical structure of these riddles. Similarly the reading material found in Book II (pp. 74-5, pp. 107-9), which is taken from classical Malay Prose and Poetry is unacceptable. This material may be suitable for those who have progressed and want to become acquainted with older literature, but for beginners it is too difficult to understand, and may even confuse them because there are no clear grammatical explanations of these texts.

My second objection is to Mr Lie's presentation of grammar. Every chapter in his book contains, in a most traditional manner, grammatical analyses which place heavy emphasis on morphology. Statements concerning the names of parts of speech such as *Noun*, *Pronoun*, *Verbs*, etc. are based on semantic criteria. There is nothing wrong with the use of the names themselves, because these terms are widely known, but the term *Noun* for example is used for a particular word not because that word is the name of 'a person, place, object or any idea that is conceived as an object' (Book I, p. 24), but because that word occupies a particular position in sentence structure. Conventional names can be maintained and used but in Indonesian the classification must be set up on the basis of the positions words could occupy within the structure

of a sentence. Mr Lie's treatment of grammar is still very strongly influenced by concepts of traditional grammar. He still speaks of 'nominative', 'possessive' and 'objective cases', and of 'active' and 'passive voices' (Book I, p. 30, pp. 89-90) which have no real application to Indonesian. He still uses the grammatical category of 'gender' which he confuses with 'sex' (*djenis kelamin*) whereas as with 'number' and 'case', it is clear that Indonesian does not possess 'gender' as a grammatical category. Statements such as 'person, number, and tense are not indicated by change of form in the verb', (Book I, p. 89) are irrelevant and meaningless in a description of Indonesian.

At the syntactic level, sentences such as '*Namanja Hasan*', and '*Badannja gemuk dan besar*' are grouped together as one sentence-type called the 'Nominal Sentence' without any explanation being given (Book I, pp. 32-3). '*Hasan*', '*guru*' are not members of the same class as '*gemuk*' '*tinggi*' because the two sets of words have different distributions. The words '*Hasan*' and '*guru*' in their predicative function can only be preceded by the negator '*bukan*', whilst '*gemuk*' and '*tinggi*' in the same function can only be preceded by '*tidak*'. So on the basis of the structural differences of their predicates, the two sentences may not be grouped together as one type. The sentence '*Namanja Hasan*' on the basis of its predicate is obviously a nominal sentence, but '*Badannja gemuk*' is a verbal sentence because the word '*gemuk*' here behaves in the same way as '*makan*', '*pergi*', '*menulis*' etc.; they can only be preceded by the negator '*tidak*'.

The gradation of grammatical material could be said to have been completely ignored by Mr Lie. In his account of the distribution of the function word '*jang*' (Book II, pp. 66-70) he does not distinguish or describe the environments in which '*jang*' can occur, i.e. at phrase, clause, or sentence level. As a result it would be difficult for the learner to comprehend the structural difference between '*Orang jang buta itu...*', '*Orang jang baru datang dari lapangan terbang itu...*', on the one hand and '*Orang itu jang buta*', '*Orang itu jang baru datang dari lapangan terbang*', on the other. In the first case '*jang*' occurs in a phrase with '*itu*' as a slot, whilst in the second '*jang*' occurs after '*itu*' in a sentence. Mr Lie also fails to mention that the use of '*jang*' in certain environments is optional, and obligatory in others.

'Inversion', one of the basic features of sentence structure in Indonesian, is not described until p. 151 in Book II. Similarly the difference between the uses of '*apa*' as a question word and as a question marker, so important in interrogative sentences, is not described until the end of Book II. We expect these basic grammatical features to be dealt with in the very beginning of the course.

One section in Mr Lie's books which deserves mentioning is the one which contains exercises in simple sentences in the form of conversations, questions and translations. These are more useful and have been presented in a more systematic way than the reading material at the start of every chapter in his books.

Unlike Mr Lie, Mr Sarumpaet, in providing Indonesian material in

his first Book, does not begin each chapter by providing a passage, but by giving a short list of words divided up into their classes: *Nouns, Verbs, Adjectives, Conjunctions, Verbal Auxiliaries, Interrogatives* etc. It is my impression that words from many classes included in the lists are words which have a high frequency in the spoken language and need to be learned at an early stage. However, the vocabulary is not well graded. By this I mean that the vocabulary is not so arranged that the most useful words, from the point of their intrinsic meaning and function as sentence-formers, are introduced before words which are less useful. Furthermore words introduced in a chapter are not always used to familiarize the student with a new usage or to introduce discussion of a new pattern in which the words can occur. New word forms are often introduced without being accompanied by discussion or explanation. For example, the *me-i* form is included in a list of words (Book I, p. 25), together with the *ber-* forms and *me-* forms, but in that particular chapter only the latter forms are discussed; the *me-i* form is left unexplained.

The vocabulary list of each chapter is followed by a grammatical account, centred on morphology, in which the author attempts to avoid giving definitions based on meaning to the grammatical terms he employs. Mr Sarumpaet, however, could not get rid of the use of grammatical categories such as: '*gender, number, accusative and genitive*', (Book I, pp. 20-1) which are non-existent in Indonesian. In explaining the meaning of derivative forms the author uses these forms in sentences which are simple in structure and where necessary he compares them with their English counterparts, which is extremely useful to English speaking students.

Another weakness of Mr Sarumpaet's first Book is, in my opinion, the absence of a systematic treatment of compound-constructions and more seriously that of phrase-constructions which have an important role in sentence structure of Bahasa Indonesia. Admittedly, in the first chapter the author touches briefly on the role of word-order in the phrase and the sentence, but he does not make clear the arrangement of the words or the nature of the various relationships between the elements constituting the phrase. A phrase or expression does not derive its meaning merely from words being strung together, but from the arrangement of those words according to a particular order and hierarchical structure. If this was made clear in a systematic way, it would greatly assist the explanation of sentence structure which is the object of the second book.

Whereas in the first book Mr Sarumpaet concentrates on showing how words are formed and their use in the sentence, the second book is intended to teach sentences; their formation and how sentence structures can be changed to form variant sentences. From the point of view of approach and presentation this second book is better organized than the first. Sentences comprising the major sentence-types in Indonesian are presented step by step from the structurally simplest to the structurally most complex. In the same way the author discusses

imperative, interrogative and exclamatory sentences, all of which comprise the minor sentence-types. One useful section not found in Mr Lie's book, but which is presented in each chapter of the second book, is the section containing exercises I call transformational exercises.

In discussing each sentence-type a distinction is made between elementary, elementary and intermediate, intermediate, and advanced, but no explanation is given of the criteria used as a basis for making these distinctions. I was not able to determine what in fact was the nature of each of these distinctions, i.e. whether they were based merely on the selection of words or on structural arrangements of phrases and sentences. Structural concepts frequently used in sentence analysis are *subject* and *predicate*. No explanation is given of the meaning of these terms as applied to the structure of Bahasa Indonesia. Considering the importance of the student's achieving an understanding of syntactical data in Indonesian, these matters cannot be disregarded. In addition, the author does not give a description of the different structures of the predicate which forms the basis of his sentence classification (*Nominal*, *Verbal* and *Equational Sentences*). The author directs his attention mainly to the external relationships of phrases as sentence forming elements and leaves unexplored the internal relationships within phrases. With regard to the classification: *Nominal Sentence*, we find confusion similar to that found in Mr Lie's book. The difference is that sentences such as '*Namanja Hasan*', which are classified by Mr Lie as *Nominal Sentences*, are called *Equational Sentences*. If the term *Nominal* means a word or clause which is equivalent to a noun in its structural role, then '*kaja*' in '*Saja kaja*' and '*pandai*' in '*Saja pandai*', are not equivalent in their structural role with '*Hasan*' in '*Namanja Hasan*' because here '*pandai*' and '*kaja*' belong to what I call *tidak*-constructions, and '*Hasan*' the *bukan*-constructions. Therefore, it is my contention that the sentence '*Saja pandai*', because of the structure of its predicate, belongs to the *Verbal Sentences* (Book II, pp. 1-3) as in the case of the sentences '*Saja pandai berbitjara*', '*... pandai menggambar*' etc. (Book II, p. 7). I feel that in Chapters I (*Nominal Sentence*), II (*Equational Sentence*) and V (*Verbal Sentence*) of Book II the classification of sentences is confused because no explanation is given of the criteria used as a basis for these classifications.

As stated above, the transformational sentences in Book II are useful, but would be more so if these exercises were presented in a more orderly and systematic fashion, especially the transformational exercises in Chapters I to IX which I shall call single-base transformations (transformation based on a single kernel sentence). However, those in Chapter X, which I will call subordinating double-base transformations are well presented. Here it can be seen how the transformational method has real value for the teaching of Indonesian as a foreign language, and can contribute to the understanding of the structure of more complex Indonesian sentences.

Another equally important remark concerns the absence of English equivalents for each sentence or phrase found in Book II. I feel that

in the early stages, the necessity for English equivalents is still felt by beginners as a means of checking, especially by those who use the book for self study.

The important difference in approach between Mr Poerwanto's book and the books of the two authors discussed before, is that Mr Poerwanto's point of departure for grammatical analysis is the sentence. He focuses his attention on the productive patterns of Indonesian sentences, each pattern being explained and described in terms of smaller hierarchical units. The external relationship of phrases in sentence constructions and the internal relationships between elements of phrase-constructions themselves are also described. The substitution method is used in presenting phrase and sentences construction exercise — a useful method for acquiring proficiency in the use of the language. In explaining Indonesian grammatical constructions Mr Poerwanto always points out the structural similarities and differences between Indonesian and English grammatical constructions. From Chapters I to IV simple sentence-types are discussed, i.e. *Equational* and *Subject-Predicate Sentence patterns* with their transformations into Question and Negative sentence patterns. In Chapter V Mr Poerwanto discusses the sentence-type he calls the *Subject + Predicate + Object* pattern, in which the *Predicate* comprises a verbal phrase (this term 'verbal' is distinguished from the term 'verb'). Words such as *pandai*, *lelah*, *sakit* are grouped into one class by Mr Poerwanto with '*mengantuk*', '*bekerdja*' (and I agree), because in predicate constructions these words behave similarly (p. 12). In describing the composition of verbal phrases, the author does not deal with an important feature of the Indonesian language, that is, the affixation system. Apparently this was deliberately left undiscussed in Book I and possibly will be dealt with in the second book which has not yet been published. I suspect that the delayed treatment of affixation will cause students to have difficulty in understanding the various verbal constructions presented in the first book. Systematic syntactical analysis of verbal sentences can be made together with descriptions of the distributions of affixes so that the student can understand why forms such as *duduk*, *mendudukkan*, *menduduki* have occurrences which differ from *pendudukan* and *kedudukan*. Similarly, in Mr Poerwanto's first book, we do not find treatment of *ku-*, *kau-*, *di-nja* forms and their variants, which are used in object-constructions as transformational variants of the transitive *me-* forms in subject-constructions. These *ku-*, *kau-* and *di-nja* constructions form one of the most productive structures and in my opinion need to be taught at an early stage, together with the other verbal constructions, to enable the learner to acquire an insight into the general structure of the language. If the author feels that the affixation system is too difficult to describe in the first book, why does he describe so specifically the distribution of the prefix *ke-* followed by *Number + Noun*, (*ke-duapuluh peladjar itu*) and the prefix *ber-* + *Number* following a *Pronoun* (*Mereka ber-tiga*) (pp. 102-3)? In explaining sentence-formations based on double-base transformations, only those of a subordinating nature

are dealt with — coordinating sentences are not mentioned (pp. 109-13).

Finally I want to turn briefly to the treatment of phonemic and intonation systems as set forth in the book. Compared to Mr Lie's and Mr Sarumpaet's books, Mr Poerwanto's presentation of the phonemic system is better organized, more complete and more accurate. As well as descriptions of each phoneme, the author gives distributions of each vowel and consonant, and a list of minimal pairs, which is useful for developing the ability to differentiate between and pronounce the meaningful sounds. On the other hand, his treatment of the intonation system of Indonesian (including word-stress) is not as clear. Of word-stress he says: 'The words of Bahasa Indonesia are stressed consistently on the last but one syllable. The word stress shifts when the word is enlarged, for instance with the addition of a suffix'. (See Word-stress.) This statement is somewhat inaccurate. The problem in discussing Indonesian word-stress is not whether the stress falls on the ultimate or penultimate syllable but rather when the word-stress falls on the ultimate syllable and when it falls on the penultimate syllable in an utterance. The factor which determines the placing of stress on the ultimate or penultimate syllable in an Indonesian utterance is the terminal contour of the Indonesian intonation pattern of that utterance. The stress falls on the penultimate syllable if the word is accompanied by sustaining or falling terminal contour, with the condition that the word is not monosyllabic and does not have a *pěpět* (shwa) in its penultimate syllable. However, if the word accompanied by a sustaining or falling terminal contour is monosyllabic or has a *pěpět* (shwa-vowel) in its penultimate syllable, then the stress falls on the ultimate syllable. If a word is accompanied by a rising terminal contour, the stress always falls on the ultimate syllable of the word.¹

Mr Poerwanto's description of intonation could be elaborated by a discussion of different pitch-level patterns and terminal contours of basic utterances in Bahasa Indonesia.

In conclusion I would say that, despite the fact that the books reviewed have weaknesses, Mr Poerwanto's is perhaps the most successful in its approach and presentation. The content, however, is less comprehensive than that found in Mr Sarumpaet's books. Mr Lie's book I feel is the least successful in its grammatical approach and presentation. This review, however, does not lessen my appreciation of the sincere endeavours on the part of each author to promote knowledge of the Indonesian language in countries outside Indonesia. Their work, I am sure, will encourage others interested in this field to carry out further study on the teaching of Indonesian as a foreign language, benefitting from the weaknesses as well as the strengths of these works.

Australian National University

SOEBARDI

¹ Cfr. Moeliono, A.M. 'Suatu Reorientasi dalam Tatabahasa Indonesia', *Simpodium Bahasa dan Kesusasteraan*, Lembaga Bahasa dan Kesusasteraan, Departemen P. dan K., Djakarta, 1966, pp. 23-4.

JOSEPH VERGUIN, *Le Malais. Essai d'analyse fonctionnelle et structurale*. Cahiers de l'Homme, Ethnologie - Géographie - Linguistique. Nouvelle Série VII. Mouton & Co. Paris, La Haye 1967, 146 pp. Prix 45 F.

French publications on the Malay language have been few and far between. Therefore one turns with special interest to a French study, written by a student of no one less than André Martinet and which presents itself as an essay on functional and structural analysis.

However, the present reviewer regrets to state that the expectations with which he started reading this book have been greatly disappointed. It does not seem to be a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the structure of the Malay language. The unsatisfactory results of Mr. Verguin's study are mainly due to the following causes, which however are not without interconnection:

1. The author has not made clear what kind of Malay his analysis is based on. He calls it a description of Malay as spoken in the southern part of the Malay peninsula, but on the other hand he says that his study is based on the investigation of written texts (p. 9). And from the specimens of Malay which he gives it is obvious that his material is partly traditional *hikayat* Malay, partly an artificial kind of spoken Malay, sometimes made 'pour besoin de la cause'. In fact this material is a hotchpotch of different forms of Malay which is hardly susceptible to systematic analysis: cf. a sentence such as *hamba tiada mempunyai tangan hendak mengangkat dia* (p. 84), as compared to *tukang kayu buat rumah aku* (p. 85).¹ The alternance, supposed to exist between *me-* on the one hand, and *-kan* and *-i* on the other and exemplified in the pairs *merasa* and *rasai*, *mentutuk* (sic!) and *tutukkan* is wholly false (p. 69); there is either an opposition *merasa/merasai*, *mentutuk/menutukkan* or an opposition *rasa/rasai*, *tutuk/tutukkan*.

2. It is clear from the examples given in this book that the author's knowledge of Malay is insufficient. He is, for instance, not aware of the fact that a *di-* form, with or without *-nya*, implies a 'patient' which may or may not be expressed in the sentence, but which has to be taken into account in the translation: *ditempuh* (p. 75-6) does not mean 'l'assaut est donné', but '(he) is attacked'. *Lalu* (p. 137) does not mean 'passé, fini' and is not 'la marque du passé'; it means 'next', and is used in connecting a new action, situation, etc. to a previous one; *bermohon* (p. 66) does not mean 's'éloigner' but 'to ask permission to leave'; *sa(ha)ya* is not used 'd'un supérieur parlant à un inférieur'; it is on the contrary a polite substitute for the non-polite pronoun *aku* 'I'; *berbuat*, *berkata*, etc. do not have a reflexive meaning 'faire pour soi', 'se dire', etc. etc.

3. The author is extremely careless and superficial in his definitions and conclusions. I will restrict myself to two examples from his 'Phonologie': (a) he interprets the phonetic entities *mb*, *mp*, *nd*, etc.

¹ For convenience sake I use my own spelling of Malay.

as single nasalized phonemes rather than as clusters of $m + b$, $m + p$, etc.; but his one argument for this interpretation is circular: because the structure of the Malay 'lexème primaire' excludes consonant clusters he prefers the 'interprétation monophonématique' for *mb* etc. But it is exactly because of this interpretation that the Malay 'lexème primaire' does not have any consonant clusters! (p. 27-28); (b) the author interprets Mal. *w* and *y* as allophones of the vowels *u* and *i*. This implies that words such as *pawai*, *kayau* have a sequence of 4 vowels CVVVV, but nowhere in the chapter on 'Distribution' etc. (p. 39) does the author account for these consequences of his phonemic interpretation of *w* and *y*.

4. Neither in morphology nor in syntax does the author make a distinction between productive or regular and unproductive or exceptional formations and constructions. Petrified derivations such as *ketua* and *pengetahuan* from *tua* and *tahu* are put on a par with productive ones such as *penjahit* and *keelokan*. Whereas a highly unusual sentence such as *lembu itu yang lembu raja meminum*, or even an impossible one like *rumah amat elok raja itu hangus* are dealt with in the chapter on syntax (p. 130, 133), the normal and very frequent use of *yang* is hardly discussed.

5. All too often facts are forced to fit into a rather arbitrary system; a few examples out of many: the word-class distinction made between *jatuh* and *pergi* on the one hand, *tidur* and *lari* on the other, is completely artificial (pp. 101, 103). The author constructs a fundamental syntactic opposition between a normal Subject-Predicate construction for what he calls 'bivalents' such as *tidur* (e.g. *anak tidur*) and a normal Predicate-Subject construction for adjectives (e.g. *lembut anak*) which is wholly unwarranted by the facts (pp. 133 ff.). The treatment of Syntax as a whole, starting from the S-P construction which is called the 'énoncé indépendant minimum', strikes the present reviewer as arbitrary and largely irrelevant.

A. TEEUW

CYRIL SKINNER, *The Civil War in Kelantan in 1839*.
Monographs of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal
Asiatic Society, II, 1965. vii, 175 pp., 3 maps.
Price M \$ 12.—.

A brief stay of Professor Skinner in Bangkok a couple of years ago yielded the find of a number of Malay letters in the Wachirayan National Library. These letters were from Malay rulers and chiefs of the Northern Malay States in the Peninsula to their Siamese overlords. That these letters are not without historical interest becomes abundantly clear from the work under review, in which Professor Skinner has edited and translated twenty-five letters pertaining to the civil war in Kelantan in 1839. The Malay text of the letters is contained in Part Two of the book. They are given both in facsimile and in romanized

transliteration, together with remarks on spelling and style and other details. This is preceded by an Introduction (Part One) which gives the historical background of the letters, in four chapters, viz. (i) The Northern Malay States in the 1830's; (ii) Kelantan in the late 1830's; (iii) Kelantan during the period covered by the letters; and (iv) an Epilogue. Appendices (index of persons and places and transliteration of Siamese names mentioned in the letters), a Bibliography and 3 maps complete the work.

Chapter II of Part One contains the English translation of the Malay letters. They are arranged in chronological order and linked together by a connecting text. Additional information necessary to a better understanding of the letters is given in a great many detailed footnotes.

Skinner's *The Civil War in Kelantan in 1839* will be welcomed by historians and philologists alike. To the student of Malay Peninsular history Professor Skinner has made available new, as yet unknown, records, and moreover, he has also made them accessible in an admirable way; the student of Malay will with great interest study these samples of Northern Peninsular Malay which shows a marked influence of Siamese; both will be grateful to the editor for the English translation of these by no means easy Malay texts.

The facsimile reproductions seem to have been somewhat reduced and as a result are sometimes difficult to read. In cases a magnifying glass will prove to be useful. Otherwise the book is well produced.

R. ROOLVINK

GENERALE MISSIVEN van Gouverneur-Generaal en Raden aan Heren XVII der Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie. Deel III: 1655—1674. Uitgegeven door Dr. W. Ph. Coolhaas. 's-Gravenhage. Rijks Geschiedkundige Publicatiën. Grote Serie 125. Verkrijgbaar bij Martinus Nijhoff. 1968.

De delen der Generale Missiven verschijnen thans met prijzenswaardige regelmaat om de vier jaar. Dit zware deel doet niet voor zijn voorgangers onder, zowel wat de omvang (1e dl. 797 blzn., 2e dl. 879 blzn., 3e dl. 1020 blzn.), als wat de belangwekkende inhoud betreft, die door talloze aantekeningen verduidelijkt wordt. Doch waar zal de eerzame koloniaal-historicus in een steeds bescheidener wordende beuizing deze mammoetdelen op den duur kunnen opslaan?

De groeiende omvang dezer delen ligt niet aan de kundige verzorger der uitgave, aangezien hij meer dan vroeger tot de regestvorm overgaat, waartoe de overvloed en de rijkdom van de stof hem dwongen. Voetstoots nemen wij aan, dat hierbij niets wezenlijks overgeslagen werd.

Wat bij de Jonge of in de Dagregisters, dan wel in andere bronnen-uitgaven reeds verscheen, werd niet meer herdrukt, zodat men veel

bekends zal missen. Des te meer zal men er zeldzame en bijzondere zaken in aantreffen, m.n. uit de z.g. Grote Oost of van de buiten-comptoiren. Zo komt men tal van bijzonderheden tegen als: belangwekkende, over de militaire bruikbaarheid der Ambonnezen (p. 896); afschuwelijke, over de ramp, die de retourvloot in 1602 bij Madagascar trof (p. 403; waarom werd hier niet even in een voetnoot De Vlaming's droevig einde vermeld?), of curieuze: een vergelijking tussen de prestaties van predikanten en schoolmeesters (p. 283-84).

Natuurlijk treft men bij aandachtige doorlezing kleine omissies aan, hoe kan het anders? Van de uitgever wordt een zó veelzijdige en veelomvattende kennis der koloniale historie vereist, dat kleine tekortkomingen haast onvermijdelijk zijn. Gelukkig vond ik er in de door mij doorgenomen gedeelten slechts weinige.

Over Radja Tohalille (bij Rumphius en Valentijn: Tahalile of Tahalille; thans gewoonlijk: Tahalele) is veel meer bekend dan de in noot 1) van blz. 150 aan hem gewijde drie regels. Deze eerste der grote Ambonese condottiere's in dienst der Compagnie komt ook niet uit Ceram, doch uit het nabij gelegen Boano. Zie over hem: De Stem van Ambon, 18e jaargang, no. 209, p. 6-7.

Bij Mr. Aernout van Overbeke had toch wel vermeld mogen worden, dat deze behalve jurist ook nog een der zeldzame Oost-Indische poëten was, wiens Rijmwercken in 1699 de 7e druk beleefden.

Bij Ds. Leyendecker (p. 849) weet men niet dadelijk, of men te maken heeft met de ruziemaker uit Malakka (Hubertus) of met de befaamde Malaicus (Melchior) te Batavia.

De Noach van het personenregister is niet de bekende schipper van de Ark, doch de weleerwaarde Noach Gerardi, die volgens Troostenburg de Bruijn zeilende tussen Batavia en Ambon kwam te overlijden (Biographisch Woordenboek p. 143). Zie ook Valentijn III, 69.

Desniettegenstaande acht ik de uitgave van dit derde deel zo waardevol dat ik met spanning naar het vierde uitzie, waarmede de gouden eeuw der Compagnie bijkans voltooid zal zijn. Doch waarschijnlijk zullen wij nog vier jaar ons geduld dienen te bedwingen.

H. J. DE GRAAF

G. J. RESINK, *Indonesia's History between the Myths: Essays in Legal History and Historical Theory*. Selected Studies on Indonesia, Vol. 7; The Hague, Van Hoeve, 1968. 457 pp., price fl. 36,50.

Once again, the incorrigibly lazy English-speaking world owes a great debt to the ever-anonymous Amsterdam translators, Messrs Van Marle and Holmes. These translations of Dutch writings on Indonesia have always been models of style and technical accuracy. The present volume has probably presented the greatest test. Resink the historian, as the editors point out, is never far from Resink the poet. His style is richly complex, abounding with extended metaphor and parenthetic

aside. Nevertheless, the translation is an undoubted artistic success. If the reader is ever reminded that it *is* a translation, it will be by the excessive generosity towards Anglo-Saxon eccentricity in continuing to use such old-fashioned English spellings as Achin and Jakarta. The only ground for complaint is the map, which gives the quite erroneous impression that Resink's thesis is related to the arbitrary distinction in the 'high-colonial' period between 'self-governing' and 'directly-ruled' territories. The maps in Colijn's *Neerlands Indië*, (Vol. II, pp. 19-20 or 93) would have been more appropriate.

Of the fourteen essays included, all but the two last were written in Djakarta during the 1950's. They provide a fascinating commentary on Dutch/Indonesian academic life during those critical years, and in particular on the development of the writer's own intellectual position. He enters the period as a gifted literateur, academic polemicist, and philosopher-historian, much absorbed with the theoretical debate over regiocentric historical writing. The first five essays cover this area, but draw him increasingly into debate with the colonial historians over specific issues. In 1955 begins a series of seven essays drawing evidence from his own field of international law with which to attack the myth of three centuries of Dutch domination in Indonesia. The final two essays written especially for the volume in 1964-5 give the maturest statement of what had by then become established as 'the Resink thesis'.

Professor Resink is a 'marginal man', attempting to bridge not only the fissures between the sub-cultures of literature, law, and history, but the chasm between the Netherland and the Indonesian world-view. It is his acute sensitivity to this problem which enables his writing often to transcend history into art. At the commencement he still has confidence in the possibility:

Marginal men living on the border between two cultures and their historical myths, we must read in between colonial and national history... Estranged from the former ruling caste and its conceptions, and still rather ill at ease in the company of the new elite class and its ways of thinking, we flatter ourselves that reflection on theoretical and methodological problems can serve a purpose for Indonesian history as for other histories.

Later, as the ground of debate shifts perceptibly from the Dutch to the Indonesian academic arena, there is a gradual withdrawal to "a life more exclusively directed towards literature. Perhaps", he concludes, "other partly or wholly foreign elder scholars will be equally willing to withdraw to footnotes as partly or wholly Indonesian younger intellectuals move to the fore".

In the early theoretical essays Professor Resink appears to recognise the myth-creation at work in the subjective writing not only of the colonial apologists and the younger nation-builders, but also of his own 'school', whose ancestry he traces to the historical relativism of Huizinga and Romein, through the professors of legal history in pre-war Batavia. Subjectivity is in fact inescapable, and the myths to which it gives rise are often dangerous. In considering the positive values with which historians ought to temper their subjectivity he advocates purity (or

universalism), fairness in presentation, and personal certainly in the worth of the creation. It is indicative of the optimism of the early 1950's that he felt these qualities would come relatively easily to the new generation of Indonesia's historians.

The major theme with which Professor Resink's name has become associated is built up in eight of the essays, each adding extra evidence but repeating much of the past material. As a work for historians (though not as a personal portrait) the book would certainly have been more effective if the earlier formulations of the theme had been omitted. The reader's sympathy is unnecessarily strained by too frequent a reassertion of the ideas.

This is especially true of the English-language readership of 1968, unfamiliar with the Dutch academic mood of an earlier day, to whom Professor Resink may seem to be battering down a temple whose gods are already dead. Fortunately for such readers, Professor Resink does devote some space in a later chapter (pp. 292-301) to chronicling the growth of the myth of 3½ centuries of Dutch rule in Indonesia. But the evidence advanced is incommensurate with the strength of the iconoclasm, because Professor Resink broke off his chronicle in the 1930's, thus not when the myth was "in full flower", as he suggests, but as it was just beginning to shoot. He refrained from describing the eager acceptance of the myth by pre-war PNI nationalists, for whom it was linked with a romantic view of Majapahit to explain the contrast between the "grandiose past" and the "dark present".¹ During the war Japanese official publicity emphasised in the furthest corners of Indonesia the contrast between three centuries of Dutch exploitation and three years of Japanese leadership.² In the bitter polemics of 1945-9 the myth reached its fullest flower. Only with all this in mind is it possible to appreciate the positive importance of Professor Resink's iconoclasm, even in a postcolonial world.

Professor Resink's mastery of international law and legal history is clearly evident from such specialist essays as 'The Conflict of Laws'. These were his major weapons for attacking the myth. The argument is difficult to summarise with confidence in positive terms because it is so often put polemically, but in the later essays it appears as follows: The 'native states' of outer Indonesia (clearly demarcated in the nineteenth century from directly-ruled Java, Amboina, and later West Sumatra by the wording of the 1824 Treaty and the limited application of Van de Bosch's *cultuurstelsel*, as well as by legal theory) were recognised by Dutch legal opinion to have retained legal sovereignty up until 1910 or even 1915. Until that period, we cannot speak of a 'state' or 'colony' of Netherlands India spanning most of the archipelago,

¹ e.g. Sukarno's 'Indonesia Menggugat', cited in Benda and Larkin, *The World of Southeast Asia: Selected Historical Readings* (New York, 1967), pp. 190-3.

² e.g. *Kita Sumatora Sinbun* (Medan) of 8-XII-2603 (1943) and 27-III-2604 (1944), addressed to an area manifestly devoid of the slightest Dutch influence less than a century earlier.

but rather of one *état puissance* and a number of *états patrimoines*. The relations between the former and the latter in the nineteenth century were those of suzerainty, unequal treaties, and diplomatic or semi-diplomatic relations, rather than those of sovereignty or administration. Thus, as Professor Resink points out himself in the later essays (pp. 327-40), the 'sovereignty' accorded such states in the nineteenth century was not sovereignty in the modern sense, but an older sense not inconsistent with a vassal relationship.

These conclusions are adequately demonstrated, and are important. They do not, however, damage the myth of Dutch 'domination'. To do this Professor Resink spices his legal dish with a number of better-known political facts, notably from Colijn's work, showing the non-effectiveness of Dutch control in most of outer Indonesia before Van Heutz. It is perhaps timely to repeat these points, but we must not forget that all the colonial historians were very well aware of the wide discrepancy between Dutch treaty claims to sovereignty (now read suzerainty) and the effective independence of most of the states concerned in the nineteenth century. On this rested the cult of Van Heutz, one of the major colonial deities. Younger historians, mainly British in training, have continued to stress the point. If there has been a myth among historians, therefore, it must rest on a different basis.

I would suggest that for the political, economic, or social historian, the myth of Dutch dominance has been the myth of Dutch importance. The colonial historians overemphasised the role of the Dutch not because they ignored the effective independence of other states but because they believed wrongly that the important, continuous, progressive theme in Indonesian history was the rise and consolidation of the Netherlands Indian 'state'. By putting stress on other states Professor Resink has helped to weaken this myth. But it can only be finally overthrown by the positive demonstration of the importance and continuity of other developments which have gone to make Indonesia what it is. It is a task which challenges the patience as well as the imagination of us all.

University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur

ANTHONY REID

S. TAKDIR ALISJAHBANA, *Values as Integrating Forces in Personality, Society and Culture*. University of Oxford Press, Kuala Lumpur, 1966, 248 bldz.

Takdir is met het in dit boek behandelde „grote onderwerp” lang bezig geweest. Hij wilde er bij mij in Djakarta op promoveren en wij hebben er heel wat gespreksuren aan besteed. Het is er niet van gekomen, omdat wij allebei zijn geboorteland verlieten. Hij heeft daarna geruime tijd in Duitsland (Bonn, Keulen) en in de V.S. (Stanford) gewerkt. Het resultaat daarvan heeft eerst in stencilvorm gecirculeerd en is tenslotte in druk verschenen. Er schijnt ook een Duitse vertaling op komst te zijn. Belangrijke Amerikaanse geleerden, onder wie Kroeber,

Nagel en Merton, hebben het manuscript geheel of gedeeltelijk gelezen. Wanneer ik, op mijn herinnering afgaande, het eindresultaat met de ontwerpen uit de eerste fase vergelijk concludeer ik, dat Takdir zijn buitenlandse studietijd goed heeft gebruikt. De grondstemming, door hemzelf in het voorwoord als „optimistisch idealisme” gekwalificeerd, is onaangetast gebleven, maar is er hier en daar toch niet zonder realistische kleerscheuren van afgekomen. Begrippen als dialectiek, conflict en spanning brengen er een zekere tempering in aan, waardoor het geheel ten slotte iets minder hooggestemd geworden is — wat, in mijn ogen, ook wel mocht. Ambitueus is de onderneming onverminderd gebleven: een algemene, omvattende theorie van „personality, society and culture” onder het gezichtspunt van de integratieve functie der waarden. Over de vraag of het een werkelijke of eigenlijke theorie is kan men natuurlijk gaan twisten. Uit de zeer algemene ethische en cultuurfilosofische beschouwingen, die de schr. ten beste geeft, zal het in elk geval niet gemakkelijk zijn uitspraken of beweringen te ontwikkelen, die aan empirische toetsing kunnen worden onderworpen. Takdir verkeert, zoals hij zelf te kennen geeft, nog zwaar onder de indruk van de Duitse idealistische filosofie, zij het meer onder die van de natij dan onder die van het hoogtij. In Amerika moest hij daar wel gedeeltelijk van bekomen en de sporen daarvan zijn in de tekst goed merkbaar. Iets van spanning tussen twee niet goed harmoniseerbare uitgangspunten is daardoor wel achtergebleven. Maar tenslotte is het de onverwoestbare universalist, integralist en parallellist Takdir die, zij het niet moeiteloos, de overhand houdt.

Het betoog bestaat uit vier hoofdstukken en een conclusie. Het eerste is getiteld „The science of man as a synthesis of the theory of value and the positive sciences”. Het beslaat niet meer dan 15 bladzijden, wat, de titel in aanmerking genomen, weinig moet worden genoemd. Het eindigt met een pleidooi voor een „all-embracing science of man” en de schr. maakt geen geheim van zijn hoop, die te kunnen leveren door wat hij noemt zijn „total approach”, waaronder moet worden verstaan een nieuwe integratie van psychologische, sociale en culturele theorieën. (15) Wat dat betreft had hij, ondanks het respect dat ik voor zijn werk heb, beter enige voorzichtigheid in acht kunnen nemen. Voor een dergelijke „one-man show” is meer vereist dan één man in zijn mars kan hebben.

In de drie volgende delen komt het „ethische proces” ter sprake, resp. in de persoon, de samenleving of maatschappij en de cultuur. Daarin handelt de schr. over vrijwel alles wat er in de psychologie, de sociologie en de cultuurkunde/filosofie aan de orde is, in een bestek van ruim 200 bladzijden. Hij verbindt daarbij de zes door Spranger „horizontaal” onderscheiden waarden met een „verticale” psychologische driedeling (het vitale, de „level of the heart” en het geestelijke) en komt zodoende tot achttien ideale persoonstypen. Die gebruikt hij tegelijk voor de klassificatie van maatschappijen en culturen. Dat is natuurlijk een uiterst gewaagde onderneming, die de schr. tot de gevangene dreigt te maken van zijn eigen calculus. Hij komt dan tot

hachelijke uitspraken als: „the members of the different classes organize their lives on different psychological levels; the lower classes live primarily on the vital level, the middle classes primarily on the level of the heart, and the upper classes on the level of the mind” (121) en: „As the vital level of the psyche is inseparable from the level of the heart and of the mind, so the lower class of society cannot exist without the higher class and *vice versa*” (124). Plato redivivus! Eenmaal rekenend is het einde niet direct in zicht. Indien men de verschillende combinatiemogelijkheden en gewichtsverdelingen der onderscheidene waarden in acht neemt komt men theoretisch tot $6^8 = 46,656$ cultuurtypen met verschillende waardensystemen en integratieve „mengingen”. Later haalt schr. er nog de drie z.i. voornaamste cultuurprocessen, onderscheidenlijk betiteld als het organisatorische, het expressieve en het progressieve bij om tot een klassificatie van 27 cultuurtypen te komen. (203) Het is aardig bedacht, maar uitermate steriel. Aan de klassificeerlust van de schr. mag men zijn boek echter niet ophangen. Hij moge zich door het hooggestemde universalisme, waarvan hij blijk geeft, enigszins overtillen — hij verdient achting door de onverschrokkenheid en belezenheid waarmee hij zich over gebieden beweegt, die helaas allang onder de specialisten zijn opgedeeld. Zij moeten op hen ook voortdurend weer heroverd worden, al komt daardoor geen wetenschap in de „eigenlijke” zin (meer) tot stand.

R. F. BEERLING