Book Reviews

- K.A. Adelaar, Muhadjir, Morphology of Jakarta dialect, affixation and reduplication, Nusa II, Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri Nusa, 1981, pp. xii + 117.
 - H.D. van Pernis, A.Ed. Schmidgall-Tellings, Contemporary Indonesian-English dictionary, a supplement to the standard Indonesian dictionaries with particular concentration on new words, expressions and meanings, Ohio University press, Chicago, Athens Ohio, London. 1981., Alan M. Stevens (eds.)
 - D.J. Prentice, Pierre Labrousse, Dictionnaire gnral indonsien-franais (Cahier dArchipel 15, 1984). Association Archipel, Paris. xxi + 934 pp.
 - H. Steinhauer, J.T. Collins, Ambonese Malay and creolization theory, Dewan bahasa dan pustaka, Kuala Lumpur 1980, xii + 84 pp., 2 maps.
 - A. Teeuw, Claudine Salmon, Literature in Malay by the Chinese of Indonesia; A provisional annotated bibliography. tudes Insulindiennes - Archipel 3. ditions de la Maison des Sciences dlHomme, Paris, 1981, 588 pp.
- In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 140 (1984), no: 4, Leiden, 522-540

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

BOEKBESPREKINGEN

Muhadjir, *Morphology of Jakarta dialect, affixation and reduplication*, Nusa II, Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri Nusa, 1981, pp. xii + 117.

K. A. ADELAAR

Jakartanese is one of the major speech forms in Indonesia. Geographically it is the language of Jakarta and its surroundings, but it is exercising a considerable influence on Indonesian as spoken in informal contacts by young urban people. It is the language of emotion and wit, and is of growing importance in newspapers and on radio and television. It has become the affective and emotional counterpart of Standard Indonesian, which is felt to be far too formal and is mainly used for official speeches, official communications in the media, and official documents. Jakartanese is the most important dialect of Malay.

In view of the growing importance of Jakartanese, the appearance of two grammatical descriptions over the past three years (Ikranagara, Nusa 9, 1980; Muhadjir 1981) is not superfluous. They are the first descriptions based on modern linguistic principles and methods to deal with the main aspects of Jakartanese grammar. Before their publication there was only some very outdated or very limited information available on the subject. Muhadjir's study is a detailed and thorough account of the processes involving affixation and reduplication in Jakartanese. These processes are described by reference to a sufficient quantity of instructive linguistic material and within a carefully considered theoretical framework.

Moreover, this study is more accessible to the general public than Ikranagara's, which requires prior familiarity with the theory of lexibase grammar. It nevertheless also has a few shortcomings. After a general survey of its contents, I will give my comments on some of these.

Morphology of Jakarta dialect consists of eight chapters, of which the first contains a general introduction giving information on the role, the speakers, the areal and social variation, and the geographical extent of Jakartanese. It also presents an overview of previous research, and delineates the subject of investigation.

In chapter II Muhadjir deals with the theoretical problems encountered in his description. He draws a basic distinction between non-root-morphemes and root-morphemes. Non-root-morphemes are further divided into paradigmatic and derivational morphemes.

Root-morphemes are either particle-morphemes (prepositions, particles, and indicators of degree and modality – these never undergo morphemic processes) or lexical morphemes. The latter either belong to the nominal (pronouns and nouns), the verbal (intransitive, semi-transitive, and transitive verbs) or the adjectival class, or they are precategorials. Syntactic units comprise three syntactic components: 1) grammatical function (subject, predicate, adjunct), 2) the category of the element which fulfils the grammatical function (nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.),

and 3) the role played by the element which fulfils the grammatical function (agent, object, location, beneficiary, active verb, etc.).

Furthermore, sentences can be categorized in terms of their predicates: there are verbal and non-verbal sentences, verbal sentences being subcategorized into intransitive, semi-transitive, and transitive verbal sentences.

Chapter III contains an inventory of the relevant phonemes (there are seven vowels: /a/, /e/, /ɛ/, /ə/, /i/, /o/, /u/, and nineteen consonants: /b/, /p/, /d/, /t/, /j/, /c/, /g/, /k/, /m/, /n/, /ŋ/, /s/, /l/, /r/, /h/, /ʔ/, /w/, and /y/). Chapter IV discusses morphophonemics, Chapter V paradigmatic affixation, and Chapter VI derivational affixation. Whereas paradigmatic affixes (nasalization, /di/-, and the non-volitive affixes /tə-/ /kə-/ /kə- -an/) do not modify the meaning of the base they are affixed to, derivational affixes (= all other affixes) do.

Chapter VII deals with reduplication. Reduplication processes can be distinguished into 1) reduplication of root-morphemes (involving complete reduplication, complete reduplication with phoneme changes, or reduplication of the first syllable), and 2) reduplication of affixational processes and root-morphemes together as one morphemic process (which involves either reduplication of root-morphemes which have already undergone affixation, or reduplication and affixation as applied simultaneously to a root-morpheme). Furthermore, reduplication can be categorized according to meaning viz.: 1) reduplication yielding lexical meaning, and 2) reduplication as a morphemic process transferring the base form from one class or category to another word-class. Finally, there are a bibliography and two lists (the one presenting verbs, adjectives and nouns according to (sub-)class, and the other giving the complete vocabulary in alphabetical order).

My main criticism concerns Muhadjir's division of affixes into a paradigmatic and a derivational class, his concept of semi-transitive verbs, and his definition of precategoryals. In connection with the distinction of paradigmatic (or inflectional) and derivational morphology Muhadjir begins by discussing the views of other scholars. He concludes on semantic grounds (p. 12) that such a distinction is justified for Jakartanese: paradigmatic affixes, in contrast to derivational affixes, do not modify the meaning of their base. This is all very well, but why does he in that case include the non-volitive affixes in the paradigmatic class? Non-volitive affixes definitely add to the meaning of the base (denoting stativeness, nonintention, suddenness, feasibility, etc.). Furthermore, although Muhadjir is right in pointing out that /di/- and nasalization are paradigmatic affixes, and hence of a different order than the other affixes, one wonders about the value of a basic dichotomy into paradigmatic and derivational affixes, since only two affixes belong to the former kind, and all the others (including the non-volitive ones) to the latter.

Besides transitive and intransitive verbs, Muhadjir distinguishes 'semi-transitives'. Like transitive verbs, semi-transitives have co-constituents, but in their case these are complements (in the objective role), not objects: unlike the objects of transitive verbs, it is impossible for them to function as subject in object-oriented constructions. These

co-constituents are introduced by /amɛ/ 'with, to'. All reciprocal verbs also belong to the category of semi-transitive verbs because they usually also have co-constituents (p. 13). I doubt whether much is gained from the introduction of this concept, and from adding another sub-class of verbs to the ones already distinguished. Moreover I disagree with Muhadjir's definition of semi-transitives. Firstly, he discusses (p. 13) semi-transitive *sentences* and then switches to a discussion of semi-transitive *verbs*, without actually defining the latter. Secondly, semi-transitives do not meet the essential preconditions for the definition of transitivity (viz. the occurrence of a *direct* object, and the ability of this object to be the subject in object-oriented constructions). Finally, /bə-aban/ (/amɛ/) 'address as an older brother' as an example of a reciprocal verb is ill-chosen, as it does not imply a symmetrical relationship.

Precategorials are defined as root-morphemes which have an unclear class-identity: they are a category of lexical morphemes the class of which becomes clear only after they have undergone certain morphemic processes. Examples are /baʒun/ and /lipət/, which are transitive verbs when they have nasalization (cf. /mbaʒun/ 'to wake up' /ʒəlipət/ 'to fold'), and intransitive verbs when prefixed with /bə/- or occurring without affixation (cf. /baʒun/ 'be awake' and /bə-lipət/ 'folded'). It is useful to have a precategorial class as a residual category of root-morphemes which are impossible to classify in any other category. But one should not overuse it, for the simple reason that the word class is not determined by using it. It is clear, for instance, that /baʒun/, /mbaʒun/, /lipət/, /ʒəlipət/ are verbs, the question being only whether they are intransitive or transitive. Moreover, /baʒun/ and /lipət/ may occur as imperative forms of transitive verbs. So why not treat them as transitive verbal bases? I find Muhadjir's definition too summary. He bases it on Verhaar (1975; 1977), and I was unable to find a more satisfactory treatment of precategorials in this source. Indonesian linguistics would benefit greatly from a thorough study of this subject, and from a more precise definition of precategorials.

It seems that Muhadjir himself is not always confident about the classification of root-morphemes. In many cases there is contradiction between the final lists and other parts of the book dealing with the word-classes of root-morphemes, cf. /bandəl/ (intransitive verb on p. 54, adjective on p. 97); /jaɪl/, /jahat/, /pəlɪt/ (semi-transitives on p. 66, adjectives on pp. 110 and 113); /baʒun/ (semi-transitive on p. 11, intransitive and transitive in the list on p. 106); cf. also /gile/ (pp. 83 and 109), /ribut/ (pp. 66 and 114), etc.

My further criticism is of a minor kind; it concerns the following points. Muhadjir distinguishes 7 vowel-phonemes and 19 consonant-phonemes. I consider his vowel system quite useful: it is more economical and less artificial than Abdul Chaer's (8 vowel-phonemes) or Kähler's (11 vowel-phonemes). As for his description of the consonants, I generally agree with Muhadjir, although I would question his analysis of /d/ as an alveopalatal, /t/ as an alveolar, and /n/ as basically an alveolar (except when directly preceding /d/, when it also becomes an alveopalatal). It is true that in many Southeast-Asian languages (including Indonesian and Sundanese, but excluding Javanese) /d/ and /t/

are not entirely homorganic, but that in these languages /d/ (and /n/ unless preceding /t/) is an alveolar, and /t/ is a supradental (Henderson, *Lingua* 15, 1965:420-21). This was probably also the situation in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (Adelaar, *Nusa* 16, 1983:65). From a report on dialectological field-training in Cilebut and surroundings it appears (questionnaire D) that in the Malay of Cilebut (Semplak, Bogor) /d/, /n/, and /l/ are apico-alveolar, and /t/ is dental-alveolar (see 'Bahasa dan Dialek di Cilebut dan Sekitarnya', *Penataran Dialektologi* [ILDEP], Tugu 1976, Unpublished).

I do not always agree with Muhadjir's distinction of role, either – cf. sentence 65 (p. 39), /duit kiriman lu kəcopət waktu guə kəcopetan/ 'the money you sent was taken when I was robbed', where he attributes a benefactive role to /guə/ 'I'; sentence 70, /diə kəujanən . . ./ 'he got caught in the rain', where he considers /diə/ to be in the object role; or sentence 183, /tuluŋ nəlain lampu/ 'please light the lamp', where he assigns /lampu/ the benefactive role, etc.

Finally, the reader should be cautioned against some regrettable terminological confusion, e.g. p. 53 (1st column, 2nd line from bottom) 'object' should be 'subject'; p. 11 (1st column, 6th line from bottom) 'intransitive' should be 'transitive'; p. 83, head of paragraph 7.5.6.1: 'transitive' should be 'intransitive'.

The above criticism notwithstanding, I find *Morphology of Jakarta dialect* a carefully written book containing much useful information. It is recommended not only to linguists but also to other scholars who want to inform themselves about the Malay dialect that has had the greatest impact on the development of informal Indonesian. They will no doubt also enjoy the colorful examples of everyday speech provided by Muhadjir.

Note: Muhadjir's dissertation, defended in Jakarta, 1977, was recently also published in Indonesian as: Muhajir, *Morfologi Dialek Jakarta. Afiksasi dan reduplikasi*, Seri ILDEP, Jakarta: Penerbit Jambatan, 1984.

A. Ed. Schmidgall-Tellings en Alan M. Stevens, *Contemporary Indonesian-English Dictionary, A Supplement to the Standard Indonesian Dictionaries with Particular Concentration on New Words, Expressions and Meanings*, Ohio University Press, Chicago, Athens Ohio, London, 1981.

H. D. VAN PERNIS

Dit woordenboek is volgens de voorrede een aanvulling voornamelijk op Echols' *An Indonesian-English Dictionary*. Alwie in het voorste gelid van het vertaalfrent staat, zal het met mij eens zijn, dat het hier gerecenseerde supplement-woordenboek een belangrijke steun in de rug is. Ik heb het nu ruim 2 jaar lang geraadpleegd bij de vertaling van de meest uiteenlopende stukken zoals tenders, echtscheidings-, adoptie-, en andere civiele vonnissen, (geologische enz.) rapporten, memories van appel e.d. en tróf van allerlei begrippen vaak dezelfde vertaling aan als

genoteerd in mijn aantekeningen, maar stootte ook wel eens op mij onbekende Indonesische begrippen, die Schmidgall-Tellings (hierna: ST) meestal wist te verklaren.

Op juridisch gebied heeft ST wel wat, maar er is nog heel wat aan te vullen. Drie voorbeelden: ST heeft wel *pembanding* (appellant), maar niet *terbanding* (geïntimeerde), dat letterlijk “geappelleerde” betekent, maar dat is in Nederland een verouderde term. In adoptievonnissen ziet men veel: *Menyatakan sebagai hukum*, of *Menyatakan sah* = Verklaren voor recht. In vonnissen is *lawan*: (A) contra (B).

Enkele andere voorbeelden, met tussen haakjes door mijzelf gevonden vormen en betekenissen, niet gegeven door ST zijn: *pengadaan*: voorraadvorming (voorziening in, aanschaf, levering en installatie); *Pengadilan Negeri*: districtsgerecht (landgerecht; *pengadilan tinggi*: appelraad = gerechtshof); *pengakuan*: getuigenis (volgens eigen *verklaring*); *pengakuan penerima* (*pengakuan lunas*): getekende kwitantie, bewijs van kwijting; *alat negara*, ook: geheime dienst, door ST aangeduid met G.men; *pengamatan*: toezicht (eigen waarneming, eigen gegevens, overweging); *mengangkat anak*: een kind adopteren; *anak angkat*: adoptief kind (*orang tua angkat*: adoptief ouders); *pengangkatan*: adoptie; *angkatan bersenjata*: gewapende macht; *angkatan kerja*: beroepsbevolking; *angkatan bahari* (*angkatan laut*): zeemacht; ST kent wel *penguasa*: authority, maar weer niet *penguasa perang*: militair gezag [waaruit later de *Kopkamtib* voortkwam], door Echols ten onrechte vertaald met war administrator. *Pegawai catatan sipil*: registration officer (*pegawai luar biasa*: registrar extraordinary). *Diantar-pulaukan*: vervoerd van bijv. Kalimantan naar Java (*pelayaran antar-pulau*: inter-insulair verkeer); *antar-waktu*: tussentijds; *antarkerja*: arbeidsbureau; *antar-suku*: (relaties) tussen bevolkingsgroepen; *antariksa*: atmosfeer (waarschijnlijk beter: outer space). *Antek*: helper, meeloper, hand-langer. *Diatas-namakan*: in iemands naam (overgeschreven op naam van: *dibalik diatas nama*). *Badan usaha*: bedrijf, onderneming (*Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan*: Rekenkamer; *badan kesehatan*: gezondheidsdienst; *badan pengurus*: beheerraad, bestuur; *badan mobil*: karosserie, enz.). Bij *pihak ketiga* (derden) teken ik aan dat hiervoor simpelweg ook *pihak lain* gezegd wordt. *Bahan bacaan*: leesstof, lectuur; *bahan baku*: grondstoffen; *bahan2 galian*: delfstoffen; *bahan jadi*: gereed produkt; *bahan pembantu* (of *bahan penolong*): hulpstoffen, hulpmateriaal; (*bahan bakar minyak*, afgekort tot BBM: oil-based products, olieprodukten; *bahan bantahan*: strijdpunt; *bahan pembangunan*: verbruikstoffen; *bahan bekas*: gebruikte stoffen; *mendapatkan bahan2 baru*: nieuwe feiten vinden; enz.). *Membakar (hati)* ken ik niet zozeer in de betekenis: toorn, als wel: in opwindung brengen, prikkelen, (de gemoederen) opzwepen. *Membawahi*: onder zich hebben (beheren; A *membawahkan* B: B staat onder A); *bawah sadar*: het onderbewuste; *bebas dari tugasnya*: ontheven van een taak (of verplichting; *dibebas-tugaskan*: op non-actief gesteld). *Keterbelakangan*: achterstand; *terkebelakang*: onderontwikkeld (land). *Stabil*: stable; (*stabil terhadap*: bestand tegen). *Pesangon*: severance (pay), maar ook: uitkering ineens, bijv. aan wie geen pensioen krijgt.

Hoezeer de ontwikkeling van de B.I. nog “im Fluss” is, moge nog

blijken uit twee voorbeelden: (in vonnissen) *tentang duduknya perkara* = *tentang jalannya kejadian* = *tentang kejadiannya* of kortweg *peristiwa*, die alle vier “ten aanzien van de feiten” betekenen. En dan *berita acara*. Volgens ST: officieel rapport of verslag, (beëdigde) verklaring. Volgens mijn aantekeningen: a) *b.a. rapat*: agenda of notulen; b) verslag; c) *b.a. notaris*: notarieel stuk; d) aantekening; *b.a. sumpah*: procesverbaal van beëdiging, enz. enz.

Bij ST's grote trefwoord *bina* teken ik aan: *membina*, ook: indoctrineren; *dibina* oleh PKI: geïnfiltreerd door de PKI; *pembina* (sinds ± 1960) ook: referendaris, begeleider (directie) in tegenstelling met *direksi pelaksana*: uitvoerende (executive) directie. *Brengsek*, o.a. willekeurig, onbruikbaar, slecht, gemeen (*cuaca yang brengsek*: het gure weer). *Bromocorah*: onderwereld, gespuis. *Kebutuhan*: het benodigde; (*kebutuhan hidup* of *pokok se-hari*², of *bahan pokok kebutuhan hari*²: eerste levensbehoeften). *Maju-mundurnya*: ups and downs (welslagen, succes van de strijd e.d.). Maar *maju-mundur* (op een parkeerplaats bijv.): in de zin van manoeuvreren ontbreekt.

Ik laat de vele honderden juridische termen, die ik heb verzameld hier verder zoveel mogelijk buiten beschouwing en ga nu enkele begrippen aanstippen die niet zijn genoemd door ST/Echols. Af en toe zal ik een woord van kritiek uiten op ST's woordverklaringen. *Ahli* is bij ST een groot trefwoord, maar is voor uitbreiding vatbaar: *Asisten ahli madya*: middelbaar assistent(e); *ahli kedokteran*: medisch specialist. Onder het trefwoord *air* geeft ST 31 kostbare regels lang een opsomming van meest Minangkabause spreekwoorden, waarvan het de grote vraag is of dat wel Indonesisch is. Het jonge geslacht kent ze niet, ook niet in Maleisië. Zie bijv. ook onder *lapuk*: ST geeft daar wel het bekende Minangkabause gezegde: *nan indak lakang de' paneh, nan indak lapue de' ujan* (deze adat zal nooit vergaan), maar een geologisch begrip als *pelapukan*: verweering, erosie, geeft hij niet.

Vreemde omissies zijn: *mencakup*: omvatten, to cover, betreffen, voorzien in (behoeften), impliceren, met zich brengen, insluiten, betrekking hebben op, weergeven, uitdrukken; *tercakup dalam*: vallen onder (to come under), vervat of besloten liggen in. Voor *mencuci mata* is, althans in de mij bekende Engelse romanliteratuur, eigenlijk meer de term: to feast one's eyes, niet het vlakke “girl watching”. *Pendangkalan* is niet zozeer het *lager* worden van een waterspiegel als wel: het *ondiep* worden van een rivier of zee(straat) door overvloedige bezinking van *lumpur* (modder) en *lanau* (een bestanddeel van *lumpur*). *Daya ingat*: geheugen; *daya rembesan*: doorlatendheid (van grond); *daya efektif*: (motor)vermogen; *daya alami* = *sumberdaya*: natuurlijke hulpbronnen; *daya surut*: met terugwerkende kracht. *RT (Rukun Tetangga)*: Buurt-onderdeel; *RW (Rukun Warga)*: Buurtorganisatie. *Penggali Pancasila*: degene die de P. formuleerde. *Grup* heeft met PKI weinig te maken. Het is de algemene term aan het worden voor: groep. *Harga jatuh*: sterk verminderde prijs. *Menghidupkan*, ook: zorgen voor iemands levens-onderhoud. *Ilmu kesehatan anak*: kindergeneeskunde. *Imbal(an)*, ook: tegenprestatie, betaling in ruil voor. *Interesan*: interessant. *Jarak umur*: leeftijdsverschil; *jarak jangkauan*: bereik. *Kipas air (di kaca)*: ruiten-wisser. *Mengajukan saksi*: een getuige voorbrengen; *saksi pengenalan*:

attesterende getuige(n). *Membebaskan biaya kepada*: de kosten ten laste brengen van. *Binatang peliharaan*: vee. *Perlelangan*: aanbesteding (in tenders). *Lingkungan hidup* is niet “Lebensraum” of “living space”, maar “environment” of wel milieu in modern Nederlands. *Lingkungan sosial*: kennissenkring. *Ruang lingkup*: bestreken gebied, bereik. Ik vraag mij af of de vertaling *scope* de betekenis geheel dekt. *Kelurahan (kota)*: wijk. *Selain itu* (zonder *daripada*) is vaak te vertalen met: overigens.

Mandi in een zwembad of bos of riviertje is zwemmen. “*Berenang*” heb ik bijv. in Maleisië in 1979 en in Bandoeng of Djokja in 1983 nergens gehoord, waarmee ik niet wil zeggen dat het geen BI is. Het lijkt meer een sportterm. *Berdasarkan* is vaak te vertalen met: blijkens, uit (bewijsstukken) volgt dat, ingevolge, naar aanleiding van, uitgaan(de) van. *Listrik mati*: de stroom is uitgevallen. In plaats van *negosi* (zeldzaam) ziet men meer *negosiasi*: onderhandelingen. *Pemikiran*: idee, standpunt, denkbeeld (= *gagasan*); *membutuhkan pemikiran*: vereist doordenken. *Kepemimpinan*: leiding. *Pravokasionil* (in diploma’s): prevocational. *Potongan*, ook: doorsnede. *Roman muka tanah* = het (oorspronkelijk) profiel. *Daftar riwayat pekerjaan*: staat van dienst. *Sangka* is niet zozeer: imagination, assumption, als wel: verkeerde, achteraf allang onjuist gebleken mening. Ik heb inzake dit punt vorig jaar enige honderden vindplaatsen verzameld o.a. uit romans van Ali-sjahbana en Mochtar Lubis en ook uit oude hikayats, maar ’t schijnt, dat ST de romanliteratuur praktisch buiten beschouwing heeft gelaten.

Bij de lange lijst met *pra*- teken ik aan, dat *prakarya* (als schoolvak) = handenarbeid. Bij *menyerahkan* teken ik nog aan: (bewijsstukken) produceren, overleggen, (een kind moeten) afgeven, (z’n ontslag schriftelijk) indienen, (goederen, diensten) leveren, enz. *Sorotan*, ook: kritiek; *kejadian yang ingin saya soroti = teropongi; lepas dari sorotan*: ontging (hun) aandacht. *Sreg dengan*: passen bij. Bij *suangi* teken ik aan, dat men in Oost-Indonesië meer zegt: *suanggi* = iemand die zich met hekserij bezig houdt. Bij *suplai* teken ik aan, dat men in handelsstukken minstens even vaak ziet: *melever*. Bij *surat*: *surat bukti diri* = identiteitsbewijs; *surat berharga*: waardepapieren, waardevolle stukken; *surat jalan*: travel permit, reispas, reisvergunning; *surat perjalanan* is echter: soort reispas voor geadopteerde babies; *surat bersumpah*: akte van ondertrouw, maar een *surat sumpah* = een procesverbaal van beëdiging; *surat keluarga*: familiebescheiden; *surat perintah kerja*: werkorder. Bij *dapat (mampu) bertanggung jawab* is blijkbaar *tak* uitgevallen. Bij *tata* teken ik aan, dat in akten *tata laksana kotamadya* schijnt te betekenen: (hoofd van de onderafdeling organisatie) stadsbeheer, maar in diploma’s betekent *tatalaksana pakaian*: behandeling van kleren. ST’s vertaling van *tatalaksana* met manager spreekt weer boekdelen over het niet vaststaande karakter van sommige termen. Bij *total*: *totalan* = in totaal. Bij *tunjuk*: *surat penunjukan* = gunning (van een tender). Bij *tunggang*: *penunggang* = misbruik. De term *wanprestasi*, veel voorkomend in de stukken, ontbreekt merkwaardigerwijs bij ST.

Mijn algemene indruk van dit boek is en blijft: warm aan te bevelen. Ik heb maar een klein deel ervan besproken!

Pierre Labrousse, *Dictionnaire général indonésien-français* (Cahier d'Archipel 15, 1984). Association Archipel, Paris. xxi + 934 pp.

D. J. PRENTICE

In very many ways the Indonesian-French dictionary of Prof. Labrousse and his colleagues represents a dramatic improvement in Indonesian lexicography and is without doubt the best available bilingual Indonesian dictionary aimed at a non-Indonesian public. Despite a number of minor defects and errors, some of which I shall discuss in this review, the *Dictionnaire général indonésien-français* forms one of the most welcome developments in the bilingual lexicography of the Indonesian language for many years and will certainly function for a long time to come as *the* guide for other "Indonesian-Foreign" dictionaries.

For the first time in the history of Indonesian dictionaries, every main entry provides an indication of the wordclass membership of the head-word, which simultaneously serves as a criterion for division into sub-entries. When the reader looks up *hidup*, for instance, he finds *hidup* 1. divided into sub-entries A. (stative verb, 'verbe d'état') with meanings "alive, living, lively", B. (intransitive verb) "live, survive, function", and C. (noun) "life, existence" (there are also main entries *hidup* 2. and *hidup* 3., of which more below). At the same time the so-called "pre-categorials" (lexemes without wordclass membership which only appear with affixes or in compounds, e.g. *dadak*, *hibur*, *temu*) are distinguished by the absence of such part-of-speech indications, being followed immediately in the entry by derivations. Also for the first time, verbs appearing with the prefix *me-* are divided clearly into transitive and intransitive by the placement of the sign (*di-*) after the transitive verbs, to show that they can appear in the object-focus or "passive" form. In this way the intransitive *menghébat* "get worse, escalate" is distinguished from the transitive *menghémat* (*di-*) "economize/save on (sth.)".

Another novelty for Indonesian lexicography is that function-words are not only clearly marked off from content-words by a special sign, but also dealt with very thoroughly and lucidly, with a wealth of examples. The treatment of *saja*, for instance, occupies almost one column, encompasses at least seven different meanings and includes no fewer than 33 examples.

At the end of many articles the user of the dictionary will find a list of synonyms or near-synonyms (yet another "first" for Indonesian lexicography). The entry *bodoh*, for example, furnishes references to eighteen other words, all meaning "stupid". Other cross-references, referring to formal varieties, are consistently accompanied by short (usually one-word) glosses, which for the practical user are often sufficient to eliminate the need to search for the cross-reference. So, instead of '*cuba*, see *coba*', we find '*cuba* "try", see *coba*'.

Labrousse's dictionary distinguishes itself further from all others of the same genre produced in the past 50 years by the large numbers of examples provided, many of them consisting of quotations from well-known literary works, accompanied by an attribution to the author. Under *sama* 3., for instance, we find the pithy example '*Terkejut sama*

terkejut. Héran sama héran (Pram.): we were all as startled and surprised as each other', a quotation from the pen of Pramudya Ananta Tur.

Entries and sub-entries with a high cultural content are marked with an asterisk and are sometimes – in the case of items of material culture – accompanied by illustrations, of which there are about 130 in the dictionary. Such illustrations have a very high explicatory (and pedagogical) value and their numbers could be greatly increased in a future second edition. This value was brought home to me when I was unexpectedly confronted in an Indonesian translation class with the unfamiliar word *kecrék*. Like a *deus ex machina*, Labrousse's dictionary – which I happened to have with me – produced not only a written description but also a drawing of this Javanese musical instrument.

Polysemic words are split into two or more main entries according to semantic differentiation. Thus in the case of *hidup* already mentioned, *hidup* 2. is an interjection meaning "long live . . .!", while *hidup* 3. occurs only as an element in the compound plant-name *daun hidup*. Although this is a perfectly valid approach when applied consistently (as it is in this dictionary) and although in many cases it enhances the clarity of the description, it does mean a longer search for the dictionary-user, particularly in the case of derivatives. The verb *menduduki*, for example, occurs in each of the four separate main articles which are devoted to *duduk*, with the meanings "sit on", "inhabit", "occupy (militarily)" and "fill, occupy (a position)". European-based derivatives are grouped together within one main entry, so that the words *kolonial*, *kolonialistis*, *kolonisasi*, *kolonialisme* and *(meng)kolonisir* are all sub-entries within the main article *koloni*. When this strategy comes into conflict with that for dealing with polysemy, the latter takes precedence. Thus *konvensi* is split into three main articles: 1. "agreement", 2. "convention" and 3. "reunion, meeting", with the word *konvensional* as a sub-entry of *konvensi* 2.

Another, rather insignificant, nuisance for the reader is that Labrousse has followed Poerwadarminta's inconsistent and now outmoded practice of treating digraphs in word-initial position (but not elsewhere) as separate letters. In the case of *ny-* and *sy-*, of course, this policy produces few difficulties, but it is rather disconcerting to have to remember anew, every time one consults the dictionary, that words beginning with *kh-* or *ng-* are to be sought after all other words beginning with *k-* or *n-* respectively. The modern monolingual dictionaries (e.g. *Kamus Umum*) have abandoned this practice.

Labrousse's dictionary concentrates entirely on the modern Indonesian language, so that those who seek words and/or meanings peculiar to classical Malay or (with some exceptions) modern Malaysian, will seek in vain. It does, however, include many words and meanings from the colloquial spoken language which are lacking from all existing Indonesian dictionaries.

Like all dictionaries in their first editions, this one has its share of inconsistencies, lacunae and errors. Pointing out such defects is usually the easiest of the reviewer's tasks; occasionally, as here, it is also the most reluctantly undertaken. The following selection of discovered

errors is offered in the belief that it will contribute towards an improved second edition.

The many Indonesian acronyms receive rather arbitrary treatment. Some well-known ones such as *hansip* "civil defence guard" (from *pertahanan sipil*) and *tapol* "political prisoner" (from *tahanan politik*) are included as entries, whereas others, equally well-known, are not: *mapram* "university initiation, greening" (from *masa pramasiswa*), *puskesmas* "health centre" (from *pusat kesehatan masyarakat*) and *Golkar* "functional groups" (from *golongan karya*), although the last-named acronym is listed under the entry *golongan*. The same applies to the treatment of proper names: *Mesir* "Egypt" is included, but not *Maluku* "the Moluccas" or *Hindia (Belanda)* "the (Dutch) East Indies" or *Singapura* "Singapore". Other inexplicably missing words or meanings include *téwas* "die (in battle), be defeated (in competition)", *bloon* "innocent, naive", *main* "have sexual intercourse", *menerbangi* (from *terbang*) "overfly, fly to", *térmodinamika* "thermodynamics" and *menggado* (from *gado*) "eat (meat, fish, vegetable, etc.) without rice".

Apart from the usual printing errors, such as on p. 929 *romusnya* for *romusya* "forced labour" and on p. 643 the almost Freudian misprint *puki maki* for *puki mai* "dammit!" (literally "mother's cunt"; *maki* means "curse, swear"!), there are also occasional instances of faulty phonological or morphological analysis. The derivatives *mengembara*, *mengembarai*, *pengembara*, *pengembaraan* are all assembled under the non-existent base *embara*, instead of under the true base *kembara* "wander" (cf. *dikembarai* "be traversed, wandered over"), which rates only a cross-reference. The words *esa* "one", *peta* "map" and *bela* "defend" are reproduced as *ésa*, *péta* dan *béla* respectively, with no reference to the original and, in many cases, still prevailing pronunciation with [ə] ("e" *pepet*) in the first syllable. On the other hand, the equally common variants *térong* and *pégang* of *terung* "egg-plant" and *pegang* "hold" go unrecorded.

In his original design for this dictionary, Prof. Labrousse had included in each entry extensive historical and etymological information, where available. Unfortunately, this praiseworthy initiative had to be subsequently replaced by the much less satisfactory (though now traditional) one-word indication of source-language for non-Indonesian loanwords. Needless to say, this danger-ridden procedure has led Labrousse's dictionary into just as many pitfalls as its predecessors. Many European words of English origin are assigned to Dutch (e.g. *pérformans*, *éditorial*) and vice versa (*obyék* "object, aim, source of income"). The two meanings of *pénsil* "1. pencil; 2. paintbrush" are both assigned to English, whereas only the first is from English *pencil* (Dutch *potlood*, Indonesian *potlot*), the second being from Dutch *penseel* "artist's brush". Some words of known foreign origin are given no source, such as *lues*, a medical term for "syphilis" (from Latin *lues*, presumably via Dutch) and *mék* "friend, mate" (vocative; from American English *mac*). Real howlers are fortunately difficult to find: *kardamunggu* "cardamom" is from Tamil, not Dutch, while *élpiji* is not, as the dictionary claims, a Japanese brand-name, but a representation of the English pronunciation of the initials L.P.G. "liquid petroleum gas".

Perhaps the largest category of errors comes under the heading "faulty translations", many of which concern Indonesian words borrowed from English or Dutch which have cognates in French. All too often it is assumed that the Indonesian word has the same meaning as its French cognate: in other words, the dictionary frequently falls prey to the notorious "false friends" and "faux amis" which have plagued generations of European school-children. The Indonesian *hérnia* for instance, which means "slipped disc" (like its Dutch source *hernia*), is translated by the French *hernie* which (like English *hernia*) means "abdominal rupture". Other examples include *brutal*, translated as "brutal, rough, violent", which has the same meaning as its Dutch source *brutaal*, namely "cheeky, impudent, insolent"; and *mengédit*, translated as "publish, bring out" (like French *éditer*), which however means "edit (a manuscript)", being borrowed from English (and not from Dutch as asserted in the dictionary). Other types of translation errors are also present, however: *peran* as noun is translated as "actor, actress" instead of "rôle", *watermantel* as "raincoat" instead of "water-cooled machine-gun", *Perenggi* as "Frenchman" instead of "European, white man", and *pianggang* as "sp. of cricket" instead of "sp. of bug" (which translation is, however, to be found under the synonymous entries *cenangau*, *jenangau* and *walang sangit*, all names for *Leptocoriza* sp.). The expressions *tali dugang* and *mendugang* are defined as "(rope for) pulling down, felling, uprooting a tree", while the true meaning is "(guy-rope for) supporting a tree during felling (to prevent it falling prematurely or in the wrong direction)".

The reader of this review must not forget that the abovementioned shortcomings fade into insignificance when compared with the advances which this dictionary represents over all other bilingual Indonesian dictionaries ever produced. Prof. Labrousse has provided us with a firm launching-pad for further expeditions into the still rudimentarily mapped and rapidly expanding universe of Indonesian lexicography.

J. T. Collins, *Ambonese Malay and Creolization Theory*,
Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur 1980, xii + 84
pp., 2 maps.

H. STEINHAEUER

Since about a century the official and scholarly interest in local forms of Malay has been appallingly low. The necessity of having some form of standard Malay in education and government in combination with a marked bias towards written language during this period has put the language of classical Malay literature, identified as Riau Malay, in the focus of attention, both in colonial Malaysia and the Dutch East Indies. The need for a national language during the struggle for independence and for its subsequent development was the main reason why the interest of indigenous SE Asian scholars and of the governments of Malaysia and Indonesia in local forms of Malay remained limited also during the first decades of independence. Only recently have programs for the (more)

systematic study of local dialects and languages been started in both countries, while linguistics as a whole is recovering from its decades-long bias towards English and speculations about universals of linguistic competence. New fields of study are being discovered, and old ones rediscovered.

One of these fields is the study of creole languages and the development of a theory of creolization. In the study under review, Collins, who is one of today's most prolific writers on Malay dialects and languages in the Moluccas, combines a discussion of this theory as it had developed up to 1975 (when the text for his book was written) with a presentation of data on Ambonese Malay.

As is known, this language has been termed a creole by various authors. But Collins, in the prefinal chapter of his study (the final chapter consisting as it does only of footnotes, many of which are quite informative and original), comes to the conclusion that it is not, saying (p. 59): "Neither AM [Ambonese Malay] nor TM [Tengganu Malay] are creoles". This rather surprising conclusion – in the context of the preceding chapters – should be read, however, as a final kick at the creolization theory and its europacentricism, rather than as a socio-cultural or linguistic qualification of Ambonese Malay. Fortunately, Collins' scepticism about this theory did not deter him from the enterprise of writing this study. Furthermore, taking the sociocultural and linguistic characteristics of creoles seriously enough to investigate by reference to them whether Ambonese Malay can be described as a creole has enabled the author to present the reader with quite a lot of unique observations on elements of the structure of AM (as well as of TM, which he compares with it). These observations are contained in the third, and longest, chapter of the book (pp. 14-54).

The other chapters are a two-page introduction, in which AM is presented as a "problem in contact languages", being "a non-European based 'creole' ", and an 11-page chapter on the sociocultural context in which Malay is and was used in the archipelago. This latter chapter is divided into five sections. In the first a short history of Malay is presented. The second confutes the persistently repeated misrepresentation in sociolinguistic literature of Indonesian and Malaysian as creoles which allegedly developed from the pidgin Bazaar Malay. The third section presents a history of the spice trade, and emphasizes the fact that busy trade centres with a linguistically mixed population already existed in the Moluccas (long) before European expansion affected the archipelago, while at the same time the use of Malay – at least as a trade language and vehicle of interethnic communication – was already firmly established in the region. Furthermore, 19th century sources are quoted, according to which the Malay which had developed in the capital of Ambon by that time was considerably different from the Malay of Leijdecker's bible translation, from the classical Malay which that translation was meant to resemble, and from the 'Riau' Malay which the Dutch colonists started using as a language of instruction and administration as from the middle of the 19th century. After a survey, finally, of the subsequent cultural changes on Ambon, Collins concludes that "a closer look at the use of Malay on Ambon island supports the notion that both the language and

the culture are to be regarded as creole" (p. 11). In the fourth section of this second chapter the author discusses the distribution of languages on Ambon. Dialects of the indigenous Moluccan language(s) are spoken in villages (mainly on the north coast) whose isolated position and resistance against Portuguese and Dutch penetration prevented the process of language replacement (by Ambonese Malay), which did take place in villages which were more subject to Portuguese and Dutch influence. In the final section Collins stresses the parallels in Ambonese patterns of cultural change and language replacement with the processes of creolization as they are described in the current literature, as a consequence of which "it is very difficult to draw any conclusion other than that AM is a creole language which developed from a *lingua franca* spoken" in the area (p. 13). Finally, the increasing importance of standard Malay/Indonesian is emphasized, as a result of which a sociolectal continuum can be observed of the type known in Jamaica, ranging from the purest form of AM to complete standard Indonesian.

As was said above, the main chapter of the book is the third. Here Collins evaluates three sets of linguistic criteria according to which a language might be qualified as a creole. First of all, there should be a comparative perspective: the pidgin or the creole developed from it should show a 'palpable' difference in structure with their stock languages. After a digression in which Collins shows the weakness of the claim that the only two non-European 'creoles' generally discussed in the literature, Sango in Equatorial Africa and Katanga Swahili, are indeed creoles, he compares current AM, as being closest to the pidgin/creole which developed as a restructuring of a non-creole variety of Malay, with standard Malay/Indonesian (SM), as representing the latter language (cf., however, Collins' caution discussed below). Collins starts by noting a number of phonetic divergencies, which are also found in other East Indonesian varieties of Malay, mentioning especially Makasarese Malay.

From personal experience I know that Kupang Malay (KM) also shows remarkable similarities (cf. Steinhauer, 1983). Also lexically there are clear differences. Collins mentions a few examples. And although there are no (recent) comprehensive studies of AM vocabulary, Dyen's standard wordlist cognate rate of only 80.7% for AM as compared with SM is indicative. The most striking divergencies, however, are found in the morphology and syntax. Although these are only (too) briefly indicated, the similarities with KM again are apparent. It is remarkable that in the cases where KM and AM differ (e.g. in the (optional ?) absence of /puŋ/ in (some ?) 'possessive' constructions: AM /doŋ laki/, KM /doŋ puŋ laki/ "their husbands"; or in the use of AM /par, fur/ "for" in equational sentences: AM /beta puŋ bapa par tukaŋ kayu/, KM /be puŋ bapa tukaŋ kayu/ "my father is a carpenter"), Collins notes similarities with the Asilulu dialect of the indigenous language on Ambon.

By way of conclusion he states that there is indeed a palpable difference between AM and the 'contributing' languages, which is Malay in the first place, "with a great deal of influence from indigenous languages

cognate with . . . Asiluluan" (p. 34), so that "on that basis we can claim that AM is a creole" (p. 35).

The second set of criteria concerns four linguistic features which are claimed by creolists to be valid for creoles in general: 1. the use of "preverbal particles or tactical devices to express aspect and tense", 2. the use of "the same word for different syntactic functions", 3. "the use of reduplication in derivatives", and 4. "omission of the copula" (cf. pp. 35-36). Collins gives a few examples which could be considered as evidence that AM reflects these characteristics. The criteria are too vague, however, to be taken very seriously. Apart from that, it should be questioned whether aspect and tense are expressed at all, instead of being just implied, in AM and whether the other characteristics need to be present in large number or without constraints. As it is, they can hardly be said to be pervasive in the structure of AM; moreover, they are just as characteristic for SM.

The third set of criteria discussed is Taylor's list of 12 features common to all or many European-based creoles. Collins adduces evidence that five of these 'common' features are also found in AM, which is a higher score than that produced by some European-based creoles themselves. Again one may question to what extent (part of) these features have to be present in the structure of the language to be considered as real characteristics.

In a following section of the third chapter AM is compared with Wurm's characterization of 'Bazaar' Malay, which would perhaps be equally similar to the lingua franca from which AM has developed. According to Collins the observed divergencies (alongside similarities) do not disprove such an origin.

So far the linguistic evidence would confirm that AM is a creole. However, Collins makes a number of qualifying remarks with regard to this evidence. In the first place it is highly probable that already in the 16th century varieties of Malay were in a state of diglossia, so that it might be questioned whether a 'palpable' difference of AM needs to be proved with SM rather than with a less standardized, less exclusively literary variety of Malay as spoken before at least 1800.

In the second place the value of the linguistic criteria in singling out the creoles from among the various varieties of Malay should be tested by applying them to a Malay dialect for which there is not the slightest sociocultural evidence of creolization. One such dialect is TM as it appears from the texts edited by C. C. Brown.

As it is impossible owing to lack of data to compare AM with a variety of Malay spoken centuries ago, Collins subjects TM to the same tests as AM. As it turns out, this also shows a palpable difference with SM: it has undergone marked phonetic changes, has considerably fewer affixes than SM and also shows some conspicuous syntactic divergencies. More surprising is the finding that the second and third sets of linguistic criteria mentioned above also would indicate that TM is a creole.

This outcome leads Collins to his observations in the fourth chapter ('Questions and Conclusions'), in which he summarizes his criticism against the creolization theory. What it boils down to is the following. The 'palpable difference' criterion does not specify with what language

such a difference should be established. Neither is it clear to what extent the development of this difference should differ from the process of 'normal' linguistic change, or how this can be established for a language the development of which has not been historically documented. The second and third sets of linguistic criteria could only be verified by comparing languages that were already recognized as (European-based) creoles for other reasons. As criteria most are so vague and general, that many more languages of the world than just AM and TM would turn out to be creoles. In my view, however, Collins' most fundamental objection against them is the fact that only *prima facie* similarity has been the reason for selecting them: "Rather than examining each language to see how each item in this list [i.e. Taylor's list, which is exemplary, H.S.] operates within its grammatical domain and how it relates to the rest of the elements in that domain and within the total language system, a conglomeration of this and that element and subsequent enumeration provides an alternative to rigorous classification of the data" (p. 54-55).

Collins is right, of course. But it is exactly this same objection that can be raised against his own presentation and handling of the AM and TM data. One cannot avoid the impression that they are identified too easily and without regard for their precise structural function with the elements of Taylor's list.

Yet, in view of the extreme paucity of other than mere lexical data on AM one must be grateful for the material Collins presents. Besides, the main contribution of his study is the to my knowledge hitherto unchallenged criticism with regard to the validity of the linguistic criteria for the recognition of creoles. Linguistically, *creole* appears to be an empty term. As it is typically used for languages which have resulted from cultural and commercial contacts between Europeans and non-Europeans, its applicability as a label for a language such as AM becomes indeed questionable. Collins' implication is programmatic: AM, and the other varieties of Malay in East Indonesia for that matter, deserve comprehensive structural descriptions instead of labels under which to be filed away.

CITED SOURCES

- Brown, C. C.
 1935 'Trengganu Malay', *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. XIII Part III, 111 pp.
- Dyen, I.
 1965 'A Lexicostatistical Classification of the Austronesian Languages', *Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics*, Memoir 19, 64 pp.
- Steinhauer, H.
 1983 'Notes on the Malay of Kupang (Timor)', *Studies in Malay Dialects, Part II, NUSA Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and other languages in Indonesia*, Vol. 17, pp. 42-65.

Taylor, D.

- 1971 'Grammatical and Lexical Affinities of Creoles', in: Dell Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages: Proceedings of a Conference Held at the University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica, April 1968*, Cambridge, pp. 293-296.

Wurm, S. A.

- 1971 'Pidgins, Creoles and Lingue Franche', in: T. A. Sebeok (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics*, Vol. 8, The Hague, pp. 999-1021.

Claudine Salmon, *Literature in Malay by the Chinese of Indonesia; A Provisional Annotated Bibliography*. Études Insulindiennes – Archipel 3. Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris, 1981, 588 pp. 4°. Price fr. 160.—.

A. TEEUW

Madame Salmon has written an amazing and admirable book which will prove a truly 'precious gift' to all students of Indonesian literature. Through this book she not only opens up a completely new field of studies, which will keep students occupied for decades to come; but she also provides us with a reliable guide and excellent access roads to what hitherto looked like an impenetrable jungle to anyone gazing at it from a distance.

Basically this book is a bibliography of Malay works written by Chinese in Indonesia. The author collected more than 3,000 titles (excluding re-editions) for this, covering nearly a century of writing by over 800 authors and translators. The number of original pieces of literature in a more restricted sense (novels, short stories, plays and *syairs*) amounts to over 1650 – more than twice the number of works of 'Modern Indonesian literature' mentioned in the present reviewer's book on the subject (1979 edition). These few figures testify sufficiently to the quantitative importance of *peranakan* Malay literature.

However, Mrs. Salmon provides much more than a mere catalogue of these three thousand titles. Her book starts with a detailed introduction on the historical development of *peranakan* Chinese literature, divided into four periods. In this survey she far from restricts herself to exclusively literary facts. The literary development is linked up with cultural, economic and socio-political developments both in Indonesia, in particular within the Chinese community there, and in China itself. She also gives extensive attention to direct translations from Chinese, as well as to non-literary publications (didactic, philosophical, religious and political texts). The introduction further has two interesting Notes appended to it, one on 'Printers, Publishers and Booksellers', the other on the 'So-Called Sino-Malay Language'. In addition extensive footnotes contain a wealth of bibliographical and biographical details.

The catalogue proper also is much more than just a listing of book titles. The arrangement of all the titles collected is by author's or translator's name and is preceded in almost every case by valuable bio-

graphical information, often quite detailed, about the author or translator. Then there are separate chapters presenting a number of literary sub-categories, such as the *syair*, plays, translations from Chinese, and so on, making for easy reference to and tracing of particular works. Similarly a useful, extensive survey of 'literary reviews' and their contents, covering serial works and stories and novels published in serial form, is given. Finally, an extensive bibliography is added. The fact that the titles here are arranged according to a large number of subjects and sub-subjects unfortunately has the drawback of making certain items hard to trace because of difficulty in deciding under what heading they may have been included. A number of Plates, mainly portraits of authors and illustrations of title-pages and front covers of publications, complete this impressive volume, and bear further witness to the high scholarly level and competence of the work and the direct socio-historical interest of French Southeast Asian studies in recent decades. The fact that the book has been published in English deserves special praise as an act of self-negation by a French author which is bound to considerably enlarge the market for and the compass of this book. This should be particularly appreciated by students in Southeast Asia, who often lack access to French-language publications.

Mrs. Salmon's book not only opens up a new field of studies. It also forces those working in related fields, including the present reviewer, into an agonizing reappraisal of some basic concepts they have been working with. The all too loosely used and imprecisely defined expression *Modern Indonesian Literature* has been called into question by the author with respect to all three of its components. First of all, as regards the concept of literature itself, Mrs. Salmon raises the old and much debated question again of whether literary value is relevant in the study of literature. For the purpose of this book her main task obviously had to be to make as complete as possible an inventory of the relevant literary output, rather than 'singling out the "masterpieces"'. The validity of this approach does not, however, imply that evaluation as such is illegitimate or irrelevant in literary studies. This very book provides an excellent foundation for the literary criticism which will be necessary for the further development of the study of modern Indonesian literary history, in accordance with Mrs. Salmon's own eloquent and convincing plea for abandoning the a priori idea of Balai Pustaka novels being the first and only manifestations of pre-World War II Indonesian literature. The book leaves little doubt that *peranakan* literature forms an essential link in the chain of literary developments leading to present-day Indonesian literature. As Mrs. Salmon puts it: 'The *Peranakan* merely performed one act of a long story, after the Malays, the Acehnese and the Bugis, and before the Minang, the Sundanese and the Javanese'. And indeed, this is not just a matter of numbers. Although Mrs. Salmon rarely pronounces any qualitative judgment on the works she discusses, it is obvious that her book makes a literary assessment of the texts concerned imperative. The facile opposition of 'literature' (= Balai Pustaka) vs. 'rubbish' (Sino-Malay and other 'popular' literature) needs to be rejected on both scores, and replaced by a more balanced evaluation.

The term 'modern' is also put in a new perspective, within the context of literature in Indonesia. If 'modern' has something to do with the influence of Western culture in a broad sense, then *peranakan* literature of long before 1920 bears witness to an awareness of socio-cultural problems created by modernizing influences. In this sense at least part of this literature should be termed 'modern', as it deals with issues similar to those which in the twenties became major topics for the Indonesian literature published by Balai Pustaka.

The concept 'Indonesian', too, is open to redefinition: the rather vague identification of Indonesian nationalism with the Indonesian language and Indonesian literature is inappropriate in the light of the wealth of *peranakan* literature described by Mrs. Salmon. With respect to the language used in this literature, Mrs Salmon argues that so-called Sino-Malay in most cases is indistinguishable from 'a Malay of Java spoken in the towns, by all ethnic groups, whether Javanese, Dutch or Chinese' (p. 121). This so-called 'Sino-Malay' – a pejorative term coined and circulated in the twenties for political reasons – was not a deviant form of an otherwise standardized Malay which gradually developed into Indonesian; rather, Balai Pustaka Malay was a deviant form, which was created in the twenties on the basis of Sumatran and classical Malay as a new standard over against the commonly spoken and written Javanese Malay of Java. Mrs. Salmon argues that there was no real language difference between *peranakan* Malay and the Malay used in newspapers and, e.g., the writings of early nationalists, whose 'Indonesianness' can hardly be called into question.

One important question remains unsolved. Mrs. Salmon argues that the main task now 'should be to try to fit the "two" literary outputs (i.e. Sino-Malay and Balai Pustaka Malay) together and to show that they undergo osmosis to such an extent that they become one . . .' (p. 94). The first part of this statement points to an obvious and urgent requirement for further work in this field. The second part for the time being remains no more than an unconfirmed, if plausible hypothesis. Only further research will enable us to determine whether and to what extent there really has been an osmosis, or whether the two streams remained relatively separate. For the proper investigation of this fundamental problem of modern Indonesian literary history Mrs. Salmon's fascinating book provides literary critics and literary historians with an invaluable tool. It is to be hoped that this tool will be used to the fullest possible extent by future researchers.

The following publications which may be of interest to our readers have also been received:

Kapita, Oe. H., *Tatabahasa Sumba Timur dalam Dialek Kampera*, Ende – Flores: Percetakan Offset Arnoldus, 1983.

Liaw Yock Fang & Bahri Rajib (eds.), *Pelajaran Bahasa Melayu*, volumes 2A-6B, Singapore: Educational Publications Bureau Pte Ltd., 1982.

Rectification

In the review of Sally Falk Moore's *Law as Process* (BKI 140 I, p. 189) a few words were inadvertently omitted in the second sentence, the latter part of which should read: "... and the ideological premises and practical consequences of descent among the East African Lango."

J. F. Holleman.