

Mark Taber, Leslie A. Forster, Charles E. Grimes, et al., eds. 1996. *Atlas Bahasa Tanah Maluku*. Ambon: Pusat Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Maluku, Universitas Pattimura, and Summer Institute of Linguistics. Maps, drawings, appendices, index. Paper.

Reviewed by AONE VAN ENGELENHOVEN, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden

How to review a linguistic atlas? One does not need to be a publishing expert to imagine the pitfalls exclusive to atlas-making. What is the use of such an atlas, and who is going to read it? These questions are important not only for the publisher, but also for the reviewer, who is compelled to provide a critical evaluation for aspiring buyers. How can one do that properly? Too much criticism might imply that either the reviewer would have done a better job, or that the book does not have any value at all. Too little criticism may end up disappointing buyers who base their purchase on this review. The best thing to do, it seems to me, is to evaluate this linguistic atlas in comparison with similar atlases, namely, the Moseley and Asher's (1994) *Atlas of the world's languages* (*WL*) and Wurm and Hattori's (1981–83) *Language atlas of the Pacific area* (*LA*). To obtain a full appreciation, I focused on one region in Maluku I am familiar with, Southeast Maluku, and one I know nothing about, North Halmahera.

The *WL* and the *LA* are quite similar in approach. Both have large maps that show either the languages or their families (or stocks) in different colors. This makes it easy to see the spread of the Austronesian and non-Austronesian (or Papuan) language families at first glance. The *LA* is easier to read than the *WL*. It uses a loose-leaf system that provides the names on the maps themselves, as in the *Atlas bahasa tanah Maluku* (*AB*, for short). In the *WL*, which is a bound book, these must be found in the legends. The *AB*, also a book, uses different kinds of shading instead of colors. Although this has clearly lowered the cost, it also makes the maps harder to interpret. The *AB* is quite different from the other two atlases, which look very much alike. This similarity is not very remarkable, because the compiler of the relevant maps in the *WL* (maps 39 and 40) happens to be one of the editors of the *LA*. The aim of the *WL* was to give an indication of the global diffusion of languages, not of dialects. As such, its maps are nothing more than simplifications of the maps in the *LA*, which also shows dialects.

The *AB*, which is based on the latest lexicostatistic calculations of members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, often gives a different picture of the language situation in the area. The *WL* lists 10 languages for North-Halmahera, while the *LA* differentiates 20–22 dialects. The *AB*, on the other hand, shows 16 languages and distinguishes 19 dialects for the same area. According to the editors (x), the *AB* is based on Voorhoeve (1987). This may explain the differences. However, the *AB* does not fully follow its source. A closer look on the maps reveals that three of the five isolects that Voorhoeve (1987) lists as dialects of Sahu are displayed in *AB* as if they were separate languages. At the same time, the *AB* discards minimal dialect differences in Tidore.

The *WL* mentions 19 languages for Southeast Maluku, for which the *LA* distinguishes 14 dialects. The *AB*, on the other hand, mentions 33 languages and 23 dialects. Much of this is due to the wealth of information that the *AB* provides on the Aru Islands. The *WL* lists only 5 languages, and the *LA* adds two dialects for a single Wokam-Tarangan language. The *AB* adds 4 more languages and meticulously reanalyses the Wokam-Tarangan dialects into 2 separate languages. For the Babar Archipelago, the *AB* lists 10 separate languages, while both the *WL* and the *LA* note only 4 languages.

In principle, its low cost and Indonesian text make the *AB* accessible to a Malukan audience. If the goal of the *AB* were only to show the current state of language and dialect geography in Maluku, then I could end this review with a strong recommendation. Its maps are generally superior to the ones found in other atlases. However, the *AB* tries to be more than just a language atlas. Its appendix on local Malay and its bibliography indicate that it intends to introduce both linguists and “laymen” to Malukan linguistics (ix).

The bibliography is far from complete. According to the compilers, it was added “as a source for the richness of research that has been accomplished in all Maluku in the social sciences, and not only in linguistics ... It is hoped, however, that this bibliography can help those who intend to learn more about the society and places that form the province of Maluku” (xi). Therefore, the bibliography must be read not only through the eyes of a linguist.

One problem of bibliographies is that they are always dated. The publication of a book takes at least a year, and therefore one does not expect to find in it all the titles of the year before it appears. One might

wonder how this bibliography has been compiled and what the motives were to insert or not to insert certain titles. It mentions a 1991 evaluation by Charles E. Grimes, but nothing of Blust (1993), nor of Nothofer's (1992) important reevaluation of both Grimes and Blust. Certainly Blust's paper could have been added, because it is published in the same *Oceanic Linguistics* volume as Taber (1993).

The references that are found are often incomplete, or duplicated, or do not actually exist. In the reference to Johnny Tjia's (1992) paper on Ambonese Malay, *Cakalele* is mentioned, but neither the volume number, nor the pages. Neither is it said anywhere that *Cakalele* is a journal devoted to research in Maluku, which may not be common knowledge among those readers the *AB* targets. What of the uncommon Dutch name Toes van Jonge, whose paper "The house on the hill: Moieties and double descent in Babar" reappears in the bibliography as a (1987) paper by Toos van Dijk and Nico de Jonge? Barbara Dix Grimes is said to have published two papers in *Pacific Linguistics* A-81 (Steinhauer 1991), but I have only found one. Meanwhile, Steinhauer's papers on East Indonesian Malay in the same volume are not mentioned. Finally, I disagree with the compilers' statement that the "sociolinguistic complexity ... has not yet been studied satisfactorily and therefore no conclusion can be drawn" (ix). The Australian sociolinguist, Margaret Florey, has focused her entire research on the Alune on Seram. Her publications are nowhere mentioned in the bibliography.

However, the *AB* is in the first instance a language atlas and not a bibliography. Therefore I would like to emphasize here that it certainly is a useful tool, not only for Malukan linguistics, but also for other scientific disciplines. The additional informal notes on how the language speakers live and how they can be reached would be helpful for those who are preparing to do research in Maluku for the first time.

The *AB* has unintentionally shown the need for an updated bibliography on Maluku. In expectation of it, I suggest consulting the "old" sources referred to below. Linguists can also consult the many volumes of the linguistic bibliography that have been published by Kluwer Academic Publishers since 1939, or they can surf the Internet to the AN-Biblio Project (<http://coombs.anu.edu.au/~Marck/anhmpg.htm>).

REFERENCES

- Blust, Robert. 1993. Central and Central-Eastern Malayo-Polynesian. *Oceanic Linguistics* 32:241–293.
- Janse, Mark and Sijmen Tol, eds. 1993. *Linguistic bibliography for the year 1993 and supplement for previous years*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kennedy, Raymond. 1945. *Bibliography of Indonesian peoples*. Yale Anthropological Studies 4. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Moseley, Christopher, and R. E. Asher, gen. eds. 1994. *The atlas of the world's languages*. London: Routledge.
- Nothofer, Bernd. 1992. *CEMP and CMP, two Austronesian subgroups? A critical evaluation of Blust (1990) and Grimes (1991)*. Paper presented at the Second International Maluku Research Conference, 29 July–1 August, Honolulu.
- Polman, Katrien. 1981. *The North-Moluccas: An annotated bibliography*. Bibliographical Series 11. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Polman, Katrien. 1983. *The Central-Moluccas: An annotated bibliography*, Bibliographical Series 12. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ruinen, W. 1928. *Overzicht van de literatuur betreffende de Molukken (exclusief Nieuw-Guinea), I, 1550–1921*. Amsterdam: Molukken-Instituut.
- Steinhauer, Hein, ed. 1991. *Papers in Austronesian linguistics, no. 1*, Pacific Linguistics A-81. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Taber, Mark. 1993. Towards a better understanding of the indigenous languages of Southwestern Maluku. *Oceanic Linguistics* 32:389–441.
- Tutein Nolthenius, A. B. 1935. *Overzicht van de literatuur betreffende de Molukken (exclusief Nieuw-Guinea), II, 1921–1933*. Amsterdam: Molukken-Instituut.
- Voorhoeve, C. L. 1987. The Non-Austronesian languages in the North-Moluccas. In *Halmahera dan Raja Ampat sebagai kesatuan majemuk*, ed. by E. K. M. Masinambow. *Buletin LEKNAS, vol. II, no. 2*. Jakarta: Lembaga Ekonomi dan Kemasyarakatan Nasional and Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia.
- Wurm, S. A., and Shiro Hattori, eds. 1981–83. *Language atlas of the Pacific area*, pts. 1 & 2. Canberra: The Australian Academy of the Humanities in collaboration with The Japan Academy.

Roy Ellen. 1993. *The cultural relations of classification: An analysis of Nuaulu animal categories from central Seram*. Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology, no. 91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. xxi + 315 pp.

Roy Ellen. 1993. *Nuaulu ethnozoology: A systematic inventory*. Centre for Social Anthropology and Computing, Monograph no. 6. Canterbury: University of Kent at Canterbury. xii + 217 pp.

Reviewed by CHRISTOPHER HEALEY, Northern Territory University

Roy Ellen (E) has already made significant contributions to the ethnography of Central Maluku and to anthropological theory in a series of publications based on his field research spread over two decades among the Nuaulu of south central Seram. His previous work has covered a diverse range of interests, from symbolic representations and ritual, through systems of folk classification, to human ecology. The two monographs under review combine E's meticulous attention to ethnographic detail with a command of theoretical issues in contemporary anthropology. Taken together, they also combine the diverse threads of his previous publications into a single fabric of richly textured ethnography and analysis.

Cultural relations (CR) and *Nuaulu ethnozoology (NE)* are intended as companion works, though either could be read with profit by those interested in the ethnography of one of the more traditionally oriented of the indigenous peoples of Central Maluku, or in comparative issues on indigenous systems of knowledge pertaining to the natural world. E advises us that *NE* provides the detailed ethnographic data that support the analysis of the cultural representation of knowledge about animals contained in *CR*.

As a compendium of data, *NE* is fairly straightforward and descriptive. It holds much of value for anyone interested in the ethnographic particularities of local cultural conceptions of the animals that share the Nuaulu habitat, more generally in ethnozoology, or in the natural history of Central Maluku. However, its appeal is likely to be somewhat limited beyond such specialists. *NE* achieves its wider significance as a complement to *CR*, which is more self-consciously theoretical in orientation. *NE* presents the descriptive background that the economics of the modern publishing industry precludes from incorporating into the other vol-

ume. It is thus clear that, while *NE* appears “simply” descriptive, it is actually organized to enable the curious reader of *CR* to pursue elements of the analysis by a closer, more detailed reading of the ethnographic data than could be provided in the Cambridge volume.

The two works are located within that branch of sociocultural anthropology often labeled “ethnobiology,” or the study of human relations with, and conceptions of, the biological elements of environments. Cultural conceptions are essentially categories of thought, generally with customary modes of behavior associated with the “things” so categorized. Categories applied to “things” lend themselves to classification; there are those who suggest that classification behavior is a human universal.

The study of classifications of biological entities has a long tradition in ethnobiology. At the risk of oversimplification, the variety of approaches in anthropological studies of ethnobiology can be lumped into two broad groupings. There are those who seek to explicate a rather formalist account of systems of classification, with particular attention to the taxonomies of nested hierarchies of discrete categories of increasing inclusiveness, universals of systems of classification, and general principles of the evolution and elaboration of classificatory systems. Among principal examples of such approaches are works by Brent Berlin (e.g., 1992) and Cecil Brown (e.g., 1984). I like to think of this camp of ethnobiologists as “Berkeleyites,” for two reasons. First, the proponents of this perspective have a tendency to systematize their basic data, and construct concrete categories—or create systems as observers—much as Bishop Berkeley proposed that things were given existence by the perception of others. There is, in short, a sense of the omniscience of the creative observer (the systematic, scientific ethnographer). Second, this perspective on ethnobiology is particularly associated with the anthropological linguists at the University of California at Berkeley. One example familiar to many scholars of Maluku that employs this general approach is Taylor’s (1990) detailed ethnography of Tobelo folk classification.

Set against this approach are a range of contrary views that might best be characterized as “Symbolist.” While the Berkeleyites tend to treat ethnobiological systems of knowledge as constituting self-contained semantic domains (amenable to an essentially linguistic description), the Symbolists are more inclined to examine such systems in their broader social and cultural contexts. The symbolist approach is thus to explore

the relations of categories of thought and representation of the biological world to other domains of culture. Important theoretical influences include Durkheimian sociology and structuralism.

The theoretical underpinnings of the two volumes under review must be understood in the context of the recurrent tension between the different approaches to ethnoscience just sketched. E's work thus constitutes part of an ongoing dialogue in ethnosciences. In the first chapter of *CR*, E distances himself from the narrow formalism and pursuit of general principles of classification and cognition associated in particular with what I have called the Berkeleyites. His main theoretical concern is to examine classifications as "situationally adapted" (*CR*, 3), and as dynamic devices of practical significance to their users. Classifications are treated as semantic and lexical fields embedded in a wider context of beliefs and practices. In short, E's principal concern is to examine the classificatory behavior of Nuaulu individuals in specific "natural" contexts. Rather than elaborating abstractly on this theoretical approach in the introduction, E constructs his exposition so as to enable it to emerge in the context of the ethnography itself.

However, the introduction also makes a very important theoretical point: E argues cogently that the supposed uniformities of folk classification, or the apparent systematic properties of classificatory schemes that may be described, are in significant part a consequence of being inscribed on paper. This process, characteristic of literate cultures, necessarily formalizes and decontextualizes knowledge. E argues to the contrary that, "Nuaulu animal classifying is highly contextual and less reflective than comparable processes in literate cultures, binding ideas to events rather than to other ideas" (*CR*, 32).

It is the exploration of context and the situational significance of categories applied to animals that provide grounding for E's insistence that we should resist the temptation to discover (invent?) systematic properties and hierarchical taxonomic structures in Nuaulu classificatory behavior. The implications of this general point are elaborated in the succeeding chapters of *CR*, while *NE* provides the detailed ethnographic description of Nuaulu categories as applied to animals and the contexts in which they were recorded.

The second chapter of *CR* deals with "the language of classification." In it, E provides an overview of Nuaulu as an Austronesian language. He then outlines some of the lexemic characteristics of the 462 terms so far

recorded for animal categories. However, Ellen goes on to point out that, as language is socially situated, a purely linguistic model is insufficient to reveal classificatory behavior and principles. Although language may embed taxonomy—for example, by polynomial names indicating that *x* is a kind of *y*—not all the classifying that Nuaulu do is systematically taxonomic.

Chapter 3 of *CR* takes up the issue that classificatory behavior does not necessarily yield a taxonomy as such, as a hierarchical set of mutually exclusive categories. Most Nuaulu identifications of animals take place in a social context, and are subject to the negotiation of consensus or deference to the opinions of elders. This raises the question for E of whether the Nuaulu have any conception at all of “natural kinds,” which are likely to be invoked by the knowledgeable regardless of the opinions of others. Reviewing linguistic and behavioral evidence of instances of identifications, Ellen concludes that the Nuaulu do indeed operate with a corpus of what he refers to as “basic categories,” which have for the Nuaulu a “thinginess” (*CR*, 68), generally represented by a “prototypical member” (*CR*, 72). The terminology adopted is deliberately suggestive of imprecision, for while these “basic categories” for the most part correspond to phylogenetic genera, this correspondence occurs at the level of identification of specific animals, rather than classification as an abstract system, and in practice, categories may appear to be given variable boundaries by Nuaulu naturalists. One important reason for this is that, while Nuaulu display sometimes impressive practical mastery of the skills required to identify animals, based on mostly objective properties (appearance, behavior, smell, sound, etc.), they often have difficulty articulating criteria for distinguishing them.

E is critical of the widespread use of terms in ethnozoological studies that are borrowed from Linnaean systematics. Thus, he eschews Berlin’s influential identification of general principles in folk classifications, which refers to “folk generics” (E’s “basic categories”) that are then subdivided into “specifics” and “varietals,” all contained within “unique beginners” (see, e.g., Berlin 1992). Such terminologies evoke a rigidly hierarchical two-dimensional imagery of differentiation and contrast between categories occupying distinctive levels in a branching taxonomic structure. E proposes an altogether different, three-dimensional iconography of two surfaces of variable contour—with bumps and hollows. On one surface are located the most inclusive, primary categories;

on the other are all the terminal categories—those not further differentiated. In places, the hollows on the upper surface of primary categories will touch the bumps on the lower plane of terminal categories, where primary categories are also terminal. Sandwiched between these two surfaces is a third one representing the “basic categories.” Two, or even all three layers will converge in some places. Elsewhere they will be layered, and the variable space between them may even be filled by fragments of additional layers.

While Nuaulu basic categories show a high level of correspondence with the categories of Western science, as many studies of ethnozoology have attested for other cultures, there is lesser correspondence with more inclusive categories and a greater degree of informant variability when dealing with the classificatory space occupied by nonbasic categories. E addresses this issue in chapter 4, where he argues that while the Nuaulu clearly theorize the structure of nature, as implied in their symbolic and ritual practices, there is no overarching, distinctly articulated system of classification. Rather, “classificatory space” consists of constellations of small segments of more carefully defined classificatory relationships. “More inclusive categories are characterized by ambiguity, variability and cross-cutting ties.” But for those who find this lack of apparent system disquieting, we are reassured that “there is nothing cognitively anarchic about this; it allows for a high degree of invention and flexible response to different situations and contexts” (*CR*, 124).

Flexibility and invention, in the contexts of individual variability of opinion and knowledge, the cosmographic significance of animal categories, and changes in classifying behavior associated with changing ecological knowledge and language shift are explored in chapters 5–7.

Chapter 5 addresses problems of variability that have bedeviled ethnobiology perhaps more than many other fields of ethnographic endeavor. One of the reasons for this, I think, is the often implicit adoption of scientific biology as a yardstick against which ethnobiological systems of knowledge are measured. This motivates ethnographers to develop methodologies that will reveal the systematic foundations of classifications. E critiques aspects of the formal elicitation techniques (which are particularly associated with the Berkeleyites) that try to avoid bias caused by the presence of others when informants are responding to elicitation of concepts of classification. E points out in respect of the Nuaulu that much identification of animals and classifying behavior is in

fact done in collective and public contexts. Individuals are rarely consistent in the statements made in response to elicitation by the ethnographer. What is sometimes referred to as “informant error” stems from the attempt by the ethnographer “to construct composite ‘folk models’ of culture” (CR, 145).

We should expect variability and diversity, rather than focus on the search for “the system,” if only because there are inevitable differences in knowledge, competence, interest, and skill on the basis of time, place, age, gender, and the presence or absence of others whose opinions warrant deference. Further, variability should be expected because categories (whether ethnobiological or others) are employed without their being formally defined in different ways on variable occasions. What Ellen seems to be getting at here is that ethnobiological classifications have their own logic of practice (cf. Bourdieu 1977), which is socially embedded.

This point becomes a primary focus of chapter 6, which explores the classifications of animals as parts of larger patterns of belief and cultural practice. Ellen elaborates on this theoretical and ethnographic point by exploring a number of issues that have attracted attention in the ethnobiological literature. These include the variable degree of differentiation of categories in different segments of classificatory space. For example, we learn that while Nuauulu classifications are based on the perception of objective discontinuities in nature (a loose concept of “natural species”), reptiles are “overdifferentiated” while birds are “underdifferentiated.” He suggests this may be accounted for by the utilitarian aspects of classifications, where it is useful to have categories available to describe individual animals encountered (or concrete examples), as opposed to identifying folk species with discrete boundaries (or conceptual categories), in those realms where there is a high level of morphological variability “in nature”—as is indeed the case with reptiles as opposed to birds.

This argument has much merit, but to my mind betrays the lingering influence of the systematic scientific paradigm that E criticizes. I believe E might have pushed the argument further in the direction of the relation of ethnobiological classification to cosmologies. I think one might argue for the variable influence of cosmological schemata in different cultures on the general “interest” that different domains of the biological world excite. (I prefer the imprecise term “interest” rather than the term “cul-

tural salience” so widely used in the ethnobiological literature, as the latter implies some quantifiable psychological component.) For example, I have done ethnobiological research among two montane rainforest dwelling peoples, the Alune of western Seram, and the Maring of Papua New Guinea. Birds are a prominent feature of the environments in both areas, and of comparable economic significance as objects of trade. But while the Maring exhibit an intense interest in birds, which are exploited for elaborate feather ornaments and which figure prominently in metaphoric speech, mythology, and ritual, the Alune share with the Nuauulu only a moderate interest and intellectual engagement with birds.

Chapter 7 addresses the important issue of changes in classifying behavior. There has been considerable speculation in the literature about aspects of the evolution of classificatory schemes. But E rightly points out that most of this work is in abstract terms of how categories of certain formal type (such as life forms) are added to languages. Little attention has yet been given to how local historical processes influence the development of particular ethnobiological classifications. E explores changes in classifications through a discussion of the development of cognate and divergent terms for selected animals in several related Malukan languages. Thus, he looks at changes in classifications over the long timeframe during which the local languages diversified from Proto-Austronesian and Proto-Maluku languages, as well as the impact on classifications of the human introduction of animals to the region, the influence of Asian and later European trading relations, and of colonial and postcolonial administration. Of particular significance over the last few hundred years has been the emergence of Ambonese Malay as a local lingua franca, and more recently of Bahasa Indonesia. E notes that Malay and Indonesian terms have entered into Nuauulu classifications, but he provides only a brief discussion. It is a pity not to explore further the opportunity to analyze the impact of language shift in the modern sociopolitical context of the encapsulation of the Nuauulu into the nation-state.

The final chapter, titled “Cognition and the cultural relations of prehension,” argues for the importance of focusing upon processes that generate classifications in particular situations, rather than treating classificatory schemes as separate abstractions. This chapter provides a cogent critique of the formalist approach to ethnobiology that underlies the more substantive chapters of *CR*. In particular, E argues that when eth-

nographers apply taxonomic models, with their presumption of hierarchy, and use formal elicitation methods, there is a danger of decontextualizing data and reifying classifications into formal systems. Such neat taxonomies tend to reflect the proclivities for order on the part of the investigator, rather than being a presentation of the scheme of things “from the native’s point of view.”

E refers to the situational grounding of classifications, which constitute the theoretical underpinning of his work, as “prehension.” He defines this (*CR*, 229) as “those processes which through various cultural and other constraints give rise to particular classifications, designations and representations. ... Prehension stresses the situational bias of classification.” In short, prehension is a social process. E argues persuasively for the importance of accepting nontaxonomic, nonhierarchical forms of classification—for admitting divergences from clearly bounded and distinctly ranked levels of categories. The results of this approach may be disquieting to many ethnographers whose proclivities for order, regularity, and system make them uncomfortable with the contingent, contextual, and flexible, which E sees as core elements of Nuauulu classifications.

E’s style is careful and direct, and both books are well produced. There are a few unfortunate typographical and other errors that have slipped through in *CR*. It is worth noting some that E has identified (in litt.). On page 32, line 8, “contextualisation” should be “de-contextualisation” and the table on page 237 in appendix 1 contains the following errors: the Nuauulu gloss for “wild pig” should read “*hahu numte*”; the species entry for “*Sus verrocosus ceramicus* Java pig” should read “*Sus domesticus* Domestic pig”; and the Nuauulu gloss “*hahu pale*,” the species entry for “domesticated cat,” should be “domesticated cow”; and the species entry for “*Capra aegagrus*” should be “*Capra hircus*.”

But these are minor quibbles. *CR* on its own and both books together mark a significant point in the maturing of ethnobiology as a legitimate and important subfield of social anthropology. E’s work will stand for a long time to come as the yardstick against which other studies of the social embeddedness of classificatory behavior will be measured.

REFERENCES

- Berlin, Brent. 1992. *Ethnobiological classification: Principles of categorization of plants and animals in traditional societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Cecil H. 1984. *Language and living things: Uniformities in folk classification and naming*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Taylor, Paul Michael. 1990. *The folk biology of the Tobelo people: A study in folk classification*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

David Mearns and Christopher Healey, eds. 1996. *Remaking Maluku: Social transformation in Eastern Indonesia*. Special Monograph No. 1. Darwin: Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Territory University. 185 pp.

Reviewed by LEONTINE VISSER, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden

In 1994, the Northern Territory University (NTU) in Darwin, Australia, and Universitas Pattimura in Ambon, joined forces to organize the Third International Maluku Conference in Ambon (27 June–1 July). NTU has extended the support of its Centre for Southeast Asian Studies by facilitating the publication of the first volume in a Special Monograph series. The majority of the eleven chapters of *Remaking Maluku (RM)* are edited versions of the conference papers. They are primarily ethnographic in nature, although various theoretical viewpoints become evident as well. One of the merits of the volume is the fact that almost half of the authors are Indonesian, a majority of them from Maluku.

Although neither the conference nor the present volume have an explicit focus, the editors rightly stress the fact that the contributions all offer examples of the manifold ways in which Malukan people are actively engaged in “remaking” Maluku. The contributions to this volume demonstrate the resilience of hegemonic ideas about “citizenship” and “modern” society. The transformation processes of Malukan societies incorporate highly flexible and practical interpretations of adat, in relationship with or contrary to the different religions (Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism). Many examples throughout the book show that changing socioeconomic conditions have a primary impact on the social relation-

ships between individuals and groups concerning access to and tenure of natural resources. Both Soselisa (on East Seramese sea rights) and Taale, F. von Benda-Beckmann, and Brouwer (on land issues and *sasi* in Hila, Ambon) give evidence of the complexity of local regulations and principles concerning land and sea according to *dati*, *pusaka*, and *perusah* relationships, and the (re)invention of *sasi*. Today, national development policy is keen to incorporate the institution of *sasi* as a kind of ideal construct of local resource management. Brouwer (72) duly warns against its inherent simplification for central-administrative rather than environmental purposes, as it prevents a proper understanding of the actual differentiation and variety through time and place of local resource extraction.

A second theme that emerges from this volume is social security. In particular, the studies by Mearns (on urban Ambon), by Goss and Leinbach (on the habitus of urban classes), by Brouwer (on resource use), and by K. von Benda-Beckmann (on social security and care in Hila) render the myth of the “lazy native” highly problematic. Both subsistence strategies and social security mechanisms, such as adoption, are inductive to extensive socioeconomic networking through kinship and alliance, religion, and trade relationships. On the other hand, the national institution of PKK (Family Welfare and Development), which focuses on (married) women and mothers, appears to be more than an instrument in the process of civilization. Pannell points out that women in a Southeastern Maluku village are very clever in playing the national game. Meanwhile, the very social construction of PKK confirms the historical sociocultural hierarchies within this class-based society, which renders PKK ineffective at the level of practical implementation. Laksono, in an excellent paper on the social dynamics of a Kei village, enhances our understanding of local social security institutions by explaining (159–60, 164) why Malukan people are “in need of debt” relationships, and keep stressing even small differences in identity. Religious factionalism is just one example, to which one might add language. These differentiate both individuals and groups, thus creating a relationship of inequality and indebtedness, with the primary aim of keeping a “security” claim on the other party for the return of a future “gift” or support. The analyses of the transformation of social-economic relationships are not restricted to the village level. In fact, they include transmigrant settlements (Goss and Leinbach) and the impact of Butonese traders (Pariela), as well as urban

elites (Mearns). One contribution (Manusiwa) addresses the local–global relationships of Malukans in the Netherlands and their relatives in Maluku.

RM succeeds in calling our attention to the enormous variability and differentiation of modernization processes in Maluku. Personally, I think there is no need to “break with [the] tradition” (2) of earlier anthropological studies on Maluku to render the remaking of Maluku a “radical” (2) experience. Nor is there a scientific need to “characterize so-called ‘peripheral’ communities” (8). Healey does not even seem to aim at this in his chapter on Aru, as suggested in the Introduction. As a whole, the volume is of course not a monograph, yet it could have profited from more rigorous editing (31, 34, 65, 67, 110, 111, 116, 117, 144, 158, 164). In particular, the homogenization of commonly used Indonesian abbreviations and their translations would have benefited. For example, *pusaka* rights are described as “bilateral inheritance rights” (45), and as “individually inherited land owned by a household head” (108). Also, the LMD is variously called a “Village Council” (116), a “Village Consultative Committee” (143), and a “Village Deliberation Council” (158). Nevertheless, *RM* presents a highly relevant regional perspective based on very interesting—sometimes astonishing—cases. It should be on the reading-list of every student of eastern Indonesia, particularly of those who are interested in the Austronesian part of Central and Southeastern Maluku (Ambon, Seram, Kei, Aru).

Wyn D. Laidig, ed. 1995. *Descriptive studies in languages of Maluku*, pt. 2. NUSA 38. Jakarta: Universitas Atma Jaya. 122 pp.

Reviewed by MARK DONOHUE, Concordia University, Montreal

In this volume, Laidig brings together five articles detailing aspects of Maluku languages, a majority (three of five) concerned with non-Austronesian languages of Halmahera. Three papers deal with phonology and one with issues of transitivity, while the last is a very brief sketch grammar. As is often the case with collected works, the contributions vary widely in quality, ranging from quite insightful and speculative analyses of complicated phenomena to rather uninterpretable applications of poor understanding. I shall deal with them in the three main categories mentioned above.

In their study of Tidore phonology, Joost and Cheryl Pikkert begin with a survey of the literature on Sahu and its position within the North Halmahera family. Following this is a list of phonemes, each exemplified in detail. Given that none of the phonemes show any allophony whatsoever, six pages of wordlists (not even phonetically transcribed) and (near-)minimal pairs seems rather excessive. There follows a discussion on the nature of what the Pikkerts analyze as vowel sequences, and a brief mention of borrowings and the *N*- morpheme (more on this later). Tidore does not appear to be the sort of language that will trouble phonologists too much, but the article includes a glossed text that is interesting, although it does not exemplify anything phonologically.

John Severn's look at Sahu syllables gives the impression of one newly venturing into the world of acoustic phonetics. It consistently confuses levels of analysis, such as fundamental frequency, pitch, and "tone" (intonation?), and adds much rather gratuitous and uninterpretable acoustic data. (For instance, a mingograph trace of /tuusu/ in the second half of figure 8 adds no more information than what is already included in the first half of the same figure.) While it is commendable to pursue acoustic measurements in order to quantify material that is otherwise hard to decipher, Severn appears to have used them in order to support his own ears. Given that the human ear is more capable of fine phonological differentiation than any acoustic program, it would seem that one's energy could be better spent in analyzing other aspects of Sahu structure.

The detailed study by Edward Kotynski is the most speculative—and most intriguing—of the phonological articles. He examines the phonological status of the glottal stop and the "nasal prefix" in Tabaru and other languages of North Halmahera, essentially concluding that the Tabaru glottal stop is nonphonemic, but has evolved historically from a falling together of *k and nonphonemic glottal stops in vowel-initial words. However, there is a contrast in Tabaru between initial glottal stops and initial vowels; medial syllables also contrast the presence or absence of a glottal stop. Kotynski notes that the syllables that lack a glottal stop often correspond to syllables beginning with a *w in other North Halmahera languages (and other dialects of Tabaru). He thus concludes that there is an "empty consonant" in Tabaru that fills the onset position. This ties in with data about the *N*- prefix, which surfaces as voicing when attached to words with a voiceless initial consonant (*N*-

+ *temo* = *demo*), a *g* when added to a word with initial glottal stop, and a velar nasal *ng-* when added to a glottal-initial word. Historically this account seems to be plausible, but we must wonder what the learner does when presented with two words, one with an initial glottal stop and one without? Surely the reality of the synchronic situation is that there is a contrastive glottal stop in Tabaru.

Wyn and Carol Laidig's minisketch of Larike bears a striking resemblance to the *Tata Bahasa Larike* that appeared in limited edition a few years ago. This publication makes it more generally available and is to be welcomed for that. It is hard to summarize the material here, but the phonological highlights include an interesting process of dissimilation in a suffix that appears as *-i* or *-u*, with the front allomorph after back vowels and the back allomorph after front vowels. Morphologically the language has a split intransitive system, with unergative subjects marked the same way as transitive subjects, and unaccusative subjects marked in the same way as transitive objects. This is an aspect of Larike and other languages of the area that deserves further work.

Kathleen and Mark Taber present an analysis of the alternations found in the subject prefixes in Luang, a language of southern Maluku. The data are complicated by a range of factors, including the fact that certain phonological shapes of verb roots dictate the choice of an agreement marker from one set or the other. However, there are enough verbs that permit either set of prefixes, and a crucial subset that show changes in meaning, that the Tabers are able to tease out semantic differences between the two sets of prefixes. Essentially, they analyze the difference in terms of transitivity. One set of prefixes is described as showing less "transitivity"—in the sense(s) of Hopper and Thompson—than the other. In addition to invoking the ten criteria that Hopper and Thompson discuss, the Tabers also make frequent reference to the construal of events in Luang culture. This is an interesting extension of Hopper and Thompson's ideas, the notion that transitivity is not simply a notion that varies in a uniform way along a standard set of criteria, but that it can (and must) also be defined in terms of the culture in which the language is spoken. (In this respect, I would love to have read some anecdotal material about the Tabers learning Luang, and some cultural/linguistic problems they encountered.) All in all, this is a provocative paper and a good challenge to the mentalist tradition of linguistics.

Overall, this volume presents a collection of intriguing material. As with most NUSA volumes, the reader is left more tantalized than satisfied, but that is to be expected when a lot of the material reported on is the result of research still underway. We can only hope that the various researchers involved will continue to produce (and publish) material to challenge and intrigue us. The NUSA series plays a useful and satisfying role in making such material available.