

A “blundering Cyclops,” the U.S. could have won in Vietnam if a “blocking force” had been employed to stop infiltration and the president had listened to Samuel Huntington, Allen Goodman, and William Colby (pp. 321, 130). Policy makers who take care to look before they leap should be able to resuscitate what Tom Engelhardt has called “victory culture” (*The End of Victory Culture: Cold War America and the Disillusioning of a Generation* [New York: Basic Books, 1995]). “The difference between a Viking’s raid for plunder and a posse’s ride for justice,” Lomperis concludes, “lies in the legitimacy with which the venture is viewed in the receiving demographic terrain” (p. 321).

DAVID HUNT

University of Massachusetts, Boston

Language Use and Language Change in Brunei Darussalam. Edited by PETER W. MARTIN, CONRAD OZÓG, and GLORIA POEDJOSOEDARMO. Athens: Southeast Asia Monograph No. 100, Center for International Studies, Ohio University, 1996. xvi, 373 pp. \$26.00 (paper).

The overall intent of this edited volume is to present what is known of the languages of Brunei Darussalam and to encourage further study. This anthology is divided into three parts that focus on, respectively: the variety of Malay dialects in the country; the role and form of English used in Brunei; and the indigenous languages in Brunei. All chapters are pertinent, clear, and well-written.

The initial chapter gives solid background enabling a reader unfamiliar with Brunei to readily understand the succeeding chapters. Peter Martin and Gloria Poedjosoedarmo point out in “An Overview of the Language Situation” that the country is small in area and population, but is “linguistically complex and provides a fascinating area of study for scholars in linguistics” (p. 1). Peter W. Martin’s “Brunei Malay and Bahasa Melayu: A Sociolinguistic Perspective” analyzes the usage spheres of each language and the social consequences of their coexistence.

Gloria Poedjosoedarmo’s chapter on “Variation and Change in Sound Systems of Brunei Dialects of Malay” provides original data which show the uniqueness of the language. Soepomo Poedjosoedarmo’s paper on “An Overview of Brunei Malay Verb Morphology” points to major differences between the verb morphology of BM and of modern SM. Both topics need much fuller study with careful differentiation of local dialects.

“Some Notes on Brunei Malay Syntax,” by Gloria Poedjosoedarmo and Hj Rosnah Hj Ramly, is based on quantitative analysis of folktale texts. The authors conclude that some syntactic forms predate those of the earliest classical Malay texts that occur in colloquial Brunei Malay, and this suggests considerable antiquity for the use of Malay in north Borneo.

James T. Collins’s thought-provoking discussion of the Malay nature of the language of Bacan, southwest of Halmahera, points out the lexical and syntactical features in the Malay of Bacan similar to those of North Bornei Malay, and suggests that much remains to be learned about the historical and social interactions that relationship implies.

“The Palace Language” by Fatimah Awg Chuchu provides a unique view into a linguistic realm little known to scholars. The paper points to multiple features that characterize palace language and how palace language is being elaborated and taught

to wider Brunei circles. This sociolinguistic development sharply delineates relative social statuses and is a means “to strengthen the concept of Bruneian cultural identity and to hinder liberal influences” (p. 90).

“Language Shift in Kampong Ayer,” coauthored by Hjh Sumijah Alias and Gloria Poedjosoedarmo, considers the “Balandih” speech of the Water Village. Though this is treated as a single entry, the present reviewer is aware of some significant dialects or subdialects within Kampong Ayer, and has heard elders state that in the past different Kampong Ayer villages spoke markedly different dialects. These subdialectal variations need to be studied.

All of the papers in part 2, “The Role of English in Brunei Darussalam,” draw heavily upon data collected from students at Universiti Brunei Darussalam. Gary M. Jones’s essay “The Bilingual Education Policy” details this important policy which was implemented in 1985–93. “Factors Influencing the Choice of a Role Model for Trainee English Teachers” by Gaeme Can and Hjh Rosnah Hj Ramly finds that a native-English speaker’s accent is not the target linguistic model as is the Asian model. There is social pressure for Bruneians to not sound like native English speakers. In “Unplanned Uses of English” A. Conrad Ožóg delineates the different social settings in which English is used.

Both Brunei and Malaysia have dual linguistic streams, Malay and English. Ožóg’s essay “Codeswitching in Peninsular Malaysia and Brunei Darussalam: a Study in Contrasting Linguistic Strategies” analyzes similarities and differences in the parameters of code-switching use. Bruneian English has a number of distinctive linguistic features. Jonathan Mossop analyses the phonology and makes the comparison with Singapore Malay. Graeme Cane looks at syntactic simplification and argues that it parallels the patterns found in New Englishes. James A. H. McLellan examines unit discourse and how it follows Brunei Malay patterns rather than more of Standard English. “The Bah Particle in Brunei English,” by Ožóg and Peter W. Martin, examines the Brunei Malay emphatic/urging/agreement particle “bah” as it is used when Bruneians speak English.

In part 3, Peter W. Martin’s “Social Change and Language Shift among the Belait” provides a unique description of sequential language swamping. First Meting, now known as Belait, swamped the previous language of the Sukang area; now Iban is swamping Meting. Martin’s discussion of “A Comparative Ethnolinguistic Survey of the Murut (Lun Bawang) with Special Reference to Brunei” points out that the “Murut” do not use that term to refer to themselves, but rather use “Lun Bawang” in Brunei and Sarwak and “Lundayah” in Kalimantan and Sabah. Martin points out the loss of “Murut” among the younger generation.

In “Aspects of Language Maintenance and Language Shift among the Chinese Community” Kevin Dunseath observes the complex interaction of language and social factors. Mandarin is taught in the private Chinese schools; students need to learn English, Malay, and Brunei Malay in order to succeed in life. Dunseath concludes that the Chinese community in Brunei shows no signs of wanting to give up its linguistic identity. The essay “The Penan of Brunei: Patterns of Linguistic Interaction” by Peter W. Martin and Peter Sercombe describes the Penan of Sukang Village, and how Iban has become the dominant language there.

Appended to the volume is an excellent discussion of Bruneian names and titles, the alphabetizing of which follows specific roles rather different than those of English. In addition, Peter W. Martin’s “An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Linguistic and Ethnolinguistic Sources” covers works on non-Malay and language groups of Brunei published since Collins’s 1990 work, and lists those not included in it.

Each of the papers in this volume is a new contribution to knowledge, and an indication of how much still remains to be done studying the languages of Brunei. The limitations are those of knowledge not yet obtained. There is for instance no chapter on "Tutong Malay" which is actually a Dusunic language, nor does Kedayan receive an analysis in its own right. The amount of scholarship and analysis which has been assembled is impressive and should serve as inspiration for much future linguistic work in Brunei Darussalam. This is a book for graduate students doing advanced work in Austronesian or Bornean linguistics and Bruneian and Bornean scholars.

LINDA AMY KIMBALL
Western Washington University

Inventing a Hero: The Posthumous Re-Creation of Andres Bonifacio. By GLENN ANTHONY MAY. Madison: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison in cooperation with New Day Publishers, Manila, 1996. xi, 200 pp. \$40.00 (cloth); \$19.95 (paper).

To most Filipino intelligentsia, the struggle for independence from 1872 to 1901 is the initial, defining event in the formation of their nation. The heroism and sacrifices of that era have provided models of proper action and justified the Philippine claim to separate, unique nationhood in the modern world. The period has about it a sacred quality, and foreign criticism of its heroes, no matter how rational, provokes Filipinos of diverse ideology. What Glenn May has published will surely arouse their resentment.

In this brief volume, May questions much that historians have written about Andres Bonifacio, an important leader of the revolution. To certify his inflammatory claim, May scrutinized the extant sources, small in number, and found that most possess a dubious provenance. He inspects the evidence for logical, linguistic, and paleographic inconsistencies, which he finds in abundance.

In the first two chapters he critiques the sources provided by Manuel Artigas, Epifanio de los Santos and his son, Jose P. Santos, and doubts that these letters, poems, and articles are authentic. The absence of most of the originals makes investigation difficult, for the three prewar historians provided little explanation about where they obtained their information. May asserts that without the originals and more background about them the sources should not be trusted, and in some cases may well be forgeries. In other instances, he shows that even if the materials prove genuine they cannot be verified to have been composed by Bonifacio. Next, he dismisses comments referring to Bonifacio found in the memoir of Katipunero Artemio Ricarte, whom May finds self-serving and therefore unreliable.

Having eliminated these crucial sources, May concludes that too little evidence remains to support Bonifacio's current reputation. In the final two chapters, the author considers the work of two major Filipino historians, Teodoro Agoncillo and Reynaldo Ileto, who have utilized this data to construct their portraits of the complex, putative proletarian. He points out that their dependence on this shoddy material means that the characterizations cannot stand. What May says about the supposed motivations of the five historians most responsible for creating the portrait of Bonifacio is less convincing, at times accusatory, sometimes exculpatory. His case about the documents is more thoroughly and solidly grounded than are his explanations of intentions.