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The selection of exemplary dialogues in self-teaching language books can reveal the way in which the learner of the language is imagined in the mind of the author. Seven textbooks aimed at the self-tuition of adults in Malay, through the medium of English, are examined. They reveal how the imagined learner has changed from the sea-faring trader of the pre-colonial period (Spalding 1614, Bowrey 1701), to the colonial master giving orders to his underlings (Keasberry 1862, Swettenham 1881, Lewis 1947) and experiencing rural Malaya (Lewis 1947), and finally to the post-colonial residents of the egalitarian cities of Malaysia and Singapore (Liaw 1988, Zaharah & Sutanto 1995).

The imagined learner reflects the history of British colonial activity in the Malay region, and notions of Malay and Malays in the pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial periods.

Introduction

The use of bilingual dialogues in books intended to teach a language has a long pedigree. These ‘dialogues’ are constructed conversations in parallel text whose purpose may be to teach a set of vocabulary (e.g. sailing terms, numbers), or to develop some grammatical structure (e.g. interrogatives, commands), or to model plausible conversational settings for the learner (e.g. at the market, giving instructions to servants), or (usually) a combination of these. The dialogues place learners in an imaginary setting, often one in which the textbook writer believes learners may actually find themselves. Learners are intended to match the text in the new language against the text in the language they already know, and, usually in conjunction with a glossary, and often in conjunction with a grammar, are expected to be able to work out the nature of the equivalence of the two texts.
I have selected seven books which were designed for self study of Malay by English speakers, and will be showing how the dialogues create an imagined learner whose social context reflects the history and conceptualisation of the Malay region (see Appendix for representative examples). All are general works, not aimed at a specific group (such as tourists or soldiers). Two of the books (Spalding 1614, Bowrey 1701) can be described as pre-colonial, as they come from the first phase of British involvement with the region, when British traders (alongside Portuguese and Dutch rivals) organised trading ventures and ‘factories’ in the emporiums of the Malay region. The Portuguese and the Dutch were well ahead of the British in their political involvement during this period. Three books (Keasberry 1862, Swettenham 1881 and Lewis 1947) are colonial, dating from a period when the British had established rule in parts of the region. And two (Liaw 1988 and Zaharah & Sutanto 1995) are post-colonial, written at a time when European colonial control had ended.

All the works seem to be relatively original, with the exception of Spalding, which is an acknowledged English version of Arthus (1613): Arthus is in turn an unacknowledged Latin edition of Houtman (1603). Arthus and Spalding both omit Houtman’s prefatory and explanatory material, and his glossary, at considerable loss to pedagogic usefulness. Although my reference shall be to Spalding’s English version of 1614, it must be remembered that Houtman was the true author of the Malay dialogues, which are in a Houtman’s Romanisation, based on Dutch orthographic tradition.

Bowrey developed his own romanisation, and the quality of his treatment of Malay was such that he was plagiarised by Howison (1801), grudgingly praised by Marsden (1812b:xli f) and is still of use to modern scholars of Malay (Benjamin 1997). Three of his dialogues are new versions of three of Houtman’s, keeping the same outline narrative, but making many changes in language and content, as well as totally changing the
orthography. Swettenham (1881) appears to have based three of his dialogues on topics from Keasberry (1862).

The number and length of the dialogues varies, the books with fewer dialogues tending to have longer ones. Five of the dialogues in Lewis (1947) were intended to be used as translation exercises. As the answers were supplied in end pages, I have treated these dialogues along with the exemplary dialogues. Most dialogues in the colonial and post-colonial books have only two speakers, but in the two pre-colonial books some dialogues have a large cast list, and a concomitantly complex dramatic structure (Table 1).

[Place Table 1 about here]

In the analysis, both the English and Malay texts are used to make inferences about the social context. The pattern of personal and gender reference being noticeably different in the two languages, this increases the information given by the text.

Where is the learner?

When examining an issue of bilingualism over a period of 400 years a number of political and linguistic issues arise. The first issue relates to the naming of places whose boundaries and rulers have been liable to change. I have, wherever possible, had recourse to the modern geographical rather than political terms (Figure 1). Singapore’s elder statesman, Lee Kuan Yew, ends the first volume of his autobiography (Lee 1998:667) with a map of this region, to which the caption is “We were a Chinese island in a Malay sea. How could we survive in such a hostile environment”. Bowrey (1701) has a very attractive map of the region. Most of the region which I am calling the Malay region is now distributed between 5 independent countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei Darussalam and East Timor. However, the boundaries of the region are potentially very wide, stretching from what is now southern Thailand to the north, to the Philippines to the
east, and northern Australasia to the south. The texts used in this study do not make any explicit reference to areas beyond my map.

In the seventeenth century this Malay region was ruled by a complex of linked kingdoms and other polities (Turnbull 1980 has a very clear and readable account). People we may loosely call ‘Malays’ (the ethnic terms of the region are, and have long been, complex) dominated regional trade and littoral settlement, and Malay was the major lingua franca in the cosmopolitan trading centres of the area. Applied to the language, the term Malay has also always been used as an umbrella term for a whole range of varieties, regional, social and functional (Benjamin 1993:352f, 1997:2f outlines this complex situation in synchronic and diachronic terms). Many of the authors of books on Malay (Houtman 1603, Bowrey 1701, Marsden 1812, Shellabear 1899, Lewis 1947, Liaw 1988) make an effort to characterise some of this variation in their treatment of Malay, as do many of the general discussions of the region (e.g. Hamilton 1815:444, 542f, Crawfurd 1856:207f, Swettenham 1907:156f). Swettenham (1881) makes several reference to geographical variation in the dialects of the peninsula. The other texts (Spalding 1614, Keasberry 1862, Zaharah & Sutanto 1995) have little or no discussion of variation.

Many writers deplore the varieties of Malay used by and to foreigners, and refer to the ‘true’ Malay to be found among Malays. Every treatment of Malay in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries makes a distinction between the ‘pure’ or ‘best’ Malay (usually associated with the Malay of peninsula Malaya or with the Rhio archipelago) and the Malay used as a lingua franca:

Whereas in all the Islands of [the Archipelago]... the Malayo Language is received and generally used in all the Trading Parts of those Islands having a peculiar Language of their own: Nay on some of the greater Islands, (as particularly on Borneo) there is several different Nations and Languages, with several of which I have conversed. But I must tell you, that the Malayo Language spoken in the Islands, is somewhat different from the true Malayo spoken in the Malayo Country, altho not so much,
but to be easily understood by each other. The Malayo spoken in the
*Islands* is called *Basadagang* [in Modern Malay this would be *bahasa
dagang* = ‘the language of (foreign) trade’], that is to say, the Merchants’
or Trading Language, and is not so well esteemed as the true *Malayo*.

(Bowrey 1701²)

These varieties of Malay could appear to facilitate the learning of Malay, but their prevalence also hampered the learning of the ‘pure’ Malay:

> It generally happens ... that Europeans in India³ acquire from each other in the first instance, rather than from the natives, their knowledge of the language; by which means the imperfections of expression are propogated, and the difficulties of correcting them are increased by the proneness of servants and other dependent connexions to conform to the idiom of their masters, in order that they may be the more readily understood.

(Marsden 1812a:vii f)

Swettenham (1881:x) also divides responsibility between Europeans and Malays, because “every Malay, when introduced to a white face, takes it for granted that the stranger’s knowledge of Malay is very halting and imperfect, and will try always, through politeness, to talk down to the standard of his white friends”. This lingua franca was recognised in the nineteenth century, however, to the extent of being officially recommended as the medium through which English should be taught (Hullett 1887, Gupta 1994:42).

By the mid-twentieth century two major standard varieties had emerged from Malay, which are now often called *Bahasa Indonesia* (‘the Indonesian language’, Indonesian) and *Bahasa Melayu* (‘the Malay language’, Malay -- also called *Bahasa Malaysia*, ‘the Malaysian language’, in Malaysia). The three twentieth century books are based on modern standard Malay (an official language in Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei), although Liaw (1988) adds appendices on the differences between ‘Bahasa Melayu and Bahasa Indonesia’. The blurb of Liaw claims that the book “will enable you to read and write Standard Malay language in a couple of months and have a comprehensive grasp of Bahasa Indonesia.” Sutanto has authored a companion volume to Zaharah & Sutanto
(1995) on Indonesian (Sutanto 1994), reflecting the partial separation of these two modern standard languages in the twentieth century.

The linguistic features of the varieties of Malay used in these books (like any discussion of the pedagogical implications of the works) is outside the scope of this paper, but the social complexity of Malay is certainly relevant.

From the sixteenth century to the twentieth century the Malay world experienced colonial activity of various sorts from the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the British, with some areas (such as Malacca) experiencing colonisation by all three colonial powers, others (such as Bencoolen) by two of the three, and others (such as Singapore) by only one. Different parts of the region were also variably affected by a range of types of contact with India and with China, including substantial migration from China and (to a lesser extent) from India, especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The pre-colonial and colonial books under examination are all written by British people with some knowledge of the region. Claims of experience in the region may be made in the introductory materials (as they are by Houtman, Spalding, and Bowrey). Bowrey (1701) refers to his nineteen years (for documentation see Temple 1927:xvii f) in the East Indies, when:

I did Furnish my self with so much of the Malayo Language as did enable me to Negociate my Affairs, and Converse with those people without the assistance of a Prevaricating Interpreter, as they commonly are.

For these two pre-colonial writers, the main arena for European activity is in the sea ports and trading centres of Sumatra and Java, although few of their dialogues are specific about location. Seven of Spalding’s dialogues appear to be located in the region, two of them in or near Acheh (in one dialogue two men arrive in Acheh on horseback and anticipate hitting the bars), and two of them at an unspecified sea port en route to Acheh
or Bantam. Four of Spalding’s dialogues are apparently located in the Low Countries (presumably in a Dutch-speaking environment, although in one of them a character unexpectedly explains that she hasn’t contributed much to the conversation because “I cannot speake French well”) and the remaining one could be anywhere. Lombard (1970:7f) refers to Houtman’s choice to place his ninth dialogue so firmly in the Low countries as giving an interesting insight into his mentality. Certainly there is a stark contrast between some of the strongly located early dialogues, where sea captains from Gujarat, Holland and Flanders are greeted with pomp, elephants and dancing girls by Malay kings, and the later texts involving Northern European domestic scenes (and food) and trading of English wool with people from Ghent. The placing of these dialogues in the imagined learner’s own culture is inexplicable.

A century later, Bowrey is still centred in Java and Sumatra, with Bantam being the only named place where a dialogue is set. Five of the dialogues are set in or near unspecified trading ports in the Malay region, where English merchants are rivals for trade (mostly in spices) with Dutch merchants. Bowrey’s eighth dialogue is clearly based on the same source as Spalding’s (and Houtman’s) twelfth, with a similar narrative of a landlubber approaching a boat for passage, going on a sea voyage, having a storm, and arriving at the destination. However, while the Houtman-Spalding ship sails from an unspecified port in the Low Countries to Lisbon, Bowrey’s sails (in great detail) from Bantam to Persia.

In contrast to the archipelagic setting of the dialogues, Bowrey’s very full preface situates the “true Malayo language” in the peninsula, and two of his dialogues portray an encounter, in a place outside the region, between two travellers, one English and one from the Peninsula. In his ninth dialogue the Englishmen answers questions about Christianity (this involves reproducing the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Commandments). In the tenth, however, the Englishman interrogates the Malay about the
Malay region from *Patani* in the north (tributary to *Siam*) through the peninsula, to Sumatra, Java, and Borneo, with detailed information on all the major coastal trading cities (including three pages on *Banjarmasseen*). In the early eighteenth century, the Dutch controlled major trading centres in the region, especially Batavia (a threat to the Malay-run Bantam), and Malacca. The main British interest was a modest fort in Bencoolen, rather out of the main routes, and Bowrey’s whole aim is expressed by the English traveller in this dialogue. The two hope to meet again:

> I had rather that meeting could be in those South-Sea Countries, where the *English* might gain great profits by Trade, if they would settle Factories in proper places.

Over the course of the nineteenth century British interests transferred to the peninsula, where British control was first established in the offshore islands of Penang (from 1786) and Singapore (from 1819), and, to a lesser extent, Borneo, while Dutch and Portuguese interests remained in other parts of the archipelago.

At this crucial period, when British colonial interests can be said to have really begun, appeared Marsden’s grammar and dictionary (1812a, 1812b), which was to be the standard treatment of Malay until Winstedt (1913). Marsden proudly uses real texts, not constructed dialogues, but it is worth mentioning that he situates the learner very differently from any of the books I am examining in this paper. His 21 texts range widely, but despite Marsden’s attachment to Sumatra as the source of the best Malay, there is a domination by the peninsula that was not present in the earlier texts. Two of Marsden’s texts are translations of the Bible. Of the rest, 11 are letters from members of peninsula royal families (10 of them to Francis Light, the founder of British Penang, and one to the ‘Governour General of Bengal’), 5 are literary texts, and two are historical documents from Sumatra. Marsden’s imagined learner is apparently a reader and writer of Malay as
well as a speaker, and his scholarly treatment and exemplary texts show his imagined learner to be someone operating at the highest social and linguistic level.

Keasberry’s book has no preface, but is published in Singapore by an author who was a long term resident (Abdullah 1843, transl. A H Hill, in Hill (ed) 1969:289f). Keasberry had spent most of his life in the Malay region, mostly in Singapore, but also in Batavia. After a period studying in America, he returned to Singapore as a Malay teacher and missionary. He was a pupil of Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir, usually known as Munshi (‘Teacher’) Abdullah. Born in 1797, Abdullah was a Malaccan of mixed Tamil, Yemeni and Malay background, coming from a highly educated family of religious teachers (his father had taught Marsden). Abdullah’s autobiography has become a classic of Malay literature and in the twentieth century his style came to be seen as a model for a modern but ‘pure’ type of Malay (Hill 1969:28).

Given the length and depth of Keasberry’s Malayan experience, it is surprising that his dialogues are (as we will see) so homogeneous. All 5 place the learner firmly in the urban parts of the peninsula. One is specifically set in Singapore.

Swettenham’s book (1881) was written explicitly for those in the Straits Settlements. When he wrote the Vocabulary he was the Assistant Secretary for Native Affairs, and was later to become Governor. He explains why he has chosen the topics and locations for his dialogues:

Some of the conversations, such as those with the Cook, Gardener, Syce, &c., are for the help of persons living in the Colony, and would naturally be held with Chinese or Tamils, Javanese and Boyanese. Others, such as the dialogues on a River, in the Jungle, during Disturbances, &c, may prove of use to those whose duties or pleasure take them into the Malay States.

(Swettenham 1881:viii)
The places mentioned in Swettenham’s dialogues include a number of very precise locations on the island of Singapore, Penang, and places in the (then) wilder parts of the peninsula. Shellabear (1899) unfortunately does not have dialogues that lend themselves to my method of analysis (he has carefully graded exemplary sentences), but his sentences suggest similar contexts to Swettenham’s.

Lewis (1947) acknowledges help from British scholars of Malay. She also identifies two men with Malay names (both barristers with degrees from Cambridge), and two women with Malay names, as having made “contributions to the conversations” (Lewis 1947:viii). The blurb of the second (post-colonial) edition of Lewis (1968) refers to the use in the book of “the romanised script authorised for Government publications in Malaysia”. Lewis does not reveal much about herself (not even her gender), but her sources of authority are all peninsular and she firmly situates her learner in Malaya, and in a Malay environment, not in the trading littoral of the wider region:

People will tell you that it is possible to ‘pick up’ Malay in a couple of months. So it is, if you are going to be content with the ‘bazaar’ Malay of the sea-ports. But if you are interested in language and wish really to know and understand the Malays, you will find that the initial confidence which such a method gives you will prove illusory and will be succeeded by a feeling of frustration.

(Lewis 1947/1968: xi)

Her book is aimed at someone who is beginning their study of Malay “before they reach Malaya.” Of those of her dialogues which can be located, 1 is set in Kuala Lumpur, and 5 in rural parts of the peninsula.

The two post colonial books are written by people with non-European names. Liaw (an ethnic Chinese) is identified in the preface as being in the Department of Malay at the National University of Singapore. No biographies or affiliations, most unusually, are supplied for Zaharah or Sutanto, and there is no preface. One of the authors has a Malay
name, and the other an Indonesian name. The locals have learnt English, so that they can
directly introduce the target language through the medium of English.

The two post-colonial books locate their imagined learner in the urban world of
Singapore and of the peninsula. Of those dialogues which can be more precisely located,
5 of Liaw’s dialogues are located in Singapore, and a sixth, which relates a road accident
in Malaysia, appears to be located in Singapore. Zaharah & Sutanto’s 10 locally located
dialogues are all in peninsula Malaysia (of these 2 are in Kuala Lumpur, 1 in Penang, and
1 on the East Coast of Malaysia). Two of their dialogues are overseas (one in London,
one in Washington DC).

Over the four hundred years of self-teaching books on Malay, we see a geographical
narrowing. The earliest books place the imagined learner in the coastal trading centres,
especially those of Java and Sumatra. In the colonial period the learner is situated in the
peninsula, and its urbanised islands, while the two post colonial texts firmly locate the
learner in one of the two independent countries of the peninsula, Malaysia or Singapore.
Malaysia locations appear to be entirely peninsular (‘West Malaysia’), rather than
including those parts of Malaysia on Borneo. With the exception of Swettenham (1881)
and Lewis (1947) the imagined learner operates in a heavily urban environment. Spalding
(1614), Bowrey (1701) and Zaharah & Sutanto (1995) do have one or two dialogues in
rural settings, but the characters are on horses or in cars en route to an urban centre.

The changing focus of location of the dialogues reflects the development of British
colonial interest in the region, which began in the trading ports across the whole region,
but came to be centred on the peninsula. The post-colonial texts reflect the post-1946
separation of the region into independent states with their own socio-political and
linguistic traditions.
Who is the learner

The characters of the dialogues are usually gendered and are sometimes named or characterised in a way that allows their geographical or ethnic origin to be established. Surprisingly few of these books include characters who appear in more than one dialogue. Where a character is clearly the same person in more than one dialogue (such as Liaw’s Tan Ah Lek, a Singaporean Chinese learning Malay, who appears in 5 of the dialogues, including the example in the Appendix) I have classified that character only once. However, if a character is not characterised much, and if there is no continuation of narrative from one dialogue to another, we cannot assume continuity of person even if there is a continuity of name. For example, Lewis has two characters with the name of ‘Ahmad,’ one a child who appears with his mother in two dialogues (in one of which she is named as ‘Aminah’) and one of whom is an adult, the husband of ‘Fatimah’. The only book in which this difficulty may give rise to misrepresentation is Keasberry’s, as his dialogues all contain a character identified as M[aster] and one or two others identified as S. The S character is a servant in 3 instances, but also a shopkeeper, a washerman, a shoemaker, and a poultry seller. In my calculations I have assumed that the M character is a single person, and that his servant is also one individual, but that the shoemakers, shopkeepers and so on are separate individuals. As the example in the Appendix illustrates, Swettenham’s dialogues degenerate into topic-linked lists of phrases, but all begin with a dialogic section.

Gender

Characters may be gendered by a pronominal reference in the English text (e.g. he, she), or by reference with a gendered term in either English, or Malay, or both (e.g. a man, washerman, Sir, Lord, lady medical officer, housewife, Mr, headman, mother, the girls, tuan, Mak, misi, saudara, saudari). Sometimes common sense allows identification (it’s
likely that the captains and sailors of a seventeenth century ship, whether an East
Indiaman or a ‘country ship’, would have been largely or wholly male). At times only the
name gives gender information (e.g. Fatimah, Asma, Mahmud).

Using all this information we can see that it is only in the later texts women become
potential learners of Malay (Table 2).

[Place Table 2 about here]

The placement of the imagined learner in a very male world indeed seems reasonable in
the two earliest texts, at a time when it is unlikely many British women would have been
moving around the region. Two of the females in Spalding are in the Dutch domestic
scene of his ninth dialogue, while the third is a woman who briefly speaks to the king in
the first dialogue (about a Gujarati sea captain encountering the local king). Even so,
these dialogues are supposed to place imagined learners in a situation where they might
wish to speak the language, and presumably the captains and traders of Spalding and
Bowrey’s world might have wanted to have conversation of one sort or another with local
women at times – certainly some of the exemplary sentences in Bowrey (e.g. He nipt the
nipple of her breast) suggest this. The absence of women from Keasberry and
Swettenham is more surprising, as by this time European women, including Keasberry’s
own American wife (Abdullah 1843, transl. A H Hill, in Hill (ed) 1969:290), were
certainly learning Malay. Liaw’s relatively low proportion of females probably reflects
the norm of gendered characters in books of this type (Gupta & Lee 1990). All the authors
except Lewis and Zaharah are male.

The learner in the dialogue
The imagined learner often appears in dialogues as a character with whom the actual
user of the book might identify -- the foreigner or the outsider who wants to learn Malay.
Such characters appear in many of the dialogues from all periods, but the identifying character can be a little hard to tease out. A speaker’s national or ethnic group is often explicitly identified by the author. Spalding (1614) and Lewis (1947) sometimes make explicit comments in introductory material or in notes. For example, Spalding normally introduces characters in headings (see Appendix), where, as in this example, we need to understand terms like *Germane* and *Indian* in their seventeenth century sense, and to use the Malay text for clarification when necessary (*orang Hollande*, ‘a Holland person’).

Lewis includes a number of cultural comments in footnotes on dialogues. For example, in her thirteenth dialogue, ‘An Invitation’, Che’Hawa comes to Che’Rakiah’s house to invite her to a wedding feast. ‘Makan-lah sireh’ says Che’Rakiah, which is glossed in English as ‘Help yourself to sireh’, and footnoted as follows (Lewis 1947:270):

> By this time the two women would be seated on the ground, on the creamy-green *mêngkuang* matting of the inner room. Che’Rakiah pushes the betel-nut box (*bêkas sireh*) across to Che’ Hawa, and there is a pause while they prepare their “quids” for chewing. The ingredients of a quid are: lime, gambier, tobacco, betel-nut and sireh leaf.

> Malays are never effusive in their manner of greeting, and in their conversations are usually quiet and leisurely, with few words and long pauses.

This is a very clear contextualisation. It is equally clear when characters identify themselves. In many of the dialogues of all the books, characters make self-revelation. For example Liaw’s first dialogue (1988:3, ‘About oneself’) sees Ahmad and Tan exchanging names, dates of birth, place of birth and nationality, thus identifying Tan as Singaporean and Ahmad as Malaysian.

When characters are given names (except in the two pre-colonial books, where names seem to be ethnically meaningless) they can predict a likely ethnicity -- a *Mary Tan* can be assumed to be an ethnic Chinese, and a *Mrs Brown* can be expected to be European. I also make the assumption than everyone with a Muslim name of a type that might be
carried by a ‘Malay’ is a Malay (Fatimah, Jamilah). I fully recognise (as I of all people, an ethnic European with an Indian surname, should) that names can mislead or be ambivalent: I have consistently gone for the obvious, on the assumption that the writer is working with stereotypes rather than with oddities (though Zaharah & Sutanto seem to be especially keen on names that give little away, such as Anthony, Sony, Susan). At other times identification must be inferential, and, as can be seen from the figures (Table 3) many dialogues do not allow for any inference. It seems reasonable to assume that a king is likely to be (in the widest sense of the word) ‘Malay’, and that shopkeepers and service providers are likely to be ‘local’, while in 1947 a district officer was bound to be British. A dialogue with only ‘Malays’ in it would have no potential learners, but a dialogue with locals of mixed ethnicity potentially does, as (more obviously) does a dialogue with a foreigner.

[Place Table 3 about here]

Foreigners (of whom 2 are identified as Dutch, one as Flemish, and one as Gujarati) appear in all but one of the Spalding dialogues that are located in the Malay region. Most of Bowrey’s foreigners are generic Europeans, though two are identified as English, and one is clearly not Dutch, as he is in competition for nutmegs with the Dutch captain. Keasberry’s master is “an European and a gentleman” (Keasberry 1862:71, fifth dialogue) of unknown nationality. Swettenham’s dialogues all have an identifiable male master-type, who can safely be assumed to be the potential learner and a European. In many dialogues this character places himself as an outsider by asking about local conditions, and in some cases comparing them to conditions in Europe (as in the discussion about the weather). Names are actually suppressed by Swettenham (Túan – –).

Lewis’s district officer must be British, and the others all have Anglo-Celtic surnames (White, Black, Brown and, anomalously, McNeill and Smith). All but one of Lewis’s
foreign characters are in the passages intended for the learner to translate from English to Malay, where presumably the identification of the learner with a character is intended to be stronger than where only reading is involved. No-one in Liaw’s book comes from outside the Malay region. Three of Zaharah & Sutanto’s foreigners are identified as English or British, two as American, and one more has an Anglo-Celtic surname (Smith!). Although both Lewis and Zaharah & Sutanto have a reasonable number of female characters, only one of Lewis’s foreigners (Mrs Brown, who gives commands to her gardener) is female, and while 6 of Zaharah’s foreigners can be identified as male, only two can be identified as female (one of the tourists, and Sue, a student in London, who explains a Trafalgar Square demonstration to the Malaysian Anthony) -- the business visitors and residents are all male.

In the pre-colonial and colonial books the learner is clearly imagined as a ‘European’ foreigner. This character is still around in the post-colonial period, at least in Zaharah & Sutanto (1995), published outside the region. Liaw, published within the region, concentrates on a different imagined learner, one whom we also see in Zaharah & Sutanto’s multicultural Malaysian dialogues. Apart from a handful of dialogues in which an educated guess at ethnicity of speakers is impossible, all the mixed-local dialogues in these books include at least one character who is identifiable as a Malay. So this imagined learner is a non-Malay local, using Malay in the company of Malays. In the earlier periods it would have been unthinkable that a local would have been learning Malay through the medium of English -- the acceptance of this in Liaw’s book especially is a clear reflection of the impact of the spread of English in the post-colonial period.

Malay as the major regional lingua franca has, since the mid-twentieth century, been threatened by the encroachment of English as an intra-national, as well as an international lingua franca (Gupta 1997). In a postcolonial context, where proficiency in English is a
marker of prestige, it may be seen as offensive to speak Malay cross-etnically -- the choice of English by an English-speaker may be seen as an implication that the hearer is unable to speak English (and is therefore uneducated). Because Malay is the national language of Malaysia in a very real sense, Malay is much more available as a lingua franca in Malaysia than it is in Singapore, where Malay is the national language only \textit{de jure}. The rare use of Malay as a lingua franca in post-1980s Singapore makes some of Liaw’s dialogues difficult to parallel in real life Singapore. In modern Singapore it is unlikely that (as happens in dialogue 6) a Chinese man coming to an office to visit another Chinese man would address an ethnic Indian office worker in Malay. Many of Liaw’s dialogues, perhaps responding to his own sense of implausibility in some of his settings, clearly position one participant as a learner, whose use of Malay is pedagogically motivated.

\textbf{Equality}

This is one of the hardest aspects of the dialogues to analyse. In order to consider the power relations between the learner and the speakers of Malay, I have examined the dialogues in an effort to determine what proportion of them show characters engaged in relatively egalitarian relationships, and what proportion show characters in which one is noticeably superior to the other.

I have classified the dialogues (with some caution) on the basis of both situational inequality and the pattern of social deixis (Levinson 1983:89f) revealing linguistic inequality.

- Some relationships are inherently hierarchical. The relationship of employee and employer is hierarchically determined, as is (in a different way) the relationship of a parent and a child. On the other hand, if characters are described as \textit{friends} or \textit{colleagues}, the relationship is being portrayed as equal.
- An asymmetry of style of address and reference reveals an unequal relationship.
Usually the asymmetry of a known relationship is reflected in the language, as, for example, when a business executive, Asmah, addresses her secretary as Maznah, while Maznah addresses Asmah as Puan Asmah, where ‘Puan’ is a title (Zaharah & Sutanto 1995:152). But sometimes the language is the only evidence of an unequal relationship, the information being present in either both the English and the Malay text, or (rarely) in just the English text, or (more commonly) in just the Malay text. This is the case when, in a conversation about the customs connected with getting rice from the barn, Che’Wan calls his companion Aminah and ‘Minah, but Aminah uses Che’Wan, where Che’ is a title. Where kinship terms are used these may reflect hierarchically ranked relationships (e.g. use of a kinship term for an elder sibling, terms of address for parents). The relationship of husband and wife where it occurs in these texts is linguistically egalitarian, and I have classed it as such.

The Malay text is especially helpful in determining the symmetry of the relationship, as, in first and second person singular reference especially, most varieties of Malay situate the relationship between speaker and addressee rather precisely by the use of pronominal, quasi-pronominal, and nominal self and addressee reference. The range of choice is extensive, with many options of great subtlety. Modern colloquial Malay even includes the possibility of using pronouns drawn from English (I and you).

The four most recent books have extensive and explicit discussion of this aspect of Malay and many of the dialogues in all books but Spalding (1614) allow for a straightforward identification of hierarchy. For example the extracts (Appendix) show the speakers using the following first and second person terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bowery</th>
<th>1st person</th>
<th>2nd person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>kita</td>
<td>tuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>kita</td>
<td>tuan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[incomplete information, but tuan likely to have been mutual, as it is between two friends in second dialogue.]
As we see from the example texts, a whole range of nominals may be used in the first person and second person. Some of these books (including Houtman, the writer of Spalding’s texts) identify some of the words as *pronouns* (Table 4).

Table 4 obviously cannot reflect in full the sophistication of some the treatments of personal reference in Malay in the more recent books, especially Lewis’s (1947:119f). Nor does it reflect the even greater complexity of what actually happens in the dialogues (let alone real life). Obviously, even in Spalding, something is going on in the first person and second person singular which isn’t happening elsewhere. Bowrey states:
The Second Person has several Words to express it by, according to the quality of the Person spoken to; as to a Person of Quality or Superior, tis proper to say [Tuan] Thou or You, to an Equal [Joo] Thou or You, to a Servant or Inferiour, [Packa-ne-ra] Thou or You.4

We know then that Bowrey was aware of social deixis, at least in the second person, and his dialogues are amenable to analysis in this respect. In some of the more complex dialogues we see speakers varying in both the first and second person depending on addressee. However, when we come to Spalding it is much harder to see any pattern of social deixis (and nor is Houtman of any help). Spalding’s eighth dialogue corresponds to Bowrey’s fourth, and personal reference is one of the (many) linguistic changes made by Bowrey in his adaptation of the same text (Table 5).

[Place Table 5 about here]

In this example there does seem to be social deixis in Spalding’s text, but these patterns are not clearly sustained in the book as a whole. In the first person singular, speakers use, apparently indiscriminately, aku, beta, (h)amba / (h)amma and in the second, equally randomly, tu(a)(‘)n (and once tuanna to a female), kamoe, angkou / en(g)(c)ko and kita5. Tuanko(e) does seem to be used only to kings, but otherwise it is hard to understand any overriding system given the rapid shifts between addresses, as for example when a character asks another (in the third dialogue) who he is and where he is from:

Orang appa enkou? derri manna tun datan?
person what 2ps from where 2ps come

Note the contrast with the first line of the extract in the Appendix, where the speaker uses kamoe in the same question. But what does the contrast mean? The same term can be used in a startling range of relationships. For example, tun is used in many very different relationships, including by a mother to her son (she also uses kamoe to him), and by a shepherd to a more socially elevated horseman (alongside kita). Spalding’s English text (like Bowrey’s) never uses thou, so that the only indication of status in the English is
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the occasional *My Lord*. Once again, it is necessary to bear in mind these uncertainties, which do not really affect the overall picture (Table 6). Where a dialogue has only 3 characters or fewer, I have classified the relationships between the dyads created in the discourse. I have not classified the very complex dialogues found in Spalding and Bowrey, in which a number of types of relationship are embodied, and this has the effect of slightly overstating the egalitarian.

*Place Table 6 about here*

This is a satisfyingly sandwich pattern, with the unequal discourses centred in the colonial period. The precolonial books centre on European traders who engage in trade and friendship with their local equivalents on an equal basis. They introduce their local equivalents to tobacco, while their local equivalents reassure them about the dangers of tigers.

In the two nineteenth century texts, the European is undoubted master, and every text but one in these two books includes a European giving orders to locals. The exception is Swettenham’s first dialogue, a discussion comparing the climates of Penang, Europe and China, in which the characters address each other as *Tûan*.

Most of Lewis’s texts deal mainly with hierarchical relationships among Malays (e.g. parent / child) but it is interesting that if we look at the 6 texts with an identifiable foreigner, all embody unequal relationships, and in 4 of them the local addresses the European as *tuan* (in one the local uses *ênche*, while in one the European is female, and is addressed by the statusful *mem*) -- no European addresses a local by *tuan* (they did in the pre-colonial texts). Lewis glosses *tuan* as “master, lord, owner” (p362). *Tuan* isn’t used at all in Liaw (1988) or Zaharah & Sutanto (1995), set in the new egalitarian world of modern Singapore and Malaysia. In Liaw the only dialogue in which address forms are
asymmetrical is one in a bookshop, where the book seller uses a respectful (by 1988 standards) *encik* in Malay and *Sir* in English. There are no ‘Europeans’ in Liaw’s book. Zaharah & Sutanto have a number of unequal workplace relationships (e.g. headteacher/senior teacher, boss/secretary) and family relationships. The Europeans participate only in equal relationships -- they are sometimes tourists seeking information from friendly tourist offices or policemen, and making friends with locals when hitchhiking (not in fact a common activity in Malaysia), but more often they are residents who are involved in business activities in Malaysia. Rather as in the pre-colonial period they are doing business on an equal basis with locals, and making friends with them.

Some of these dialogues have a light touch (especially Spalding, Bowrey, Keasberry, and Zaharah & Sutanto), drawing on various literary and cultural stereotypes. Keasberry’s S characters are servitors in the tradition of Figaro -- the Master has great difficulty getting his shirt collars starched, faces unreasonable difficulty getting fresh food, and is obviously paying over the odds for his shoes (this humour is largely lost in Swettenham’s rewrites). Some of Spalding’s and Bowrey’s dialogues are almost stageworthy – Spalding’s Dutch domestic dialogue presents complexities of life in an extended family full of rivalries and complex relationships (some of the family members are too fond of the bottle), and the characters in the dialogues from Bowrey (as in the example in the Appendix) clearly have a complex life beyond the pages of the book. In Zaharah & Sutanto characters tell tall stories, gossip maliciously, and chat each other up.

The balance of egalitarian and ranked relationships in these books, and especially the placement of foreigners in them, very clearly reflects the colonial interlude, when hierarchy dominated, and when Europeans were high in that hierarchy. The pre-colonial texts portray a world in which notions of white superiority had not yet emerged, while the post-colonial texts reflect the modern ideals of social and racial equity.
What does the learner want to do?

Table 7 shows the general picture. Of all the authors, Liaw is the least likely to give his dialogues a specific settings, but the anomalously low score for domestic setting is a real difference, linked to Liaw’s imagined learner being the local non-Malay, whose interaction with Malays is in the public rather than private domain. Conversely, the dominance of the domestic environment in Lewis is linked to her concentration on Malay among the Malays, in dialogues in which a potential learner rarely appears. The palatial and maritime settings of the pre-colonial texts, set against the educational and medical institutions of the later books, reflect the change in the times (although Spalding’s sea captains in two dialogues seek medical help for their crewmembers, along with the meat and fruit). In nineteenth century Singapore it appears (Keasberry and Swettenham) that vendors of various sorts were often summoned to the house – their dialogues are dominated by the obtaining of goods and services in a domestic setting. Although Keasberry includes no maritime settings, he does include a list of ‘Nautical words’. If these settings are compared to the settings of modern books aimed at teaching English speakers French, or Dutch, or Italian, it will be seen that the tourist environment usually dominates in those texts, whereas here it is rare -- a single tourist office in Zaharah & Sutanto, but no hotels or restaurants, or car hire offices. The imagined learner of Malay is not a tourist.

It can be hard to reduce the function of the conversation to something that can be displayed in tabular form (Table 8). There are no clear categories for this, and characters can mix business and pleasure in one dialogue, for example (especially in Spalding 1614, Bowrey 1701, and Zaharah & Sutanto 1995). However, Table 8 shows the general purpose of talk which these authors are presenting.
The three twentieth century texts illustrate a much wider range of contexts than the three earlier ones, with Lewis’s concentration on the domestic being again reflected in a great deal of personal talk. The earlier texts are functionally oriented, reflecting once again the pre-colonial traveller engaged in trade and some social activity, while Keasberry’s imagined learner is interested only in getting goods and services from menials, also a main concern for Swettenham’s, whose rather wider concerns included negotiating with local royalty, attacking a rebel fort, and setting up a plantation. Those who used Lewis’s book also were expected to need Malay to address domestic staff. Only in Liaw (1988) is the obtaining of goods and services unimportant -- represented by one bookshop where a Malay dictionary is bought. The types of transactions to be undertaken in the medium of Malay include especially the purchase of foodstuffs (Spalding, Bowrey, Keasberry, Swettenham, and Lewis), medical care (Spalding, Swettenham, Lewis, Zaharah & Sutanto) and business meetings (Spalding, Bowrey, Swettenham, Zaharah & Sutanto). Only the two postcolonial texts have dialogues in which the main focus is the sharing of biodata (as in the example from Liaw in the appendix). Other texts (including those in Spalding and Keasberry) include introductions and greetings, but do not focus on them. This is a common trope of modern language learning, in which the first lesson is typically to enable the imagined learner to give information about name and background to an interlocutor. The twentieth century books also include a certain amount of information on local culture, the focus being Malay rural culture in Lewis, Malay high culture in Liaw, and Malaysian culture and politics in Zaharah & Sutanto.

**Conclusion**

The way in which these books imagine the learner of Malay echoes the way in which the Malay region and the Malay language have been seen, and have been needed, by
English-readers. It is striking that over four hundred years of books for self-teaching of Malay, the imagined context of the learner has been so predominantly in the cosmopolitan world of work in the Malay littoral. Of these books, only Lewis devotes any substantial part of her dialogues to life among Malays, while, even in the recent books, the tourist, familiar from self-help books on European languages, is also almost entirely absent. Very few of the possible psychological, social and integrational motivations of the learner (Gardner & Lambert 1972, Schumann 1979) are exploited in these seven books.

Despite the rhetoric of the earlier books against anything looking like a contact variety, we can see that the dialogues in all periods imagine the learner as someone who reasonably could be expected to participate in this interethnic contact, and for whom the deplored contact varieties might be appropriate. Shellabear (1899) explicitly addresses this dilemma. He warns the learner against “those corruptions of the language which have come into use among the mixed populations of the large towns” (p iii), singling out the use of *kaseh* as an auxiliary verb, and the “continual use of the possessive particle *punya*”. He identifies both of these as “Chinese constructions, and in the Malay language they are quite unnecessary and very clumsy”. However, the needs of his students oblige him to teach aspects of this despised kind of Malay. For example:

> The Straits-born Chinese use the Chinese pronouns, *goa*, I, and *lu*, you, when conversing among themselves; and it has become common among Europeans in the Straits to use the pronoun *lu* when addressing the Chinese and Tamils. A Malay should never be addressed by this pronoun *lu*, which would be considered an affront.

(Shellabear 1899:6)

Benjamin (1993) accounts for how the complex patterns of Malay for insiders and for outsiders have given rise to a situation which is problematical for the linguist. It’s also problematical for the language teacher if the outsider is associated with certain linguistic varieties. The twentieth century books can escape the issue completely because they have
inherited a standard language which is seen as suitable for non-Malays. Analysis of the dialogues shows that only in Lewis is Malay presented as the language of the Malays -- rather in these books the Malay that is presented across the centuries is a regional lingua franca.

The boundaries of the region shrink in the colonial period to the central area of British involvement, which is the same region as that of the two post-colonial books -- the peninsula and Singapore (not Borneo, for some reason). To gain access to the rest of the region the modern learner must turn to books on Indonesian, although the two post-colonial books both reflect (in authorship and explicitly) the continued closeness of the two modern languages, even making reference, for example, to the increasing use in Malay of the pronoun anda, under Indonesian influence.

The colonial experience is clearly reflected in way in which the colonial dialogues place the imagined learner in a superior role, while the pre-colonial and post-colonial dialogues reflect a shared assumption that the learner needs to function across a range of hierarchical relationships with interlocutors.
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Appendix
This appendix contains representative texts (or extracts from them) of the seven books.

Spalding 1614: Extract from the second dialogue (p10f)

**THE SECOND DI-ALOGVE FOR THE BVY-ing of victuals and diuers prouision, when you come to a strange coun-tree. And the persons talking together are a certaine Germane, and In-dian, and a King.**

...  
I. But who are ye? & whence come you?  

G. Wee are good men, and brought from farre countries.  
I. What is your countries name?  
G. Our countrey is called Holland.  
I. But wherefore came you hither?  
G. Wee came hither driuen by contrary tempest, to buy some fresh victuals, for we haue been long tossed in the sea.  
I. It is well. I will declare vnto the King, that strange ships are come.  
G. If you please, I will send two men with you to the King.  
I. Goe to, doe as you please.  
G. What meaneth so great a multitude of armed men comming hither? what sound of trumpets and cornets doe I heare?  
I. The King commeth there with all his princely traine.  
G. If this be so, I my selfe will go to meete him, that I may giue him honour and reuerence.  
I. Goe to, let vs go together.

**IANG DVA BAR-CATTA SAMMA TATCAL-la moela sampey dálam satoe ne-gri dagang, ken bly maccanan-satoe orang Hollande, satoe orang Indiaen, deng’an rayia di’a.**

...  
I. Orang appa kamoe? derri manna datan kamoe?  
D. Kyta orang baick, datan dérri negry iáou.  
I. Appannama negry kamoe.  
D. Negry kyta namma Hollanda.  
I. Appa bowat engkou de siny.  
D. Kyta datan siny carna angin sallach, iang mau bly maccánan, carna kyta adda lamma de láoet.  
I. Baick beta pegy somba ken Sultan, iang cappal dagang adda datan.  
D. Iicka túan mau, beta soeroh dúa órang sarta moe pada rayia.  
I. Baick beta káboel.  
D. Boat appa datan bagytoe óorang banta sammoenia tanggong siniatá? lagy beta deng’ar boenij namfierrí deng’an seroney.  
I. Itoe Sultaen deng’an rayat di’a.  
D. Bagitée? beta pegi díri hambaken somba áken dúa.  
I. Baick. pégy dúa kyta.

Bowrey 1701: first dialogue

A Dialogue Between Two Friends.

Relate to me the matter you would have told me of yesterday.  
I received a letter which advertizes that our friend Joseph after a long melancholy

Tootoorawn antāra sóbat dua óran.

Chéritra can pada ko hāl étoo éang cālam arree maoo bree taoō pada ko,  
Kitta sooda tārēma soorat éang bree taoō cāmee poonea sóbat Joesoof cōmādēan
jumpt into a well and drowned himself.

Truly I am sorry, for every body counted him a sober and wise man.

And very rich, besides his house furnished with very rich ornaments.

Has he any children.
Only one son.
How long has his wife been dead.
Seven years.
Will you drink a cup of wine.
Yes if mingled with water.
Will you smoak tobacco.
I am not yet used to it.
Will you walk in the plain lands.
What in the heat of the day.
We can walk under the shade of the trees,
besides the wind is cool.
Il'e accompany you.

M. Now take all the things out of the room and put them in the sun.
S. What things, Sir?
M. Get every thing out, for I want to have the room washed.
S. Very well, Sir.
M. Make haste in taking out the things, do not be so long about it.
S. They are all out, Sir.
M. Have you counted all the things?
S. Yes Sir, there are 7 tables, and 12 chairs.
M. How many cloths are there?
S. There are in all 32 pieces of cloths.
M. Well, stay here, and if it should rain take them in quick.
S. Very well, Sir.
M. Where have you been, just now it rained, and the cloths are quite wet?
S. I only went home to my meal, Sir.
M. Why! did not you see it was going to

Keesaberry 1862: Extract from the first dialogue (p49f)

M: Master; S: Servant

CONVERSATION WITH A SERVANT

...
The gardener is waiting, Sir.

To-night there are some people dining here, get a good many flowers and arrange them on the dinner table.

What kind of flowers would you like?

Whatever you can get will do.

Go to the gardens and ask the gardener, he will give you some; take a basket to put them in.

There are no red flowers, Sir.

Never mind, get some pretty leaves.

The garden is like a jungle.

I think you are lazy.

I have no implements, Sir, how can I work properly?

What tools do you want?

I will give you money and you can buy.

You had better buy about twenty flower pots, and put the flowers into them.

This road is very bad, mend it.

Break some stones small and put them on the road, and then lay sand on the top.

The grass in the garden is very high, cut it shorter.

That is not enough it must be shorter than that.

Lewis 1947: Sixth Dialogue (p146f)

Emak dengan Anak

Aminah: Mat! Chepat-lah minum kopi. Matahari ’dah tinggi. Bila lagi ’nak bergerak ka sekolah?

Ahmad: ‘Mak, minta duit lima sen.
Ahmad: Kalau ’mak ’nak ka-kedai petang ’karang tunggu-lah sampai saya lepas sekolah ugama, boleh saya ikut sama.
Ahmad: Baik-lah, ’mak.

Mother and Child
Aminah: Mat! Come and have your breakfast quickly. It’s late. When in the world are you going to start for school?
Ahmad: Mother, give me five cents, will you?
Aminah: What a boy you are! Just now your father gave you fifteen cents and now you are asking for more.
Ahmad: Don’t be mean Mother! The money that Father gave me I am going to spend on a pencil, and a pen, and some paper. If you won’t give me another five cents I shall go hungry when play-time comes.
Aminah: Well, here you are. Here’s five cents. But remember, don’t come asking for money tomorrow, to buy them over again. Hurry up and put your baju on, or you’ll be late for school.
Ahmad: If you are going shopping this afternoon, wait until I come out of Koran school, then I can come with you,
Aminah: I shan’t be going this afternoon. Tomorrow afternoon, we’ll go together. Good!
Ahmad: Good!

Liaw 1988: Seventh Dialogue (p93f)

Berkenalan

Tan: Maaf, siapa nama saudara?
(Excuse me, what is your name?)

Hadi: Nama saya Hadi. Siapa nama saudara?
(My name is Hadi. What is yours?)

Tan: Nama saya Tan. Apa pekerjaan saudara?
(My name is Tan. What is your occupation?)

Hadi: Saya pelajar.
(I am a student.)

Tan: Oh, saudara masih belajar? Di mana saudara belajar?
(Oh, you are still studying? Where do you study?)
Hadi:  *Saya belajar di Sekolah Menengah Serangoon.*
(I study at Serangoon Secondary School.)

Tan:  *Saudara orang Singapurakah?*
(Are you a Singaporean?)

(No. I am not a Singaporean. I am an Indonesian.)

Tan:  *Patutlah saudara pandai bercakap bahasa Melayu. Mengapa saudara tidak belajar di Indonesia?*
(No wonder you can speak Malay very well. Why didn’t you study in Indonesia?)

Hadi:  *Bapa saya menghantar saya belajar di Singapura. Dia mahu saya pandai bercakap bahasa Inggeris.*
(My father sent me to study in Singapore. He wants me to be able to speak good English.)

Tan:  *Sudahkah saudara pandai bercakap bahasa Inggeris?*
(Can you speak English fluently?)

Hadi:  *Bolehlah, sedikit-sedikit.*
(Yes, a bit.)

---

**Zaharah & Sutanto: Seventeenth Dialogue (p92f)**

**Pukul berapa mesyuarat?**

Chong has a reputation for turning up late at meetings and he is forever missing appointments. Fatimah, his colleague, is anxious that he should turn up to a crucial board meeting on time, as it is rumoured that his promotion is on the agenda. Fatimah tries to persuade her laid-back colleague to be more organized.

FATIMAH:  Pukul berapa mesyuarat esok?

CHONG:  Tak tabulah. Mungkin petang.

FATIMAH:  Kau mesti tahu masa yang tepat. Kalau tidak, terlambat pula!

CHONG:  Oh, ya menurut surat ini, **pukul 3.15 (pukul tiga suku).**

FATIMAH:  Semua dokumen-dokumen sudah siap?

CHONG:  Belum, tapi masih ada banyak masa lagi. Bila saya sampai pejabat pada **pukul 8.30 (pukul lapan setengah),** saya harus berjumpa Ketua Kerani, kemudian bolehlah saya habiskan surat-surat itu.

FATIMAH:  Bukankah kau mesti berjumpa Encik Rama pula pada pukul **12.45 (pukul dua belas tiga suku)?** Mana ada masa untuk membuat kerja itu? Habiskanlah hari ini sebelum kau pulang!

CHONG:  Tak boleh. Sekarang sudahpun **kurang lima minit pukul 5.00.** Kawan saya akan datang jempit saya pada pukul **5.15 (pukul lima suku).**

FATIMAH:  Kalau kau tak selesaikan kerja itu sebelum mesyuarat kau akan lambat lagi dan semua orang tertunggu-tunggu nanti! Bawalah kerja itu balik dan habiskan di rumah!
CHONG: Itu satu canangan yang baik. Selepas pulang dari berdansa malam ini, saya akan habiskan! Saya pasti habis dalam masa dua jam.

**What time is the meeting?**

FATIMAH: What time is the meeting tomorrow?
CHONG: Don’t know. Perhaps in the afternoon.
FATIMAH: You must know the exact time. If not you’ll be late again!
CHONG: Oh yes, according to this letter, (it is at) 3.15 (a quarter past three).
FATIMAH: Are all the documents ready?
CHONG: Not yet, but there’s still plenty of time. When I reach the office at 8.30 (half past eight), I have to meet the Chief Clerk, only after that can I finish those letters.
FATIMAH: Aren’t you meeting Mr. Rama too at 12.45 (three quarter of an hour past twelve)? Where is the time for you to do the work? Finish them today before you go home!
CHONG: (I) can’t. It’s already five minutes to five. A friend is fetching me at 5.15 (a quarter past five).
FATIMAH: If you don’t finish the work before the meeting, you’ll be late again and everyone will be kept waiting! Bring home the work and finish it at home!
CHONG: A good idea. I’ll finish it after the dance tonight. I’ll be sure to finish it in two hours.
**Tables** [to be inserted at appropriate places]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of dialogues</th>
<th>Dialogues with 2 speakers</th>
<th>Dialogues with 3 speakers</th>
<th>Dialogues with more than 3 speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spalding 1614</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowrey 1701</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keasberry 1862</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swettenham 1881</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis 1947</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaw 1988</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaharah &amp; Sutanto 1995</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**: Number of characters in dialogues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of characters identifiable as male</th>
<th>Number of characters identifiable as female</th>
<th>percentage of gendered characters male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spalding 1614</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowrey 1701</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keasberry 1862</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swettenham 1881</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis 1947</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaw 1988</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaharah &amp; Sutanto 1995</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**: Gender of characters in dialogues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dialogues with identifiable foreigner</th>
<th>Number of dialogues involving ‘locals’ only, but of mixed ethnicity / nationality</th>
<th>Number of dialogues involving only ‘Malays’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spalding 1614</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowrey 1701</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keasberry 1862</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swettenham 1881</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis 1947</td>
<td>6 2 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaw 1988</td>
<td>17 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaharah &amp; Sutanto 1995</td>
<td>9 7 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Ethnic and national mix in dialogues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 sg</th>
<th>2 sg</th>
<th>3 sg</th>
<th>1 pl</th>
<th>2 pl</th>
<th>3 pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houtman 1603 (p183f)</td>
<td>amba,</td>
<td>tun, tun,</td>
<td>dya</td>
<td>kyta</td>
<td>kamoe</td>
<td>orangdia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beta,</td>
<td>packa-ne-ra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ako</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowrey 1701</td>
<td>aako,</td>
<td>joo, tuan,</td>
<td>dea</td>
<td>caame</td>
<td>kaamoo</td>
<td>deóran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kitta</td>
<td>packa-ne-ra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keasberry 1862</td>
<td>aku,</td>
<td>angkau, tuan,</td>
<td>iya,</td>
<td>kita,</td>
<td>kamu,</td>
<td>dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sahya,</td>
<td>inchi</td>
<td>dia</td>
<td>kami</td>
<td>kamu</td>
<td>orang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hamba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>orang</td>
<td>orang</td>
<td>marika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swettenham 1881</td>
<td>sahya,</td>
<td>Tūan(M)</td>
<td>dia</td>
<td>kiti,</td>
<td>kiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>âku</td>
<td>angkau, awak (+</td>
<td></td>
<td>kami</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+ regional variations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; info. on royal forms and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written forms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 4:** Pronouns identified in the books (those identified as ‘informal’ or similar in italics; those identified as especially elevated underlined; all ungendered except where shown).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 sg</th>
<th>2 sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Houtman/Spalding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bowrey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Houtman/Spalding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bowrey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant to Partner</td>
<td>beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant to King</td>
<td>hamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King to Merchant</td>
<td>ako</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5:** Comparison of social deixis in Spalding’s eighth dialogue and Bowrey’s fourth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equal relationship</th>
<th>Unequal relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spalding 1614</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowrey 1701</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keasberry 1862</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swettenham 1881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis 1947</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaw 1988</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaharah &amp; Sutanto 1995</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6**: Number of dialogues showing egality in relationships of characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic / hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public place (including in or on modes of land transport)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On ship (sea &amp; river)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7**: The setting of the dialogues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of talk</th>
<th>1614</th>
<th>1701</th>
<th>1862</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing bio-data</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal talk, news, invitations, domestic plans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-political issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural topics / tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transacting goods &amp; services (including medicine &amp; war)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Types of talk.

1 I have benefitted from comments on this paper, both when it was in draft form, and during discussion when it was presented orally. I would especially like to thank John Barnard, Geoffrey Benjamin, Michael Brennan, Avijit Gupta, Clive Upton, and Katie Wales.
2 Bowrey’s pages are unnumbered.
3 It must be remembered that at this period the region referred to as India was much more extensive than the subcontinent. Marsden is of course referring to the Malay region here, which was very much part of India.
4 Square brackets are in original.
5 The two twentieth century books identify kita as 2 pl inclusive, contrasting with kami exclusive. Keasberry and Swettenham have it as 1pl, Bowrey has it as 1 sg, and Spalding as 1 pl and 2 ps sg.
6 ‘Foreigner’ presented as a non-local in the Malay region. Spalding’s dialogues with a Low Country setting are not being counted here.