

misprinted others (e. g., p. 19, “sù” (sic) for “sù” [history]). The translation rectifies some errors but then goes on to add supposed clarifications where the original was silent. For example, the original lists a series of Vietnamese vowels (p. 26), namely “a, o, o, u, u” which would confuse the layman, but which the specialist would easily guess was meant to read “a, o, o, u, u.” The translation (p. 19) reads “a, o, ò, u, ù,” substituting an inaccurate tone mark for the missing vowel sign. Such minor irritants do little to impair the general value of the work, but they ensure that one can never quote it with complete safety.

Review by a specialist would have also eliminated transparent oversights such as Hawke’s (p. 19) supposing that the Italian word *ghermire* was actually Vietnamese for “to catch,” but the translator would not have been protected against the incessant small errors that were never eliminated from the original, particularly from the first part of the book, that written by Maurice Durand. Here, however, one must be careful not to infer that the section written by Durand was as he would have wanted, because that fine scholar died before the book had been proofed.

STEPHEN O’HARROW  
*University of Hawaii*

**Maritime Trade and State Development in Early Southeast Asia.** By KENNETH R. HALL. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1985. xvi, 368 pp. Maps, Figures, Photographs, Endnotes, Bibliography, Index. \$25 (cloth); \$14.95 (paper).

The influence of maritime trade on state development has been a common theme in university lectures on Southeast Asian history for at least twenty years; and it is accepted that trade routes and their shifts were crucial in the formation and decline of “Funan,” several early peninsular and Indonesian “states,” post-tenth century eastern Java, Pegu, and Ayutthaya. A rough bipolar typology of states has also been accepted: the coastal trading areas and the inland agrarian states of which Cambodian Angkor (and seventh- to eighth-century pre-Angkor) and Burmese Pagan are prime examples.

The task for historians now is to flesh out the picture with additional details about trade and socioeconomic information about the Southeast Asian states, and their interactions. Because most primary sources are not explicit about such matters, much historical synthesis must depend on inference, a legitimate procedure as long as the inferences are solidly based on evidence, not merely hypotheses. Any such new work must critically examine both the original sources and the interpretations of earlier generations of scholars; and the new syntheses must rigorously avoid source “consumerism”—the treatment of all previous writing as more or less true and as repositories of details that may be selected to fit the new theory in vogue.

However, Kenneth Hall often shows ignorance of the latest work; he resolutely refuses to attempt any source criticism; he frequently draws illegitimate inferences from material that he does not fully understand; and he misuses the work of others.

Chapters 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 have been reprinted from previous publications with few changes. The book has no central concept; the area treatment is uneven; and there are contradictory statements among and even within some chapters. These faults are illustrated in the treatment of Cambodia, which inevitably occupies much of the book, because its earliest recognized manifestation, Funan, is the first recognized Southeast Asian state and the clearest example of one based on maritime trade.

Funan's ethnic character is uncertain, and an innovation by Hall is to assert that the population was Malay (pp. 53–54, 64, 70, 74). Then he confusingly says that “funan” is Khmer *bnam* (mountain), a view increasingly in doubt. Certainly, Khmer rulers were never known as “kings of the mountain.”

Hall also strays in “Political Transitions in Fifth-Century Funan” (pp. 68–69). Seventh-century inscriptions indicate that no Funan ruler had “chang[ed] all the rules according to the custom of India”; there is no record of an “Indian dating system” before A.D. 611; there is no date 478 in Gunavarman's inscription (p. 71), which does not name King Jayavarman, as is clear from Coedès' *Etats* (p. 117). I would agree that “pre-fifth-century succession . . . was dependent on the candidate having royal blood” (p. 70), but Hall contradicts his earlier assertion that Funan kings were individual “men of prowess” (pp. 50–53).

Furthermore, no Funan monarch is “known in inscriptions as the ‘King of Vyādhapura’” (p. 76); and the alleged reference of note 88 is misused. Chams may have “moved to fill the power void” as Funan declined, but the idea is based ultimately on a misconstrual of the Vo'-Canh inscription (p. 76; see also pp. 64, 67, 178). Totally wrong is the statement that “the agrarian population [sixth-seventh centuries] moved . . . to the Khmer ruler's developing economic base in the Tonle Sap area” while “Funan's ricelands quickly reverted to swamp and jungle” (p. 77). An impressive epigraphic corpus shows those lands flourishing all through the seventh century and a direct political continuity from “Funan,” although that term is unknown. The *political* shift to Angkor, with no evidence of neglect of southern ricelands, did not occur until the eighth-ninth centuries.

In chapter 6, the sections on “Khmer Religion” and “Jayavarman II's Devaraja Cult” (pp. 138–48) were entirely obsolete before Hall's book went to press. Historians have agreed that *devarāja* was not “god-king,” that it did not formalize the royal worship of Śiva, and that it was to be distinguished from Śivalinga with royal names, that is, *Indreśvara*. Nor was Jayavarman II's capitol Hariharalaya on a mountain.

The status of Angkor's hydraulic works is in doubt, but Hall has attempted to reconcile the irreconcilable in synthesizing the views of Van Liere and Groslier, drawing now one conclusion, now another (chap. 3, n. 93, pp. 146–47, 161, 170, 186).

If Hall's detailed discussion of temple economic functions (pp. 161–65) is at least faithful to current scholarship, it has been entirely lifted from L. Sedov's *Angkor Empire* (pp. 170–72 in the original Russian). Everything from the second paragraph of p. 162 to the last paragraph of p. 163 (except fig. 5), including note 90 (Sedov's pp. 170–71) should be in quotation marks with attribution to Sedov.

In chapter 7 Hall attempts to show the reign of Sūryavarman I (pp. 1002–1049) as a period of royally sponsored commercial expansion. Nearly all the crucial details are wrong. It is doubtful that *khlon jnval* were merchants (p. 171). *Vanik* is “merchant” by etymology, but no evidence indicates that they were itinerant merchants as opposed to resident vendors. The source in note 6 does not show what Hall claims, and *kamstein* were not “retinues,” but *always* individuals. The eighteen merchants identified in A.D. 1042 (p. 175) were not merchants, but *vap*, a hierarchical title of uncertain significance. It requires real imagination to speak of Sūryavarman “establishing standards of weights and measures” or to allege royal “surveys of commercial activity” (pp. 173, 175).

One area in which the influence of trade could be interestingly invoked is the shift of state center from Central to Eastern Java, but Hall has neglected his own subject to give emphasis to old-fashioned idealistic and catastrophic explanations (pp. 126–28). Moreover, in his outline of “The Śailendra Era in Javanese History” (pp.

108–114), Hall accepts uncritically a reconstruction thoroughly demolished by Louis Damais in 1968, while ignoring most of the recent work in Javanese epigraphy, on which evidence for the nature of the Javanese state depends.

At best, this book contains a number of interesting working hypotheses, not yet ready for presentation as conclusions. Where it is unobjectionable, it is not original, and most of the attempts at originality have misfired.

MICHAEL VICKERY  
*University of Adelaide, Australia*

**The Maloh of West Kalimantan.** By VICTOR T. KING. Dordrecht-Holland: Foris (Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde, no. 108), 1985. viii, 265 pp. Maps, Photographs, Tables, Figures, Appendix, Endnotes, Glossary, Bibliography, Indexes. \$12 (paper).

For generations, until the end of the last decade, small parties of Maloh silver-smiths traveled unmolested among the perennially warring peoples of west-central Borneo. Enjoying immunity from attack, they journeyed from longhouse to longhouse, especially among the Sarawak Iban, fashioning ornamental headdresses, girdles, and other fine brass- and silverwork for their hosts before returning again to their homes in the upper Kapuas region of West Kalimantan.

In 1962, the then curator of the Sarawak Museum, Tom Harrisson, took under his care three Maloh aristocrats, entrusting them to the inspired Iban ethnographer Benedict Sandin who engaged them in a series of long-running conversations. An annotated summary of their content was published in the *Sarawak Museum Journal* (vol. 12, 1965). This fascinating, if overly formalized, sketch of traditional Maloh culture was our only extended account of the Maloh until this book appeared. In his introductory notes to the *Sarawak Museum Journal* summary, Harrisson expressed pessimism that, by the time a trained fieldworker studied the Maloh in their home setting, much of their rapidly eroding traditional culture would be lost. In part, *The Maloh of West Kalimantan* bears out Harrisson's prediction. Its author, Victor King, lecturer in Southeast Asian sociology at the University of Hull, makes the historical situation of the Maloh a major concern of his study, and, by retrieving a significant record of their past, traces in detail changes in the structure and nature of Maloh society that have occurred from the nineteenth century on as a result of contacts with surrounding indigenous groups, Malay and Chinese traders, Christian missionaries, and colonial and post-independence governments. The result is a first-rate work of social and historical analysis.

Maloh society, like that of a number of other central Bornean peoples, is markedly stratified, and the primary focus of *The Maloh of West Kalimantan* is on social ranking. The book centers in particular on what its author describes as "relationships between observed conditions of inequality and [Maloh] ideology of superiority and inferiority"; factors generating, and maintaining, formal inequality; and the historical development of Maloh ranking and its comparative analysis in relation to other systems of indigenous stratification in Borneo, most notably those of the Kenyah, Kayan, and Kajang-Melanau groups (pp. 4–5). The terms of analysis are essentially Weberian.

Materials in each chapter are related to the focal theme of ranking. Thus, King tells us, the Maloh defined themselves in hierarchical terms, and their traditional institutions of social inequality were maintained historically by both internal mech-