

Michel Foucault and The Malay Author

HARRY AVELING

ABSTRAK

Kebenaran yang terdapat dalam Hikayat Raja-Raja Pasai dan Sejarah Melayu ialah kenyataan yang dibenarkan oleh kerajaan Samudra-Pasai dan Melaka. Ceritera pengislaman Samudera-Pasai yang terdapat di HRP diubahsuai semula oleh pengarang SM sehingga kerajaan Sumatera Utara itu besar dalam teks yang kedua itu. Teks SM tidak diciptakan oleh pengarangnya. Menurut pemikir Perancis yang cukup terkenal, Michel Foucault, sebuah teks selalu menciptakan penulisnya. Dan pengarang terbentuk dari konvensi-konvensi yang sudah ada, konvensi literair.

ABSTRACT

The paper uses of example of the different ways in which the Islamisation of Samudra-Pasak is recounted in Hikayat Raja-Raja Pasai and Sejarah Melayu to suggest that the aim of these Malay literary chronicles is "to produce truth" for the glory of the kingdom rather than recount objective fact. Following Foucault, it is further proposed that the role of "the author" of the Sejarah Melayu was to give form to a written text in accordance with the principles of historical literary discourse characteristic of the genre before and after him; he is no way an individual writer concerned to impress his unique personality onto a new a original work.

In the volume *Teori dan Kritikan Sastera Melayu Tradisional* by Noriah Taslim (1993 : 19) we find the following "quotation" from the French Scholar Michel Foucault:

Like any heritage, like any field of knowledge, Malayistics - the corpus of texts, written in English, that discuss things Malay, just a small fregment in the nebula of western knowledge - is an unstable assemblage of faults and fissures and heterogeneous layers, each operating from a set of rules and regulations that censures certain problems, secludes certain perspectives and restricts the collection of knowledge.¹

Few scholars of Malay Studies would, I think disagree with the judgement of "texts written in English" which is advanced here.

As Noriah Taslim goes on to say, the Western reading of Malay Literature begins from a fragmentary and limited paradigm, which it nevertheless considers the correct and appropriate way of confronting all reality and answering all possible questions.

In fact, as she continues, it is perfectly natural to interpret new knowledge in the terms of the knowledge which we already possess and trust. When confronted with Malay culture, the west found no difficulty in using its own models and formulae of understanding. Its mistake was, however, to believe that western knowledge was the most accurate and appropriate way of assessing the products of a very different culture. Western patterns of logic were not suitable for the very distinctive cultural dynamics of Malay Literature, formed as it was by the way Malay society perceived the world.

Malay textual knowledge is different from western textual knowledge. This is a crucial insight and one which has been increasingly explored over the last two decades by writers such as Errington, Sweeney and Maier, as well as by Mohammad Haji Salleh and Noriah Taslim herself.

The consequence has been a greater respect for the internal consistency and strength of the Malay Literary tradition. They have taught us to see Classical Malay Literature as a series of non-absolute written texts, available for oral (and improvised) recitation, to an emotionally responsive (and usually aristocratic) audience. To borrow Peter Worsley's words (1972):

The narrative has a logic of its own, it possesses an inner necessity, a built in propelling force, determined by the laws of the story as such.

In this paper I would like to explore the nature and role of the Malay "author" as this function has been developed at one point in time. My efforts will be guided by a further two "propositions" put forward by the same Michel Foucault (1984:74) as "suggestions to be further tested and evaluated". These propositions are that:

Truth is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statements.

And

Truth is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extends it. A 'regime' of truth.

THE REGIME OF THE SEJARAH MELAYU

Winstedt (1969: 158) has described the *Sejarah Melayu* as "the most, famous, distinctive and best of all Malay literary works". As M. Khalid Taib (1993:3) points out, however, there are not one but at least three versions of the *Sejarah Melayu*:

1. a "fragmentary" version, distributed over six manuscripts;
2. two short versions, consisting respectively of five and two manuscripts each; as well as
3. two long versions, consisting respectively of nine and one manuscripts.

Here my remarks will be confined to two edited texts, the manuscript Number 18 of the Raffles collection as edited by Sir Richard Winstedt (1938), and the romanised text edited in 1909 by W.G. Shellabear (1984). Winstedt suggests that the bulk of the first text may be dated about 1535 at the latest and the second at 1612.

The exordium of the Raffles ms No. 18 is quite short. It begins with a few short conventional sentences in Arabic, then settles itself in the year 1021 A.H., on the twelfth of the month Rabi' u'l-awal, on a Sunday, at the hour of morning prayer, during the reign of Sultan Ala' u'd-din Ri'ayat Shah, who had a settlement at Pasir Raja.

At that time, we are told, Seri Nara Wangsa - that is, Tun Bambang, the son of Sri Agar, Raja Patani - came bearing an order from Yang Pertuan di Hilir ("His Highness Downstream", as Winstedt translates, p. 39):

Bahawa hamba minta diperbuatkan hikayat pada Bendahara, peraturan segala raja-raja Melayu dengan isti'adatnya supaya didengar oleh anak cucu kita yang kemudian dari kita dan diketahuinya segala perkataan syahadan beroleh fa'idahlah mereka itu daripadanya.

I ask the Bendahara to make me a *hikayat*, on the lineage of the Malay rulers and their customs, which can be heard by our grandchildren who come after us and that they may know these words and benefit from them.

Aware of his own weaknesses and lack of knowledge, the '*Fakir*' (wretched pilgrim) then prayed for the blessing of God and His Prophet before setting about to compile the chronicles of the men of days long past ("*himpunkan daripada segala riwayat orang tuha-tuha dahulu kala*") for the pleasure of the king ("*supaya akan menyukakan duli hadrat baginda*"). Finally, he asks the reader to be considerate of the imperfections of his text, and to speak of the greatness of God and not His essence.

The exordium of the Shellabear text is much fuller. It begins with a very long Arabic passage, which Winstedt (p. 35) insists is "cribbed word for word from the Bustanu's - Salatin which was begun in 1638 A.D.". Following reference to his own weakness and lack of knowledge, as in the previous text, the Shellabear text then tells a different story to its predecessor:

pada suatu masa bahwa fakir duduk pada suatu majlis dengan orang besar-besar bersenda-gurau. Pada antara itu ada seorang orang besar, terlebih mulia dan terlebih besar martabatnya daripada yang lain, maka berkata ia kepada fakir, 'Hamba dengar ada hikayat Melayu dibawa oleh orang dari Goa; barang kita perbaiki kiranya dengan isti'adatnya, supaya diketahui oleh segala anak cucu kita yang kemudian daripada kita, dan boleh diingatkannya oleh segala mereka itu, syahdan adalah beroleh faedah ia daripadanya.

at one time I was sitting in a group of nobles who were engaged in light conversation. Among these men was a noble, who was greater and of a higher degree than the rest. He said to me, I hear that there a Malay *hikayat*, which has been brought here by men

from Goa. Perhaps we can improve it by adding details of our customs, so that it can be known by these our grandchildren who will come after us and can be remembered by them and that they will derive benefit from it.

The Shellabear text next gives full details of the *fakir*, whose name was Tun Muhammad and nickname Tun Seri Lanang, whose title was Paduka Raja, Bendahara. It lists six generations of his ancestors, back to the king Mani Purindan, a Malay from Bukit Siguntang Mahameru. Then it provides the date as before (although, apparently incorrectly, placing this on a Thursday and not a Sunday), and provides a long genealogy of the king, who is described as having died in Aceh (*yang mangkat di Aceh*). Finally it further describes "Raja Dewa Said... Sri Nara Wangsa named Tun Bambang, the son of Sri Akar, Raja patani" and provides fulsome praise of him as well.

Having done all this, the text repeats the command as above (clearly showing, I would suggest, the interpolation of Tun Seri Lanang), adds a few extra prayers for strength, and then ends with the same warning to consider the greatness of God and not His essence.

What are we to make of the differences between the two texts? Muhammad Haji Salleh (1991) makes a great deal of the text. The "cribbed" Arabic passage, he tells us, "has the manifold function of prayer, praise, invocation, capsule history of creation and lastly, but also very importantly, orientates in as many ways as possible, the author or composer to his world". It is an opening ritual which he performs "With a strong sense of temporariness, the weaknesses and the frailty of human beings" (p.10)

The use of the term "*fakir*" is a double act of humility, serving to link the author to his community, for whose "values and ways" he is a spokesman, and to God, who has knowledge of everything while the author had knowledge of only a little.

Muhammad admits "a tinge of boastfulness" in the author's genealogy. Winstedt describes this passage as "vainglorious", something which is simply "not done" among Malays, and a sure sign that the passage is an interpolation after Sri Lanang's passing (1938 : 36). Muhammad prefers to justify it as a way of "putting all them as surety for his words, for the truth of his work" (p.11).

The praise of the King, Paduka Seri Alau'-din Riayat Shah; his brother, later to become Sultan Abdullah Maayah Shah; and the noble, Tun Bambang - these too all have their purpose for Muhammad. They are "the source of the idea and the point of beginning" as well. Although the brother is the "real patron" of the work (p13), it is "only with the consent and blessing of the king" himself, that the work can begin. The very fact that the Bendahara is asked to do this work serves to establish him as "a historian who knew the genealogies of the different kings and nobles, of court ceremonies and ways" (pp 13-14), as a respected "man of talent", "a court sage, rather than a mere scribe", and, in fact, one who "must have been inclined to worry more over

the nature and concept of history, of the greatness of the Melakan empire, of the moral qualities of states and sultans" (p. 14).

In the end, perhaps, Muhammad makes far too much of these additions, for all the wonderful things he has to say about "the mind of the Malay author", treating Tun Sri Lanang as typical of all traditional writers, is based on these additions and on them alone. The same tour-de-force could simply not be done on the Raffles manuscript, let alone on the *Hikayat Raja-raja Pasai* or the *Hikayat Hang Tuah*.

But Muhammad does recognise the intensively political nature of the work, as his citation of the last words of the Bendahara Paduka Raja, the Great Minister of Melaka, Tun Perak, show. These words declare in part:

in all the laws the just king and the prophet are like two jewels on the same ring, and therefore a king is like a representative of God on earth, for he is the shadow of God on earth. If you work in the service of the king it is as though you are serving the prophet of God, and if you serve God's prophet it is as though you are serving God.²

The lessons of the *Sejarah Melayu* are the "great moral lessons of history" (p. 21), "the experience of a wise king" concerning "the problem of justice and ways to achieve it" (p. 22), as well as, pragmatically, "the strategies of survival in the bewildering currents of history" (p. 23) These are "the central values" not only of kingship and also of the state itself but they are, of course, far from disinterested. It is the power of the ruler which leads to the creation and continued circulation of the *Sejarah Melayu*. Its truths are those of the ruler; its values are those of the expediency of service to the ruler, even if the king is cruel and extremely stupid (and Muhammad does cite examples of such rulers, who are to be judged not by the people but by God).

THE SEJARAH MELAYU AND THE PRODUCTION OF TRUTH

How does the *Sejarah Melayu* "produce truth" for the glory of the ruler and the benefit of future generations of loyal subjects? Muhammad emphasises the existence of "a tradition at this time that works of literature were not seen as final products and sacred in their forms after they have been composed" (p. 15). He dismisses Winstedt's "castigation" of the "the continual act of changing, adding and improving to the original" which are "an extreme example of the liberties taken by all copyists", describing Winstedt's claim as nothing more than "a misreading of the concept and the tradition of Malay Literature". For:

Texts were produced for the different audiences and the different ages. Each had its own meaning and was complete in itself. (p. 16)

Muhammad may only be justifying what Winstedt is castigating; there seems to be little dispute, however, over the assertion that the texts of the

Sejarah Melayu were consistently adjusted to meet the “truth” considered appropriate to the times and circumstances of the new productions of the work.

On one point, nevertheless, Muhammad is surely wrong. He suggests that “As we have no description of the original manuscript we can only speculate what forms of improvement Tun Seri Lanang might have made” (p. 16). We have already seen some of the improvements which were made by Tun Lanang, including the possible addition of his name to the opening of the book. Muhammad himself notes the inclusion of more details in certain lines of the genealogy; the ‘correction’ of the genealogy (including the legitimization of Sultan Abdullah’s line), and the bolstering of royal legitimacy “with natural or supernatural proofs”. He also recognises that “the more legitimate Perak line is not given equal space and importance” by the Bendahara who was part of the Johor line and belonged in the Johor court (p. 16).

It is certainly possible to show what use the author of the *Sejarah Melayu* also made of the earlier *Hikayat Raja-raja Pasai*. This use goes far beyond a mere “following of an earlier manuscript”. It is a definite use of the past, open to archeological inspection.

The *Hikayat Raja-raja Pasai* begins directly with the claim (Jones 1987:1):

Alkisah peri mengatakan ceritera raja yang pertama masuk agama Islam ini Pasai; maka ada diceriterakan oleh orang yang empunya ceritera ini, negeri yang di bawah angin ini, Pasailah yang pertama membawa iman akan Allah dan akan Rasulullah...

This is the story which tells of the first king to enter Islam and he came from Pasai. The one who owns the story tells that it was this country which lies beneath the equator, Pasai, which first spread the faith in God and in His Prophet...

In fact, the text takes a comparatively long time to reach this point of the story. The author has first to establish the royal house. Then he describes a prediction of Prophet of God that, long after his death, a kingdom will arise below the equator, to be known as Samudra, which will be a Muslim kingdom and the home of many great missionaries (*wali*). The Prophet orders that a ship be sent to Samudra carrying royal regalia (*perkakas alat kerajaan*) and that on the way there it is to pick up a *fakir* from a state called “Mengiri”.

This done, the state of Samudra does duly appear, founded by Merah Silu, and the Khalifah Sharif of Mecca orders a ship to depart for Samudra and to stop at Mengiri on the way. In Mengiri, the king, Sultan Muhammad, a descendant of Abu Bakar al-Siddiq, renounces his throne to become the *fakir* promised by the Prophet.

Even before the ship arrives in Samudra, Merah Silu has a dream in which the Prophet of God appears to him. After ordering Merah Silu to become a Muslim, and to eat the foods Islam allows and avoid those it forbids, the Prophet shows his face to Merah Silu, circumcises him, and hears his recitation of the Profession of Faith. Merah Silu then reads (*membaca*) the whole *Koran*, without any instruction at all.

The boat arrives after forty days. A passing fisherman confirms that this is Samudra and the king is Merah Silu, who bears the title Sultan Malikul Saleh. Sheikh Ismail hears Malikul Saleh recite the Profession of Faith and wipes his hands on his beard in delight. The next day he hears the king read *Koran*, without instruction, and is again delighted. He teaches the leaders of the army (*hulubalang*) and the people, both great and small (*rakyat besar kecil*), the Profession. The state is renamed "Samudera Darulsalam" because of its allegiance to Islam and the royal regalia, including appropriate costume for the king and the royal orchestra (*nobat*), is delivered. The rudiments of the state bureaucracy are established. Eventually the Shaikh takes his leave and is farewelled with great honour, leaving behind him the fakir to confirm the place of Islam in the lives of the people of Samudra.

It must have been a very satisfying story for the king of Samudra-Pasai and his people. The Prophet Muhammad himself had seen the rise of their state, prepared its regalia, and led its king directly into the religion of Islam.

The author of the *Sejarah Melayu* does include the story as one of the stories told by men of long ago. His retelling is far from innocent; he most assuredly does not submit himself to what he has before him, making a few minor adjustments in the interest of greater accuracy.

In the sixth chapter of the Raffles text of the *Sejarah Melayu*, the author of that work begins his account of the king of Pasai by describing how Merah Silu paid the people of the forest to serve him, using gold he had obtained by boiling worms (*gelang-gelang*) he has caught in his net while fishing. In the *Hikayat Raja Pasai*, the gold is described as a divine blessing to Merah Silu. The naming of Pasai and Samudra is then described, before the Prophet's prediction of the rise of this state which will produce many great *Wali Allah*.

When those in Mecca eventually hear of Samudra, the Sharif orders a boat to go there, taking the royal regalia and calling in at "Muktabar" on the way. The ship's captain (*nakhoda*), Shaikh Ismail, calls in at Muktabar and is joined by Sultan Muhammad, who renounces his throne and becomes the *fakir* of whom the Prophet spoke.

The journey is much longer than in the earlier book. After sailing for some time, the ship stops at Fasuri. The people of Fasuri become Muslims. It proceeds to Lamiri and the people there too become Muslims. It then proceeds to Haru and the people are again converted to Islam. In none of these places, however, are the people able to read the *Koran*. Concerned at

his inability to find Samudra, Fakir Muhammad asks directions and is told in what is surely a master piece of dry understatement - “*Sudah lalu*”, you have already passed it.³ On his way to Samudra, the ship calls in at Perlak and they too are converted to Islam.

In Samudra, the *fakir* meets Merah Silu himself gathering shells (*berkarang*) on the beach. He asks the name of the state and its ruler, and is told that he, Merah Silu is the leader (*pengetua*) of the state. The *fakir* then converts Merah Silu to Islam and teaches him the Profession of Faith. That night, the Prophet appears to Merah Silu in a dream and empowers him by spitting into his mouth. The next morning Merah Silu is able to read the *Koran*, in confirmation of the earlier prophecy, and Sheikh Ismail gives him the royal regalia, as well as the title Sultan Maliku’s-Saleh. Once Shaikh Ismail sails away, leaving the *fakir* to establish Islam in Samudra, the text then passes to a version of the story of the marriage of Sultan Maliku’s-Saleh to the daughter of the Ruler of Perlak. Contrary to the version in the *Hikayat Raja-raja Pasai* (Jones 1987: 19), Maliku’s-Saleh is not informed in the *Sejarah Melayu* (Winstedt 1938: 737) that Puteri Genggang is the daughter of a concubine.

The new version of the history of Pasai-Samudra was no doubt as satisfying to the people of Malacca as the old one must have been to the people of the north of Sumatra. By careful rewriting and the manipulation of events, Pasai-Samudra is turned into a city of no consequence, invisible to passing ships, and only one of the many cities Islamised in fulfillment of the Prophet’s commands. This king is a coarse fool, happily paddling on the beach collecting shells. He receives Islam as everyone else receives it, from Sheikh Ismail. All this added to Malacca’s glory.

However, the worst insult is still to come, as the *Sejarah Melayu* (Winstedt 1938: 83-84) tells that it was the first ruler of Malacca, Raja Tengah, who saw the Prophet in a dream and was taught by him to recite the Profession of Faith. In the morning a ship arrived from Jeddah and confirmed the king’s dream. The king, now known as Sultan Muhammad Shah, encouraged all the people of Malacca (*segala orang Melaka kecil besar*) to enter Islam, which they did. The king then set about establishing his administration (*mengatur takhta kerajaan baginda*). By retaining the structure of the earlier story, the *Sejarah Melayu* has made Malacca the state favoured by the Prophet and its administration divinely sanctioned. Thus the author of the later *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* (Matheson 1982: 4-5) can be lead to say:

dan ialah Raja Melayu yang mula-mula masuk ugama Islam, yang bermimpikan berjumpa hadrat Nabi kita Muhammad....

and he (Sultan Muhammad Shah) was the first Malay King to enter the religion of Islam, having dreamed of meeting our Prophet, Muhammad...

THE DISCOURSE OF THE ROYAL REGIME OF LITERARY TRUTH

Virginia Matheson Hooker (1986: 36, cited in Noriah Taslim 1993: 123) has written of later Malay histories:

Although the Lingga, Riau and Inderagiri texts are local histories, they express themselves in a widely known mode, the mode of the *Sejarah Melayu*. The *Sejarah Melayu* can be seen as a localizing tool, a text to plug into, but then diverge from, with conventions which can be refashioned and adapted in local, specific needs.

In Foucault's terms, as developed in *The Archeology of Knowledge* (1969:64), we are in the presence of a "discursive field": a finite and limited set of possible statements, certain types of enunciation, which form, according to their degree of coherence, rigour, and stability, themes or theories constitutive of acceptable and true speech. Within this "completed system" lies not an endless possibility for the generation of all types of literary texts, but "an immense density of systemacies, a tight group of multiple relations" (p. 76), and a limited number of possible historical chronicles. For Foucault (1969:76):

One is not seeking therefore to pass from the text to the thought, from talk to silence, from the exterior to the interior, from spatial dispersion to the pure recollection of the moment from superficial multiplicity to profound unity. One remains within the dimension of discourse.

In this world, to take one simple example, Hang Kasturi can never lead The rebellion which will drive the king from his palace; and the king will always leave of his own free will, outraged only by Kasturi's moral incompetence (Winstedt 1938: 112).

"YANG EMPUNYAI CERITA"

Foucault notes in his fascinating, if difficult essay, "What is an Author" (1984: 109) that what he describes as "the author function" does not "affect all discourses in a universal and constant way", in other words that different societies treat the concept of author differently with regard to particular texts. Foucault reminds us that in the European middle ages, "literary" texts (narratives, stories, epics, tragedies, comedies) were accepted and appreciated without any concern for the identity of their author. "Their anonymity caused no difficulties", he suggests "since their ancientness, real or imagined, was regarded as sufficient guarantee of their status". On the other hand, scientific texts (those dealing with cosmology, medicine, illness, natural science or geography) were only taken as "true" if marked with the name of their author - Hippocrates, Pliny, or whoever. The situation we know today, which is the reverse of this, began in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Today literary discourses are acceptable only when "endowed with the author function" (p.109).

It is extremely possible, I would suggest, that the question of "the author" of a classical Malay text is a meaningless one. The texts themselves do not name the anonymous others who "own" earlier versions of the stories about to be recounted - "*yang empunya cerita*", "*yang empunya cerita ini*", "*sahibulhikayat*" - and are content to mention the stories themselves but not their authors - "*seperti yang di dalam hikayat Iskandar itu*", "*seperti hikayat Sayyidina Hamzah banyaknya*" and "*kata setengah riwayat*" (for references see Umar Junus 1984: 34).

Muhammad Haji Salleh may be right. Tun Sri Lanang may have been a highly respected "man of talent, to whom the nobles and sultans looked up (1991: 14). He may have spent long sleepless night pondering on problems of truth and their implications for future generations (1991: 14). On the other hand, as Winstedt (1938: 36) suggests writing may have seemed a bothersome task, not worth owning up to, and the proper task only of those prepared to consider themselves "poor wretches" (*fakir*) and "double ignoramuses" (*jahil murrakab*). On the basis of *all* the available evidence (and not just the Shellabear preface), we simply do not know. As Foucault repeats: the author function "does not affect all discourses in the same way at all times and in all types of civilization" (1984: 113).

Are we left them, with nothing more than a small fragment from Saint Bonaventure⁴ which claims that: "There are four ways of making a book"? One is the way of the scribe, who "writes others' words, adding nothing and changing nothing". The second is the way of compiler, writing "others' words" and "putting together passages which are not his own". The commentator "writes both others' words and his own, but with others' words in prime place and his own added only for clarification". The author, finally, "writes both his own words and others'", but with his own words in prime place and others' added only for the purpose of confirmation.

Which is "Tun Sri Lanang", who uses the words of others and adds his own words to contradict, alter and amend theirs? whose world is that of the court and not the school? and who writes with the political persuasion that obedience to the truth he proposes leads to happiness in this world and the next, and disobedience to death and external punishment? He seems to be none of these.

Foucault suggests in "What is an Author" that today's writing has freed itself from the dimension of expression" and now only refers "to itself" (1984:102). The author has sought to voluntarily efface him or herself, by setting up all manner of "contrivances" between himself and what he writes, so that all "the signs of his particular individuality" are cancelled out. Writing is a form of self-sacrifice and even (as in the case of Chairil Anwar) of the sacrifice of one's own life. If the European author is not, these days, dead, he (or she) is at least suitably absent.

One may argue about whether this is the case with modern Malay and Indonesian literature. (I suspect that the opposite generally holds.) It does seem, however, that Foucault's *Archeology of Knowledge* again challenges us on this point. Foucault writes (1972: 95) that "the subject of the statement", the one who proposes it:

should not be regarded as identical with the author of the formulation - either in substance, or in function. He is not in fact the cause, origin or starting-point of the phenomenon of the written or spoken articulation of a sentence; nor is it that meaningful intention which, silently anticipating words, orders them like the visible body of its intuition; it is not the constant, motionless, unchanging focus of a series of operations that are manifested, in turn, on the surface of discourse through the statements.

No. Instead Foucault proposes a radical alternative, one which makes perfect sense in terms of the structuralist model which we, he and I, have been following:

[The subject of the statement] is a particular, vacant place that may in fact be filled by different individuals; but, instead of being defined once and for all, and maintaining itself as such throughout a text, a book, or an oeuvre, this place varies...

The place of *sahibul-hikayat* is "assigned"; it is one which "can and must be occupied by any individual if he is to be the subject of it" (p. 96). The book creates the author, so to speak, not the author the book. (Just as Malay speaks us, more than we speak Malay.)

What matters, finally, is not "who speaks?" but "whom does the discourse serve?" ("Truth and Power" 1984: 57). All discourse is traversed with power, Foucault would suggest. The task of the intellectual is "to detach the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic, and cultural within which it operates at the present time" (p. 75). And not just now, but in the past as well, when the past is part of the present.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper was presented to a seminar of the Institut Alam dan Tamadun Melayu, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, on 7 July 1994. I would like to thank Prof Dato' Wan Hashim and his staff for their assistance to me during the month I spent as Writer in Residence at the Institute.

NOTE

1. Noriah draws her citation from Maier 1985: 3 but does not provide the original source. It is actually paraphrase by Maier of the use he intends to make of Foucault's work.
2. Muhammed makes exclusive use of the text of the *Sulatulus Salatin* (Sejarah Melayu) edited by A. Samad Ahmad (DBP 1979). The text there (p. 178) reads:

pada segala hukum, bahawa raja-raja yang adil itu dengan nabi salla 'lahu 'alaihi wa salam, umpama dua buah permata pada sebetuk cincin; lagi pula raja itu umpama ganti Allah dalam dunia, kerana ia kepada *Zillu 'llah fil 'alam*. Apabila berbuat kebaktian kepada raja, serasa berbuat kebaktian akan nabi Allah; apabila berbuat kebaktian kepada nabi Allah, serasa berbuat kebaktian kepada Allah Taala....

3. These words (Winstedt 1938: 72) do not appear in the Shellabear text (1984: 41): proof, perhaps of the former's greater literary sophistication. One can imagine how the audience must have laughed at them.
4. Muhammad Haji Salleh (1991: 103), citing J.A. Burrow *Medieval Writers and Their Work*, Oxford University Press 1984, pp. 29-30. Original source not given.

REFERENCES

- A. Samad Ahmad, ed. 1979. *Sulalatus Salatin (Sejarah Melayu)*. Kuala Lumpur: DBP.
- During, S. 1992. *Foucault and Literature*. Routledge: London.
- Foucault, M. 1984. "Truth and Power", and "What is an Author?". In P. Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Jones, R. ed. 1987. *Hikayat Raja Pasai*. Kuala Lumpur: Fajar Bakti.
- Khalid Taib, M. 1993. Konsep dan Kedudukan Wira dalam Teks Melayu Klasik. In Siti Aisah Murad (ed.), *Konsep Wira Dalam Sastera Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: DBP.
- Matheson Hooker, V. ed. 1982. *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*. Kuala Lumpur: Fajar Bakti.
- Maier, H.M.J. 1985. *Fragments of a Reading*, Konters. Alblasseurdam.
- Mohammad Haji Salleh. 1991. *Yang Empunya Cerita: The Mind of the Malay Author*. Kuala Lumpur: DBP.
- Norih Taslim. 1993. *Teori dan Kritikan Sastera Melayu Tradisional*. Kuala Lumpur: DBP.
- Shellabear, W.G; ed. 1984. *Sejarah Melayu*. Petaling Jaya: Fajar Bakti.
- Umar Junus. 1984. *Sejarah Melayu, Menemukan Diri Kembali*. Petaling Jaya: Fajar Bakti.
- Winstedt, R.O. 1938. "The Malay Annals or Sejarah Melayu. *JMBRAS*, Vol. XVI, Part III.
- Winstedt, R.O. 1969. *A History of Classical Malay Literature*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.