ABU BAKAR AND MODERN JOHOR: THE QUESTION OF MODERNISATION AND WESTERNISATION IN MALAY TRADITION

A Rahman Tang Abdullah

Abstract

This article discusses the application of modernisation in the process of transformation of Johor during Abu Bakar's reign from 1862 to 1895. The transformation here is the changes to the Malay tradition as a result of the adoption of western orientation. Such changes are the transition from a traditional to modern circumstances in Malay society. The aim of the article is to evaluate and construct a distinction between 'modernisation' and 'westernisation' from terminological perspective. The discussion leads to the conclusion that the process of transformation in Johor should be regarded as 'modernisation' and not westernisation' simply because the process of transformation should be regarded as complementary to the Malay tradition. The hypothesis is based on the transformation in governmental affairs and the Johor's constitution of 1895.

Introduction

Historians agree that the only term to be applied to the process of transformation in Johor during Abu Bakar's reign is 'modern and modernisation'. The modernisation included the development of commercial agriculture, especially pepper and gambier, the establishment of a western bureaucratic system, and the promulgation of a written constitution, education, and infrastructure.[1] The transformation here is the changes to the Malay tradition as a result of the adoption of western concepts. Such changes are the transition from traditional

to modern circumstances in Malay society. However, a Malay sociologist tends to conclude that the process of transformation in Johor should be regarded as 'westernisation' and not 'modernisation'. Thus Abu Bakar is pronounced a pioneer of the westernisation of Johor,[2] not the father of modern Johor.

This is the view that the Malays tend to regard the penetration of a western orientation into Johor as an alien phenomenon simply because of the differences between the east and west. This is because historians do not provide a firm definition of the terms 'modernisation' and 'westernisation' and their application to Johor. This article explores the use of those terms in order to argue that 'modern' and 'modernisation' should be applied only to elements of the transformation of Johor during Abu Bakar's reign. It provides the view that the process of transformation should be regarded as complementary to the Malay tradition.

The Distinction Between Modernisation And Westernisation

The first historian to give Abu Bakar the title 'Father of Modern Johor' was Winstedt in a work published in 1932.[3] It was used by Winstedt to reflect the emergence of Johor as a new political entity under Abu Bakar, distinctive from the ancient empire of Johor-Riau-Lingga. The word 'modern' is also applied to Johor in the same context by Emerson, Trocki, Khoo Kay Kim, and Gullick.[4]

In 1970, the phrase 'Father of Modern Johor' was translated into Malay by Buyung Adil and Fawzi Basri as 'Bapa Johor Moden'. Buyung Adil adopted this title in the same context as Winstedt. However, Fawzi Basri took it a step further by referring to the 'process of modernisation' in Johor, the introduction of modern elements in Johor's administration, economy, and social development, such as economic infrastructure and communications.[5] Fawzi Basri's interpretation of 'modern Johor' in this context is derived from several terms, such as 'civilised nation, advancement and development'. These terms were mentioned in the British correspondence in the 1860s, and were applied to the process of modernisation in Johor under Abu Bakar.[6] In fact, in 1940 Mohammed Said Sulaiman applied the term 'modern' to Johor's rules and regulations, derived from similar regulations practised by the British authorities in Singapore.[7]

Since most aspects of Johor's modernisation during Abu Bakar's reign were derived from the west, there is a tendency among Malay scholars to view the introduction of modern elements into Johor as a process of 'westernisation' rather than 'modernisation'. This view is proposed by Rahimah Aziz, a Malay sociologist. She argued that 'modernisation' and 'westernisation' should be distinguished in terms of a strict terminological perspective. In her study of the transformation of Johor during the period 1800-1945, she concludes that Abu Bakar should more accurately be called the 'pioneer of the westernisation' of Johor, not the 'father of modern Johor'. She explicitly

applies a distinction between 'modernisation' and 'westernisation' in a study that focuses on the modern aspects of Johor's government, such as administration, a written constitution, education, and agricultural development. However, many aspects of her discussion, defining the distinction between 'westernisation' and 'modernisation', and her counter-argument to the longstanding view of Abu Bakar as the 'father of modern Johor', are not compelling. It is pedantic to separate the term 'modernisation' from 'westernisation' in the context of the nineteenth century. Although these terms are not synonymous, the process of modernisation in the context of the nineteenth century was an integral part of the process of westernisation. This is because modernisation was virtually derived from the west, and there was no other source of modernisation, either in Asia or Africa. Thus Rahimah's argument, that modernisation could be derived other than from the west, is not applicable in the nineteenth century. The countries suggested by Rahimah, such as Japan, Turkey, China, and Thailand, where modernisation could be found, were also undergoing transformations inspired by western modernisation.

She also argues that a distinction between 'westernisation' and 'modernisation' can be made by identifying the way a transformation was transmitted. She states that westernisation can be perceived as a historical process of transforming Oriental and African peoples towards western standards. This transformation was implemented by force applied to non-western societies, in order to change their way of life. Consequently, all elements that are derived from the west become universal.

In contrast to westernisation, she argues that modernisation is the process of social change where any less developed society acquires the characteristics that are normally available in an industrial society. The process of modernisation is transferred through communication at the international level. In this context, westernisation was applied to Johor because Johor did not exist in a vacuum, but was actually subjected to the process of global imperialism.[8]

Again, the framework that she proposes to apply to the distinction between these two terms is not conclusive. Both westernisation and modernisation could be realised in either way, by force or by free communication. Rahimah associates westernisation with its realisation by force, because she has overemphasised the fact that most transformation, which was derived from the west, took place during the period of western imperialism and colonialism. Nevertheless, in the case of Johor under Abu Bakar, the process of transformation cannot be fully associated with British intrusion. In fact, this transformation was initiated by Abu Bakar and his Malay officials without any pressure, because during this period, Johor was not under British control. This transformation had long been implemented before a political tension arose between Abu Bakar and Governor Weld over the appointment of the British Resident and Agent in the 1880s.

Thus it is pedantic to see the concepts of 'modernisation' and 'westernisation' in an exclusive manner, unless we are able to find 'modern' aspects that are not derived from the west, or to be more precise, Europe and America. In fact, the superiority of Islamic civilisation had also been overtaken by new advances which were associated with the modernisation of the west. In the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire had also begun to adopt modernisation from the west.[9] During the same time, the Japanese had also undergone a process of transformation by adopting modern aspects from the west, particularly in science and technology. Certainly, modernisation and westernisation were important features in the historical development of the Malay Peninsula, especially Johor, in the nineteenth century.

However, it is still necessary to clarify a framework which justifies the distinction between 'modernisation' and 'westernisation' in the context of the Malays in the nineteenth century. Modernisation should be applied to the circumstances where the western orientation is complementary to the existing tradition that is still evident and identifiable. A changing orientation was manifested in innovation in traditional institutions and characteristics in both nominal and substantive manners. Modernisation can also be applied to the circumstances in which both old and traditional and new elements are universal, and not purely subject to ethnocentricity. In short, ethnocentricity refers to the strong tendency to view other races or cultural groups in terms of the standards of one's own race or group.

In contrast to modernisation, Westernisation is applicable only to the circumstances in which the penetration of a western orientation into Malay society resulted in the total demolition of traditional institutions, characteristics, and orientations. Westernisation does not reflect a mixture of western and traditional characteristics because the traditional element is no longer identifiable. In fact, the historical development in the nineteenth century indicates that westernisation can be applied to sensitive circumstances, which are subject to ethnocentricity, such as language, culture and religion. In short, modernisation is perceived as neutral while westernisation is ethnocentric.

This application of the term 'modernisation' is compatible with most aspects of government affairs in Johor during Abu Bakar's reign. In general, Abu Bakar and the Malays in Johor were among those most affected by the influence of westernisation and were most successful in digesting it. The characteristics that were derived from the west but did not cause any disturbance in the modernisation of Johor during Abu Bakar's reign were urbanisation and the establishment of a modern infrastructure and modern communications. These included the establishment of new towns at Johor Baharu, Muar, and Batu Pahat, together with the construction of roads, railways, and other modern facilities such as water reservoirs, hospitals, and the introduction of the telegraph, telephone, and postal service. To most Malays in those days, all these elements were considered new, and the latest

advancements which came with the advent of British rule in the Malay Peninsula. Thus the penetration of this western orientation into Malay society did not cause conflicting perceptions, because this particular advancement did not undermine Malay custom. Moreover, during this period, from the European point of view, the progress in social infrastructure and development clearly manifested the enlightened and energetic administration of Johor that was closely associated with Abu Bakar's credibility.

Indeed, during this period, the Johor Malays had acquired modern techniques and technology from European officials. The *Singapore and Straits Directory* of 1873 mentioned the presence of several Europeans who were hired in a private capacity to take charge of certain departments. Among them were James Meldrum as the Director, and Frederick Richard Boultbee as the Chief Engineer, in the Johor Arsenal; R.J. Duncan Overseer, as engineer in the construction of the railway; Captain Davis as the chief engineer, to take charge of the steamboats; and R.R. Read as the accountant. There were several Malays who had acquired experience and knowledge under their supervision. For instance, it was mentioned in *Tawarikh Dato' Bentara Luar* that Mohamed Salleh bin Perang and Yahya Awal learnt how to conduct a land survey under the supervision of Mr. Langley and Mr. McCalum. Mohamed Salleh later became the head of the Survey Department, and he was the main official in charge of the establishment of the new towns at Muar and Batu Pahat in the 1880s and 1890s.[10]

Another aspect that should be referred to as 'modernisation' rather than 'westernisation' is development of the agricultural sector. According to Rahimah, the main criteria for using the term 'westernisation' for agricultural development is the change from self-sufficiency or subsistence, dominated by indigenous labour, to capitalism, which is based on capital investment and profit and the intensive use of immigrant labour.[11] But this point is not convincing, because self-sufficiency is not exclusively and specifically a Malay custom. It is universal, and could be found in most societies in the east and west before they developed more complex structures with the emergence of commercialisation. Commercialisation as a universal concept requires increased productivity, motivated by modern technology and mass-production, and is associated with capitalism. This indicates that both subsistence and commercialisation are universal and that the latter should be perceived as modernisation.

In the case of Johor and Abu Bakar, the only aspect that would justify the application of the term 'westernisation' was the use of the English language and roman script in government affairs. However, this aspect is minor. The roman script and English language cannot be categorised as 'modern', but are exclusively 'western'.[12] In fact, the use of those elements in Johor government affairs during Abu Bakar's reign was very limited, and did not demolish the Malay tradition of using the Malay language and Malay

Jawi script.[13] The correspondence in the Johor Archives indicates that the use of English and writing in the roman script was only in official correspondence with the Straits Government.

The limited use of English and the roman script in government affairs is evidence that Abu Bakar was committed to preserving certain traditional elements. During this period, all government proceedings were conducted in the Malay language, even where Malay officials had acquired English. Abu Bakar was committed to preserving the use of the Malay Jawi script in all government correspondence. This practice was implemented even for Chinese affairs, such as 'Surat Sungai', and the pepper and gambier plantations, which were issued in Malay Jawi writing.[14]

Muhammad Ibrahim Munshi, who was a prominent official and also exposed to Malay and English education, explicitly emphasised the importance of preserving the integrity of the Malay language. He was the first Head of the Department of Education in Johor and was responsible for promoting the development of Malay.[15] He insisted that the Malays acquire literacy in Malay and have access to Malay literature. He even criticised Malays who employed English, abandoning Malay without any sound reason. He regarded the use of English for the names of roads in Klang as unnecessary and unfortunate for the Malays. The names such as King Street and Market Street would more suitably be 'Jalan Raja' and 'Jalan Pasar'. He felt that the adoption of those names should reflect harmony towards the Malay language.[16]

In 1888, he and other Johor officials came to a rational solution for promoting the integrity of the Malay language. They established an association to promote the teaching and learning of Malay, known as 'Pakatan Belajar Mengajar Pengetahuan Bahasa'. One of their major contributions was to create Malay terminology derived from English, such as 'Setiausaha' for Secretary, 'Pesuruhjaya' for Commissioner, 'kerjaraya' for public works, 'jabatan' for department, and 'pejabat' for office. The creation of those Malay terms enhanced the credibility of Malay as the official language of Johor. Adopting English terms into Malay was pioneered by the Malays in Johor. It contributed to the enrichment of the Malay vocabulary.

To many historians, the main criterion in assessing the transformation of the Johor government's affairs was the extent to which western ideas and concepts were adopted into the Malay tradition. The introduction of these modern elements established an effective and efficient central government in Johor, and made its reputation distinctive among the Malay states during that time. Trocki remarked that not only were the British authorities and Abu Bakar himself proud of Johor's remarkable reputation and achievement but it was also appreciated by the other Malays. Furthermore, the British expected those Malays to follow Abu Bakar's footsteps.[17] Khoo Kay Kim remarks that in comparison with Perak and Selangor, Johor proved to be remarkable, not only in terms of its modern development up to the mid-1870s but also because

the Malays in Johor were able to adapt to the new order without undue convulsion.[18]

Contrasting views on the transformation in Johor's government affairs can be traced to the different perceptions of the west and the Malays. Emerson and Trocki argued that the Council of State and the Constitution remained traditional forms. This is because they were more concerned to observe the traditional elements that remained. Commenting on the Johor Constitution, Emerson stated that: 'No pretence is made in it that it is a Western Constitution or that it establishes a democratic form of government. It is essentially a statement and a regularisation of the political structure of Johor as it existed at that time with the addition of certain clearly defined checks on the ruler and his associates that only slightly impaired the traditional oriental despotism. The preamble makes clear that it is the Sultan himself who is handing down the constitution... .'[19] From the western point of view, the constitution did not conform to a modern pattern because its western element was still marginal and was overshadowed by the traditional autocratic form. Certainly Emerson is right to state that it is not a western constitution. However, this constitution manifested a departure from the Malay tradition, because a written constitution had never existed in Malay society. It is more important to note that the Council of State's function too was not part of the Malay tradition.

Meanwhile, Trocki perceived the Johor State Council as ' ... a larger and latter day version of the traditional group of kin, supporters, and advisers which surrounded almost all the major Malay chiefs...' but '... was given a more formal status within the state and dignified with the title of "Council"'.[20] Trocki implies that the council did not manifest a transformation from the old to the new order because its members had close ties with the ruler. However, it is not possible to argue that the Council of State was not modern simply because of its membership. It is more sensible to argue that the council should be seen as modern because it was empowered with a legislative function that was derived from western practice. This legislative function should be seen as the more substantive criterion than the membership to reflect the modern characteristics of the council because it had never before existed in the Malay tradition.

It is unreasonable to expect a total transformation of the fundamental elements in a traditional practice and full re-orientation into a western one. This is because the adoption of western ideas in the transformation of Johor under Abu Bakar was still at the elementary stage. The fundamental characteristics of the Malay tradition in the major governmental institutions, especially the Council of State and Johor's written constitution, were initiated by the Malays without direct intervention from British officials.

On the other hand, Malay historians, represented by Fawzi Basri, argued that the process of transformation which was dominated by the adoption of western ideas into Johor's governmental affairs should be regarded as an

explicit manifestation of change in the Malay tradition. He applied the term 'modern' to the transformation in Johor's governmental affairs with regard to the establishment of Johor's Council of State as a legislative body, its western style of bureaucracy, and the promulgation of Johor's constitution, which established the Sultan of Johor as the first constitutional ruler in Malay history.[21] This view is moderate and has long been widely accepted in Malaysia. This is because it reflects the positive sentiment among the majority of Malays who regard the adoption of a western orientation into the Malay tradition as a realistic historical phenomenon. Nevertheless, this view was taken to extremes by Rahimah Aziz, who argued that the adoption of western elements in Johor's governmental affairs should be regarded as an extreme circumstance, because most of the Malay traditional practices and orientation had been replaced by western ones. Rahimah Aziz suggests that the adaptation of western elements into Johor's governmental institutions was fundamental, and completely removed the traditional ones. Her view is based on her generalisation that the transformation in Johor's administration and constitution is more precisely described as westernisation than modernisation.[22] This contradicts the western historians who argued that western ideas had no fundamental impact on the orientation of the Malay tradition, due to the explicit characteristics of autocracy within its royal prerogative. Nevertheless, in constructing her argument, Rahimah Aziz made a substantial error when she stated that Johor's Council of State resembled the legislative body of the British Parliament at Westminster in its form of operation, even though she acknowledged that the functions of Johor's Council were not as complex as the British legislative council.

The Process Of Transformation In Governmental Affairs As A Complement to Traditional Institutions

Those contrasting views only emphasised the extent of the transformation in Johor's governmental institutions. Nevertheless, no historian has ever made an in-depth examination of the link between any particular aspect of the transformation into the new order and its orientation in the traditional order. Although the adoption of certain western practices was a new element to the Malays in the nineteenth century, it should not be regarded as a complete diversion from the Malay tradition. In fact, the adoption of such practices indicates that the traditional framework of orientation, structure, and institutions was remoulded into a new mode. This implies that the presence of such western elements and orientation are complementary to the Malay tradition. This framework can be applied to the Johor Council of State and Johor's written constitution.

The closest attempt to apply the term 'modernisation' to the transformation in Johor's Council of State and constitution was made by Fawzi

Basri. He refers to all elements of this transformation as modern, because those elements were different from the Malay tradition and had not been found in the other Malay states. However, there is one point in his argument where he confused the characteristics of the Council of State as modern. He saw the Johor Council of State as different from the traditional system because it was not based on a multiple concentric four-chieftain hierarchy. He described the Malay traditional political structure as akin to a feudal system with the Sultan occupying the apex of the hierarchy followed by the multiple four-chieftain system, such as four, eight, sixteen and thirty-two chieftains or Orang Besar.[23]

Johor's political structure in its Council of State, which was not based on multiple four concentric chieftains, is not relevant in judging the diversion from the Malay tradition. This criterion cannot be used to compare the Johor Council of State with the political structure in the ancient Johor Empire, or even with Malacca as the founder of the Malay traditional political order. It is probable that this multiple four-chieftain hierarchy was never ascribed to those empires. None of the Malay classical texts concerning the history of the ancient Johor empire, such as *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* and *Hikayat Negeri Johor*, mention this multiple chieftains system. In the political structure of this ancient empire, there were only four high-ranking chiefs, the Bendahara, Temenggong, Bendahari, and Laksamana. Other chiefs were only the officials in the central administration or the territorial chiefs; but they were not given any particular position that instituted them into a ranking system of eight, sixteen, or thirty-two chieftains.[24] Thus the fact that this multiple four system was not adopted into the political structure in Johor under Abu Bakar, or even before his ascendancy, cannot be considered as unique, or a diversion from the Malay tradition. Johor's Council of State in the 1870s still contained high-ranking members, such as the regent and two regional commissioners, and all these posts were held by Abu Bakar's brothers, Engku Abdul Rahman, Engku Abdul Majid, and Engku Abdullah. Other members were district chiefs known as residents, heads of department, religious officials, and the head of the Chinese community in Johor.

The adoption of the multiple four concentric chieftains system in the Malay traditional political order in the nineteenth century can be considered a relatively new element, as a result of innovation in the Malay tradition. In fact, during this period, fewer Malay states subscribed to this hierarchical system than states that did. Besides Johor, this system was not used by the Malay states that still retained the traditional form of political order, such as Selangor, Kelantan, Terengganu, and Perlis. The states which practised the multiple four chieftains were Perak, Kedah, and Pahang. Even so, this multiple system came into existence in those states only in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[25]

Fawzi Basri is right to point out that during the pre-colonial period, there was no formal institution of a Council of State in the Malay states. He

stated that Johor was the first state that had such a formal institution. He saw the Johor Council of State as an official institution, simply because it was the first council empowered with legislative functions.[26] The establishment of such an institution can be regarded as modern but it cannot be regarded as a complete diversion from the Malay tradition. In principle, this legislative function created the impression that Abu Bakar was following the western concept of a legislative function for the Johor Council of State. This is based on the historical documents relating to the laws and regulations of Johor, stating that those laws and regulations were passed by the members of the Council of State. Johor's constitution also explicitly stated that the Council of State was responsible for regulating the provisions of the constitution and other laws and regulations.

The practice of legislative function should not be regarded as undermining the integrity of the existing political institutions in the Malay tradition simply because it was derived from the west. In fact, this element actually contributed to strengthening the fundamental role of the Malay traditional chieftains. It also provided a complement to the advisory role of the Malay traditional chieftains. These chieftains normally acted as an advisory institution for the purpose of advising the ruler in all-important matters, especially in the matters which involved external affairs. In principle, any decision-making commanded by the Malay rulers in the Malay tradition should be best achieved by gathering a general consensus among their chiefs.

The traditional Malays had already recognised the imposition of laws and regulations on society. This was manifested by the existence of Malay legal digests such as the Laws (Undang-undang) of Malacca, the Laws of Pahang, the Laws of Johor, and the Ninety-nine Laws of Perak. In this context, the existence of rules and regulations in the traditional legal digests cannot be regarded as a manifestation of a legislative function because those rules and regulations were originally imposed as royal commands. These royal commands were orally handed down through the aristocrats who were entrusted as the administrators of the law in traditional Malay society, before those commands were compiled in writing as the Malay legal digests.[27]

The absence of legislative function created the impression that all the laws and regulations in the Malay tradition were derived from royal commands which was seen as despotic. It seems that the reason for Abu Bakar to empower his chiefs with legislative function was to answer Governor Cavenagh's criticism of him as a complete despot who ruled his country according to his will.[28] In 1863, in his letter to the Straits Government, Abu Bakar stated that he had asked his chiefs to revise all regulations and laws in Johor.[29] In another correspondence to the Straits Government, he stated that all laws in Johor were ratified in a consultation between him and his chiefs.[30] There is evidence to support Abu Bakar's claim to the Straits Government of his willingness to recognise the practice of legislative function, which in principle required the

gathering in consultation of his chiefs in the process of law-making. In the preamble to all laws and regulations promulgated in Johor in the 1860s and 1870s, it was explicitly stipulated that those were passed by members of the Council of State. In fact, all these rules and regulations were produced in written form.[31] These historical documents also suggest that every law that involved the Chinese community in Johor was passed by the members of the Council of State after consulting their Chinese representatives who were mainly merchants in Johor.

The earliest source of information regarding the establishment of Johor's reformed administration during this period can be found in the *Singapore and Straits Directory* of 1873.[32] This source, which was published in the official record of the Straits Government, had been extensively used by most historians such as Trocki, Andaya, and Fawzi Basri. The directory recorded that the state of Johor was governed by its ruler, who was advised by the Council of State composed of 24 members. Johor's Council of State was known in Malay as Majlis Mesyuarat Negeri. Its members were called Ahli Mesyuarat Johor, or Members of the Council of Johor, in the manuscript of the law relating to gambier and pepper of 1285H (1868).[33] In 1873, it was composed of high-ranking members, such as the regent and two regional commissioners, and all these posts were held by Abu Bakar's brothers, Engku Abdul Rahman, Engku Abdul Majid, and Engku Abdullah. Other members were district chiefs known as residents, heads of department, religious officials, and two Chinese, with the title Major and Kapitan as the representatives of the Chinese population in the state.

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the legislative function was always brought into question. It cannot be said that Johor fully adopted the same legislative function as in the Straits Settlements and the State Council established by the British in the other Malay states. In principle, in comparison with the Legislative Council of the Straits Settlements and the Council of State of Perak established by Hugh Low in 1877, Johor's Council of State was the most autocratic because it did not have any unofficial members. In the Legislative Council of the Straits Settlements, there were unofficial members who were regarded as the opposition, and they were expected to voice their criticism of the measures of the government. In the Perak State Council, its members were composed of two contrasting parties; British officials, the Resident and the Assistant Resident on one side, and on the other, Malay members, the Sultan or the regent, a Malay chief justice, and the Qadi or Muslim magistrate.[34]

Before 1914, there were virtually no opposition members appointed to the Johor Council of State. In the 1860s and 1870s, the membership of the Johor Council was composed of Abu Bakar's brothers, his followers from Teluk Belanga, and his Arab and Chinese financial associates. These Arab and Chinese members cannot be regarded as opposition members because of

their direct financial interests with the ruler and the top ranking Malay members in the Council. The membership of the Council in the 1880s and 1890s seemed to have the same composition, except for some marginal changes of personnel. The European officials in the government of Johor were appointed as private advisers. Some of them were appointed as members of the Council of State, such as Rodyk and Davidson, legal advisers to Abu Bakar.

Another aspect unanimously viewed by historians as modern was the western style of bureaucracy in Johor's administration. This bureaucracy was imposed on the numerous government departments for the purpose of conducting specific tasks. Indeed, there was no such bureaucratic system in the Malay tradition. However, this fact was misconstrued, especially by Rahimah Abdul Aziz, who saw the bureaucratic system as a diversion from the Malay traditional practice simply because it was derived from the west. This presumption is apparent in the argument that Johor had adopted a 'western style of bureaucracy'.

In this context, no historian has ever explored the possibility that this bureaucratic system can be perceived as complementary to the Malay tradition. During the pre-colonial period, the Malay kingdoms adopted the concept of a diffusion of authority to the various chieftains. The traditional Malays recognised the practice of a distinct division of duties and responsibilities. For instance, the Temenggong was given jurisdiction over all matters concerning the security of the state, and the Laksamana was responsible for taking charge of maritime affairs. The Shahbandar was authorised to take charge of the customs affairs in the ports, and the treasurer, generally known as Bendahari, was entrusted with the Sultan's treasury and the palace. In addition, the diffusion of authority in the Malay tradition was applied to the territorial chiefs.[35]

In the Johor bureaucracy from the 1860s, this diffusion of authority was further applied to specific divisions, marked by the establishment of departments. This was not only to accommodate the growing complexity of the new responsibilities undertaken by the central government but also to accommodate an expansion of certain government tasks in the old tradition. For instance, the Treasury Department was established as a result of the centralisation of tax collection. Another example was the establishment of the Police Department as a complement to the Temenggong, because his function was now transferred to a state Police Commissioner. Other new departments, such as those of land and survey and public works, were to carry out new tasks that had never existed in the old order.

The *Straits Directory* of 1873 gave details of Johor's bureaucratic structure. It reported that the state was divided into two commissions that were further divided into residencies and dependencies. There were 13 residencies and two additional dependencies that governed two separate groups of islands on the east and west coasts of Johor, in the South China Sea and the

Malacca Straits. The directory also noted other administrative institutions and numerous departments established to deal with specific government functions, such as the Treasury, Commissariat, Police, Police Court, Jail, Land and Public Works.[36]

Before the 1880s, both the legislative and executive functions lay in Johor's Council of State. The executive function of the Council was taken over by the Executive Council at the beginning of the 1880s. The *Singapore and Straits Directory* of 1883 and 1885 provided information on this restructuring of Johor's administration. The Executive Council had more authority than the Council of State. Several new institutions were also established, such as the State Secretariat, the Supreme Court with a magistrate and a judge, and a mufti for conducting Islamic law. The directory also noted the establishment of several departments and the restructuring of old ones, such as land, public works, survey, and education.[37] In the Johor Constitution of 1895, the Legislative Council was called Majlis Mesyuarat Kerajaan, and the Executive Council was called Majlis Jemaah Menteri, or the Council of Ministers.

The Transformation From Absolute To Constitutional Monarchy.

From the Malays' point of view, the most important impact of Johor's Constitution[38] was to signify the change in the traditional Malay concept of Sultan from absolute to constitutional monarchy. Both western and Malay historians unanimously agree that the Johor Constitution justified the change. Before the promulgation of the constitution in 1895, Abu Bakar cannot be regarded as a constitutional monarch. During this period, even though Abu Bakar was prepared to accept advice from his council, he was generally regarded as a despotic ruler because there was no written limitation on his absolutism.

Although the concept of constitutional monarchy was derived from the west, such a change is attributed to modernisation because Johor's constitutional monarchy preserved the position of the Sultan as the head of the state. In this circumstance, the degree of absolutism that had long been attributed to the royal prerogative of the Malay rulers decreased.

In reviewing the constitution, historians focus on the provisions that can be applied to the concept of a constitutional ruler, seeing this as the adoption of western democratic practice. On the one hand, Malay scholars such as Ahmad Fawzi Mohamed Basri and Rahimah Abdul Aziz are justified in arguing that the provisions that imposed restrictions on the Sultan were intended to demonstrate Abu Bakar's desire to abide by the constitution as a constitutional ruler. This view is based on the argument that the concept of a constitutional ruler was a complete departure from the Malay tradition that recognised only the absolute ruler. On the other hand, Emerson is typical of some western historians in playing down the provisions which imposed

restrictions on the Sultan: he notes that it was the Sultan who handed down the constitution. He also notes the provisions which reinstated traditional principles, especially in the rules of succession that were based on the Malay tradition. Emerson has reservations with respect to the provisions that governed the legislative function of the Council, including the regulations for the appointment of the successor to the Sultan, the allocation of the Sultan's allowance, the regulations for the Sultan's absence abroad, and the prohibition on the Sultan's authority to surrender any part of the state to any other power.[39] However, from these two contradictory views, it can be seen that the existing historical writings did not focus on the extent to which any particular provision demonstrated that a transformation from absolute to constitutional monarchy had taken place. The provisions constituted restrictions on the Sultan: but the question remains whether those restrictions should be perceived as elements in the transformation from absolute to constitutional monarchy. The first provision that imposed restriction on the Sultan was that regarding the period of the Sultan's absence from the state, Article 12. This provision stated that if the Sultan were absent from the state for five years, the Council could consider whether to wait for his return or appoint a new Sultan. It was further stated in Articles 13 and 14 that any ex-sultan who had violated the provision in Article 12 could not regain his position as Sultan and was obliged to pay allegiance to the new Sultan.

This provision imposed a restriction that had never been imposed on a Malay Sultan as a traditional absolute ruler. However, realistically, there is a question to be raised, because an absence of five years in one instance would be an extreme circumstance. A much shorter duration would be more restrictive, of course. Abu Bakar's absence from the state, in Europe, was 18 months, between August 1889 and February 1891.[40]

No explanation was offered as to why the duration was five years. It could be because the total of Abu Bakar's travels abroad covered a period of five years. His first visit to England in 1866 took around eight months. The second visit to Europe, in 1878, was about six months, while the third, in 1885, the fourth, in 1889-1891 and the fifth, in 1893, were about fourteen, eighteen and six months respectively. He also visited India in 1875 for around 40 days and Japan in 1883 for about six months. These visits took around sixty months or five years. They did not include his last visit to England, when he died in London in June 1895.[41]

It can be presumed that this provision was a meaningless restriction or rather a symbolic one. The reality is that it was unlikely that Abu Bakar would violate the five year clause. However, the serious implication of violation cannot be dismissed, even though this restriction had little effect in preventing Abu Bakar from leaving the state. Shortly after the promulgation of the constitution, in May 1895, he made his last visit to England, where he died in June. He had ignored the advice given by his chiefs not to proceed with the visit, even though his health was deteriorating.[42]

The second provision that imposed restrictions on the Sultan concerned the surrender of the state or any part of its territory to a foreign power. Under Article 15 of Johor's Constitution of 1895, it was stipulated that if this provision were violated by the Sultan, he was to be judged 'sinful' for violating the trusteeship that was entrusted by God to him. It was stipulated that his subjects should then discontinue paying allegiance to him.[43]

This provision should be regarded as the most significant restriction on the Sultan, considering that, in principle, its application could lead to the deposing of the Sultan. This is Emerson's opinion. However, it can be said that this provision did not present any major diversion from the Malay tradition. In Malay history, the transfer of the sovereignty of the state by a Malay ruler to another would be difficult, unless in extreme circumstances, such as defeat in war or through a treaty ratified by force, as in the case of Sultan Ali in 1855. Even in Abu Bakar's situation, it was impossible to claim that he or his successors would violate these provisions voluntarily.

The only realistic possibility of such a violation would be if Johor was brought under direct British control. This occurred in 1946 when Sultan Ibrahim, Abu Bakar's son, was compelled by Harold MacMichael to agree to join the Malayan Union, which brought the whole of Malaya together as a British colony. As a result of this violation, a demonstration organised by the Johor Malays was held in February at Abu Bakar Mosque in Johor Baharu. The purpose of this demonstration was to insist that the Sultan should withdraw from joining the Malayan Union.

However, historians have ignored another significant implication in Article 16 of the constitution. According to article 16, the prohibition on surrendering any part of Johor's territory was also imposed on the members of the council. Before the constitution, the decision to surrender the sovereignty of any part of Johor's territory would be considered legal as long as it was made by the Sultan in conjunction with the consent of the Temenggong, as Johor's senior chief. This was related to the transfer of the sovereignty of Singapore by Sultan Husain and Temenggong Abdul Rahman of Singapore to the English East India Company in the treaty of 2 August 1824. Now, under the provisions in Articles 15 and 16 of the constitution, any similar transfer of sovereignty was no longer constitutional. This concerned the sovereignty of Johor over the two islands of Pulau Batu Putih and Pulau Pisang. These islands were administered by the Singapore authorities with the consent of Temenggong Ibrahim in the 1840s. This case was limited to the building and supervising of the lighthouses, especially the Horsburgh Lighthouse at Pulau Batu Putih. This also implied that if the Sultan and the members of his councils were to transfer sovereignty over those islands to Singapore, this would be unconstitutional.

The third restriction imposed on the Sultan was the provision in Article 25 stipulating the allocation of an allowance from the state treasury for the

personal disposal of the Sultan. This provision stipulated that the Sultan was prohibited from having access to more than the funds allocated to him by the State Council. The provision also defined the difference between the Sultan's personal properties, such as his palace and his other personal belongings, and the properties belonging to the state.

The imposition of these limitations was to come into effect after the ratification of the constitution in September 1895. In the Malay tradition, there was no such limitation imposed on the Sultan, since the disposal of the treasury was carried out on the royal command. Moreover, the Malay tradition did not make a clear distinction between the Sultan's personal and state properties. This was the situation in Abu Bakar's case before the promulgation of the constitution. This can be seen when he applied for a loan from the Straits Government. In 1873 and 1886, he applied for loans for the purpose of financing developmental projects in Johor. In both cases, he put his personal property in Singapore as the mortgage and the state revenue farms as the source of repayment.

The most substantive divergence from the Malay tradition in establishing the principle of constitutional monarchy was Article 55. According to this article, if any resolution, regulation, or rule which had been passed by the Council did not receive the approval of the Sultan on three consecutive submissions, it would be shelved for a year, before being resubmitted to the Sultan for a fourth time. On this occasion, it would become effective even without the approval of the Sultan.

Without Article 55, the Council of State and the Council of Ministers would have had no authority to force their positions on the Sultan. According to the traditional Malay political system, the ruler possessed absolute authority. He was merely advised by his senior chiefs but it was not obligatory for him to accept the advice. In most essential matters, particularly involving outside parties or foreign powers, any binding contracts were to be subject to the approval of the Assembly of Malay Senior Chiefs in the Malay ruler's court. Meanwhile, decisions on matters less significant, for example the appointment of a particular chief, were not subject to this procedure. In other words, although there was a general understanding in the Malay tradition that the Sultan was to follow the advice of his chiefs, there was no provision that required him to abide by the decisions of his Council.

Most historians offer only a brief explanation of this provision. The only historian who has offered an in-depth account is Moshe Yegar. He noted that this provision involved a legal limitation on the royal prerogative. However, he also argued that its implementation could be superseded by amendments to legislation made by the Sultan himself and his Council. He further argued that the force of this provision could be demonstrated only when a serious disagreement arose between the Council and the Sultan. Yegar stated that such a serious disagreement between the Sultan and his Council

never occurred, because the members of the Council were too dependent on the Sultan, and their disagreement with the Sultan would be considered as outright opposition to him.[44]

Other historians have not thoroughly discussed the significance of Article 55. In fact, Emerson, in his evaluation of Johor's Constitution, does not mention Article 55 at all. Fawzi Basri mentions Article 55 merely to recognise the advisory role of the Council of State in making decisions. He implies that the force of this article was that the authority of the Council could supersede the will of the Sultan. He also argues that the article, which gave such authority to the Council, complemented by Article 64, gave the Council authority to amend any provision in the constitution: but he made no other comment.[45]

It is impossible to examine the motives of Abu Bakar and his Council in committing themselves to this new principle. Indeed, there are no official records in the Johor Archive and Colonial Office Records relating to the Constitution before its promulgation (14 April 1895) or the immediate aftermath. However, it could be argued that this provision was designed to impress British officials, and to show that Abu Bakar was committed to abide by any resolution of his Council. It is also possible that Abu Bakar and his Council had consulted his European advisers, especially Messrs. Rodyk & Davidson, who were entrusted to prepare the English version of the constitution.

In reality, there is no way to judge the extent of Abu Bakar's commitment to this provision, because the constitution was promulgated less than two months before his death. No serious disagreement between him and the members of the Council occurred during his reign. Thus the constitution as a whole, with particular application to Article 55, can be judged only on events after his death. It is generally believed by historians, especially Gullick, that Abu Bakar's intention in promulgating the constitution was to steady and restrain his successor.[46] This also suggests that all provisions that imposed limitations on the Sultan, especially Articles 15 and 55, were intended for his son, Sultan Ibrahim.

Nevertheless, it did create the impression that Sultan Ibrahim had a far more autocratic temperament than Abu Bakar. This was reflected in his determination to preserve his control over the Council through the appointment of his relatives to several key posts. It was difficult for non-royal members in the Council to express their criticism of the Sultan, or even to propose any resolution that contradicted his will. This was partly because his Menteri Besar, Jaafar bin Hj. Mohamed, and his Deputy Menteri Besar, Mohamed Ibrahim Munshi, who were both considered sound advisers to the Sultan, were getting older.[47] Gullick suggested that the ineffectiveness of the non-royal members in the Council was also due to their fear of losing office as a result of a clash with Sultan Ibrahim. Since most of them were lacking personal wealth, such as land, they were dependent on their salary as their main source of income.[48]

Moreover, it can be said that there was virtually no serious disagreement between Sultan Ibrahim and the members of the Council regarding a resolution passed by the Council. This is possibly due to the fact that, in the eyes of the Malay principal chiefs in Johor, the promulgation of the Constitution had very little impact on the traditional loyalty and allegiance to the Sultan. This is reflected in the writings of Mohamed Salleh bin Perang who said that his loyalty to the Sultan was part of the legacy of his ancestors who had served the Sultan for several generations.[49]

Thus the only way for Article 55 to be invoked was by a person who was not a member of the Council of State but was associated with the Straits Government. In other words, pressures came from the British, not from the council acting independently of the Sultan.

Conclusion

Having considered the distinction between the terms 'modernisation' and 'westernisation', it can be concluded that the transformation of Johor during Abu Bakar's reign is more accurately considered a process of modernisation, despite the domination by western elements. Most of the western elements were included in the process of transformation, especially in government affairs, but were not a complete penetration of westernisation. This is because they were imposed in a selective manner, and were subject to innovation. Most of the new elements, such as the western style of bureaucracy and western concept of law, should be perceived as complementary to Malay traditional political institutions, rather than a diversion from the Malay tradition, simply because the bureaucracy and advice were acknowledged but marginal in the Malay tradition.

The term modernisation was also accurately applied to Johor's written Constitution of 1895 because the change in the status of the Sultan from absolute to constitutional ruler was generally evolutionary. Most of its provisions, regulating the status and the position of the Sultan as a constitutional monarch were to be applied only in extreme circumstances, for example the provisions relating to the surrender of the state to other nations. The only fundamental principle that imposed limitations on the Sultan as a constitutional monarch that did not exist in the Malay tradition is Article 55. This article subjected the Sultan to decision-making by the Council of State. However, it was evolutionary, partly because the Sultan could be over-ruled only after four submissions, partly because of the supremacy of the Sultan's royal prerogative. The only provision that came into effect after the ratification of the Constitution of Johor in 1895 was Article 25, preventing the Sultan from having access to the state treasury. In this regard, Johor is always perceived by historians as unique, due to its modernization derived from its western orientation. It is remarkable to note that this transformation took place under indigenous initiative without undue convulsion.

Notes

[1] See A. E. Coope, 'The Kangchu System in Johore', in R. O. Winstedt, *A History of Johor 1365-1941 A. D.*, latest publication in MBRAS reprint no. 6, Kuala Lumpur, 1992, p. 125; first published as 'A History of Johor 1365-1895 A. D.', in *JMBRAS*, Vol., 13, pt. III, 1932. Second publication was *A History of Johor 1365-1895 A. D.*, Kuala Lumpur: Art Printing Works, 1979, pp. 163-79; C. A. Trocki, *Prince of Pirates: The Temenggongs and the Development of Johor and Singapore 1784-1885*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1979, chapters 5-7; J. M. Gullick, *Rulers and Residents: Influence and Power in the Malay States 1870-1920*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1992, pp. 107-18; Khoo Kay Kim, *Malay Society: Transformation and Democratisation*, Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publication, 1991, Chapter 4; Ahmad Fawzi Mohamed Basri, *Johor 1855-1917: Pentadbiran dan Perkembangannya*, Petaling Jaya: Fajar Bakti, 1988, chapters 2 and 3; Rahimah Abdul Aziz, *Pembaratan Pemerintahan Johor (1800-1945): Suatu Analisa Sejarah*Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1997.

[2] Rahimah uses the word 'perintis' which means 'pioneer'. See Rahimah Abdul Aziz, *Pembaratan Pemerintahan Johor (1800-1945)*, p. 3.

[3] R. O. Winstedt, *A History of Johor 1365-1941*, p. 137.

[4] R. Emerson, *Malaysia: A Study in Direct and Indirect Rule*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1964, pp. 196-202; C. A. Trocki, *Prince of Pirates*, p. 26; Khoo Kay Kim, *Malay Society*, p.16; J. M. Gullick, *Rulers and Residents*, p. 107.

[5] M. A. Fawzi Basri and Hasrom Harun, *Sejarah Johor Moden 1855-1940*, Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Muzium, Muzium Negara, 1978, pp. 97-101.

[6] Ord to Secretary of State, 10 February 1868, in CO 273/17.

[7] Major Dato' Haji Mohamed Said bin Haji Sulaiman, *Hikayat Johor dan Tawarikh al-Marhum Sultan Abu Bakar*,Singapore: Malay Publishing House, 1940, pp. 18, 21.

[8] Rahimah Abdul Aziz, *Pembaratan Pemerintahan Johor (1800-1945)*, pp. 3, 8, 18, 34-6, 224-6.

[9] For the modernisation of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century, see Lord Kinross, *The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire*, New York: William Morrow, 1977, see under the section 'The Age of Reform' pp. 452-516; L.S. Stavrianos, *The Ottoman Empire: Was It The Sick Man of Europe?*, New York: Rinehart, 1957.

[10] Mohd. Hj. Elias, *Tawarikh Datu Bentara Luar*, edited by Amin Sweeney, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980, pp. 6-14.

[11] Rahimah Abdul Aziz, *Pembaratan Pemerintahan Johor*, pp. 234-7.

[12] The use of roman script in Malay language was initiated by the mixed Chinese-Indonesian community and generally labelled as Chinese. See Timothy P Barnard, (ed.), *Contesting Malayness: Malay Identity across Boundaries*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2004, p. 14. Even today, the Malays still regard the issue of the English language and roman script as ethnocentric because those two elements are perceived as undermining the integrity of the most fundamental aspects of Malayness. See Wan Suhana Wan Sulong, Saudara (1928-1941): Its Contribution to the Debates on Issues in Malay Society and the Development of Malay World-View, PhD. Thesis, University of Hull, 2003, pp. 337-51.

[13] Malay Jawi Script originated from the Arabic script with five additional indicators for C, Ng, P, G, Ny.

[14] Various samples of 'Surat Sungai' and other documents relating to the Kangchu System can be found in C. A. Trocki, 'The Johor Archives and the Kangchu System', *JMBRAS*, Vol. 48, pt. I, 1975, pp. 13-50.

[15] Abdul Malek Munip, 'The Pioneers of Modern Johore', *Malaysia in History*, 1977, p. 6; M.A. Fawzi Basri and Hasrom Harun, *Sejarah Johor Moden 1855-1940*, pp. 82-7.

[16] Mohd. Fadzil Othman, *Kisah Pelayaran Mohammed Ibrahim Munsyi*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1980, pp. 38, 86-7; See also Nigel Phillips and Amin Sweeney, *Voyages of Mohamed Ibrahim Munshi*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 73.

[17] C. A. Trocki, *Prince of Pirates*, p. 155.

[18] Khoo Kay Kim, *Malay Society*, p. 121.

[19] R. Emerson, *Malaysia*, p. 203; C. A. Trocki, *Prince of Pirates*, p. 186; J. M. Gullick, *Rulers and Residents*, pp. 210-14.

[20] C. A. Trocki, *Prince of Pirates*, p.157.

[21] M.A. Fawzi Basri and Hasrom Harun, *Sejarah Johor Moden 1855-1940*, pp. 190-99.

[22] Rahimah Abdul Aziz, *Pembaratan Pemerintahan Johor*, pp. 1-36, 221-39.

[23] M. A. Fawzi Basri and Hasrom Harun, *Sejarah Johor Moden, (1855-1940)*, p.209.

[24] L. Y. Andaya, *The Kingdom of Johor: 1641-1728*, Kuala Lumpur: East Asian Historical Monograph, Oxford University Press, 1975, pp. 31-54.

[25] Khoo Kay Kim, *Malay Society*, pp. 27-30.

[26] M. A. Fawzi Basri and Hasrom Harun, *Sejarah Johor Moden*, (1855-1940), p. 209.

[27] For a brief explanation of the existing traditional Malay legal digests, see M. B. Hooker, (ed.), *Islam in Southeast Asia*, second impression Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988, pp. 160-81.

[28] Governor Cavenagh to Government of India, 16 July 1861, in SSR, No. 116, R39, National Archives of Singapore

[29] Abu Bakar to Burn, 26 September 1863, in MLB (1855-1869).

[30] Abu Bakar to Burn, 26 May 1864, in MLB (1855-1869).

[31] These rules and regulations were written in the Malay Jawi script and can be found in Microfilm JQ. Mal. 3, under the title 'Various Rules and Regulations', Library of the National University of Singapore.

[32] See 'Johore, Malayan Peninsula', in *Singapore and Straits Directory* (*SSD*) 1873, pp. 1-7. Besides the printed copy, this directory is also available in Microfilm NL1174-88, available at the National Library of Singapore.

[33] Undang-Undang Gambir Lada dan Undang-Undang Bagi Kesejahteraan dan Hak kerana Gambir/Lada 1285 H, in Microfilm JQ. MAL., National University of Singapore Library.

[34] Paul H. Kratoska, (ed.), *Honourable Intentions: Talks on the British Empire in South East Asia Delivered at the Royal Colonial Institute, 1874-1928*, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1983, pp. 45, 58-9.

[35] L. Y. Andaya, *The Kingdom of Johor: 1641-1728*, pp. 31-54; Mohammad Yusoff Hashim, *The Malay Sultanate of Malacca: A Study of Various aspects of Malacca in The 15th and 16th Centuries in Malaysian History*, Ph.D. Thesis, Translated by D. J. Muzaffar Tate, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa Dan Pustaka, 1992, pp. 104-50.

[36] SSD, 1873, pp. 1-7.
[37] SSD, 1883, pp. 123-7; 1885, pp. 164-71.
[38] See Johor Document of 14 September 1895 (translation) in J. de V. Allen, A. J. Stockwell, L. R. Wright (eds.), *A Collection of Treaties and Other Documents Affecting the States of Malaysia 1761-1963*, Vol. I, London: Oceana Publication, 1981, pp. 77-101.
[39] R. Emerson, *Malaysia*, pp. 202-4.
[40] E. Thio, *British Policy in the Malay Peninsula 1880 - 1910* Volume I: The Southern and Central States, Oxford University Press, (Singapore, 1969), pp. 222-3.
[41] See the detailed account of Abu Bakar's travel abroad in J. M. Gullick, *Rulers and Residents*, pp. 242-8; and Major Dato' Haji Mohamed Said bin Haji Sulaiman, *Hikayat Johor*, passim.
[42] Mohd. Hj. Elias, *Tawarikh Datu Bentara Luar*, edited by Amin Sweeney, p. 13.
[43] M. A. Fawzi Basri and Hasrom Harun, *Sejarah Johor Moden 1855-1940*, p. 158.
[44] Moshe Yegar, *Islam and Islamic Institutions in British Malaya,* Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1979, p. 81.
[45] Ahmad Fawzi Mohamed Basri, *Johor 1855-1917*, p.66.
[46] J. M. Gullick, *Rulers and Residents*, p. 112.
[47] See Swettenham's report on his visit to Johor in *SSD*, 4 July 1903.
[48] J. M. Gullick, *Rulers and Residents*, p. 114.
[49] Mohd. Hj. Elias, *Tawarikh Datu Bentara Luar*, edited by Amin Sweeney, p. 17.