VERHANDELINGEN
VAN HET KONINKLIJK INSTITUUT
VOOR TAAL-, LAND- EN VOLKENKUNDE

63

CHAIRIL ANWAR:
THE POET AND HIS LANGUAGE

BOEN S. OEMARJATI



THE HAGUE · MARTINUS NIJHOFF 1972

CHAIRIL ANWAR

.....
So here I am, in the middle way, having had twenty years —
Twenty years largely wasted, the years of *l'entre deux guerres* —
Trying to learn to use words, and every attempt
Is a wholly new start, and a different kind of failure
Because one has only learnt to get the better of words
For the thing one no longer has to say, or the way in which
One is no longer disposed to say it. And so each venture
Is a new beginning, a raid on the inarticulate
With shabby equipment always deteriorating
In the general mess of imprecision of feeling,
Undisciplined squads of emotion .....

(T. S. Eliot, *East Coker V*)

To my parents as a partial instalment
in return for their devotion
To 'MB' with love and in gratitude
for sharing serenity and true friendship with me

VERHANDELINGEN
VAN HET KONINKLIJK INSTITUUT
VOOR TAAL-, LAND- EN VOLKENKUNDE

63

CHAIRIL ANWAR:
THE POET AND HIS LANGUAGE

BOEN S. OEMARJATI

THE HAGUE - MARTINUS NIJHOFF 1972

I.S.B.N. 90.247.1508.3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS VII

PREFACE IX

INTRODUCTION XIII

1. The Japanese Occupation: The Break with the Past . . XIII
2. The Situation respecting the Indonesian Language . . . XIV
3. The Situation in respect of Indonesian Literature . . . XVI
4. Biographical Data XX

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS XXVII

CHAPTER I: LANGUAGE AND POETRY 1

1. Prologue 1

A. Aspects of Presentation 1

1. The Title 1
2. The Dedication 2
3. The Date 2
4. The Punctuation 2
5. The Use of Capitals 3

B. Aesthetical Aspects 4

1. Final Rhyme 4
2. Stanza 5
3. Verse Structure 6
4. Phonaesthetical Aspects 7
5. Other Aesthetical Aspects 8

C. Linguistic Analysis 8

1. Preliminary Remarks 8
2. The Analysis 10

2. The Poems Selected for Analysis 17

3. Preliminary Remarks on Indonesian Syntax and Morphology 19

3.1. Main Sentence Structures in BI 19

I. Sentence Constructions Consisting of Three Elements 20

A. The Agent-Directed Construction 20

B. The Patient-Directed Construction 21

II. Sentence Constructions Consisting of Two Elements 23
A. The Equational Sentence Construction 23
B. Other Types of Sentence Construction 23
3.2. Transitive and Intransitive Verbs with *me-* 23
A. Transitive Verbs 24
B. Intransitive Verbs 25

CHAPTER II: ANALYSIS OF THE POEMS 27
1. Diponegoro 27
2. Kupu Malam dan Biniku 39
3. Kenangan 44
4. Hampa 53
5. Dimesdjid 59
6. 1943 63
7. Isa 68
8. Kepada Pelukis Affandi 75
9. Sendja di Pelabuhan Ketjil 81
10. Puntjak 88
11. Aku Berkisar Antara Mereka 94
12. Jang Terampas dan Jang Putus 103
13. Derai-Derai Tjemara 107

CHAPTER III: CHAIRIL ANWAR'S LANGUAGE 111
1. Preliminary Remarks 111
2. Morphological Multivalence 119
2.1. *Ke-an* Forms derived from Adjectives and the Nominal Use of Adjectives 119
2.2. *Me-* Forms 122
3. Poetic Licence as a Source of Ambiguity 127
3.1. The Use of the Demonstratives *ini* and *itu* 127
3.2. The Omission of *jang* 129
4. Colloquialism 130
5. Epilogue 132

NOTES 139

APPENDIX 149

BIBLIOGRAPHY 155

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It was during a two weeks' visit to the University of Leiden in August/September 1969 on a grant from the Netherlands Ministry of Education and Sciences that the idea of writing the present book was first put forward. A short period of intensive research at the Wason Collection section of the Cornell University Library in Ithaca, New York, in September 1969, which was made possible by a grant from the South-east Asia Program of Cornell University, provided me with valuable material for pursuing this work. All this would not have been possible, however, had I not been granted a two years' scholarship by the German Academic Exchange Service (October 1968-October 1970) to study modern German literature at the Eberhard-Karl University in Tübingen. It was with their generous permission that I was able to resume and complete my studies at the University of Leiden with the writing of this book, for which the Ministry of Education and Sciences of the Netherlands kindly made a scholarship available.

I cannot hope to express sufficiently my heartfelt gratitude to all those who have made it possible for me to write this book. But I do want to extend my sincere thanks to Dr. Hans-Georg Kemper (Tübingen), who encouraged me to carry through the idea despite numerous obstacles; to Prof. John M. Echols, whose modest suggestions and kind words of advice guided me in my research while at Cornell University; to the Dean of the Faculty of Letters of the University of Indonesia for granting me leave of absence; to Drs. H. B. Jassin for sharing so much of his indispensable knowledge with me; and last but not least to the Netherlands Ministry of Education and Sciences whose generosity made possible the completion of my study in Leiden and the publication of the present book. I am indebted to all those who assisted and encouraged me in the writing of this book in various ways, by providing me with material and other information, by discussing the subject matter with me, and by listening to and not being bored by the problems involved in this study. But most especially I would like to express my sincere gratitude to those members of the Faculty of Letters of the University of Leiden — whose names must remain anonymous in accordance with

the traditions of this university — who freely gave their time, encouragement and inspiration, and invaluable advice and information throughout this lengthy and often laborious undertaking.

I am grateful to various members of the staff of the *Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* for their most generous assistance in the completion of the book, especially to Miss M. J. L. van Yperen B.A., who patiently and willingly went through the entire manuscript, smoothing out a great number of errors and inconsistencies, and to the management and staff of *Drukkerij en Uitgeverij Smits,* The Hague, for the patience and efficiency with which they carried out the task of presenting this book in its final form.

As a final acknowledgement, we hope that this book will be accepted by Hapsah as a contribution toward the understanding of the poetry of her late poet-husband.

University of Leyden, November 1972 Boen S. Oemarjati

PREFACE

In general it can be said that the ordinary reader in his intuitive reading and understanding of a poem does not distinguish the various aspects which together make up the total message of the poem. In a scholarly analysis, however, we have to take due account of these various aspects. We need a thorough knowledge of the language used by the poet, its phonemic and grammatical structure, and its vocabulary; we have to be aware of the writing conventions [1] of the language in question; and finally, we have to take into account the specific conventions and characteristics of poetry written in this language.

Attempts to describe and analyse Bahasa Indonesia as used in poetry so far have been few in number and, moreover, not very successful. Although some studies, e.g. those by Slametmuljana (1951; 1954; 1956), Junus (1965; 1968; 1970), and Nababan (1966), may be mentioned in this respect most of them lack both the theoretical foundations [2] and the thoroughness and scientific consistency necessary in dealing with the various aspects involved in the language of poetry (see e.g. Teeuw, 1953 and 1955, on Slametmuljana's 1951 and 1954, respectively).

The aim of the present study is to make a linguistic analysis of Chairil Anwar's poetry and to reveal the poet's specific treatment of his language. We have chosen Chairil Anwar for this study because he is generally acknowledged as the forerunner and most important representative of modern Indonesian poetry (Braasem, 1954:43; Jassin, [3]1968; Teeuw, 1967). By focusing the analysis on the linguistic aspects of his poetic language, this study aims to bring into prominence the characteristic qualities of both the poet and his poetry. It is hoped that this linguistic approach will provide a basis for further interpretation and evaluation of Chairil Anwar as a poet in particular, as well as presenting relevant material and opening up some new lines of inquiry for a further study of poetic usage in Bahasa Indonesia in general.

Chairil Anwar's poetry was originally published in three volumes: *Deru Tjampur Debu* (Noise Mixed with Dust, 1949), jointly published by Pembangunan and Djambatan; *Kerikil Tadjam dan Jang Terampas dan Jang Putus* (Sharp Gravel and The Ravaged and The Broken,

1949), i.e. two collections combined into one volume, published by Pustaka Rakjat; and *Tiga Menguak Takdir* [3], published by Balai Pustaka in 1950. In the last-mentioned, ten poems [4] by Chairil Anwar appear together with poems by Asrul Sani and Rivai Apin. However, only one of them had not been published previously in either of the two earlier collections [5]. In Jassin's excellent study, *Chairil Anwar Pelopor Angkatan 45* (Chairil Anwar, A Pioneer of the Generation of 1945), published by Gunung Agung in 1956 (third edition 1968), a number of poems and prose writings that had either never appeared in print before, or were scattered throughout numerous magazines, have been brought together and published. Burton Raffel's *The Complete Poetry and Prose of Chairil Anwar,* published by the State University of New York Press (1970), contains a complete edition of Chairil Anwar's poetry together with English translations which, however, are not always altogether exact (Teeuw, 1971b, and below). The poems selected for discussion in the present study (see Chapter I, Section 2) have been taken from one or other of the first four books mentioned above. Wherever any of these poems is available in more than one printed version, the particular source used here and the variant readings which are relevant for the analysis will be mentioned.

Further, Poerwadarminta's monolingual Indonesian dictionary *Kamus Umum,* first published in 1952, was used as the main reference work, both for lexicographical and morphological purposes, since it is 'a standard work, coming right at the beginning of the history of BI lexicography, and excelling in the large number of well chosen examples of the use of words' (Teeuw, 1961:69); moreover, it is almost contemporaneous with Chairil Anwar's poetry in its data. Occasionally we also refer to the Indonesian-Dutch dictionary of Poerwadarminta and Teeuw (first published in 1950). In dealing with certain problems of Indonesian syntax we have consulted Poedjawijatna and Zoetmulder's *Tatabahasa Indonesia Untuk Sekolah Landjutan Atas* (Indonesian Grammar for High Schools), first published in 1955. The insufficiency of our reference material is obvious; however, at the present stage of Indonesian grammatical description and lexicography we are left with no better alternative.

In view of what has been said above about the scarcity of previous works in this field and also because Chairil Anwar's use of Bahasa Indonesia is so obviously different from the pre-war form of that language that had become more or less standardized in Balai Pustaka Malay (see below), we are of the opinion that the most appropriate method

of approach to and analysis of this poetry as an example of linguistic use is that of induction and description. We furthermore feel that, since the book is being published for a predominantly non-Indonesian speaking public, this type of description (i.e. using the inductive method and the method of descriptive analysis) will help to give the readers some idea of the problems involved in understanding (and/or translating) modern Indonesian poetry.

In order to make the reader acquainted with the framework in which our subject should be placed, a brief survey is given, by way of Introduction, of the situation as regards Indonesian language and literature during Chairil Anwar's lifetime, as well as an outline of the main biographical facts relevant to this study.

In order to make the reader acquainted at the outset with the kind of problems we face in dealing with Chairil Anwar's poetry we shall begin in Chapter I, intended as a kind of Prologue, with a detailed discussion of one of his shorter poems, which happens to be chronologically his first, and which even so is typical for his poetry in many ways. This poem will also give us an opportunity of making a few introductory remarks on some of the aspects of presentation of this poetry (such as titles, punctuation, etc.), as well as on the aesthetic qualities of Indonesian poetry and Chairil Anwar's attitude with regard to these. Through this Prologue we mean to underline the inductive approach which we have chosen for this study. In the course of our study we have frequently observed that ambiguity, as occasioned by certain morphological and syntactic characteristics of Bahasa Indonesia, looms large among the problems we face in our analysis [6]. In order to avoid unnecessary repetition we shall give a brief exposition of some of the syntactic and morphological characteristics which especially make for ambiguity in Chairil Anwar's poetry and which will therefore have to be referred to time and again in our discussion (Chapter I, Section 3).

The main body of the book is formed by an analysis of thirteen poems, selected both for their literary value and relevance and because they all present, in one way or another, some of the typical problems we are facing when attempting to understand this poetry (Chapter II). In our analysis we shall keep to the texts as they stand, including all the formal and semantic characteristics which are relevant for a linguistic analysis, but refraining as much as possible from making far-reaching interpretations (such as symbolic, allegoric, and other kinds) which are not strictly justified by the texts as such. It should be observed that the English translations following the discussions of the poems pretend to

be no more than a more or less literal rendering summarizing the linguistic analyses. The reader should be warned not to expect anything approaching a poetically satisfying translation. It is hoped, however, that they will provide a basis for such translation as well as serving as a tool for further interpretation of Chairil Anwar as a poet.

In Chapter III we shall give a systematic summary of the results of our analyses. This Chapter ends with an Epilogue, which is intended as a pendant to the Prologue. It contains a detailed analysis of another one of Chairil Anwar's short poems, one which has so far defied all our attempts at satisfactory interpretation. This way the Epilogue underlines the limitations of a linguistic analysis. It shows how in the absence of sufficient situational information or an adequate frame of reference it is well-nigh impossible for us to arrive at a proper understanding of a poem, that is, to make the appropriate choice from the alternatives emerging from an analysis of the linguistic content of its message.

We have refrained from supplying an index as the key words we would like to list are for the most part so widely scattered throughout the entire book as to render an index virtually pointless anyway. To compensate for this omission we have furnished a detailed table of contents.

In conclusion a few words about the position of the author of the present book in respect of Bahasa Indonesia. She is a native of Djakarta, and has lived in that city all her life (apart from a recent four years' stay abroad). Hence the language she has used since childhood is Bahasa Indonesia as spoken in Djakarta. Her formal education also took place entirely in schools where Bahasa Indonesia was the medium of instruction. The language used in her immediate family circle, however, is mainly Javanese, as both parents are native speakers of Javanese. Therefore it has been necessary to refer time and again to standard Indonesian dictionaries and to check with other native speakers of Indonesian who happened to be near at hand in Leiden on the use and meanings of some of the words and expressions found in Chairil Anwar's poetry.

INTRODUCTION

1 THE JAPANESE OCCUPATION: THE BREAK WITH THE PAST

Chairil Anwar's earliest poem is dated October 1942 [7], that is, approximately six months after the beginning of the Japanese occupation of what had until then been the Dutch East Indies. It seems useful, therefore, to give a brief sketch of the situation as regards the Indonesian language and literature at that time. The Japanese invasion marked a significant change in the history of modern Indonesia; it constituted a break with most of the past, as well as the beginning of new developments.

Prior to the invasion Japanese propaganda about aims to liberate oppressed countries from the white supremacy and give them their freedom and independence had regularly been broadcast through radio Tokyo (Benda, 1958:103-107). After the invasion some Indonesians, taken in by the Japanese propaganda efforts with regard to the creation of a 'Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere', were willing in the beginning to cooperate with the Japanese. Very soon, however, they discovered the duplicity of the Japanese propaganda.

The Japanese, fully aware of the potentialities of education as a means of achieving their goals, made every effort to win over influential Indonesian public figures to their side by establishing special educational institutions (Elsbree, 1953:39-41, 102-103). This mass education scheme, however, involved largely semi-military exercises and ideological or pseudo-ideological indoctrination (Anderson, 1966:26). For purposes of modelling cultural activities on the Japanese ideal of 'Asian dignity' a Cultural Centre, *Keimin Bunka Shidosho,* was founded which brought artists of all kinds together in one single organization. In practice the Centre controlled and determined every cultural activity by means of rigorous censorship. Furthermore, a military police force, *Kempeitai,* took immediate and harsh measures against any movement that had a political and especially nationalistic character (cf. Anderson, 1966:26 ff.). Last but not least, a system of forced labor, or *romusha,* was instituted by the Japanese Army. 'It was the humiliation and brutal treatment inflicted by the Japanese on these peasants (= *romusha*) which aroused

the most violent and selfless reactions among the politicized and semi-politicized Pemuda (= Indonesian youth)' (Anderson, 1966:29). In other words, the practices of the Japanese occupational army aroused general discontent and a widespread feeling of disillusionment on the part of the Indonesians, though at the same time it gave the revolutionary movement its specific character (Anderson, 1961). This situation in the political field also became manifest in the cultural field, and was reflected particularly by the language and literature of Indonesia.

2 THE SITUATION RESPECTING THE INDONESIAN LANGUAGE

In order to explain the role of Bahasa Indonesia after 1942, a brief survey of the preceding period seems called for.

On October 28, 1928, the youth organizations that had been fused into the 'All Indonesia Association' (*Indonesia Muda*) held their first congress in Djakarta and proclaimed the threefold ideal of one Indonesian country, one Indonesian people and one Indonesian language (Alisjahbana, 1957:34). Historically, Bahasa Indonesia developed from Malay, i.e. the language used in the Malay Peninsula and some areas of East Sumatra and Borneo. For centuries Malay was the *lingua franca* of Southeast Asia (Teeuw, 1959), not only for commercial purposes, but also in religious contacts both between Indonesians and foreigners and among Indonesians themselves. The spread of Islam took place largely through the medium of Malay, while Christian missions also made use of the same medium. These circumstances led to the acceptance and use of Malay by the Netherlands East Indies government as the medium of communication in the promotion of political expansion as well as in administration and education. Although the official language at that time was Dutch, the use of Malay was spread considerably further throughout the Archipelago as a consequence of more intensive colonial administration.

An important step in the promotion and systematic expansion of the use of Malay was the foundation, first of a Committee (1908), and later on of the Bureau of Popular Literature (*Balai Pustaka,* 1917) as a result of the Ethical Policy of the Dutch Colonial Government [8]. In the twenties, which in the history of Indonesian language and literature is known as the *Balai Pustaka* era, the use of Malay in a more or less standardized form was propagated primarily by books that were published under the auspices of the colonial government. In the thirties, i.e. after the historic *Sumpah Pemuda* (Pledge of Youth) of October 28,

1928, writers began to use Bahasa Indonesia by way of experiment in essays, reviews, and articles on science and cultural problems in general. A new important expansion in the Indonesian vocabulary was due to this generation of writers, which was called the generation of *Pudjangga Baru,* after the literary and cultural journal which they published from 1933 onwards (Jassin, 1963). Owing to their broad cultural interest and the wide scope of their activities — a consequence of their education, partly at Dutch universities — a large number of foreign words, particularly Dutch and English scientific terms, were introduced into Bahasa Indonesia through this journal. Moreover, these authors often deviated, consciously or unconsciously, from the grammatical rules of Balai Pustaka Malay, thus also providing the impetus for the process of modernization of the syntax and morphology of Bahasa Indonesia. But this group remained small in number, and Bahasa Indonesia in every respect remained second to Dutch as the language of social, administrative, cultural and scientific intercourse (cf. Sutherland, 1968 esp. p. 126).

This situation changed drastically with the Japanese invasion. Dutch was abolished as the official language and its use forbidden in all sectors of society, and Bahasa Indonesia was in fact the only language available to replace it. Within a very short time Indonesians from all social strata were compelled to give up Dutch and use the national language, as Japanese was generally not accessible to them. This challenging situation turned out to be of tremendous importance for the development of Bahasa Indonesia. It is true that all writing activities were from the beginning under the control of Japanese censors, but for obvious reasons this censorship could only concern itself with the contents of the writings, whether political, cultural or other. The language itself was never criticized by the Japanese, and in this respect the Indonesians were free to experiment as much as they wanted. It was evident that Bahasa Indonesia, or rather its users, was not quite prepared for this new role. Both the lexical and the grammatical aspects were subjected to innovations, which were introduced not so much because Bahasa Indonesia was inadequate or unsuitable, but rather more often because many new users of Bahasa Indonesia were insufficiently familiar with the structure and potentialities of this language. Consequently, they unconsciously turned to other sources for filling the gaps in their knowledge. First of all *calques* from Dutch (and English) were introduced on a much larger scale than ever before, as many Indonesian intellectuals began to impose virtually Dutch or English patterns on Malay, thus creating their own

brand of Bahasa Indonesia. Moreover, apart from the intellectuals who began to use Bahasa Indonesia instead of Dutch, a still larger number of Indonesians without any proper language education had to switch from their regional language to some improvised brand of Bahasa Indonesia in order to cope with the rapidly increasing intra-Indonesian contact situations as a consequence of the social development of the country; in such situations the use of their native tongue was no longer adequate. The process of interaction between the regional languages and Bahasa Indonesia took place on an even larger scale than that between Bahasa Indonesia and Dutch. More and more Indonesians began to use Javanese, Sundanese, and other regional linguistic patterns with Malay words as their brand of Bahasa Indonesia, or at least introduced many innovations, on the point of both grammar and vocabulary, into Bahasa Indonesia (Fokker, 1951b). Since the main sources of these innovations differed more markedly from Bahasa Indonesia than Minangkabau, which had been the primary source of innovation in Balai Pustaka Malay, the result was a rapid development of Bahasa Indonesia away from Balai Pustaka Malay during the Japanese occupation. A great number of colloquialisms which had been taboo before 1942 especially found their way into Bahasa Indonesia, where they were condemned by some, but tolerated or even encouraged by others.

3 THE SITUATION IN RESPECT OF INDONESIAN LITERATURE

The Japanese occupation and all the changes it entailed was not without consequences for the development of Indonesian literature either. Culturally, Indonesia was cut off abruptly from Western influences. *Pudjangga Baru,* despite all its nationalistic ideals always a supporter of freedom and democracy in the Western sense of the word, had to suspend publication (Jassin, 1963:33 ff.). Consequently this important window on Western culture and literature was closed.

As Japan did little to replace activities that were either forbidden or made impossible, Indonesians had to develop new cultural activities of their own. Some of them accommodated themselves to the Japanese censor, producing tendentious writings glorifying the 'Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere'. But there were also a number of young writers who developed a new idea of what literature should be and who possessed enough courage to preserve their integrity and sufficient critical sense to express their thoughts and feelings in a new and independent way. In their works the tremendous psychological impact of the Japanese

victory over the Dutch military power, which had for so long been considered unassailable, becomes fully apparent. In order to show how this development came about, a brief survey of pre-war Indonesian literature is necessary.

The novels of the first period of modern Indonesian literature, often called the *Balai Pustaka* period, usually all had a similar plot following a set pattern: the conflict between the older generation and the younger one, between *adat* (custom) and the individual will, between East and West. In most of these novels the main characters were described as helpless figures falling victim to conflicts resulting from social conditions prevailing within Indonesian society at the time. In the novels of the thirties an effort was made to portray the main figures as individuals with a will and conscience of their own. This, however, made these novels hardly any less tendentious. An author such as Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, who may be regarded as the most important writer of the *Pudjangga Baru* generation, purposely used his novels to propagate his ideas on *kemadjuan* (progress), which according to him was necessarily linked with westernization and modernization. There are also writings from that time employing themes which are based on some sort of Oriental philosophy and attitude to life. Sanusi Pane's poems and plays may be mentioned as the most typical examples of this, the legacy of Indian influence usually being reflected in his work in one way or another. But in his writings, no less than in Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana's books, the characters merely act as the author's mouthpiece, promulgating his ideals and ideas.

The most characteristic innovation which took place during the pre-war period was probably not so much the change in the genre of the novels from the *Balai Pustaka* period to the *Pudjangga Baru* period, but rather in the content of a magazine such as *Pudjangga Baru*. Here for the first time in modern Indonesian history many essays and reviews were published besides poems, stories, short plays, etc., as evidence of a growing critical awareness and a need for reflection on cultural problems. In this respect *Polemik Kebudajaan* (Polemics on Culture) is a most revealing collection of essays of the thirties (*Polemik,* ²1950). In poetry, even after the traditional *shair* and *pantun* forms had been abandoned — at least outwardly — still much of the old was left in so-called modern forms as, for example, the sonnet, which was used widely in imitation of the Dutch generation of the *Eighties* (Jassin, 1963). Even the more 'experimental' poems of the period can hardly be described as revolutionary in comparison with what had been written

in previous periods, with the possible exception of Amir Hamzah (Jassin, 1962; Teeuw, 1967:84-103; Junus, 1970:28-39).

The new situation after 1942 required new forms. Few novels were written in comparison with the number produced in the pre-war period, perhaps because conditions under the Japanese regime left little leisure or opportunity for novel-writing. Short stories, not completely absent before the war, became very popular and now began to fill the magazines and the literary pages of the newspapers. In these stories the main characters appear as individuals who act upon their own will and conscience, and are responsible for their own views and conduct. The conflicts are no longer prefabricated, but develop from the plot itself and from the actions of the characters, who tend to become round instead of the flat characters which were typical of the pre-war period. Actual social situations are acutely analysed and sometimes sharply criticized in literary form. Clear examples of this change in approach and attitude can be found in Idrus' stories collected in *Dari Ave Maria ke Djalan Lain ke Roma* (From 'Ave Maria' to 'Other Roads to Rome').

Parallel with the literary development in which the focus shifted to the individual and his role of responsibility, new dramatic forms began to develop. Instead of the 'historical dramas' of the pre-war period dealing with long-ago kingdoms and heroes, all of them noble but highly unrealistic, a new type of play began to develop, depicting contemporary people and conditions. There was a great demand for such plays; drama was very popular during the occupation (Oemarjati, 1971), and the Japanese took advantage of the demand for entertainment to infiltrate dramatic literature with their ideals, exploiting this art form for their war-like goals. Some Indonesians were amenable to this kind of propaganda. But here again, many young authors found in drama outlets for ideas and ideals which were far from identical with what the Japanese considered advantageous to their aims. The ideals of national consciousness and unity found their way into such dramas, sometimes in spite of Japanese censorship. Playwrights such as Armijn Pané, Abu Hanifah (= El Hakim) and Usmar Ismail each had their own way of circumventing the requirements of the censor: El Hakim through the use of subtle symbolism, and Usmar Ismail through more outspoken realism, although symbolism is not lacking in some of his early plays either.

In poetry, too, new ideas required new forms. At first sight perhaps many of the poems written during this period did not appear to differ very markedly from pre-war poetry, but instead of the old clichés there

were now a new symbolism and new motifs. Romantically idealistic poetry was replaced by more straight-forward verse, directly related to the realities of a new and challenging situation. Romanticism did not disappear altogether, for these young people, too, yearned for a new, just and peaceful world. But their romanticism was embedded in a realistic awareness of a new time. Thus the problems they encountered assumed new dimensions: at first an Asiatic dimension as a result of the confrontation with the *Keimin Bunka Shidosho,* but soon after that international and universal dimensions.

These young authors no longer were interested in the conflict between the generations within a typically Indonesian setting, or in a traditional East-West opposition ('Western materialism vs. Oriental spiritualism'); they recognized in their own problems and situation the situation and problems of all people and all nations. Hence they felt themselves to be part of humanity as a whole, and their situation was experienced first and foremost as truly universal, and only in the second place, if at all, as Indonesian [9].

Ironically, their pen was also sharpened and their craftsmanship refined by the requirements of Japanese censorship. They evolved a new kind of symbolism in order to enable their work to survive the strict criteria of the censor. Typical examples of this new style of literature, which came into being under the very eyes of the Japanese as a result of a new situation, are, among others, El Hakim's *Dewi Reni,* Usmar Ismail's *Tjitra* and also Chairil Anwar's poem *Diponegoro,* the symbolism of which admitted of such widely diverging interpretations that it satisfied both the censor and the nationalist Indonesian reader (Jassin, 1954; for Chairil Anwar's poem see, e.g., Aoh, 1952:30-33; Teeuw, 1967:149; and also our discussion in Chapter II).

It is evident that this totally new situation, both in the linguistic and in the literary field, urged young authors to try new possibilities in the use of Bahasa Indonesia. By freeing themselves from the constraints of the traditional grammatical rules they aimed at developing a new and more practically adapted style.

In prose-writing it was again Idrus who pioneered this new style, which is known as *kesederhanaan baru* (*die neue Sachlichkeit,* or *new simplicity*) [10]. In contrast with *Balai Pustaka* novels and stories, we find here short and simple sentences, a preference for basic words (i.e. words without affixes) even where traditional grammar would have required a longer form, and for Nouns rather than Verbs, and a generous use of colloquialisms and borrowings from regional and foreign languages

(Jassin, [2]1954; Teeuw, 1967:160 ff.). It is obvious that in that period Bahasa Indonesia developed from a one-sidedly intellectual language (Fokker, 1951b:13; Teeuw, 1952:16) into a genuine general language of culture. And the modern simplicity of the new prose style had its counterpart in the economy of language in poetry, of which Chairil Anwar is the main and most outstanding exponent in Indonesian literature.

4 BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Chairil Anwar was born in Medan, North Sumatra, on July 26, 1922. He was the son of a Minangkabau family and had an elder sister called Chairani (now Mrs. Halim, living in Medan). Chairil Anwar was small and slender and bore little physical resemblance to either his father, Tulus, who was tall and athletic, or his mother, Saleha, a rather plump woman. Very little is known of his early youth and basic education.

He spent his first seventeen or eighteen years in Medan, where he visited the Dutch school for indigenous children, or *H.I.S.*, and attended the first and second year classes of the *M.U.L.O.* (Junior High School) (Sjamsulridwan, 1966:22). So he must have come from a family that was at least fairly prosperous for it to have been able to send him to a Dutch school, as at that time only few Indonesians could afford this (Wertheim, 1956:145-146). He is described as a very intelligent young man with a great passion for books, who was an easy social mixer. While a *M.U.L.O.* pupil he was always eager to get in contact with students of the *H.B.S.* (another type of High School, of a distinctly higher standard) (Sjamsulridwan, 1966:22). Since he was always impelled by an urge to outshine others [11], he would read books normally read by students who were his seniors in both age and formal education. This apparently posed no problems of understanding, since he seems to have acquired a sufficient command not only of Dutch, but also of English and German [12].

He must have gone to Djakarta with his mother at the beginning of 1940. The decision to leave his birthplace was reportedly provoked on the one hand by his hatred and resentment of his father, who had meanwhile married another woman, and on the other by his desire to see the capital city about which he had heard so much (Sjamsulridwan, 1966:23). Some time in the middle of 1940 he told a friend of his, Darmawidjaja, that he was forced to leave school because his father had stopped sending him money. To compensate for this premature

ending of his formal education he would read books whenever and wherever he could borrow them (Darmawidjaja, 1949a). Through his extensive reading he became acquainted with poets from both East and West, such as Hsu Chih-Mo, Alexander Blok (Russia) [13], Marsman, Slauerhoff, Elsschot, Du Perron, Nietzsche, Rilke, Oscar Wilde, Byron, Auden, T. S. Eliot, Hemingway, Steinbeck, Gide, and many others.

He assumed the airs of a well-to-do young man despite financial problems. He dressed up in fine clothes and took his dates out to dances and cinemas. In order to enable himself to go on living in this style he exploited his mother's love for him to the point where she was forced to sell all her possessions so as to find means of satisfying her son's urge to enjoy life (Sjamsulridwan, 1966:23-25). Being without fixed abode he moved from one friend's to another's. His acquaintance included a large assortment of individuals from all social strata. He slept under the bridges of Djakarta with *betjak* drivers and prostitutes, but was also a welcome guest at the homes of some of the leading figures of that time, such as Hatta and Sjahrir (the latter was related to Chairil Anwar). He also had innumerable friends among artists and other men of culture, both Indonesian and foreign. However, his loose life, often referred to as 'bohemian' (Braasem, 1954:44 ff.) and concentrated primarily on the satisfaction of his indomitable 'lust of life', seemed to assume new dimensions after the Japanese invasion.

Sjamsulridwan describes how at this point there took place a change in Chairil Anwar's attitude towards life. For the first time he began to think about human existence in general, about justice, truth and humanity. He became aware of the people's sufferings. He began to see the cruelty of the Japanese and to hate them for it (Sjamsulridwan, 1966:25).

One can only speculate as to the exact causes leading to this change. Many factors must have contributed to it, such as: his manifold acquaintances and social contacts, as well as his wide reading; the intensity of his reactions to his experiences, both personal and other, in an adverse and ever-worsening situation; his confrontation with death, and specifically the death of his grandfather, who had spoilt him excessively and whom he loved dearly (see his poem *Nisan*). However, we lack the necessary reliable information to enable us to gain a better insight into his spiritual development during the latter period of the Japanese occupation; the few scattered reminiscences written by some of his friends and the scanty oral information which is available provide insufficient facts to go on.

It is known that Chairil Anwar took an active part in the Indonesian struggle for Independence. He was fighting on the side of the nationalistic movement of 1945 (*Gerakan Angkatan 45*) when the British and Dutch forces landed in Djakarta (cf. his poem no. *41, Malam* 'Night'; Darmawidjaja, 1949c). When he left Djakarta for Krawang together with the Indonesian *lasjkar* (or people's army) in the middle of 1946, he met Hapsah, a daughter of the highly respected *Haji* Wiriaredja. Through an oral communication of Hapsah's we have further discovered that Chairil Anwar introduced himself to her as a war correspondent. After a brief, two months' courtship Hapsah became Mrs. Chairil Anwar on September 6, 1946. The couple then returned to Djakarta. However, his marital status failed to induce Chairil Anwar to take the necessary steps to provide for his family. A regular job that might eventually provide him with a regular income did not appeal to him. He remained a nonconformist in his pursuit of individual freedom. Nor could the birth of a daughter, Evawane Alissa [14], on June 17, 1947 — who was born crippled due to a disease contracted by Chairil Anwar during his life of unrestrained sexual promiscuity — bring him to his senses. After approximately two years, in which the husband failed to support the family, the Moslem *Adat* Law Court granted Hapsah her application for divorce (end of 1948) [15]. We have no exact information on the rest of Chairil Anwar's life up to his death [16].

The best source of information with regard to Chairil Anwar's attitude towards art in general and poetry in particular are without doubt his prose writings dating from the years during and shortly after the Japanese occupation. A brief survey of some of his opinions and viewpoints may therefore be useful at this stage.

At the first meeting of the New Generation of Writers (*Angkatan Muda Sastrawan*) on April 9, 1943, Chairil Anwar levelled a biting attack at the writers of the preceding generations, including the *Pudjangga Baru* [17]. At the second meeting, Chairil Anwar stated his own standpoint with regard to art, 'which for those acquainted with expressionism in the West was nothing new, but to the Indonesian people and for Indonesian literature was still a novelty.' [18] In his speech, *Pidato 1943* (Untitled Speech of 1943), he underlined his principle of literary creation, refuting the idea of inspiration as the primary source of art. For him the creation of works of art was a matter of thinking, of concentration, of critical activity, and of study. He averred that 'it is danger that constitutes the very pillars and floor of life' (*tiang dan lantai penghidupan ialah . . . bahaja*; Jassin, [3]1968:131); therefore an

artist must be both a critic and a pioneer at the same time, opening and paving the way for others with unfailing courage and energy. An artist must be discerning and resolute when making observations and taking decisions; he must be able to select, to analyse and sometimes to cast aside everything, before he begins to build and compose. This he must do boldly and with unflagging vitality (Jassin, [3]1968:128-133) [19]. Feeling also has its place in creativity, but not the romantically idealistic sentimentality which is often mistaken for feeling. Art requires genuine sympathy for and sensitivity in life (*perasaan dalam hidup*; Jassin, [3]1968:133). In his letter dated March 8, 1944, we are able to discern Chairil Anwar's preoccupation with the search for the right word in the right place in his poems:

> 'In my prose, and my poetry as well, I will scrape and dig into *every word* as far as I can get, right down to the essence of the word, to the substance of the image.' [20]

Chairil Anwar admitted that the poems he had written up to that time had never gone beyond the experimental stage (letter to Jassin, dated April 10, 1944) [21]. From the above letters Chairil Anwar's conscientiousness as a poet becomes clear. He used his language deliberately, trying the possibilities of the language with perspicacity, because 'the Indonesian language is a very dangerous language; it is so easy to rhyme', as he said to Nieuwenhuys [22]. And Jassin noted that 'Chairil Anwar was not one of those poets who wrote fluently in the sense that he could write a poem effortlessly' (Jassin, [3]1968:14). In *Hoppla!* (written in 1945; Jassin, [3]1968:139-140) Chairil Anwar elucidated his viewpoint with regard to the *Word* (*Kata*) as follows:

> '... The Word is something that spreads its roots, lives from age to age, stuffed with values, Dreams and Hopes. (It is) Love and Vengeance. Words are Truth!!! The Word cannot be enslaved by two masters; the Word is the Thesis itself!!!' (Jassin, [3]1968:140).

Perhaps this conviction constituted the very reason why he was unable to produce many poems in 1944 and 1945 (see Appendix), because under certain conditions 'it is better not to write than to violate truth and progress' (Jassin, [3]1968:140).

We can only understand a statement like this if we remember the situation at the time. In Chairil Anwar's *Pidato 1943* we can still observe

his admiration for the Japanese supremacy as manifested in Colonel Yamasaki's boundless energy (Jassin, [3]1968:131). However, after he had personally experienced the cruelty of the Japanese (he was arrested several times and tortured by the *Kempeitai,* see e.g., note 3, Chapter I) he wrote in *Hoppla!* that in both Germany and Italy, as well as in Japan itself, hundreds of artists had either risked their lives by opposing the regime, or been forced to leave their beloved fatherland (Jassin, [3]1968: 140). In this connection Chairil Anwar stressed the view that the essential values of mankind and human existence are Freedom and Responsibility (Jassin, [3]1968:140). What he meant specifically were the Freedom and Responsibility of the artist with regard to art, just as he had stated previously in his *Pidato 1943* that 'as a true artist we must give our utmost, where possible our all' (Jassin, [3]1968:130) [23].

In *Tiga Muka Satu Pokok* (Three Approaches, One Idea, 1946; Jassin, [3]1968:141-143) Chairil Anwar explained that the quality of an artist is determined by his intensity, by his aims and objectives in experiencing and going through life. True art is based on truth, and such truth has its own special rights; it is not something that is dependent on the opinions of others, nor is the artist accountable for it to other people. He arrived at this conclusion through his observation of how many people around him lacked sufficient courage to be fully themselves, and had thus become the victims of their environment by imitating those around them; 'this moral agoraphobia is the greatest traitor to life', he said (Jassin, [3]1968:142) [24]. In *Pidato Radio 1946* ('Radio Talk 1946') Chairil Anwar stated that 'every poem that comes into being is a complete world. A world realized and recreated by the poet himself' (Jassin, [3]1968:144). 'The most important thing is,' he said in *Membuat Sadjak Melihat Lukisan* ('Writing Poems, Looking at Pictures', 1949), '(that in) *using the expressive methods of his art, the artist must be sure of the power of his own emotions*' [25]. Chairil Anwar stressed the idea that a poet 'can choose special words and word-associations, weighing carefully whether these words express clearly what he has in mind. The structure of his sentences can be made to deviate from standard usage in order to put forward in a more subtle and more intricate way that which is living in his soul. The poet creates his poem through the use of rhythm and melody, through special syntactic constructions and specific choice of words, and through a variety of metaphors, and only if the reader is able to appreciate the «uniqueness» which the poet has achieved can he fully understand and get the feeling of the poem' (Jassin, [3]1968:151) [26].

From this long quotation from his last prose work it becomes clear that Chairil Anwar deliberately and consciously considered all the possibilities offered by the language he used, and exploited them to the full in order to achieve the poetic effect he intended. Intensity of experience and poetic sensitivity in the conscious act of creating are his literary creed, as can be seen from the above statement. In this very unity of poet and poem lies his poetic greatness. This also becomes manifest in some of the poems he wrote toward the end of his life. We refer to *Jang Terampas dan Jang Putus* (see the discussion in Chapter II), where he is bravely waiting for approaching death to take him away and mentions his future restingplace as the *Karet* cemetery; and to *Derai-Derai Tjemara* (see the discussion in Chapter II), where he accepts the essence of life as being 'only to defer defeat.'

Chairil Anwar died at 3:00 p.m. on April 28, 1949, at the General Hospital of Djakarta, with no-one at his bedside. He was buried at *Karet* the next day, 'escorted by a large number of young people and by many leading Republicans' (Jassin, [3]1968:38), just as he himself had once prophesied: 'Today only few can understand and appreciate my poems, but when I die, my mortal remains will be escorted by many people, school-children as well as leading public personalities, and they will make a monument of me.' [27]

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

A	=	Agent
Aj	=	Adjective
Au	=	Adjunct
Av	=	Adverb
Basis	=	Monthly Cultural Magazine, Jogja
BI	=	Bahasa Indonesia
B.K.I.	=	*Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde,* published by the *Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde,* Leiden
Cl	=	Clause
DTD	=	*Deru Tjampur Debu* ('Noise Mixed with Dust')
HC	=	Head Clause
Horison	=	Monthly Literary Magazine, Djakarta
impVt	=	Imperative Vt
Indonesia	=	Journal of the Modern Indonesia Project, Cornell University, Ithaca
KT	=	*Kerikil Tadjam dan Jang Terampas dan Jang Putus* ('Sharp Gravel and The Ravaged and The Broken')
LAu	=	Local Adjunct
Lingua	=	International Review of General Linguistics, Amsterdam
lit.	=	Literal (for translations)
Mimbar	=	Bi-Weekly Magazine, Djakarta
Mimbar Indonesia	=	Weekly Magazine, Djakarta
N	=	Noun
NP	=	Nominal Phrase
O	=	Object

P	=	Predicate
PA	=	Predicate Attribute
Pa	=	Patient
Pe	=	Preposition
PeO	=	Prepositional Object
PeP	=	Prepositional Phrase
Pr	=	Pronoun
prA	=	Pronominal Agent
S	=	Subject
SC	=	Subordinate Clause
TAu	=	Temporal Adjunct
TMT	=	*Tiga Menguak Takdir*
V	=	Verb
Vi	=	Intransitive Verb
Vt	=	Transitive Verb
/	=	Marks the beginning or the end of a quoted verse
//	=	Marks the beginning or the end of a quoted stanza
#	=	Marks the beginning or the end of a poem

CHAPTER I

LANGUAGE AND POETRY

1 PROLOGUE

NISAN

Untuk nénékanda.

1 *Bukan kematian benar menusuk kalbu*
2 *Keridlaanmu menerima segala tiba*
3 *Tak kutahu setinggi itu atas debu*
4 *dan duka maha tuan bertachta.*

Oktober 1942

A. ASPECTS OF PRESENTATION

1 THE TITLE

The poem bears the title *Nisan,* which means '(a) gravestone', or '(an) epitaph' [1]. All of Chairil Anwar's seventy-two original poems [2] but six have titles. Of these six, one originally belonged to a speech delivered on July 7, 1943 [3], and another one has a question mark for its title, being called *?,* so that we are left with only four untitled poems. In Chairil Anwar's poetry the title often gives the reader an important clue in the sense that it provides situational information and/or a frame of reference in which the message should be placed. Some instances of this are no. *20, Hampa* or 'Empty', no. *50, Sendja di Pelabuhan Ketjil* or 'Twilight at a Little Harbour', no. *3, Diponegoro,* and no. *43, Kepada Pelukis Affandi,* 'To the Painter Affandi' [4]. In other cases the title simultaneously constitutes the first line of the poem, such as in no. *69, Aku berkisar antara mereka,* 'I go about among them'; and in several cases the title may be so general as to be of no help at all, for instance no. *35, Sadjak Putih,* 'Blank Verse'; no. *40, Lagu Siul,* 'Whistling Song'; no. *24, Tjerita,* 'A Story'; etc. (for the latter see the Epilogue). In the present case the title 'Gravestone' takes us to a cemetery and confronts us with the dead in a very concrete way; it prepares us for a specific and personal experience with death.

2 THE DEDICATION

The poem under discussion has the dedication *untuk nénékanda,* which means 'for grandfather' [5]. In connection with the title we may safely assume that the poem refers specifically to the poet's deceased grandfather. Thus the dedication gives us valuable information regarding the person referred to in the content of the poem, his identity being confirmed by the use of the second person personal Pronoun. Altogether thirteen out of the seventy-two original poems have some form of dedication, while several other poems actually have dedications for their titles, such as *Kepada Pelukis Affandi* (no. *43*), 'To the Painter Affandi'; *Buat Njonja N.,* (no. *68*), 'For Mrs. N.', etc. It can be said generally that titles and dedications, either in combination or separately, often contain the contextual, situational and/or biographical clues relevant for an understanding of the poem.

3 THE DATE

The poem is dated October 1942. Only those poems written before 1946 have an exact date added to them by the poet himself (see Appendix). All later poems except three, namely nos. *44, 55* and *57,* which are also precisely dated, mention only the year. It is obvious that for a linguistic analysis the date of a poem is normally irrelevant. However, the extralinguistic information provided by such a date may make for a better understanding of the poem because, for example, it may be of help in tracing the particular situation in which the poem was created. This is the case with, for instance, poem no. *35, Sadjak Putih* or 'Blank Verse', which is dated January 18, 1944 (cf. the section on Title above) [6].

4 THE PUNCTUATION

We can observe that the poem has only one punctuation mark, namely the final full stop. As a result we have no punctuation to guide us in the analysis and interpretation of the poem in this particular case. This is not, however, a characteristic feature of Chairil Anwar's poetry as a whole. Many of his poems display a fairly elaborate punctuation which in these cases turns out to be of great assistance for their interpretation. Unfortunately the poet's use of punctuation marks is not always consistent or conscientious enough for this to be regarded as a reliable guide for the analysis of his poems. Moreover, we have to take into con-

sideration not only the poet's own inconsistency and inaccuracy, but also the intentional and unintentional introduction of changes by editors and printers in the process of publication, often posthumously, of his poems. Especially at the end of a line a punctuation mark is often lacking where we would normally expect a comma or a full stop. On the basis of our experience we must assume in such cases that a punctuation mark has somehow dropped out, such as in poem no. *69, Aku berkisar antara mereka,* where a comma is missing at the end of lines 7 and 9, for instance, while we must also assume that a full stop has somehow been dropped at the end of line 8 here (see the discussion of no. *69* in Chapter II). The reverse, namely of a punctuation mark being introduced which according to our analysis should have been left out, is very rarely found, although it is not totally absent. See, for example, poem no. *50, Sendja di Pelabuhan Ketjil,* where the third line has a full stop which, according to our interpretation, does not properly belong there (see the discussion of no. *50* in Chapter II). Especially the intralinear punctuation is as a rule reliable and often invaluable for the analysis. As one example out of many we would refer to poem no. *20, Hampa* (see the discussion of this poem in Chapter II).

5 THE USE OF CAPITALS

The first three lines of *Nisan* begin with a capital letter, but not so the fourth. This seems to indicate that lines 1 and 2 are to be considered as separate sentences, whereas lines 3 and 4 together form a single syntactic unit (see the linguistic analysis below). In the study of Chairil Anwar's poetry we have observed, however, that the absence or presence of capital letters is not always of relevance for the linguistic analysis. We can distinguish two principal tendencies in this respect: firstly, there are the poems in which either every single line begins with a capital letter, such as poems no. *20, Hampa* or 'Empty', no. *25, Dimesdjid* or 'At the Mosque', and so on, or all the lines begin with a small letter, regardless of whether the line starts a new sentence or opens a new stanza, such as no. *71, Derai-Derai Tjemara* or 'Whispering Pines'. Secondly, there are poems in which every line begins with a small letter unless the beginning of the line coincides with the beginning of a new sentence or Clause, such as, for example, no. *43, Kepada Pelukis Affandi,* and no. *64, Puntjak* (see the discussion of these poems in Chapter II). In most cases, however, we seem to have some sort of irregular combination of these two basic types, such as no. *3, Diponegoro,* which has the character-

istics mainly of the first type but has the second line beginning with a small letter; or poem no. *69, Aku berkisar antara mereka,* where lines 3, 4, 5 and 6 all begin with a small letter whereas all the other lines begin with a capital (see the discussion of these poems in Chapter II). Capital letters within the lines are, for obvious reasons, always preceded by a full stop — e.g., poem no. *20, Hampa* — or some other punctuation mark such as a colon or exclamation mark (cf. Punctuation, above), unless the capital letter is used to indicate a proper name, such as in poem no. *59, Tuti Artic,* or to mark a word specifically for other non-syntactic reasons, such as in poem no. *33, Isa* or 'Jesus (Christ)', where the words referring to Jesus begin with a capital letter.

On the whole we can say that the use of punctuation marks and capital letters together often constitutes a valuable or even indispensable help in the analysis of a poem, though their presence or absence in some cases is either irrelevant or insignificant.

B. AESTHETICAL ASPECTS [7]

1 FINAL RHYME

In languages where final rhyme constitutes part of the poetic conventions such rhyme may influence the poet's use of the language and should therefore be taken into account in the analysis and interpretation of a poem. A poet may change the form of a word or use an unusual form instead of the ordinary one in order to achieve final rhyme; or he may change the normal word order, or break up a syntactic unit at an unexpected place for the same reason. In short, the rhyme may lead to what we call 'poetic licence', i.e., deviations in one form or another from the normal usage (cf. Hrushovski, 1960).

Indonesian poetry has traditionaliy made use of rhyme. In some of Chairil Anwar's poems, too, final rhyme can be observed. This feature still requires more detailed analysis, however (see further below, and also the poet's own words on rhyme in BI in 'Biographical Data'). In some cases his preference for rhyme even leads him to strikingly unusual forms of poetic licence (see further Chapter III, Section 3).

We must add immediately, however, that Chairil Anwar does not use final rhyme as a fixed and guiding principle. It is often lacking, or only partially present, and rarely does he use regular rhyme schemes throughout one and the same poem (see, e.g., Slametmuljana, 1954:228 ff.). A notable but rather exceptional case is poem no. *69,* consisting of twenty-one lines all ending with the vowel *a.*

An additional problem with regard to final rhyme in Indonesian poetry is the fact that it is often difficult to see whether we have an instance of conscious use of rhyme or purely accidental rhyme. The vowels *a, i,* and *u* are quantitatively dominant to such an extent that about half of the vowels in a running Indonesian text are *a,* while some 15 % are *i* or *u* (Teeuw, 1952:12). This means that statistically the possibility of two lines in succession having *a* as final vowel is so high that it is difficult to prove that such lines have or do not have final rhyme as a poetic device. The poem under discussion is a good example of this. Formally one can say that it has final rhyme with an ABAB scheme: *kalbu* rhyming with *debu* and *tiba* with *tachta.* However, the mere fact that two non-successive lines within a four line poem end correspondingly with a final vowel *a* is too weak poetically and too insignificant statistically to warrant its being called final rhyme. Only in cases where more complete or elaborate rhyme schemes are present is it possible to state with some degree of certainty that there is definitely question of final rhyme in that sense, and only in such cases are we entitled to ascribe certain peculiarities in the language to the exigencies of the rhyme.

2 STANZA

The poem under discussion here comprises one stanza, consisting of four lines. This is by no means typical of Chairil Anwar's poetry. The great majority of his poems consist of more than one stanza; sometimes there is a fairly regular pattern, each stanza consisting of the same number of lines, for example; or the poem may follow the form of a sonnet or some other regular pattern. Many other poems, however, contain an irregular, haphazard sequence of stanzas of differing length.

As in the case of the rhyme, a poet may have to resort to poetic licence in order to achieve a certain pattern in the stanzas in the sense that he may break up syntactic units at unusual points, that is, either shorten or lengthen syntactic units, or use other devices. In a number of cases Chairil Anwar seems indeed to have made his language subservient to a given stanza pattern, and we will have to take such cases into account in our analysis. However, in many other instances no fixed pattern is observable. Moreover, in view of his use of punctuation marks and capitals Chairil Anwar seems often to have preferred to refrain from having his division into stanzas interfere with the syntax (cf. Junus. 1970:59). In other words, we must be careful not to draw too many

linguistic conclusions from the division into stanzas. Here, as in the case of some of the features discussed above, we should also take care to consider the role that editors and publishers may have played in the division into stanzas of poems in their printed form.

3 VERSE STRUCTURE

In many poetic works the verse or line has a number of very distinct characteristics. The number of syllables, or the number of metrical feet and their structure, the alternation of long and short or stressed and unstressed syllables, and other formal characteristics of the verse may be more or less strictly prescribed. It is obvious that such patterns may influence a poet's language in a number of ways and must therefore be taken into account in the analysis of any poem making use of such patterns.

In the case of BI and Malay neither vowel quantity nor dynamic accent is phonemically distinctive, so that irregularities caused by the metre in the sense in which we know this in languages such as Greek and Latin, or Dutch and English, are not *per se* found in Indonesian poetry.

In traditional Malay there were mainly two genres of poetry, namely the *shair* and the *pantun* [8]. As far as the structure of the line is concerned both genres are characterized by four word lines with a preference for short, basic words, that is, words with few affixes, and for as little formal expression of syntactic relationships as possible [9]. Especially in the *pantun* there is a marked preference for constructing each line in such a way that it forms a separate syntactic unit of its own. Enjambment is rare, while there is further often a break in the middle of the four word line, the first pair of words and the second pair syntactically belonging together. It is clear that formally the lines of *Nisan* are not traditional Malay lines of poetry. That does not mean to say that *pantun*-like lines are lacking altogether in Chairil Anwar's poetry, however. For an example of this we would refer to lines 9 and 10 of poem no. *33*:

// terbajang terang dimata masa /
/ bertukar rupa ini segera //,

or to lines 7 and 8 of poem no. *43*:

// Dan tangan 'kan kaku, menulis berhenti,/
/ ketjemasan derita, ketjemasan mimpi;/.

The above examples are exceptions rather than the rule, however. In this respect once again Chairil Anwar is a modern poet. His lines display a definite poetic structure. Sometimes he even extends the use of a regular pattern throughout a whole poem or stanza, such as in poem no. *71*. In cases like this the need for such a regular pattern may have predominated over other tendencies such as that of making each line a separate syntactic unit. This tendency towards regularity may have been reinforced by the use of rhyme. In other cases no consistent pattern can be discovered even within one single poem, e.g., poem no. *33*. The upshot of all this for the analysis of his poems is that we must decide in each individual case whether the poet has deliberately resorted to unusual syntactic constructions or irregularities for the sake of realizing some particular pattern in the structure of his lines.

4 PHONAESTHETICAL ASPECTS

In most, if not all languages, the phonetic quality of the linguistic elements as such is not linguistically relevant, except in special cases such as onomatopoeia. Sounds as such are, to borrow Stutterheim's formulation, waste products of linguistic usage [10]. For this very reason poets may, and often do, use them as instruments in creating aesthetic effects not characteristic of ordinary speech. We are referring to phenomena such as assonance, alliteration, sound symbolism, rhythmical pattern, etc.

Strictly speaking final rhyme also belongs under this heading. However, due to its importance as a poetic device and its special problems with regard to BI it has been dealt with separately (see 1, above).

In the case of *Nisan* the only clear example of the use of any of the phenomena referred to above is the alliteration in *debu* and *duka*. This instance of alliteration will be shown below to have some relevance for the analysis of the poem in connection with other data. When dealing with other poems by Chairil Anwar, we shall see that he makes use of a great variety of sound effects. However, in most cases they are not used as means of achieving a certain poetic pattern (such as regular alliteration, fixed rhythmical pattern, etc.) but rather in an incidental, improvised sort of way (c.f. 1, above). In several cases such sound correspondences seem to have much more than a merely aesthetic function, and also have a function with regard to the understanding of the linguistic content of the poem in the sense that they enable the reader to determine how certain elements within the poem belong together syntactically or otherwise. As an example we would mention

Chairil Anwar's use of the word *manusia,* 'human being', in the abbreviated form *'nusia* (poem no. *12*), which is not found in ordinary language. The use of the form *'nusia* in this poem in the phrase *dunia dan 'nusia* ('world and people') creates a definite phonetic parallelism between the two words which has the effect of drawing their meaning together as well, thereby putting special emphasis on this group.

5 OTHER AESTHETICAL ASPECTS

Just as the poet makes use of phonetic aspects of the language for poetic purposes, he similarly employs grammatic and semantic devices to create special poetic effects. The aim of the linguistic message as presented by the poem is not simply communication for practical or intellectual purposes, but the *Ausdruck* element in poetry (to borrow Bühler's terminology) is *per se* more strongly emphasized than in ordinary speech. By his selection from the available linguistic possibilities the poet strives to use this *Ausdruck* aspect of the message as effectively as possible. In traditional linguistics this special selection out of the available possibilities for poetic purposes is called style.

These stylistic devices cannot be separated from the rest of the linguistic message. Only in the linguistic analysis of the poem as a whole will it be possible to distinguish such features as have been specifically selected by the poet for the sake of poetic effect. Such elements are present in every single one of Chairil Anwar's poems, and we shall discuss them below, both in the analysis of *Nisan* and with reference to the other poems we have selected for this study.

C. LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

1 PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The successful interpretation of a linguistic message normally involves taking into account a number of different aspects, including not only the extralinguistic and situational data available to the hearer, but also the linguistic information itself that is contained in the wording of the message, which is invariably diverse, information being provided by the suprasegmental aspects of the message (sentence intonation) as well as by the phonological characteristics and the lexical meaning of the words, by their morphology, and by the syntax of the sentence and its component parts. In decoding the message the hearer somehow makes use of all this information (or as much as he needs) without normally being aware of

how the available data interact on each other in the process of trying to arrive at an understanding of the message.

The analysis of a literary text poses a number of special problems, the more so since it is a written message. This being the case, much less extralinguistic and situational information is available to the reader than in an ordinary speech situation. Moreover, the intonation is lacking, and is usually only imperfectly compensated for by punctuation and other features of writing (see A, above). It can be said that basically the only linguistic information available is that which is contained in the phonological structure and the morphology of the words, their lexical meaning, and the syntax of the sentence and its component parts.

Furthermore, poems are a special type of written messages that often display their own specific characteristics, according to the literary conventions of the language used (see B, above). As indicated above, the traditional genres of Indonesian poetry often seem to have employed more reduced and simplified linguistic structures than ordinary prose. Such simplifications and reductions may by themselves already have made for ambiguity. But we further have to take into consideration the fact that even in the earlier genres of Indonesian poetry, such as, for example, Javanese poetry, there are many cases where ambiguity seems to have been consciously aimed at [11].

With regard to modern Indonesian poetry little can as yet be said in general terms in this respect. It is one of the very aims of this study to discover where exactly the problems in the analysis of Indonesian poems, and more specifically those of Chairil Anwar, occur and to what extent these problems are either occasioned or encouraged by the structure of BI as such, or have been created consciously by the poet as a result of the use of certain techniques and/or devices.

The linguistic analysis of the short poem *Nisan* given below may serve as an introduction to the treatment of problems such as those mentioned above. In the analysis we shall specify as much as possible all the elements which together make up the linguistic structure of the poem, as well as any other available data. The choice of *Nisan* has by no means been prompted by any particular obscurity or ambiguity of the poem itself. As will be seen, the interpretation of the poem as a whole seems to be fairly definite and unambiguous. However, we believe that it is worthwhile pointing out in the case of even a relatively simple poem such as this what variants and alternative possibilities may have to be taken into account in the analysis, precisely because in other cases, where we are less sure about the interpretation of a poem as a whole,

the selection from among such variants and alternatives may turn out to be very difficult if not impossible.

2 THE ANALYSIS

On the basis of the division of the poem into four lines and the use of capitals as discussed above (see A, above), the poem would appear to us to consist of three main syntactic units, sentences, or Clauses, namely line 1, line 2, and lines 3 + 4 combined respectively.

Line 1: ‡ *Bukan kematian benar menusuk kalbu* /

Bukan usually negates a N (Moeliono, 1967:48); it therefore determines the interpretation of *kematian,* which follows it as a N meaning 'death', although the latter form by itself is open to more than one interpretation [12] (it may also be a V meaning 'bereft by the death of . . .', e.g. *ia kematian ibu,* 'he/she/it is (or: was) bereft by the death of his/her/its mother'). Such a *bukan*-construction at the beginning of a sentence nearly always constitutes a Predicate preceding the Subject (inversion). This S may then be either a N, a Pr, or a nominal construct, often introduced by *jang,* or possibly also a V used in a slot normally occupied by a N (i.e. representing a case of transposition without accompanying formal characteristics), e.g.

a. *Bukan kewadjiban perkara itu,* 'That affair is not a must';
b. *Bukan kewadjiban jang membuat susah,* 'It is not duty which causes trouble';
c. *Bukan kewadjiban membatja buku,* 'Reading books is not an obligation'.

In the present case the second part of the sentence is seen to be a transitive Verb (*menusuk*) followed by what can hardly be anything other than its Patient (*kalbu*). So that we have here a sentence constructed on the pattern of either (b) or (c). If the construction is the same as that of (c) this would give the rendering 'Wrenching (the) heart is not death', which does not seem to make sense, and certainly does not in the context of the poem as a whole. The only other alternative is to assume that we have here a construction as in (b), and that the poet has left out in this construction a *jang* which in prose would have been indispensable. *Bukan kematian jang menusuk kalbu* would then be the ordinary prose variant, meaning 'It is not death which wrenches the heart'; this makes good sense.

The absence of *jang* — which in itself seems to be a rather common feature of Chairil Anwar's language, as will be seen below — creates another problem, namely with regard to the interpretation of *benar*. As far as the use of *benar* is concerned, in ordinary prose both the sentences

a. *Bukan kematian benar jang menusuk kalbu,* and
b. *Bukan kematian jang benar menusuk kalbu*

would be equally possible. *Benar* is multivalent in BI (see Chapter III), as follows:

1. The Aj *benar* when following a N means 'true', 'right'; in this position it usually requires *jang,* e.g., *manusia jang benar,* 'a true man', *alasan jang benar* 'the right argument'. In view of the fact that Chairil Anwar takes obvious liberties with the use of *jang* (see Chapter III, 3.2) one might presume that here, too, *kematian benar* means something like 'real death'. This is not very probable, however, especially as the *bukan*-construction in combination with *benar* ('not real death') would seem to require a counter statement, or some oppositional phrase saying something about 'unreal, or untrue death'.
2. The Av *benar* as such may determine either a single word, e.g.

56 / *Aku pernah ingin benar padamu,*/
'I once really desired you',
59 ǂ *Kau pintar benar bertjium,*/
'You're really clever at kissing';

or a whole Clause or sentence thus being used as a sentence Adverb, e.g.,

22 // *Benar belum puas serah menjerah* /
'Indeed we are not satisfied with our mutual surrender (yet)',
49 ǂ *Aku memang benar tolol . . .* /
'I'm a fool indeed . . .'.

In the first case *benar* follows the Aj or V which it determines, while as a sentence Adverb *benar* is synonymous with *sebenarnja,* 'as a matter of fact', 'actually'. In the line under discussion here *benar* evidently occurs in this latter use of the word. In view of the absence of *jang* (see above), there are two possible interpretations of this line, viz.:

1. 'Actually it is not death that wrenches the heart',
2. 'It is not death that really wrenches the heart'.

Our choice falls on the former of the two interpretations above, because *bukan* introducing a sentence already leads one to expect some statement in opposition to it, such as 'Actually it is not death . . . *But* (something else)', and this very word *benar* as an Av underlines the sense of expectation.

It is interesting to note that the two English translations of this line that have been published so far both avoid a choice by omitting an English equivalent of *benar,* viz.:

3. 'It is not (your) death which moves me' (Johns, 1964:396);
4. 'It is not death, no, that stabs my heart' (Raffel, 1970:3).

Furthermore, these two English translations offer yet another interesting suggestion, in that the former contains two Pronouns and the latter one, where the Indonesian text does not have any. This may be due to the fact that in English there is on the whole a tendency towards the more frequent use of Pronouns than in Indonesian (see further Chapter III, Section 1, also Moeliono, 1971:233). The insertion of '(your)' before 'death' in (3) may be justified by the fact that the same possessive Pronoun is found with *keridlaan* in the next line. For whereas in BI normally only the second of two consecutive Nouns has a possessive Pronoun (e.g., *anak dan isterimu*), in English the possessive Pronoun in such cases usually precedes the first Noun. In (4) the addition of a first person possessive Pronoun, namely '*my* heart', seems less warranted. An expression such as *menusuk kalbu* is comparable to such English expressions as 'heart-breaking' or 'heart-wrenching', in which the Noun *kalbu,* like 'heart' in English, no longer takes the possessive Pronoun. In the present case we prefer this latter interpretation of *menusuk kalbu,* so that our ultimate translation of the line is, 'Actually it is not death (that is) heart-wrenching'.

Line 2: / *Keridlaanmu menerima segala tiba* /

Syntactically, the structure of this line is ambiguous. Several interpretations are equally plausible from a grammatical point of view, viz.:

a. *Keridlaanmu,* which is a N (*keridlaan*) plus the second person singular possessive suffix (*-mu*), is the S, whereas the rest of the

line, i.e. *menerima segala tiba,* is P. This analysis would imply that here again *jang* in its nominalizing function has been omitted before *tiba.* In prose such a *jang* would be indispensable. *Menerima segala (jang) tiba* would then form a P consisting of a Vt (*menerima,* 'to accept, to receive something') and a Pa (*segala jang tiba,* 'everything that comes'), so that the translation would be: 'Your willingness accepts everything (that) comes' (see further Chapter III, 3.2., on the omission of *jang*).

b. *Keridlaanmu menerima segala* is the S, consisting of a N + possessive suffix plus a verbal apposition — parallel to a construction such as *hasratnja membatja buku,* 'his/her/its desire to read (or: in reading) a book' —, and *tiba* is P. The translation would then be 'Your willingness to accept everything has come (or: comes)'.

c. The whole line should be considered as a second S, with the P of the first line the implied Predicate. This is a common practice after a *bukan*-construction, although such a second S is usually contrasted with the first one through the use of *melainkan,* 'but', e.g. *bukan guru jang membatja buku, melainkan murid,* 'It is not the teacher who is reading a book, but the student'. In fact, in prose a word such as *melainkan* would be indispensable. Paraphrasing the two lines of the poem according to this interpretation we would get:

line 1 *Bukan kematian benar (jang) menusuk kalbu*
line 2 *(melainkan) Keridlaanmu menerima segala (jang) tiba (menusuk kalbu),*

meaning '(1) Actually it is not death (that is) heart-wrenching
(2) (But) Your willingness to accept everything (that) comes (is heart-wrenching)'.

We believe that the latter interpretation is the most probable one, the one intended by the poet. The main argument for this is that it fits in best in the wider context of the poem as a whole, and more specifically that it best fulfils the expectation raised by *bukan* + N in the first line, which is further reinforced by *benar* as we have understood it, namely in the sense that it qualifies *bukan kematian* rather than *menusuk kalbu.*

Line 3: / *Tak kutahu setinggi itu atas debu* /
Line 4: / *dan duka maha tuan bertachta.*‡

Tak kutahu [13] may be translated as 'I don't know', or 'I did not

know', or 'I never knew'. In other words, BI does not possess the formal features of conjugation denoting tense, so that the translation into English of the simple sequence *Tak kutahu* is subject to the contextual and/or situational determination with regard to the tense. Mostly such absence of indication of tense in verbal forms forms no problem for the analysis, although lack of such specification may sometimes provide difficulties in translating Indonesian sentences into foreign languages. However, there are certain cases in which the absence of tense in Indonesian Verbs may, in connection with other elements in the poem, give rise to ambiguities (see further Chapter III).

As for the rest of the sentence, it has already been indicated above that the absence of a capital letter at the beginning of verse 4 tends to suggest that lines 3 + 4 form a single syntactic unit. This surmise is fully confirmed by the linguistic content of the two lines. Everything following *kutahu* should be considered as the Pa of *kutahu*; this is quite a common construction in BI, e.g. *kutahu dia sakit,* 'I know (that) he is ill'. Line 3 by itself is not a complete sentence, *setinggi itu* and *atas debu* both being Adjuncts of a type usually occurring within a larger construction, meaning 'as high as that above dust . . .'. Line 4 begins with *dan,* 'and', which normally occurs as a connective particle between any two equivalent sentence elements, whether words or word groups, Clauses, etc. It can hardly have been used as such here, as line 3 by itself is not a complete construction. The most obvious solution is to interpret *dan* as conjoining the N *debu,* 'dust', (line 3) with another N, *duka,* 'sorrow' (line 4); thus we have 'above (=*atas*) dust and sorrow'. Words like *duka, sedih,* and many others of similar semantic character expressing a psychological state are ambivalent; they combine certain syntactic possibilities both of a N and of an Aj (see further Chapter III, Section 1, ad 2, esp. 4). Here the nominal use of *duka* is indicated by its use in coordination with *debu,* which is unambiguous as to word class. With regard to the rest of line 4 it is clear that the words *tuan bertachta* form the S-P Clause of the entire group, and are dependent on *kutahu*; they mean 'you have a throne', 'you reign'. The main construction of the whole of the two lines together is clear, therefore, the translation being: 'I did not know as high as that above dust and sorrow . . . you reign.' In prose the sequence *tuan bertachta setinggi itu atas debu dan duka* would perhaps have been more common, but the word order as it appears in the poem is not really irregular. The word groups are clearly marked, *itu* being a boundary marker, and *atas,* 'above', plus N (*debu dan duka*) forming a prepositional group, while *tuan,* when considered

in combination with the second person singular possessive suffix *-mu* (line 2) and the dedication of the poem, apparently refers to 'grandfather', and a *ber*-form such as *bertachta* is a common type of P. This leaves us to deal only with *maha,* the function of which in this sentence is not immediately clear.

Maha, which is here written as a separate word, is actually not known as such in BI; it normally occurs as a bound-morpheme:

a. *maha,* itself originating from Sanskrit, occurs in compound substantives in combination with animate Nouns which as such are mostly of Sanskrit origin, e.g., *mahadewa, mahasiswa, mahaguru,* etc. This type of word formation is not productive, however.
b. More common and productive is the use of *maha* as a prefix attached to an adjectival base, e.g., *mahabesar, mahatinggi, mahaluas,* etc. Sometimes the two components are written separately, viz. *maha besar, maha tinggi, maha luas,* etc. In such words *maha* means 'very', 'most'.
c. A case apart is the form *Maha Esa,* i.e., *maha* plus the archaic numeral *esa* meaning 'one', which is used only as an attribute of God, i.e. *Tuhan Jang Maha Esa* [14].

Since the use of *maha* in line 4 of the poem does not represent any of these three uses, it may be useful to refer to other occurrences of this element in Chairil Anwar's poetry. The only other occurrence happens to be in no. *2* ♯ *Lautan maha dalam* /, which is a regular instance of (b), i.e., *maha* plus an adjectival base, together meaning 'very deep'.

In view of the fact that *maha* as a prefix always qualifies the element immediately following it, the first possibility to explore would be the combination of *maha* with the following *tuan.* Although *mahatuan* is not known to exist in Malay or BI, it is possible as a construction on the analogy of *maharadja,* 'the great king', *mahadewa,* 'the great Lord' or 'supreme deity', etc., which are of the type classed under (a) above. However, from the above analysis it is obvious that *tuan* here functions as a Pronoun, meaning 'you'; this use seems to preclude a combination with *maha.*

A second possible way of interpreting *maha* is by assuming that we have here a case of inverted word order by reason of poetic licence, so that *duka maha* would be a poetic equivalent of the prose sequence *maha duka* (see type (b) above). This poetic licence may be presumed to have been resorted to for the sake of alliteration between *debu* and

duka, with which the placing of *maha* before *duka* would otherwise interfere. The very fact that *duka* here is not an Adjective but an (inanimate) Noun — as has been argued above — makes this interpretation implausible too, however.

This leaves us with a third possibility, namely that *maha* here is being used not as a prefix, but as an independent word, of the adjectival class, comparable with, e.g., *besar, agung,* etc. Syntactically this would provide us with a fairly common construction of the type *tinggi ia melajang,* or *tenang tuan berdiri* ('high he flies' and 'quietly you stand', respectively). Such constructions, which place rather more emphasis on the Adjective than the comparable sentences *ia melajang tinggi, tuan berdiri tenang* ('he flies high' and 'you stand quietly', respectively), are quite common in prose as well. This interpretation confronts us with the interesting syntactic problem of whether in such inverted constructions the Adjectives are used in apposition to the Verb as the principal word of the Predicate, or rather are themselves the principal word, to which the verbal form would then have been used in apposition; but we need not go into this problem here.

The question of whether Chairil Anwar can somehow possibly have been aware of the adjectival character of *maha* in Sanskrit, from which language it is a borrowing, and whether this knowledge influenced his use of *maha* here, is also interesting. However, we will probably never be able to answer this question. It is worth noting that in Malay dictionaries (which may at some stage have been consulted by Chairil Anwar) *maha* is translated with 'great', or Dutch *groot,* such a translation in itself suggesting an adjectival character of the word.

The translation of the poem based on the above analysis, would then run as follows:

GRAVESTONE

For Grandfather

1 Actually it is not death (that is) heart-wrenching
2 (But) Your willingness to accept everything (that) comes
3 I did not know so high above dust
4 and sorrow (so) great you reigned.

October 1942

From the detailed discussion of this poem it is clear how much the analysis of the parts and the interpretation of the whole interact on and reinforce one another in the sense that the choice from various possi-

bilities is determined by the larger context, whereas the understanding of the larger whole is in turn dependent on the linguistic possibilities offered by the interpretation of the parts.

2 THE POEMS SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

In the course of our study of Chairil Anwar's poetry, we have come to the conclusion that there are a number of poems which seem to be especially important and relevant for an understanding and interpretation of his poetry as a whole. This list of key poems, arranged chronologically, is as follows:

A. 1 *Nisan* (1942)
2 *Diponegoro* (1943)
3 *Kupu Malam dan Biniku*
4 *Kenangan*
5 *Hampa*
6 *Bertjerai*
7 *Dimesdjid*
8 *1943*
9 *Isa*
10 *Doa*
11 *Sadjak Putih* (1944)
12 *Kepada Pelukis Affandi* (1946)
13 *Tjatetan Th. 1946*
14 *Sendja di Pelabuhan Ketjil*
15 *Dua Sadjak buat Basuki Resobowo* (1947)
16 *Perdjurit Djaga Malam* (1948)
17 *Puntjak*
18 *Mirat Muda, Chairil Muda* (1949)
19 *Buat Njonja N.*
20 *Aku Berkisar Antara Mereka*
21 *Jang Terampas dan Jang Putus*
22 *Derai-Derai Tjemara*

In our present attempt to describe Chairil Anwar's poetic language, by way of preliminary study for an eventual interpretation of Chairil Anwar as a poet, we have deemed it appropriate to select our material from this group of twenty-two poems rather than pick at random from his total work of seventy-two poems. Those poems in the above list which display a number of features that seem to be of specific interest from

the viewpoint of a linguistic analysis have been selected for a detailed discussion in the present book. These are:

B. 1 *Nisan* (1942) [15]
2 *Diponegoro* (1943)
3 *Kupu Malam dan Biniku*
4 *Kenangan*
5 *Hampa*
6 *Dimesdjid*
7 *1943*
8 *Isa*
9 *Kepada Pelukis Affandi* (1946)
10 *Sendja di Pelabuhan Ketjil*
11 *Puntjak* (1948)
12 *Aku Berkisar Antara Mereka* (1949)
13 *Jang Terampas dan Jang Putus*
14 *Derai-Derai Tjemara*

We are aware of the fact that an element of subjectivity is inevitable in a selection such as that made above; yet it is our hope that the present selection will provide sufficient data to enable us to draw at least some general conclusions concerning the problems involved in a linguistic analysis of Chairil Anwar's poetry (Chapter III). The analysis in its turn will, so it is hoped, provide some guidelines which will be of assistance for an understanding and the interpretation of Chairil Anwar's poetry as a whole.

It will be seen that in many cases there are important differences between the results of our analysis and Burton Raffel's translation of the same poems, to which we have referred time and again in the present book. Such differences may in some cases be indicative of inherent ambiguities or obscurities in a given poem thus allowing for a variety of possible interpretations. In other cases, however, they testify to what seem to us outright errors in Raffel's translation, due to misinterpretation of particular BI constructions owing perhaps to lack of a thorough understanding of the linguistic problems involved (see, e.g., Prologue). We wish it to be understood, however, that it is not our intention in pointing out specific instances of incorrect interpretation to depreciate the work of Raffel as a whole. For on the contrary, we have considerable appreciation for his pioneering work in making the poetry of Chairil

Anwar accessible to a wider public in a series of well presented English translations. Nor is it our aim to make a detailed comparison between the results of our analysis and Raffel's translations; but we shall take the latter into account only in those cases where this seems relevant for our own purposes. For further comparison the reader is referred to Raffel's book (1970). At the end of our analysis of each of the poems we shall give an English translation; this should not be regarded as an attempt at giving an adequate literary rendering of the poem concerned, but rather as a summary of our analysis.

3 PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON INDONESIAN SYNTAX AND MORPHOLOGY

Before beginning our analysis of the poems it would seem useful to give a brief general outline of those of the main types of sentence construction in BI which not only have a high frequency of occurrence in Chairil Anwar's poems, but also seem to be of crucial importance for the analysis of his language. We are referring in particular to sentence constructions characterized by a verbal form with the prefix *me-* [16] and other comparable constructions. Such general remarks are useful in order to avoid repetition in the discussion of the individual poems. It goes without saying that we do not pretend to be giving anything like an exhaustive treatment of Indonesian syntax. This would be far beyond the scope of the present book. For a more detailed grammatical description of BI we refer the reader to Macdonald-Soenjono (1967) and Halim (1969) [17]. We believe that for the present restricted purpose, however, our brief summary will be adequate.

3.1 MAIN SENTENCE STRUCTURES IN BI

We wish to distinguish between two basic types of sentence structure in BI [18], viz.: (I) Those consisting of three elements, and (II) those consisting of two elements. Only in the latter case do we use the terms Subject and Predicate. In principle the former are clustered around certain forms of the transitive Verb (= Vt), especially imperative forms, *me-* forms, *di-* forms and verbal forms with the pronominal Agent (for Vt see p. 24), whereas the latter category includes all other main types, which can be divided into two sub-types, namely (A) Equational sentences in which both the Subject and the Predicate are either a Noun or a Pronoun, and (B) Sentences in which the Predicate element is made up of an intransitive Verb (= Vi), an Adjective, or a *ke-an* verbal form, such as *kehudjanan,* etc. (see further p. 23). The problem is that the

word class of the transitive Verbs is not clearly distinguished from that of the intransitive Verbs; partly in connection with this the syntactic distinction between the two main sentence types (I) and (II), and especially (IIB), is sometimes not clear-cut. In 3.2. (below) we shall discuss the problems involved in determining to which of these two categories a Verb may belong, while in the present section we shall restrict ourselves to giving a brief summary of the main types of sentence construction mentioned above.

I SENTENCE CONSTRUCTIONS CONSISTING OF THREE ELEMENTS

The sentence types to be discussed under this heading are based on a system of opposition between syntactic constructions which is linked with a system of morphological oppositions within the verbal system. They are typically characterized by the presence of a particular form of a Vt, plus two Nouns (or Pronouns, or nominal constructs) acting as Agent (= A) and Patient (= Pa) respectively ('Actor' and 'Goal', in Bloomfield's terminology).

A. *The Agent-Directed Construction* [19]

This construction has two main characteristics: it contains a *me*-prefixed Vt (= *me*Vt), and its normal word order is N_1-*me*Vt-N_2; in the grammatical analysis N_1 will be called Agent, while N_2 is the Patient. In the sentence *Ali memukul Amat,* 'Ali hits Amat', *Ali* is A and *Amat* is Pa.

In such constructions either N_1 or N_2 may be omitted, though only provided that the context enables the reader to infer the omitted element. An example of this in Chairil Anwar's poetry is to be found in, e.g., poem no. *16, / Menunggu reda jang mesti tiba* ♯, where no N_1 occurs explicitly. From the context of the poem, however, we are able to infer that the A is *aku,* 'I', so that the translation of the line is '(I) Wait for the calmness that will surely come'.

In contrast with N_1, N_2 need not always be present even implicitly, as, for example, in a sentence such as *saja membatja,* 'I am reading'. There are many instances in Chairil Anwar's poetry in which he uses such constructions; we shall return to such Patient-less uses of transitive Verbs below (Chapter III, Section 2.2. ad E4).

The position of the N elements in respect of *me*Vt is not reversible (hence they cannot be changed to N_2-*me*Vt-N_1), since this would at the same time reverse the grammatical function of the respective elements, as in the English 'John beats Jack' vs. 'Jack beats John'.

The *me*Vt-N_2-N_1 sequence (inversion) is possible, however, though it is extremely rare. In prose, inversion implies a shift in emphasis. In speech such inverted constructions are characterized by special intonation (Halim, 1969).

The word sequence *me*Vt-N_1-N_2 is not possible in ordinary BI. However, we do find an apparent instance of this in one of Chairil Anwar's poems, namely in poem no. *6,* ♯ *Ida / Menembus sudah tjaja / Udara tebal kabut / Katja hitam lumut / Petjah pentjar sekarang /* etc.; we shall discuss this in Chapter III, Section 2.2.

B. *The Patient-Directed Construction*

1. The sequence in this construction is N_2-*di*Vt-(*oleh*)N_1, where *di*Vt is characterized morphologically by the non-nasalized transitive verbal base prefixed by *di-*, e.g. *Amat dipukul (oleh) Ali,* 'Amat is hit by Ali'.

In this construction N_1 must always follow *di*Vt immediately, except where it is preceded by *oleh* ('by'); in that case the group *oleh* + N_1 can be moved freely with regard to both *di*Vt and N_2, e.g.

*di*Vt-(*oleh*) N_1-N_2	*dipukul (oleh) Ali Amat*
oleh N_1-*di*Vt-N_2	*oleh Ali dipukul Amat*
oleh N_1-N_2-*di*Vt	*oleh Ali Amat dipukul*

It should be added, however, that in spoken language the use of these alternative constructions is dependent on fixed intonational patterns (Halim, 1969).

Frequently N_1 is omitted in the *di-* form; it may sometimes be inferable from the context or situation, though this form is also often impersonal [20].

2. N_2-Pr+Vt constructions, where Pr is the Pronoun and Vt the transitive verbal base, i.e. the non-nasalized form without the *di-* prefix. In the grammatical analysis of such constructions Pr is referred to as the pronominal Agent (= prA). Examples of this are

Ali aku pukul (for the first person singular), 'I beat Ali';
Ali engkau pukul (for the second person singular), 'You beat Ali';
Ali (d)ia pukul (for the third person singular), 'He beats Ali'.

Sometimes the Pr+Vt are written as one word, namely in cases where the proclitic forms of the first and second person singular Pronouns (*ku-* and *kau-*, respectively) are used, viz.:

Ali kupukul
Ali kaupukul [21]

As the analogous third person singular construction, however, we have N_2-*di*Vt+*nja,* where *-nja* is the enclitic form of the third person singular personal Pronoun, hence:

Ali dipukulnja,

or the alternative construction N_2-*di*Vt-*oleh*+*nja,* hence:

Ali dipukul olehnja.

Characteristic of this form in grammatically correct BI is that the Pr element combines to form one word with the V element, irrespective of whether or not it is written as one word [22]; N_2 may either precede or follow. In colloquial (Djakartan) BI the single word character of Pr+Vt is not always retained, so that other words may come in between Pr and Vt. In such cases problems of identification may arise. An example from Chairil Anwar's poetry is

69 */ Kami, timpang dan pintjang, negatip dalam djandji djuga /*
Sandarkan tulang belulang pada lampu djalan sadja /
'We, lame and crippled, negative also in promise /
Just lean (our) dry bones against the street lamps'.

Here *sandarkan* is formally probably a Vt lacking the *me-* prefix in an Agent-directed construction (see the discussion of this poem in Chapter II).

3. Vt-N_2 is the basic sequence in the case of Patient-directed imperative constructions, i.e., the transitive verbal base (with or without the transitive suffix *-kan* or *-i*) followed by the Pa element. The Pa element need not be mentioned explicitly in this type of sentence; however, it should always be inferable from the situation or context and should always be rendered in an adequate English translation. Examples of this in Chairil Anwar's poetry are:

15 *// . . . Tentang aku dengan berani //*
'. . . Stare (at) me bravely!'
55 */ Peluk kutjup perempuan, tinggalkan kalau meraju, /*
'Hug (and) kiss women, leave (them) when (they) flatter!'
55 */ Tembus djeladjah dunia ini dan balikkan, /*
'Penetrate, explore this world and turn (it) upside down!'

II SENTENCE CONSTRUCTIONS CONSISTING OF TWO ELEMENTS

A. *The Equational Sentence Construction*

The basic construction here is N_1-N_2. An example of this in Chairil Anwar's poetry is no. *38* '*Aku saksi!*', which means ' "I am a witness!" '.

In the grammatical analysis N_1 is parsed as the Subject (= S), and N_2 as the Predicate (= P).

S is a nominal construct, i.e. a N (in a basic or a derived form), a Pr, or any word that can be used as such, the latter often being accompanied by formal indications of transposition, being followed by *itu* or *ini,* for instance, or preceded by *jang,* or possessing a nominalizing affix such as *-nja.* Adjectives and Verbs may even be used as N without any formal features denoting transposition, if they occupy a typically nominal position in a sentence (see, for example, the discussion of poem no. *20* in Chapter II). The same applies to P constituting the equational counterpart of S.

The regular word order in such constructions is N_1-N_2 (= S-P); all kinds of adverbial Clauses may either precede, follow, or occur in between S and P. In these constructions both S and P may be expanded in all kinds of ways. It is impossible to discuss these in detail within the scope of our present study, however.

A special sub-type of the S-P equational sentence type is that with segmented S: S_1-S_2-P. Such constructions are typified by the occurrence of the suffix *-nja* in S_2. An example of this in Chairil Anwar's poetry is to be found in poem no. *3*: *Lawan banjaknja seratus kali,* which may be interpreted as follows: S_1 *lawan* ('enemy'), S_2 *banjaknja* ('their number'), and P *seratus kali* ('(a) hundred times'). In this construction S_2 may also follow P, hence: *Lawan seratus kali banjaknja.*

B. *Other Types of Sentence Construction*

Under this heading we would class all sentences consisting of two elements other than those mentioned above. In principle S here has the same characteristics and possibilities as the S mentioned above under (IIA); the P element, however, may be a prepositional group, an Adjective, or a Vi, including all kinds of verbal derivations other than those discussed above under (I), such as *berdjalan, kehudjanan, kelihatan, terasa,* etc.

3.2 TRANSITIVE AND INTRANSITIVE VERBS WITH *ME-*[23]

In order to avoid confusion it may be useful to point out that we have

based our definition of the transitive Verb on morphological criteria and not primarily on criteria of semantic content. Some further specification of the different morphological systems to which the various verbal forms belong may be relevant.

A. *Transitive Verbs* are characterized by a morphological system comprising a base form (used as such in the Patient-directed imperative), such as *lihat!,* a *me-* form, e.g., *melihat* (with certain morphological characteristics for which we would refer the reader to the textbooks listed in note 17), a *di-* form (*dilihat*) and forms with the pronominal Agent (*kulihat, kaulihat, dilihatnja,* etc.; see pp. 21-22). Verbs belonging to these paradigms may have bases belonging to different word classes, viz.:

1. A Vt base, such as *beli - membeli,* 'to buy something'. Such verbal bases do not occur by themselves as words except when used as a Patient-directed imperative (*beli!,* 'buy (it)!') or in compounds (*harga beli,* 'buying price').
2. A Noun base, such as *palu,* 'hammer' - *memalu,* 'to hit something with a hammer'. The morphological system of this kind of Vt is the same as that mentioned under (1), while in addition the base has the possibilities of words coming under the nominal system.
3. An adjectival base, for example, *lepas,* 'loose' - *melepas,* 'to let something loose'. Transitive Verbs based on Adjectives are rarely formed in this way in BI, Vt from adjectival bases normally being formed by suffixation of *-kan* (hence: *melepaskan*).

All Verbs with the suffixes *-kan* and *-i,* as well as those with the prefix *per-* — with or without the suffix *-kan* or *-i* — are transitive, irrespective of whether they are based on Nouns, Adjectives, or other basic words; such Verbs can take the *me-* forms (for the morphological rules again see the textbooks mentioned in note 17) as well as the corresponding Patient-directed forms. Examples from Chairil Anwar's poetry are:

4 */ Aku merangkaki dinding buta, /*
'I crawl up the blind walls'
4a. *Dinding buta kurangkaki*

42 *// Sebuah djendela menjerahkan kamar ini / pada dunia . . . /*
'A window surrenders this room / to the world . . .'
42a. *Kamar ini diserahkan (oleh) sebuah djendela pada dunia*

50 // *Gerimis mempertjepat kelam . . .* /
'The drizzle quickens the darkness . . .'
50a. *Kelam dipertjepat (oleh) gerimis*

B. *Intransitive Verbs* are those Verbs with the prefix *me-* which lack Patient-directed forms corresponding to the ones mentioned above. Such *me-* prefixed intransitive Verbs can also be formed from different bases, viz.:

1. A Vi base, e.g., *kembara - mengembara,* 'to wander'. An example from Chairil Anwar's poetry is:

4 / . . . *aku mengembara serupa Ahasveros* //
'. . . I wander like Ahasveros'

2. An adjectival base, e.g., *tinggi,* 'high' - *meninggi,* 'to rise high'. Examples from Chairil Anwar's poetry are:

21 // *Darahku mengental . . .* / 'My blood congeals . . .'
26 // *Segala menebal . . .* / 'Everything thickens . . .'
37 / *Tubuhmu nanti mengeras . . . ,* / 'Later your body will harden . . . ,'
46 // *Suaranja pergi terus meninggi,* / 'Her voice goes on rising,'
66 / *tindjauan mengabur, . . .* / 'the view blurs, . . .'

3. A Noun base, e.g., *batu,* 'stone' - *membatu,* 'to become like a stone'. An example from Chairil Anwar's poetry is:

44 // *Matamu ungu membatu* // 'Your violet eyes become like a stone'

In BI most of the *me-* forms derived from Nouns and Adjectives are of this intransitive type.

One important observation should be added here, if only provisionally. In Chapter III we shall return to this point in greater detail, but it seems useful to draw attention at this stage to a problem which will confront the reader in the discussion of several of the poems. It has already been remarked that Agent-directed forms of transitive Verbs may occur without either explicit or implicit Pa, e.g. (*20*) *Sepi memagut,* 'Loneliness bites' (cf. Poedjawijatna-Zoetmulder, ^{3}1964(I):48). In ordinary language this does not give rise to any problems, since the hearer who is

able to speak the language knows that *memagut* forms part of a morphological system which also comprises *dipagut, kupagut,* etc., or in other words, that it is a transitive Verb. Syntactically, however, there is no difference between *sepi memagut* (with a Vt) and *sepi menjanji* (with a Vi). In the analysis of Chairil Anwar's poetry we shall be confronted with problems of this nature in a number of cases, in which it is not clear even to native speakers of BI whether a particular *me-* form belongs to the Vt or the Vi system. This is especially the case with *me-* forms derived from Adjectives, which in BI are normally intransitive, but are in a number of cases used in such a way by Chairil Anwar that they can be, or perhaps should be, regarded as transitive (comparable to forms with the suffix *-kan* in ordinary BI). In combination with other characteristics, such as specifically the use of inversion, such uncertainty may give rise to ambiguity.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE POEMS

1. DIPONEGORO

Dimasa pembangunan ini
tuan hidup kembali

Dan bara kagum mendjadi api

Didepan sekali tuan menanti
Tak gentar. Lawan banjaknja seratus kali.

Pedang dikanan, keris dikiri
Berselempang semangat jang tak bisa mati.

MADJU

Ini barisan tak bergenderang-berpalu
Kepertjajaan tanda menjerbu.

Sekali berarti
Sudah itu mati.

MADJU

Bagimu Negeri
Menjediakan api.

Punah diatas menghamba
Binasa diatas ditinda

Sungguhpun dalam adjal baru tertjapai
Djika hidup harus merasai.

Madju.
Serbu.
Serang.
Terdjang.

(*KT*, 1949:7) *Pébruari 1943*

The title is the name of an early nineteenth century hero of the Indonesian national struggle. Other features of presentation worth noting are the following: all the lines begin with a capital letter, except for line 2; lines 8 and 13 each contain only one word (the same word in each case), the whole of which is written in capital letters. If these typographically salient single-word lines are intended to mark a break, a division of the poem into three sections, comprising lines 1-7, lines 9-12, and lines 14-23 respectively, results. Of the third section, lines 20-23 again are four one-word lines, which may constitute a separate part by itself. However, we shall discuss the lines as much as possible in terms of their consecutive order rather than analysing the poem in terms of 'parts'.

The first two lines form a single syntactic unit, marked by the absence of an initial capital letter in line 2, and characterized by a construction of the type PeP (line 1) + S + P. This is a very common sentence type in Indonesian, where *ini,* 'this', is the marker rounding off the PeP; the Pr *tuan,* 'you', (honorific) is a typical S element, and *hidup,* 'to live', is the P. The construction does not pose any problems. The translation is '(1) In this time of building (2) you live again' (cf. Nababan, 1966:167). From the title of the poem it is obvious that the Pronoun refers to Diponegoro.

The construction of line 3, *// Dan bara kagum mendjadi api //,* is on the whole quite clear, *bara kagum* constituting the S, consisting of N *bara* + Aj *kagum,* and *mendjadi api* a P of a most common type. *Dan,* 'and', here is the coordinating particle joining two sentences, whether these are complete sentences or Clauses. The fact that line 3 is printed as a separate stanza, combined with the use of the capital at the beginning, would suggest that it should be translated as a separate sentence. An interesting feature is the sequence *bara kagum.* Raffel translates it as 'astonished embers', which is a grammatically possible rendering of the Indonesian words; cf. *orang kagum,* 'astonished man'. Semantically, however, 'astonished embers' does not make much sense. For a better interpretation of such a group consisting of N + Aj one should compare it with such forms as *rasa kagum,* 'feeling of astonishment', or better still, 'admiration' (and not 'astonished feeling'), and *tanda setia,* 'a token of faithfulness', and not 'a faithful token'. In other words, the Aj following the N in phrases of this kind does not qualify the Noun in the ordinary way (cf. *rumah besar,* 'big house'), but has itself a nominal character. In fact, expressions such as *rasa kagum* and *tanda setia* are close in meaning to such forms as *rasa kekaguman* and

tanda kesetiaan respectively. Such *ke-an* forms derived from Adjectives represent the normal procedure whereby Adjectives are transposed into the Noun category (see further Chapter III, Section 2.1). This N character of *kagum* and *setia* is also obvious from the fact that it is impossible to insert *jang* before *kagum* and *setia* in these cases. In this poem, as in many others, the poet has used the basic form as a Noun determining another Noun, so that *bara kagum* should be interpreted as *bara kekaguman,* i.e. 'the embers of admiration'. The poetic advantage of this use is obvious: the shorter and more elementary form *kagum* is aesthetically more effective and contains an element of surprise, of novelty. Furthermore, *mendjadi api* does not mean 'burns' (cf. Raffel's translation), but 'becomes a fire', hence 'catches fire' or 'kindles'. Within the addresser-addressee context, the interpretation is clear. After addressing Diponegoro (= *tuan,* lines 1 + 2), the poet proceeds (*Dan,* line 3) to state that 'the embers of admiration' (for Diponegoro), which have lain smouldering in the soul of the Indonesian nation prior to the struggle for independence against the Dutch colonial power, have now 'become a fire'.

The next syntactic unit is marked off by the full stop occurring after *gentar* (line 5), the construction being parallel to that of the first two lines, that of line 4 being PeP + S + P (*Didepan tuan menanti,* 'In front you wait'). There are two additional elements here: *sekali* (line 4), occurring immediately after the Pe *didepan,* and *tak gentar* (line 5), after the P. *Tak gentar,* 'without fear', is a common form by which a Predicate may be extended, although perhaps in prose we would expect *dengan* to precede this construction, viz. *tuan menanti dengan tak gentar.* But even in prose *dengan* is not strictly necessary. *Sekali,* being a multivalent word (for multivalence see Chapter III), is grammatically ambiguous. It could be a temporal Adverb qualifying a Clause or sentence, in which case it possesses the meaning of 'once'; as such it may occur in a variety of positions within the sentence. The translation would then be: 'Once you waited (or: will wait) in front'. But *sekali* can also have the meaning of 'very', 'to a high degree', especially when it occurs after an Aj or a prepositional construction such as *didepan,* thus meaning 'in the very front', or 'right in front'. For semantic reasons we tend to reject the first alternative. The speaker obviously wants to emphasize Diponegoro's leadership, both in time and in quality, in the Indonesian struggle for independence. Hence we would translate these lines as: '(4) Far in front you wait (5) Fearless.' The rest of line 5 forms one single syntactic unit. Its construction is that of an equational sentence

with a segmented S of the type *Bulan banjaknja duabelas,* 'The months, their number (is) twelve', i.e. 'there are twelve months'. The translation of the remainder of line 5 is therefore: 'The enemy are a hundredfold.'

The absence of a full stop at the end of line 6, *// Pedang dikanan, keris dikiri /,* suggests that it should be read as one sentence in combination with line 7. This idea is strengthened by the semantic content of these lines. However, on analysing the lines grammatically, we come across some interesting problems. Line 6 consists of two identical constructions, each containing a N functioning as S and followed by a PeP, after the model *Wanita dimuka, laki-laki dibelakang,* 'Women in front, men behind', which is not unusual in Indonesian prose; thus line 6, 'A sword in the right, a dagger in the left', could be a complete syntactic unit by itself. It seems obvious that this description of an armed person refers to Diponegoro, the 'you' of the poem, so that a more explicit translation would be '(With) A sword in (your) right (hand), a dagger in (your) left (hand)'. In prose the same idea might more commonly be expressed by a *ber-* form, in this case *(tuan) berpedang dikanan, berkeris dikiri.* Precisely this construction is used by the poet in the next line, */ Berselempang semangat jang tak bisa mati. //.*

Berselempang semangat, consisting of a N functioning as a complement of a *ber-* form derived from a N, is quite a common construction, e.g. *(57) bersungai susu,* 'with rivers of milk'. In contrast with line 6, the *ber-* is compulsory in line 7 since *selempang semangat* would mean 'shoulder belt of the spirit'. This construction with *ber-* has in its turn been definitely exploited by the poet. It is a typical P-form which presupposes a Subject of some kind, such as *tuan* here, and as such it confirms our interpretation of line 6. Since the reference in line 7 is sufficiently clear (see above), the poet could afford not to mention the person to whom line 6 refers without giving rise to ambiguity. These two lines are also excellent examples of the kind of economy Chairil Anwar so often observes in respect of words or grammatical elements. Even the question of whether they form one single or two separate sentences is probably irrelevant in respect of these two lines that become so closely associated in the interpretation without being formally interconnected. This poetic effect has probably been overlooked by Raffel. He translates line 7 as 'And your soul has what can never die' (Raffel, 1970:7), i.e. he has regarded *semangat* as the S of *berselempang,* and *jang tak bisa mati* as the complement of *berselempang* (not to mention the fact that his translation of *selempang* is rather odd). Such a translation would be correct in the case of constructions of the type *berguru*

dia seorang wanita, which is possible alongside the more usual word order *dia berguru seorang wanita,* 'he/she/it has a woman teacher'. However, it is extremely doubtful whether the Indonesian language admits of this word order in cases where the complement consists of a *jang*-phrase. Although *dia bersemangat jang tak bisa mati,* i.e. 'he has a spirit that cannot die', is still possible, *bersemangat dia jang tak bisa mati* is highly improbable, since it would mean 'he, who cannot die, has a spirit'. But altogether apart from his misinterpretation of the syntax, Raffel's rendering is improbable from a semantic point of view. It is not the *selempang* (a shoulder belt, symbolizing rank or moral superiority, which is usually worn slung diagonally across the chest) but the *semangat,* 'spirit', that 'cannot die' (= *jang tak bisa mati*), so that the translation is 'Girt with a spirit that cannot die.' Also for semantic reasons we have rejected yet another interpretation of this line which would have been syntactically possible, namely *jang tak bisa mati* as S, *berselempang semangat* as P, thus 'those (or: he) who cannot die are (or: is) girt with a spirit.'

Line 8 consists of one single word. Although the exclamation mark is absent, the emphatic function of this line is made obvious typographically by the use of capital letters for *MADJU,* meaning 'Forward!'. It is not clear whether this word should be interpreted as P to an implicit S, which would then again be *tuan,* or as an imperative form addressed either to *tuan* or to an unknown listener. Again, these alternatives are probably irrelevant. Even though the poet is addressing Diponegoro in the first instance, this line, repeated five lines further down, may also imply an exhortation to his contemporaries, the readers, to follow Diponegoro's example.

The same problem as to the identity of the person addressed is met with in line 9, // *Ini barisan tak bergenderang-berpalu* /. It is difficult to determine whether the Demonstrative *ini,* 'this', refers to Diponegoro's army, or to the one with whom the reader or the poet is supposedly connected. However, if we take *ini* in its normal function of referring to that which is close to the speaker, we may assume that it is the army which the poet is exhorting in his imagination to join the attack.

We would furthermore draw the reader's attention to the use of *ini* before the Noun to which it is in apposition, *ini barisan* meaning 'this column' (in 'correct' Indonesian it would be *barisan ini*). This seems to be characteristic of Chairil Anwar's use of *ini,* as we shall demonstrate further down, although in this particular instance the possibility of *ini* functioning as S of a P *barisan* is not in itself ruled out (rendering the

translation 'This is a column'). It would seem preferable, however, to translate this line as 'This column has neither drums nor hammers (here: clubs)'.

The interpretation of line 10, / *Kepertjajaan tanda menjerbu.* //, is difficult. Both *kepertjajaan,* 'faith', 'belief', and *tanda,* 'signal', 'token' are N, whereas *menjerbu,* 'to attack', is a transitive Verb, here obviously without a Pa. Taking the line as it stands, it can be grammatically analysed in several different ways:

1. It is an equational sentence with *kepertjajaan* as S and *tanda menjerbu* as P, so that the translation would be 'Faith is the signal for attack (or: for attacking)';
2. *Kepertjajaan tanda* is S and *menjerbu* is P, so that the translation would be 'The faith of the signal attacks (or: is to attack; or: is attacking)';
3. The whole line should be regarded as NP with *kepertjajaan* as principal word of the construction and *tanda menjerbu* as the attribute, so that the translation would be 'Faith of the signal of attack(ing)';
4. In view of the construction of the type *orang kepertjajaan,* 'trusted person', 'confidant', one might further consider the possibility of *kepertjajaan* being a verbal form meaning 'to be entrusted'; the translation of the line in this case would be 'Entrusted with the signal for attack', and then the whole line could be regarded as appositional to *barisan*;
5. Grammatically there is yet another possibility, i.e., that of line 10 being the complement of line 9, the meaning thus becoming *berpalu kepertjajaan tanda menjerbu,* 'having as a hammer a faith . . .'. This does not make sense, however, and is also contradicted by the occurrence of the hyphen connecting *berpalu* with *bergenderang*;
6. Raffel's translation 'They show their faith by attacking' is unwarranted by the Indonesian text. It would be a correct rendering of *menjerbu tanda kepertjajaan,* 'to attack (is) the token of faith', but the three words of the line as it stands do not admit of such an interpretation.

The second, third, fourth, and fifth alternatives are semantically improbable, whereas the sixth is downright incorrect. We prefer the first of the above alternatives for the following reason. In battles of the old type the sound of drums was the audible signal for attack. The soldiers

being referred to in this poem, however, have neither drums nor clubs (line 9). Instead, a strong faith acts as their incentive. If we were to ask in *what* they have faith, the various possible answers might be: 'in winning', 'in fighting for the right cause', or, as expressed further down in lines 11 and 12, 'in the fight itself'. The translation of line 10 according to our interpretation is, therefore, 'Faith is the signal for attack.'

Lines 11 + 12, *// Sekali berarti / Sudah itu mati. //*, are illustrative of various special characteristics of the Indonesian language. Grammatically both lines could be described as Predicates without Subjects, but preceded by adverbial Adjuncts of time (*sekali,* 'once', and *sudah itu,* 'after that'). The construction calls to mind the oft-repeated slogan of the early years of the Republic of Indonesia: *Sekali merdeka, tetap merdeka,* meaning 'Once free, always free'. It seems irrelevant to speculate about who might or should be considered the S of these lines. A general statement without reference to any specific person, as in the Subjectless sentence above, is one of the interesting characteristics of the Indonesian language. The poet is undoubtedly aware of the advantages of such a construction for his poetry, and he obviously uses it here as a means of referring to the hero of his poem and of exhorting his Indonesian contemporaries to adopt this as the guiding principle in their lives [24].

Another interesting feature of these two lines is that the first part might be considered semantically subordinate to the second, the meaning thus being something like 'If one's life has been meaningful once, one can then die', or 'After having meaning once in life, one may die'. The Indonesian language often omits to express formally such a semantic dependence of one sentence or Clause on another. In earlier Malay this kind of formal coordination of sentences of which the one is semantically subordinate to the other is quite common. An interesting subject for investigation would be the question of whether modern poets show a distinct preference for such succinct constructions which have poetic advantages in that they are more direct, thus avoiding 'logical' conjunctions and leaving a great deal more to the imagination of the reader. Here, in any case, the two lines form an almost aphoristic, short, pithy expression that we would translate as '(11) To be meaningful once (12) And then die.'

Lines 14 + 15: *// Bagimu Negeri / Menjediakan api. //*. Here again, we have a case of grammatical ambiguity. The two different possibilities are as follows:

a. '(14) For you (i.e., interpreting *-mu* as the possessive Pronoun referring to *tuan,* namely Diponegoro) the Country (15) Prepares a fire.';
b. '(14) For you, o Country, (15) (We, Diponegoro, or the speaker) Prepare(s) a fire.'

The second alternative would imply that there are two 'persons' being addressed in this poem, namely *tuan* (= Diponegoro) and 'the Country' (= *-mu*). Moreover, it does not enable us to infer the A element belonging to the transitive Verb *menjediakan* from the context, while besides detracting from the consistency of the general purport of the poem (cf. lines 11 + 12). Therefore we are inclined to opt for the former alternative, although we are aware that this is at best a likely guess. It should be noted in passing that Raffel has mistranslated these lines as '(14) For your country (15) You lit a fire' (Raffel, 1970:7). For this rendering to be warranted, the Indonesian would have to read *Bagi Negerimu* in line 14. An additional argument in favour of our interpretation can be found in line 3, which we rendered 'And the embers of admiration are kindling'. Lines 14 and 15 are thus seen to link up with this earlier simile, so that where previously 'the embers of admiration are kindling', now 'the country' is bursting into flame (cf. Nababan, 1966:169).

An interesting feature of the poet's language is to be discovered in lines 16 + 17: // *Punah diatas menghamba / Binasa diatas ditinda* //. Both lines contain the Preposition *diatas,* 'above', 'upon', 'on', and in construction are akin to the following models:

Buku itu diatas medja, 'The book is on the table';
Dia diatas saja, 'He/She/It is above me'.

In other words, in constructions such as these the slots before and after the Preposition require either a N or Pr. Lines 16 and 17 demonstrate, therefore, how in Indonesian transposition of words to different word classes can take place without any accompanying formal characterization of the words as such. In the lines in question Adjectives and Verbs become Nouns without taking on any of the formal characteristics of the latter word class, simply by filling up the syntactic slot for a Noun. The literal translation of the lines thus is '(16) Destroyed above being a slave (17) Annihilated above being oppressed'; or in better English '(16) Destruction above slavery (17) Annihilation above

oppression', or '(16) Rather destruction than slavery (17) Rather annihilation than oppression'. These lines, again, have very much the character of statements of general truth.

Line 18, // *Sungguhpun dalam adjal baru tertjapai* /, also is grammatically open to more than one interpretation. This is due mainly to the lexical elements *dalam* and *baru,* which are multivalent words (see further Chapter III, Section 1, ad 2), viz.:

a. *Dalam* in *dalam adjal* may represent a nominalized Aj, similar to the type *dalam sumur itu,* 'the depth of the well' (usually *dalamnja sumur itu*); whereas *baru* (Aj 'new') may be an Attribute qualifying *adjal,* 'death', so that the translation according to this interpretation would be 'Although the depth of a new death (is) achieved';
b. *Baru* may be an Av meaning 'only', 'just now', so that the translation in this case would be 'Although the depth of death is only (or: just now) achieved';
c. *Dalam* may be a Pe meaning 'in', and *baru* an Aj, so that the translation would read 'Although in the new death (it is) achieved';
d. *Dalam* can be a Pe, *adjal* a N, and *baru* an Av, thus making for the translation 'Although only in death (it is) achieved'.

All four alternatives are equally plausible grammatically, but the first three do not make much sense semantically. Our only intention in listing the various alternatives is to show how certain elements, here *dalam* and *baru,* may give rise to grammatical ambiguities. It may not always be possible to clear up such ambiguities by determination of the context (see Chapter III, Epilogue). A satisfactory interpretation of line 18 in this case can only be arrived at by taking the general context into consideration. And only the last alternative, 'Although only in death (it is) achieved', is seen to be meaningful within the context of the entire poem. Furthermore, here again the Pa of a Patient-directed *ter-* form is absent [25]. The reader is left with the question of *what* is achieved. There is nothing in the preceding lines to help determine this, but we should probably actually look for an answer in the poem as a whole; thus we would suggest that it is 'the real purpose of life' of 'being meaningful', and so on. Note how effectively this kind of Subjectless sentence operates poetically. The construction as it stands forces the reader to try to realize what the poem is all about, while yet leaving him free to think up satisfactory answers to the questions posed.

Line 19, / *Djika hidup harus merasai.* //, again is open to more than

one likely grammatical interpretation. This is due specifically to the ambivalence of the lexical element *hidup* (on ambivalence see Chapter III), which may be both a N ('life'), e.g. (*49*) *Hidup berlangsung antara buritan dan kemudi,* 'Life moves between the ship's stern and rudder', and an Aj of the type *datang,* 'to come', meaning 'to live', 'alive', 'living', e.g. (*10*) *Aku mau hidup seribu tahun lagi,* 'I want to live another thousand years'. If we take the whole line as one dependent Clause introduced by *djika,* 'if', this leaves us with two dependent Clauses, namely line 18, which is introduced by *sungguhpun,* 'although', and line 19, which is introduced by *djika,* without a proper principal Clause preceding or following them. Regarding it as a construction of a well-known Bahasa Indonesia type, with *djika* or *kalau* introducing a Subject (cf. Javanese *jèn*), e.g. *djika saja, tidak mau,* 'as for me, (I am) not willing', is therefore more plausible. Line 19 would then mean 'As for life (or: in life), (one) must feel (it).' *Merasai* is a transitive verbal form meaning 'to feel' (often implying a painful sensation, so that *merasai* can also mean 'to suffer'). The question immediately arises *what* it is that is felt. Probably here again, we should infer the same Pa as in the previous line: 'the real purpose of life' of 'being meaningful', and so on. Together the two lines would then mean something like 'Although it is achieved only in death, we must at least feel (or: experience) what it is all about in life.'

By paraphrasing it thus it becomes obvious at the same time that the alternative of taking *hidup* as an Aj would result in virtually the same interpretation, viz.: 'If living', or 'During one's lifetime one must experience (it).' The question arises as to whether the difference between the two alternatives is relevant, or whether we have here a structural characteristic of Indonesian; and whether the alternatives, which become evident only when one tries to render a sentence like this into another language on the basis of a grammatical analysis, are real or only apparent. In other words, the problem we are facing here is the basic problem of the grammatical analysis in connection with the position of a word such as *hidup* within the system of word classes in BI (see Chapter III, Section 1 ad 4).

The concluding four lines do not pose many problems as far as the interpretation is concerned. Each of them consists of a single word expressing the spirit of the true fighter. At the same time these words describe Diponegoro's attitude to life and exhort the (Indonesian) reader to let himself be inspired by the same spirit. The grammatical structure of these four lines deserves some closer attention. *Madju,* 'Forward!',

is an Aj and can be used as a kind of Imperative such as *awas!,* '(be) careful!', *tjepat!,* 'quickly!', etc. It is, however, slightly different from the other three words that follow, these being verbal bases of transitive Verbs, and, as has been pointed out in the preceding Chapter (3.2), such verbal bases are used as Patient-directed Imperatives in Indonesian. Hence in prose a form such as *Serbu* must be translated as 'Attack it!', or 'Attack him!', etc. Even if there is no explicit Pa, in ordinary speech it can always be inferred from the context or the situation. This use of the Patient-directed Imperative is also quite common in Chairil Anwar's language. Other examples of it are:

45 / *Tulis karena kertas gersang, . . .!* ‡
'Write (it) because the paper is (still) blank, . . .!'
55 / *Isi gelas sepenuhnja lantas kosongkan* /
'Fill the glass completely, then empty (it)!'
57 / *Ah! djawab sendiri! . . .* ‡
'Ah! answer (it) yourself! . . .'

It is obvious that in the case of lines 21-23 there is no such implicit Pa available anywhere. Of course one might add to one's translation something like 'the enemy', but it seems more probable that these bases here function in an unspecified way, as do similar verbal bases occurring in compounds, e.g., *daja serbu,* 'striking power'. Formally these words may be slogans or exhortations rather than Imperatives, but this does nothing to alter the interpretation of the poem. It is worth noting once more that the grammatical distinctions which are made in an analysis of the language may become entirely irrelevant in this kind of poetry. The first-year student who is taught that *serbu* does not mean 'attack' but 'attack him/it', would be wise if he disregards the grammatically correct analysis of the language when confronted with this poem!

The translation of the poem thus reads:

DIPONEGORO

1 In this time of building
2 you live again

3 And the embers of admiration are kindling

4 Far in front you wait
5 Fearless. The enemy are a hundredfold.

(With) A sword in (your) right (hand), a dagger in (your) left (hand)
Girt with a spirit that cannot die.

FORWARD

This column has neither drums nor clubs
Faith is the signal for attack.

To be meaningful once
And then die.

FORWARD

For you the Country
Prepares a fire.

Rather destruction than slavery
Rather annihilation than oppression

Although (it is) achieved only in death
In life (one) must experience (it).

Forward.
Charge.
Attack.
Crush.

February 1943

2. KUPU MALAM DAN BINIKU

1 *Sambil berselisih lalu*
2 *mengebu debu.*

3 *Kupertjepat langkah. Tak noléh kebelakang*
4 *Ngeri ini luka-terbuka sekali lagi terpandang*

5 *Barah ternganga*

6 *Melajang ingatan kebiniku*
7 *Lautan jang belum terduga*
8 *Biar lebih kami tudjuh tahun bersatu*

9 *Barangkali tak setahuku*
10 *Ia menipu.*

Maret 1943

(*KT,* 1949:17)

The meaning of the title is 'A Whore and My Wife'. The poem consists of ten lines, all of which except line 2 begin with a capital letter. No punctuation is used apart from full stops at the end of lines 2 and 10 and in the middle of line 3. The poem is divided into five stanzas, the first, second and last of which consist of two lines, while the third and fourth stanzas are irregular, consisting of one and three lines respectively. Each stanza appears to represent a conceptual unity within the poem as a whole; there is little similarity in structure between them [26].

The absence of a capital at the beginning of line 2 suggests that the first two lines form a single syntactic unit: ‡ *Sambil berselisih lalu / mengebu debu.* //. The construction is clear and a common one in Indonesian, viz. TAu (line 1) + P (*mengebu*) and S (*debu,* 'dust'). The Verb *mengebu* poses a problem. Assuming that the word has been printed correctly, it must be a *me-* form based on one of three possible basic forms: *kebu,* or *ngebu,* or *ebu.* However, none of the three verbal bases exists in the Indonesian vocabulary. An earlier version of the poem [27] has *mengabu,* which poses no problems. It is a *me-* form derived from the N *abu,* 'ash'; as such it would be an intransitive Verb (see Chapter I, Section 3.2) meaning 'to become (like) ash'. The translation of the first two lines would be '(1) While crossing each other, (2) dust becomes (or: became) (like) ash.' Yet it is not clear what is actually meant by 'dust becomes (or: became) (like) ash' [28]. Another possible inter-

pretation, i.e. by taking *mengabu debu* as a *me-* form of a compound Noun *abu(-)debu,* 'ash and dust', thus meaning 'to become (like) ash and dust', is far-fetched and hardly less unlikely, however, specifically because there is no likely S available in that case. Another improbable solution would be to take *mengebu* as a printing error for *menggebu.* In Malay the word *gebu,* meaning 'fine', 'soft', 'plump', does occur, but it is used only in this basic form and exclusively in descriptions of the attractiveness or beauty of women [29]. In Indonesian the word is also used with *me-* plus nasalization, i.e. *menggebu,* which means 'to flare up'. Even if we were to regard *mengebu debu* as a printing error of *menggebu debu,* it is still difficult to accept that *menggebu* could be said of 'dust', unless we were to translate it freely with 'dust billowing' [30].

The first part of line 3, // *Kupertjepat langkah . . .* /, is a Patient-directed construction consisting of prA (*ku-,* i.e. the proclitic form of the first person singular personal Pronoun) + Vt *pertjepat,* 'to quicken', plus Pa *langkah,* 'step', 'pace'. The remainder of the line presents no difficulties, *noléh* being a short (Djakartan) form for the regular *me-noléh,* an intransitive Verb meaning 'to look backwards', 'to turn away'. The S to this Verb is implied in the first part of the line, '*I* don't look backwards'.

The grammatical relationship between lines 3 and 4 is not clear. The absence of a full stop at the end of line 3 may, though it need not necessarily, indicate that the second part of line 3 combines to form one sentence with line 4. *Ngeri,* meaning 'horrible', 'terrible', is an Aj which may stand in apposition to the (implied) S of *noléh,* so that the whole line may be interpreted as having an explicative function. The construction is not uncommon in BI, even if it is more usual to have a Conjunction preceding the Aj (such as *karena, sebab, sambil,* etc.), e.g. *Dia tidak datang, (karena) takut bapaknja akan memukulnja,* 'He did not come, (as he was) afraid that his father would hit him'. Assuming that line 4 also represents such a construction, we would have here a Clause consisting of a Pa plus a Pa-directed *ter-* form dependent on *ngeri*; *ini* must then be taken as the demonstrative Pronoun preceding the N *luka-terbuka,* 'open wound', as is often the case in Chairil Anwar's poetry. The interpretation would then be: '(3) (I) Didn't look backwards (4) Horrified that this open wound should be visible once more'. There is yet another possibility. *Ngeri* could also be taken as a (not formally characterized) transposition of an Aj into a N (of the type *luas sawah itu,* 'the area of the paddy-field'); in that case *ngeri* (= *kengerian*) would be the Pa of *terpandang, ini luka-terbuka* deter-

mining *ngeri.* The translation would then be 'The horror of this open wound is seen (or: has been seen, is visible, etc.) once more'. The absence of verbal tense leaves open the possibility of 'the seeing' of the horrible open wound having already taken place, causing the *aku* to quicken his pace 'without looking back', rather than his quickening his pace for fear of beholding the open wound once more. Whatever the case may be, we believe that the first alternative is more plausible, both grammatically and semantically, than the second.

Line 5, *// Barah ternganga //*, is syntactically ambiguous. There are two possibilities of interpretation, viz.:

1. It can be regarded as an S-P sentence construction, thus meaning 'The boil is gaping'; or
2. It can be interpreted as a nominal phrase, consisting of the N *barah* as principal word of the construction, and *ternganga* as the attribute, thus meaning 'Gaping boil'.

In view of the form *luka-terbuka,* which on the point both of structure and meaning as well as rhyme is parallel to *barah ternganga,* we are inclined toward the second alternative. The parallelism and use of synonyms here serve to emphasize the importance of the metaphorical meaning of the words. The translation thus is: '(3) I quickened (my) pace. (1) Didn't look backwards (4) Horrified that this open wound should be visible once more (5) (A) Gaping boil'.

Line 6, *// Melajang ingatan kebiniku /*, is a complete sentence, containing an inverted S-P construction plus PeO, *melajang,* 'to soar', 'to float in the air', here 'to drift away', being the P, and *ingatan,* 'thoughts', the S. In standard Indonesian as taught in school we would expect *kepada biniku* rather than *kebiniku,* but it is obvious that for Chairil Anwar, in this case as in many others, the shorter form was poetically more attractive.

Line 7, */ Lautan jang belum terduga /*, is appositional to *biniku,* 'my wife' (line 6); *jang,* 'that', introduces the phrase *belum terduga* modifying *lautan,* 'ocean'. A *ter-* form such as *terduga,* especially when occurring together with a negative, often means 'not . . .-able', e.g. *tidak terhitung,* 'innumerable'; thus *belum terduga* means 'as yet unfathomable'.

Line 8, */ Biar lebih kami tudjuh tahun bersatu //*, poses a problem, namely as regards the position of the Adjunct of degree *lebih,* 'more'. *Lebih* is usually found immediately preceding a Numeral or, in some

cases, after the Numeral + Noun construction determined by it, as follows:

a. *lebih tudjuh tahun,* or
b. *tudjuh tahun lebih.*

Either of these groups could both precede and follow *kami:*

1. *Biar kami lebih tudjuh tahun bersatu,*
2. *Biar lebih tudjuh tahun kami bersatu,*
3. *Biar kami tudjuh tahun lebih bersatu,*
4. *Biar tudjuh tahun lebih kami bersatu.*

Chairil Anwar's word order *Biar lebih kami tudjuh tahun bersatu,* i.e. with the S coming in between *lebih* and *tudjuh tahun* ('seven years'), is not in conformity with the rules of Indonesian syntax, however. We would compare it with the following other occurrences of *lebih* in his poetry, e.g.

10 // *Dan aku akan l e b i h tidak perduli* //
42 / . . . *Bulan jang menjinar kedalam* / *mau l e b i h banjak tahu* /
66 / *aku sudah l e b i h dulu kaku* ♯

In all of the above cases the position of the Adjunct of degree *lebih* conforms with the grammatical rules. That being the case, we have only two alternative explanations to account for the irregular order in the present case. Firstly, we might regard it as an instance of poetic licence. However, this is hardly an explanation at all, since we can give no reason, phonetic or otherwise, why the poet should have permitted himself this licence in this particular instance. The line as it stands has no visible poetic advantages over (1), (2), (3), or (4) above. The only other explanation is that this peculiarity is due to an error. The translation of the lines is: '(6) (My) Thoughts drifted away to my wife (7) As yet an unfathomable ocean (8) Although we've been together more than seven years'.

The two concluding lines form one syntactic unit displaying a typical Agent-directed construction. Here *barangkali,* 'maybe', is an aspectual Adjunct, and *tak setahuku* (line 9) is PA (in prose we would expect to find *dengan* inserted before *tak setahuku,* hence *barangkali dengan tak setahuku*), while *ia* (line 10, referring to *bini,* hence 'she') is the A and *menipu,* 'to deceive', a Vt; the implied *aku,* 'me', is the Pa.

An interesting feature worth noting in this poem is the poet's use of Djakarta colloquialisms, viz.: *Bini* instead of *isteri,* and the nasalized Verb *noléh* without the *me-* prefix as described above. Whether this feature is preconditioned by the theme or the title of the poem needs to be examined more closely.

Here, then, follows the translation of the whole poem:

A WHORE AND MY WIFE

While crossing each other
the dust billowed.

I quickened (my) pace. (I) Didn't look backwards
Horrified that this open wound should be visible once more

(A) Gaping boil

(My) Thoughts drifted away to my wife
As yet an unfathomable ocean
Although we've been together more than seven years

Maybe without my knowledge
She has deceived (me).

March 1943

3. KENANGAN

Untuk Karinah Moordjono

1 *Kadang*
2 *Diantara djeridji itu itu sadja*
3 *Mereksmi memberi warna*
4 *Benda usang dilupa*
5 *Ah! tertjebar rasanja diri*
6 *Membubung tinggi atas kini*
7 *Sedjenak*
8 *Sadja. Halus rapuh ini djalinan kenang*
9 *Hantjur hilang belum dipegang*
10 *Terhentak*
11 *Kembali diitu-itu sadja*
12 *Djiwa bertanja: Dari buah*
13 *Hidup kan banjakan djatuh ketanah?*
14 *Menjelubung njesak penjesalan pernah menjia-njia*

19 April 1943

(Jassin, [3]1968:51)

The poem bears the title *Kenangan* [31], 'Memories', and the dedication 'for Karinah Moordjono'. Each line begins with a capital letter, and punctuation is used only sparingly. There is obviously some sort of final rhyme, but the difficulties in determining what is rhyme in Indonesian mentioned earlier also present themselves in this poem. While there is definitely final rhyme in lines 5/6, 8/9, and 12/13, we lack the criteria by which to decide whether lines 2/3/4, or 11/14 (all with final *a*) can also be considered to rhyme. The most remarkable instance of final rhyme in this poem is found in lines 7/10, which is all the more effective since these are one-word lines and as such already tend to hold the reader's full attention. From the linguistic point of view an interesting feature is provided by the rather unusual extension of the syntactic units of the poem. In this respect this poem is exceptional, at any rate among Chairil Anwar's early poetry [32].

The first syntactic unit extends from line 1 to line 4 and has basically the same construction as the following model:

Kemarin di Djakarta meninggal menteri tua,
lit. 'Yesterday in Djakarta die minister old', i.e.
'Yesterday in Djakarta an old minister died'.

It consists of the TAu *kadang,* 'sometimes', LAu *diantara djeridji itu itu sadja,* 'between these very same trellises', and an inverted S-P construction. The P consists of a double *me-* form, of which the second, i.e. the transitive *memberi,* 'to give', has the Pa *warna* 'colour'; the S, *benda usang dilupa,* consists of the N *benda,* 'thing', and two qualifying words, namely the Aj *usang,* 'worn-out', and the *di-*prefixed verbal *dilupa,* '(to be) forgotten'. The frequently occurring inversion of Subject and Predicate in Indonesian normally has the function of lending emphasis to the Predicate, whereas the Subject, especially where it has been mentioned before in a particular text, fades somewhat into the background. In this case, however, where no implicit S can suggest itself to the reader in the first sentence of the message, the inversion has a different effect, an effect which is strengthened by placing the two Adjuncts of time and place at the beginning of the message. A certain tension is created and the reader's curiosity as to whom or to what all these things which are being said in the first three lines might actually refer is aroused. This effect is reinforced both semantically and formally by the occurrence of some rather unusual elements in the Adjuncts and the Predicate. One of these uncommon elements is *kadang,* which in the meaning of 'sometimes' normally occurs in the reduplicated form *kadang-kadang,* or else with the prefix *ter-,* hence *terkadang.* In line 2 the double *itu(-)itu* is as unusual as the unreduplicated *kadang*; it is colloquial, with a connotation of 'the same old song all over again', or something similar. In line 3 the reader is confronted with the enigmatic form *mereksmi,* which is not to be found in any Indonesian dictionary. It appears to be a *me-* form of *reksmi,* which may be a combination (or blending) of the Sanskrit *lakṣmī* and the Javanese *resmi.* The latter may ultimately go back to the former; they both have the same meaning, namely 'beauty', 'splendour', 'beam'. *Mereksmi* might be either a transitive Verb meaning 'to beautify something', or an intransitive Verb with the meaning 'to become beautiful'. Evidently this word should be connected with *memberi warna,* 'to give colour', 'to colour'. We are unable to decide whether *memberi warna* is coordinate with or subordinate — with some explicative function — to *mereksmi,* hence 'becoming beautiful and giving colour' and 'beautifying by colouring' respectively. If we were to take *mereksmi* (in conjunction with *memberi warna*) as a transitive Verb, it would be possible to regard line 4 as the Pa of these Verbs, thus 'beautifying (and) giving colour (to) *benda usang dilupa*'. The problem then is that we have no Agent for these verbal forms, not even an implicit one; the only possibility would be to regard

the word of the title, *Kenangan,* as the implicit Agent of the first sentence. We would then have: '(Memories) beautify (and) give colour (to) the *benda usang dilupa*'. Semantically this would make sense, but it would be highly unusual in a case such as this not to have even a Pronoun as Agent (cf. *tuan* in line 2 of the poem *Diponegoro,* which also refers back to the title of the poem). It is therefore more probable that line 4 should contain the Subject to the *me-* forms in line 3. In that case the intransitive interpretation of *mereksmi,* i.e. 'putting on splendour', becomes more probable.

Line 4 by itself, and in view of the absence of punctuation, could be analysed as a Patient-directed construction without an explicit A: 'Worn-out things are forgotten' [33]. However, this seems a trivial statement, which, moreover, would leave us with an incomplete first sentence. It is therefore much more plausible to explain the line as a nominal group in which a non-redundant element, *jang,* has been left out; hence, *benda usang jang dilupa.* In Chapter (I) we indicated that Chairil Anwar not infrequently leaves out *jang* for poetic reasons (see further Chapter III, 3.2). The meaning of the line would then be: 'Worn-out things (that are) forgotten'.

We then arrive at the following translation of the first four lines: '(1) Sometimes (2) Between these very same trellises (3) Putting on splendour, giving colour (4) (There are) Worn-out things (that are) forgotten'. In this interpretation of the first four lines it also becomes evident that the sentence is referring to the title of the poem. The *Kenangan* are made *concrete* by the word *benda,* i.e., the worn-out things are the memories the poet is turning over in his mind; he becomes aware of them through tangible, long-forgotten objects. And this consciousness elicits the exclamation *Ah!* from him. It punctuates, as it were, this moment of remembering things long forgotten and underlines the sense of regret they evoke.

This interjection marks the beginning of the second syntactic unit. Its construction is basically parallel to the model:

tertjengang ia membubung tinggi
'amazed he flies high',

and it consists of the P *tertjebar,* the Au *rasanja,* 'it feels' [34], and the S *diri,* 'I'. *Membubung tinggi atas kini* stands in apposition to *diri,* again without a Conjunction such as would normally be used in prose, e.g. (*sambil*) *membubung tinggi atas kini,* or otherwise (*jang*) *membubung tinggi atas kini.* It is interesting to note the use of the Av *kini,* 'now',

in the nominal slot here (after the Pe *atas,* 'on', 'above'), where in prose we would expect to find the form *kekinian,* 'the now', 'the present', with nominal affixation. The translation of line 6 thus becomes: 'Soaring up high above the present'. The P *tertjebar* provides us with a lexicographical problem. We are familiar with the expression *tjebar-tjebur,* which is an onomatopoea indicating the sound of water splashing. *Mentjebur* by itself means 'to plunge (into water)', whereas the word *mentjebar* does not exist by itself, since *tjebar* is only the imitative counterpart of *tjebur* in the abovementioned compound. *Tertjebar* as it occurs in the poem may also be regarded as the Indonesian variant of the Minangkabau *tatjebai* which, according to Umar Junus, who is a Minangkabau native speaker, is said of someone who has been hoping to get something and who is sure of getting it, but in the end does not get it. There are several other instances of Minangkabau words (especially of the Pajakumbuh dialect) ending in *ai* found in Indonesian variants ending with *ar,* e.g. *kisai-kisar, sembai-sembar* (= *sambar*; for the *e-a* variant in the penultimate see the discussion of poem no. *32*), etc. With regard to the rising memories, *tertjebar rasanja diri* may be translated as 'I feel frustrated (by the memories)', or more poetically perhaps 'My hopes are crushed'.

Where / *Sedjenak* / *Sadja* . . . / belongs syntactically is not clear. It may either form part of the preceding sentence, modifying *membubung tinggi,* or constitute a sentence by itself, assuming that a full stop should come at the end of line 6. The translation then would be: 'A moment only (does it last).' The fact that a full stop occurs after *sadja,* 'only', suggests, however, that line 7, i.e. *sedjenak,* 'a moment', plus *sadja* (line 8), belong to the preceding syntactic unit that begins with *tertjebar.* Semantically this interpretation does not differ greatly from that taking *sedjenak sadja* as a separate sentence. In view of what has been said above, we would suggest the translation '(5) Ah! My hopes are crushed (6) (After) Soaring up high above the present (7) A moment (8) Only.'

The poetic effect created by the use of *sedjenak* as a single-word line is obvious in both cases. It inevitably brings the reader to a momentary stop after the longer lines preceding it.

The next lines again present us with the problem of sentence boundaries. For the time being we shall assume that the lines / *Halus rapuh ini djalinan kenang* / *Hantjur hilang belum dipegang* / together form one sentence and analyse them as such (cf. Nababan, 1966:173). The analysis of the above construction yields the following three alternative interpretations:

1. It is possible syntactically to regard *halus rapuh,* 'fine (and) fragile', as the P of an inverted construction with *ini djalinan kenang,* 'this thread of memories', as S. The whole of line 9 would then stand in apposition to the S, and should hence be interpreted as (*jang*) *hantjur hilang belum dipegang.* The translation of this would be '(8) Fine (and) fragile is the thread of memories (9) (That is) Destroyed (and) lost before (it is) grasped'.
2. From a semantic point of view, however, it is perhaps more likely that *hantjur hilang* is the main Predicate, so that *halus rapuh* should be regarded as a kind of pre-placed modifier of S, standing in apposition to *hantjur hilang.* In prose such a pre-placed appositional expression is unusual; in poetry, however, it is quite possible. The translation would then be '(8) Fine (and) fragile, this thread of memories (9) (Is) Destroyed (and) lost before (it is) grasped'.
3. A third interpretation, and in our opinion the most likely one, is that arrived at by assuming another case of transposition of Adjectives into Nouns without formal characterization. We have already repeatedly referred to this phenomenon in constructions on the model of *luas sawah itu, dalam sumur itu.* Analogously *halus rapuh* can be taken to be Aj transposed into N without formal characterization as such, and *ini djalinan kenang* a nominal determinant of these Nouns. Thus we would have (*ke*)*halus*(-)*rapuh*(*an*) *ini djalinan kenang,* meaning 'The fineness (and) fragility of this thread of memories', which is plausible both grammatically and semantically and gives the sentence the grammatical coherence that is lacking in the case of the first two alternatives. The translation then reads: '(8) The fineness (and) fragility of this thread of memories (9) (Is) Destroyed (and) lost before (it is) grasped'.

A remarkable feature of these lines is the creation of a perfect rhyme pattern by the poet, using final rhyme as well as assonance and consonance, viz.:

8 ... *Halus rapuh ini djalinan kenang*
9 *Hantjur hilang belum dipegang*

It is clear that by avoiding the use of the nominalizing affixes *ke-an* with *halus* and *rapuh* the poet has succeeded in creating a positive poetic effect. This effect is strengthened by the use of the basic form *kenang*

instead of the more common Noun *kenangan* (cf. the title). Moreover, the pre-placing of *ini,* by now a familiar characteristic in Chairil Anwar's poetry, is also functional in this respect.

As indicated above, it is probable that these two lines form a sentence by themselves, and improbable both grammatically, semantically, and poetically that, even though there is no full stop after *dipegang,* the sentence should be extended into the following lines.

The next syntactic unit in that case begins with *terhentak* (line 10) and probably ends with the colon in line 12. Semantically, *terhentak,* 'to be deflated', takes up once more the image created by *membubung tinggi* (line 6). *Terhentak* combined with *kembali diitu-itu sadja* means 'Deflated, back to the commonplace things of daily life', containing a repetition of the colloquial *itu(-)itu* of line 2. The *diri,* 'I', of the poem, has come back from the old things that were long forgotten. Syntactically, lines 10 and 11 may be taken as a complete sentence with *diri* the implied S. It is also possible, and perhaps more plausible, however, to take these lines as a pre-placed apposition to *Djiwa,* the S of line 12. Such appositions without the usual Conjunctions are familiar by now in Chairil Anwar's poetry. The translation would then be '(10) Deflated (11) Back to the commonplace things of daily life (12) (My) Soul asks:'.

The next syntactic unit is that occurring between the colon and the question mark, i.e. *Dari buah / Hidup kan banjakan djatuh ketanah? /.* It seems clear that the syntactic group *buah hidup* consists of a N determined by another N; combined with *dari* this means 'of (or: from) the fruit(s) of life'. Theoretically of course, *dari buah* could be a PeP, and *hidup* could be taken as a N which is the S of *djatuh.* However, this would produce a meaning which does not make sense at all, namely 'Of (or: from) fruit(s), life falls to earth'. The form *banjakan* is unusual in Indonesian. If we take *banjakan* to be a colloquialism (which is not improbable or an infrequent occurrence in Chairil Anwar's poetry), its meaning is 'more', *-an* in Djakartan speech forming the comparative degree of Adjectives. In combination with a comparative, *dari* means 'than'; however, the resulting sentence is not very plausible, meaning 'More than the fruits of life fall to the ground'. A more likely solution is to consider *banjakan* as the shortened form of *kebanjakan,* which means 'most(ly)'; the latter is perfect Indonesian and would fit in very well in this context. The S of *djatuh* would then be *(ke)banjakan dari buah hidup,* i.e. 'Most of the fruits of life'. The highly unusual dropping of the prefix *ke-* as a form of poetic licence may here be justified by the

resulting sound effect: * *Dari buah / Hidup kan kebanjakan* would be less pleasing to the ear than *Dari buah / Hidup kan banjakan. Kan* is the shortened form of *bukan,* here meaning 'isn't it', which in its written form usually has an apostrophe before it, viz. *'kan.* The translation of lines 12 to 13 thus is '(12) . . .: Of the fruits (13) Of life don't most fall to the ground?'.

The last line of the poem, */ Menjelubung njesak penjesalan pernah menjia-njia* ‡ has a striking phonetic effect through the accumulation of palatal nasals. There are three nasalized verbal forms with these nasals piled up in this line (or four if we include both parts of the reduplicated *menjia-njia* in our consideration), while the nominal derivative *penjesalan,* 'regret', also contains the same sound. This line is difficult to analyse: *menjelubung,* 'to cover', 'to envelop', 'to wrap' is a Vt derived from the N *selubung,* 'veil', 'cover'. The form *njesak* is the nasalized form of the Aj *sesak,* 'narrow', 'crowded', 'tight', without the *me-* prefix; such forms are common in colloquial language (cf. *noléh* in poem no. *14*). The dictionaries list the form *menjesak(kan)* and explain it as a transitive Verb. It is an example of a *me-* form based on an Adjective without *-kan,* that may be both transitive and intransitive (see below, Chapter III, Section 2.2). It is obvious that Chairil Anwar also uses *njesak* as a Vt here. *Penjesalan* is a N meaning 'regret', derived from the basic word *sesal. Menjia-njia* is derived from the Aj *sia-sia,* 'in vain', 'futile', which always occurs in the reduplicated form. The form *menjia-njia* as such is not found in any of the dictionaries, although *menjia-njiakan,* which is a Vt meaning 'to neglect', 'to frustrate', is. It is probable that here, as in several analogous cases, and perhaps in relation to *njesak* in the same line, the poet has omitted the transitive suffix *-kan* (see further Chapter III, 2.2). Another possibility, though a highly improbable one, is to regard *menjia-njia* as an intransitive Verb, meaning 'to be (or: to become) in vain'. *Pernah* is an Av and denotes 'on a certain, but unspecified, past occasion'; the English equivalent is 'once' (in the past). It is also to be found with this meaning in some of Chairil Anwar's other poems, e.g.

29 // Pernah / Aku pertjaja pada sumpah dan tjinta /
56 / Aku pernah ingin benar padamu /

Thus we have a sequence consisting of Vt - Vt' - N - Av - Vt", which confronts us with the problem of determining the syntactic grouping of the words. First of all, it seems plausible that Vt and Vt' form a

compound transitive Verb, viz. *menjelubung-njesak,* especially as the meaning of the two Verbs allows of such compounding. Such formations, with or without *me-* in the second element, are not infrequent in Chairil Anwar's language, especially in his early poems, e.g. (*10*) *meradang-menerdjang,* (*11*) *dinanti-dimengerti,* (*20*) *menekan-mendesak, melepas-renggut* [35], *memberat-mentjengkung,* (*29*) *kukunjah-kumamah,* and many others. Consequently we are left with a sequence Vt_1 - N - Av - Vt_2, the grammatical analysis of which yields several alternative interpretations:

a. *Penjesalan* may be the Pa of Vt_1, so that the translation would be '(Agent) Envelops (and) smothers regret, once having neglected (or: neglecting) (Patient)', but this does not seem to make much sense. A satisfactory A can be inferred neither from the preceding statement, nor from the situation as a whole.
b. If it is improbable that *penjesalan* is the Pa, we must assume that it is the A. In that case either *menjelubung njesak* becomes the main Predicate, and *pernah menjia-njia* the complement, meaning 'Regret envelops (and) smothers, once having neglected (Pa)'; or *pernah menjia-njia* is the Predicate and Vt_1 is some kind of a pre-placed appositional or complementary phrase, resulting in the meaning 'Enveloping (and) smothering, regret once has neglected (Pa)'. Neither of these interpretations is satisfactory from a semantic point of view.
c. A third possibility is to assume that the relation between *penjesalan* and *pernah menjia-njia* is completive. If we take *menjelubung njesak* to be Vt, the translation of line 14 would then be 'Regret (at having) once neglected (Pa_1) envelops (and) smothers (Pa_2)'.

It is obvious that the difficulty of interpreting line 14 satisfactorily arises primarily from the fact that BI has no boundary markers for word-groups. As soon as more than one potential Predicate occurs, which is in itself a very common phenomenon in BI and also in Chairil Anwar's language, we are confronted with the problem of the syntactic relationship between the words. It is clear that this possibility of concatenation of potential Predicates without formal specification of their relationship provides the language-user with a device with which he can satisfy his need for effective expression by expanding predicative constructions. In this particular case the analysis becomes all the more complicated specifically because of the poet's use of (transitive) *me-*

forms (see further Chapter III, 2.2), and also because of the occurrence of an Av between *penjesalan* and *menjia-njia*. Although the alternative described in (c) may provide us with the most likely interpretation semantically, we have no data to go on for the identification of Pa. It may be inferred from the situation that Pa_1 refers to the person to whom the 'Memories' are dedicated, while Pa_2 could be the *diri* of the poem. However, there is no linguistic evidence to corroborate this.

A possible translation of the poem is:

MEMORIES

For Karinah Moordjono

1 Sometimes
2 Between these very same trellises
3 Putting on splendour, giving colour (,)
4 (There are) Worn-out things (that are) forgotten
5 Ah! My hopes are crushed
6 (After) Soaring up high above the present
7 A moment
8 Only. The fineness (and) fragility of this thread of memories
9 (Is) Destroyed (and) lost before (it is) grasped (.)
10 Deflated
11 Back to the commonplace things of daily life
12 (My) Soul asks: Of the fruits
13 Of life don't most fall to the ground?
14 Regret (at having) once neglected (her) envelops (and) smothers (me)

April 19, 1943

4. HAMPA

Kepada Sri

1 *Sepi diluar. Sepi menekan-mendesak.*
2 *Lurus kaku pohonan. Tak bergerak*
3 *Sampai kepuntjak. Sepi memagut,*
4 *Tak satu kuasa melepas-renggut*
5 *Segala menanti. Menanti. Menanti*
6 *Sepi*
7 *Tambah ini menanti djadi mentjekik*
8 *Memberat-mentjengkung punda*
9 *Sampai binasa segala. Belum apa-apa*
10 *Udara bertuba. Setan bertempik*
11 *Ini sepi terus ada. Dan menanti*

(*14 Mei 1943*)

(*DTD,* 1949:6)

The title means 'Empty', and the poem bears the dedication 'To Sri'. There are four printed versions of the poem, namely in: (a) *Pembangoenan,* Vol. I no. 1, December 10, 1945, p. 13; (b) *DTD,* 1949, p. 6; (c) *KT,* 1949, p. 22; and (d) Jassin, 1954, p. 95. If we compare these versions we see that (a) is identical with (b), and (c) with (d). That being the case we shall base our analysis in the first instance on (b), and where necessary or worthwhile use (c) as comparison.

The first line as it appears in *DTD* consists of two sentences that are marked off clearly by final full stops: ǂ *Sepi diluar. Sepi menekan-mendesak.* /. These two sentences confront us with a number of problems of a general nature. To begin with we shall examine the second sentence, in which the Verbs *menekan,* 'to squeeze', and *mendesak,* 'to push', 'to press', are both definitely known to be transitive Verbs in accordance with our definition of the term (see Chapter I, p. 24). The Pa is lacking here, however. Consequently the sentence in no way differs from the type consisting of a S-P construction with an intransitive Verb of the type *aku menjanji,* 'I sing'. *Sepi* occupies a nominal slot in this S-P construction. Indeed, *sepi* is one of the group of ambivalent words in BI that belong to the class of both Adjectives and Nouns (see further Chapter III, Section 1, ad 4). The syntactic slot in which *sepi* occurs in the first sentence confirms this ambivalence. In BI, sentences of the type *bapak diluar,* 'father is outside', or *aku didalam,* 'I am inside', are quite common, while certain Adjectives displaying the same traits of ambivalence may also occur in similar constructions, e.g. *ramai diluar,*

'noisy outside', and *hangat didalam,* 'warm inside'. Whether *sepi* in the first sentence should be considered as a N or Aj is therefore probably quite irrelevant. Later on in the poem it will become clear, however, that the nominal function of *sepi* is given formal specification as the poem progresses, perhaps not without good poetic reason.

The first unit of line 2, */ Lurus kaku pohonan. /,* is an inverted S-P sentence, *lurus kaku,* 'straightly stiff', being the P, and *pohonan,* 'trees', the S. The remainder of line 2 plus the first part of line 3, up to the full stop, form the next syntactic unit, viz.: *Tak bergerak / Sampai kepuntjak. /.* This sentence has *pohonan* of the preceding sentence as the implied S, while the P is *tak bergerak,* 'motionless', which is extended by the LAu *sampai kepuntjak,* 'to the top' (cf. Junus, 1970:58 ff.). The next sentence is formed by the remainder of line 3, line 4, and the part of line 5 occurring before the first full stop, as follows: *Sepi memagut, / Tak satu kuasa melepas-renggut / Segala menanti. /.* It would be possible, however, to consider the first part of line 5 as a separate sentence, assuming that a full stop has been left out at the end of line 4. This would make little difference for the interpretation, as this part of the poem in any case seems to consist of three consecutive coordinate Clauses, each of them comprising a S-P construction. *Sepi memagut* shows exact parallelism of construction to *sepi menekan-mendesak* (line 1); *memagut,* which is used figuratively here, means 'to bite (of a snake)'; and *segala menanti,* 'everything waits', in line 5 again is syntactically completely parallel to this. *Tak satu kuasa melepas-renggut,* however, seems to be open to more than one interpretation:

a. *Tak satu kuasa* confronts us with a case of syntactic ambiguity, as *kuasa* is another of those words (like *sepi*) that fit both in nominal and in adjectival slots. Hence the line might be interpreted either as (1) 'No one (= *tak satu*) is able to . . .', i.e. by taking *kuasa* here as an Adjective with a verbal complement, for a similar example of which cf. *tak satu pandai membatja,* 'no one is able to read'; or as (2) 'Not one power', hence by regarding the entire phrase *tak satu kuasa* as S, with *kuasa* in that case acting as N. Raffel evidently derived his translation 'No strength' from the latter interpretation, although his translation of the rest of the line does not make sense at all (Raffel, 1970:41 and p. 200). Structurally both alternatives are equally plausible.

b. *Melepas-renggut* is an interesting compound, made up for the occasion by Chairil Anwar himself. According to the dictionaries *renggut* is the base of the transitive Verb *merenggut,* 'to pull', 'to tug', while

lepas is an Aj meaning 'loose', 'free', which in the *me-* form can be either a Vi ('to free oneself') or a Vt ('to set something free'); however, in the latter meaning *melepaskan* is much more usual [36]. Combined with *renggut* it seems likely that here, too, *melepas* should be taken in its transitive meaning; the compound would then mean something like 'to tear loose', 'to pull free'. This then raises the question of whether or not there is a Pa belonging to this Vt, as none is implied in the preceding lines. However, it is worth noting that in the other version of the poem the line reads *melepas diri* instead of *melepas-renggut* (*KT*, 1949:22). This makes the interpretation of the whole sentence easier, in the first place because it makes *kuasa* practically unambiguous, the only interpretation which would in that case make sense being that according to the first alternative, viz. 'No one is able to free himself' (from the stillness mentioned earlier). This variant may furthermore provide a clue as to what Chairil Anwar is actually trying to say in our version. Obviously the line as it stands here also means something like 'no one is powerful enough to pull himself free'. The poet felt no need to keep *diri,* however, since *melepas* by itself potentially has the function of a reflexive Verb meaning 'to free oneself'. Rather than render his line clumsy through the addition of the partially redundant *diri,* which does not fit in well in terms of sound effect either, moreover, he used *renggut,* which adds an element of 'forcibly tearing', 'forcibly pulling' to *melepas,* as well as making for final rhyme with the preceding line. It does not seem too far-fetched to assume that chronologically the version we have adopted is a later one, which was improved by the poet himself. The ambiguity of the word *melepas* enabled him, on second thought, to improve and intensify the line as indicated. If this interpretation is correct, we have here yet another example of the subtle possibilities inherent in the opposition between so-called transitive and intransitive Verbs in Indonesian. At the same time, as was indicated above, the ambiguity of *kuasa* in this line is practically eliminated by our interpreting *melepas-renggut* in this way.

Segala menanti in line 5 has already been discussed, and the two following one-word sentences, *Menanti. Menanti,* require little comment. They are a repetition of the P of the preceding sentence, thereby implying the repetition of the S *segala,* 'everything', as well. We shall assume that a full stop should be understood at the end of the line. Raffel's translation is unacceptable for various reasons. 'Waits/Quiet' (Raffel, 1970:41, lines 6-7) creates an erroneous impression, as the con-

text of the poem as a whole hardly suggests the 'quiet' to be a quality of the 'waiting'. But it is also unacceptable from a syntactic point of view. Only when we come to realize that *sepi* in line 6 belongs to the following lines, i.e. lines 7 to 9, do we arrive at a satisfactory interpretation.

The sequence */ Sepi / Tambah ini menanti djadi mentjekik /* once again confronts us with problems of word class and transposition in BI (cf. Junus, 1970:45 ff.). There are two points in this sentence that are important for the formal analysis. Firstly, *tambah* is often used in Chairil Anwar's poetry to coordinate Nouns, thus meaning 'plus', e.g.

> *57* ‡ *Seperti ibu + nenekku djuga / tambah tudjuh keturunan jang lalu /* 'Like (my) mother + my grandmother too/plus seven generations before (them)' [37]

Secondly, there is the pre-placing of the demonstrative Pronoun *ini,* which is familiar by now, however. These two facts in combination — the use of *tambah* as a Noun-coordinator and of pre-placed *ini* as a Noun-determiner — compel us to take *sepi* and *menanti* as Nouns forming the S of a S-P construction here. The P is *djadi mentjekik.* Such a P introduced by *djadi* is quite common in BI, even though it is perhaps not easy to specify the syntactic relationship between *djadi* and the word following.

One might say, therefore, that in these lines the nominal function of *sepi* in this poem, which we already assumed in respect of its earlier occurrences (lines 1 and 3), is here confirmed and formalized. The poet furthermore uses *menanti* in a nominal slot here, this being comparable to the Dutch infinitive *dit wachten* or the English gerund 'this waiting'. There is a variant of this in the final line, where *ini sepi terus ada,* 'this stillness remains', is followed by *menanti,* introduced by the coordinating particle *dan.* It is curious that Raffel, who correctly translates it as 'this waiting' in line 7, should have overlooked this parallelism. Undoubtedly the final *menanti* is syntactically on a par with *ini sepi* and should hence be translated here as 'And (this) waiting (remains)'.

One might go one step further perhaps. It is feasible to assume that the transition of the Verb *menanti* into the nominal *menanti,* which seems to take place step by step as it were in lines 5-7, has something to do with the meaning and the theme of the poem. The growing rigidity of the situation and its becoming immobile (*menanti*), may have been purposely intensified by the switching from a dynamic Verb into a

static Noun. The transition of the Verb *menanti* (line 5) into the N *menanti* (line 7) through the repetition of the word in one-word sentences in that same line more than anything else seems to suggest how everything is becoming rigid. In other cases the reverse procedure is used to achieve the opposite effect, the use of *me-* derivatives from Adjectives adding a dynamic dimension to Chairil Anwar's language in cases where a simple Adjective would have produced a more static effect (see, e.g., *meninggi* in poem no. *43*).

The remainder of the poem requires little comment. *Mentjekik,* as a transitive Verb without Pa, is used in parallelism with *menekan-mendesak* (line 1) and *memagut* (line 3). The poet then switches over to a different image: stillness and the waiting are described as 'weighing down and bending the shoulders' (line 8). *Berat* and *tjengkung* are both Adjectives, and we have here a clear case of transitive adjectival derivatives with *me-,* the Pa being represented by *punda. Punda* is an instance of poetic licence, the word being a substitution for the regular *pundak,* 'shoulders', probably for the sake of the rhyme (with *apa,* line 9). Phonetically it is only a slight irregularity, as final *-k* stands for a glottal stop.

Belum apa-apa is a popular expression meaning something like 'there's nothing wrong', or 'this is nothing yet'. The absence of a full stop at the end of this phrase suggests that it should be regarded as forming one sentence together with *udara bertuba,* 'the air is poisoned' (line 10). We would then have a case of implied subordination, with the sentence meaning 'Before anything has happened, the air is poisoned'. Although syntactically this would be quite acceptable, it is not a very plausible explanation from a semantic point of view. Hence it would perhaps be better to assume that here, as in so many other cases, the final full stop has been omitted at the end of the line. We can then translate *belum apa-apa* as 'this is nothing yet' (probably meant ironically or cynically). The sentences of line 10 are clear, meaning 'The air is poisoned. The devil shrieks'. Line 11 has already been discussed above.

The translation of the whole poem thus runs:

EMPTY

For Sri

1 It is still outside. Stillness squeezes (and) presses.
2 Straightly stiff the trees. Motionless
3 To the top. Stillness bites,

No one is able to pull free
Everything is waiting. Waiting. Waiting (.)
Stillness
Plus this waiting become strangling
Weighing down and bending the shoulders
Until everything is destroyed. This is nothing yet (.)
The air is poisoned. The devil shrieks
This stillness remains. And (this) waiting

(May 14, 1943)

5. DIMESDJID

1 *Kuseru sadja Dia*
2 *Sehingga datang djuga*

3 *Kamipun bermuka-muka.*

4 *Seterusnja Ia bernjala-njala dalam dada.*
5 *Segala daja memadamkannja*

6 *Bersimbah peluh diri jang tak bisa diperkuda*

7 *Ini ruang*
8 *Gelanggang kami berperang*

9 *Binasa-membinasa*
10 *Satu menista lain gila*

29 Djuni 1943

(Jassin, [3]1968:54)

The title of this poem means 'At the Mosque' [38]. The entire poem comprises ten lines, each beginning with a capital letter, and is divided into six stanzas. Words that refer to God are also written with an initial capital letter in conformity with Indonesian writing conventions. Only two punctuation marks are used, namely full stops at the end of lines 3 and 4 [39].

The first line, ♯ *Kuseru sadja Dia* /, is a Patient-directed construction with the word order prA + Vt-Pa, in which prA is the prefixed first person singular Pronoun *ku-*. *Seru* is the base of the Vt *menjeru,* 'to shout at somebody', and *Dia* is the Pa, meaning 'Him'. *Sadja,* 'merely', is a modal Adjunct which is common in every-day language in this use, e.g. *masuk sadja!*, 'just come in!'. The use of a colloquial expression such as this suggests that the speaker is defying the usual conventions for addressing God in a prayer. The Conjunction *sehingga,* 'until', makes line 2, / *Sehingga datang djuga* //, a subordinate Clause in respect of the preceding line; the S of this unit is implied in the *Dia* of the preceding line, while *datang,* 'to come', is the P. *Djuga* after a P is another one of those modal Adjuncts which is so often difficult to translate; in this case the closest approximation is 'somehow'. Line 3 is a S-P sentence with *kami* as S and *bermuka-muka,* 'to stand face to face', as P. The enclitic *-pun* places special emphasis on the element to which it is added, i.e. in this case *kami,* 'we', which embraces *aku* (line 1) and *Dia* (line 1) and excludes the reader.

Line 4, // *Seterusnja Ia bernjala-njala dalam dada.* /, has *Ia,* 'He', as S and *bernjala-njala,* 'to burst into flames', as P; *dalam dada,* 'in the breast', is a LAu, and *seterusnja* a TAu, here meaning 'immediately', 'at once', 'suddenly'.

Line 5, / *Segala daja memadamkannja* //, is an Agent-directed construction in which *segala daja,* 'all strength', is the A and the transitive *me-* form *memadamkan,* 'to extinguish something', with *-nja* (the suffix form of the third person singular Pronoun, hence 'it', 'him', or 'her') as its Pa; *memadamkan* is the most common type of Vt derived from Aj (*me-kan* affixation).

What is remarkable about these two lines is that the poet has avoided the use of the suffix form of the possessive first person singular personal Pronoun *-ku* after the Nouns *dada* and *daja* here. In an English translation the insertion of 'my', viz. '*my* breast' and '*my* strength', is necessary. In the former case the rhyme may have induced the poet to omit *-ku*; however, it is also probable that the general BI tendency to be more sparing in the use of Pronouns was also a factor, as the content makes it quite obvious *whose* 'breast' and *whose* 'strength' are meant. It was therefore convenient for Chairil Anwar to apply his general technique of omitting unnecessary elements wherever possible here.

Line 6, // *Bersimbah peluh diri jang tak bisa diperkuda* //, consists of an inverted S-P construction. The P is *bersimbah peluh,* 'to be soaked with sweat', or 'to be drenched in sweat', and the S is *diri,* 'self', plus the attributive Clause *jang tak bisa diperkuda,* which is itself a Patient-directed construction with *diperkuda* as the *di-* form of the transitive Verb *memperkuda. Diperkuda* literally means 'to be made a horse of' or, 'to be treated as a horse', but here, as is often the case, the figurative meaning 'to be driven' is intended. The Pa here is *jang,* referring direct to *diri,* 'the self', a word that is regularly used by Chairil Anwar as a synonym for *aku,* 'I'; the implied A is God. Semantically, this line is important because it reveals the speaker's attitude with regard to the relationship between God and man, which he views as one of slavery and exploitation; hence *jang tak bisa diperkuda,* which means 'that (who) cannot be driven (by God)'.

The pre-placed *ini* of line 7, // *Ini ruang* /, not only introduces the S of the next syntactic unit (which is formed by lines 7 and 8), but also indicates the proximity of the subject to the speaker (cf. poem no. *3*). Syntactically, the sentence is not quite clear (cf. Nababan, 1966:177), as *ini ruang* might be considered as an equational construction with the next line standing in apposition to *ruang,* hence meaning '(7) This is

a hall, (8) An arena where we are fighting (or: where we fight)'. However, in view of Chairil Anwar's habit of placing *ini* before the word it qualifies, the other interpretation, which has *ini ruang* function as S and *gelanggang kami berperang* as P, is the more likely. The translation would then read: '(7) This hall (8) Is the arena where we fight', referring back to the title of the poem. In this poem we have in fact another excellent example of the functional role of the title for the interpretation of the poem. The correct understanding of what is meant by 'this hall' is aided by the indication that this poem is about a 'mosque', which is the typical institutional symbol of Islam. In point of fact, it is also the title that makes this poem a characteristic manifestation of the struggle of the poet with Allah, the God of Islam, and not, for example with the God of Christianity. This does not, of course, preclude a more symbolic interpretation of the poem, and more specifically of the words *ini ruang* as referring to *diri,* the self, within which the destructive battle evoked in the final stanza takes place.

Binasa-membinasa (line 9), which means 'destroying each other', is a reflexive form of the transitive Verb based on the Adjective *binasa,* 'destroyed'. In prose we would expect to find *binasa-membinasakan*; the transitive suffix *-kan* is here omitted because the transitiveness is already implied in the reflexive form, and probably also for the sake of the final rhyme with the last line. The question of whether line 9 (+ 10) forms an independent sentence or stands in apposition to *kami berperang* is difficult to solve formally. Although in terms of meaning the direct connection between lines 8 and 9 is obvious, it is even so possible to consider line 9 as a separate sentence in which a S *kami* has to be implied from what precedes. *Satu menista lain gila* (line 10) is yet another example of the omission of the non-redundant nominalizer *jang.* A prose text would require *jang satu menista jang lain gila,* 'the one cursing, the other mad'. Apparently the poet here, as in other cases, preferred leaving out *jang* for poetic reasons. The sequence *satu menista lain* by itself might be said to be grammatically ambiguous, since *menista* might be taken as a Vt (more common forms of this being *menistai* or *menistakan*), having *lain* as its Pa, the phrase thus meaning 'the one is cursing the other'. However, this interpretation would leave us with an inexplicable *gila,* as *lain gila* is impossible as a sequence with the meaning 'the other mad one', for example, in BI. As to the *who is who* in the final stanza there can be little doubt that God, who is described as *memperkuda* in line 6, is the implied S of *menista* (line 10), and *aku* that of *gila.*

The translation of the poem as a whole is as follows:

AT THE MOSQUE

I just shouted at Him
Until somehow (He) came

We then stood face to face.

Suddenly He burst into flame in (my) breast.
All (my) strength tried to extinguish it

I, who won't be driven (by Him), am soaked with sweat

This hall
Is the arena where we fight

Destroying each other
The one cursing, the other mad

June 29, 1943

6. *1943*

1 *Ratjun berada direguk pertama*
2 *Membusuk rabu terasa didada*
3 *Tenggelam darah dalam nanah*
4 *Malam kelam-membelam*
5 *Djalan kaku-lurus. Putus*
6 *Tjandu.*
7 *Tumbang*
8 *Tanganku menadah patah*
9 *Luluh*
10 *Terbenam*
11 *Hilang*
12 *Lumpuh.*
13 *Lahir*
14 *Tegak*
15 *Berderak*
16 *Rubuh*
17 *Runtuh*
18 *Mengaum. Mengguruh*
19 *Menentang. Menjerang*
20 *Kuning*
21 *Merah*
22 *Hitam*
23 *Kering*
24 *Tandas*
25 *Rata*
26 *Rata*
27 *Rata*
28 *Dunia*
29 *Kau*
30 *Aku*
31 *Terpaku.*

(Jassin, [3]1968:55)

The poem is striking by its many one-word lines, which comprise twenty-three out of a total of thirty-one lines. Other purely formal features worth mentioning are the full stops that mark the end of lines 6, 12, and 31, all three of which are single-word lines. Three other full stops occur in the middle of lines 5, 18 and 19, these lines consisting of more than one word. Obviously this special use of punctuation should be taken into account in our analysis, even though we have little guarantee that the absence of punctuation marks at the end of a number of other lines is intentional. Furthermore, every line begins with a capital letter, as do the words occurring after full stops.

The first line, ‡ *Ratjun berada direguk pertama* /, is a simple S-P sentence, where the S is *ratjun,* 'poison', and the P *berada,* 'to be present', plus a LAu *direguk pertama,* 'in the first slug'. By itself *direguk* might be regarded as the *di-* form of the Verb *mereguk,* 'to gulp', but this must be rejected as an alternative here for both syntactic and semantic reasons. For *ratjun berada* would be nonsensical if *berada* were interpreted as an Au, whereas the numerical Adjective *pertama* can have no possible syntactic function after a verbal *di-* form.

The second line, / *Membusuk rabu terasa didada* /, is open to more than one grammatical explanation (cf. Nababan, 1966:178), viz.:

a. *Me-* forms derived from Adjectives are usually intransitive (see Chapter I, 3.2). If the *me-* form we have here is of this type, *rabu,* 'lungs', must be considered as S, in which case *membusuk,* 'to decay', is most probably appositional to *terasa didada,* 'is felt in the chest', although preceding it; the normal word order in prose would be *rabu terasa membusuk didada,* meaning 'the lungs are felt decaying in the chest'.

b. Potentially *me-* forms derived from Adjectives may also be transitive Verbs, as was shown in the preceding Chapter. If we take *membusuk* as a variant of *membusukkan,* then *rabu* would be the Pa. The most obvious A inferable from the preceding line would then be *ratjun,* hence '(poison) ruins the lungs'. In that case *ratjun* would of necessity also be the S of *terasa.* If we accept this solution it becomes difficult to decide whether *membusuk rabu* is the pre-placed complement of *terasa didada,* hence 'ruining the lungs it (= *ratjun*) is felt in the chest', or whether *terasa didada* is the complement of *membusuk rabu,* hence 'it (= *ratjun*) ruins the lungs, being felt in the chest'. The difference between these two alternatives from the standpoint of BI is perhaps hardly relevant.

Line 3, / *Tenggelam darah dalam nanah* /, consists of an inverted S-P construction meaning 'blood drowns in pus'. Lines 4 and 5, / *Malam kelam-membelam* / *Djalan kaku-lurus . . .* /, on the other hand, display a normal S-P construction. An interesting lexical problem is posed by the Verb *membelam* in line 4.

In BI there are the Verbs *membelamkan,* meaning 'to insert something forcibly' (Poerwadarminta's *Kamus Umum* lists as synonym *mendjedjalkan*), and *membalam,* meaning 'dim', 'not clearly visible (from being too far away or covered by mist)'. The former does not seem a likely

possibility, whether we take it in its intransitive sense, meaning something like 'to crowd', 'to be jammed with' (= *terdjedjal*), or as a variant of *membelamkan* (Vt) without a Pa (meaning 'to push in'). Taking *djalan kaku-lurus* (line 5) as Pa of *membelam* would make no sense either. *Membelam* as it stands in the poem should perhaps more likely be regarded as a variant of *membalam*; there are several other cases of the existence side by side of Minangkabau and Indonesian variants with *a* and *e* respectively in the penultimate syllable, e.g. *tantang-tentang, tatap-tetap,* etc. The choice of this variant was probably determined by reasons of internal rhyme between *tenggelam* (line 3) and *kelam-membelam* (line 4); the rhyme in its turn draws the three words closer together in meaning, *tenggelam* meaning 'to drown', *membelam* 'to become invisible' (because of the darkness), and *kelam* itself meaning 'dark'. The first part of line 5, *djalan kaku-lurus,* consists of a straightforward S-P construction meaning 'the road (is) hard (and) straight.'

The full stop after *tjandu,* 'opium', in line 6 suggests that it forms a single sentence together with *putus* ('broken', line 5). However, the meaning of *putus tjandu* is obscure. We might think in this connection of similar constructions such as *putus asa,* or *putus harapan,* which mean 'desperate' and 'without hope' respectively, in which case it would have as implicit S 'we', 'people' (?), or 'the road' (?, line 5). Does *putus tjandu* mean something like 'no longer entranced (under the influence of opium)', 'no longer in a dream', 'run out of opium'? It might also be an inverted S-P construction, so that the *tjandu* is *putus,* as Raffel has taken it, although it is doubtful whether *putus* can mean 'used up' (Raffel, 1970:67). Semantically, *putus* could also be regarded as still belonging to the preceding sentence, hence '(5) The road (is) hard (and) straight; (it is) cut off', in the sense that it is a dead-end road. *Tjandu* as a one-word line might then summarize the idea evoked by lines 1 to 5, namely that it is all opium. However, it is difficult to disregard the analysis suggested by the punctuation.

The full stop after *lumpuh,* 'paralyzed', (line 12) suggests that lines 7 to 12 form one syntactic unit. There are several possible interpretations of this sentence:

a. *Tanganku,* 'my hands', is the S and the rest forms the PA. In this analysis it remains difficult to determine which is the principal Predicate word: grammatically *tumbang* could function as such, with the rest being appositional to it, but *tumbang* might also be taken as a pre-placed appositional word, which, though not a very common pheno-

menon in prose, is by now a familiar characteristic of Chairil Anwar's poetry. The latter would thus render the translation '(7) Felled down (8) My hands are held up (but are) broken (9) Shattered (10) Drowned (11) Vanished (12) Paralyzed.' Semantically, the use of *tumbang* (line 7) — being normally restricted to trees — with reference to human hands (line 8) is awkward. The same is true of the words *luluh, terbenam* and *hilang.*

b. Line 8 is appositional to *tumbang,* the S of the whole sentence being an *aku* which is inferable from *tanganku.* The translation would then be '(7) (I am) Felled down (8) (With) My hands held up . . .'; if this interpretation is correct, it is uncertain whether *patah* belongs to *tanganku menadah* (rendering the translation 'my upheld hands broken'), or is coordinate with *tumbang,* in which case the meaning is '(7) (I am) Felled down (8) (And) Broken, my hands held up'. The following lines should undoubtedly be considered as coordinate with *tumbang.*

Obviously a grammatical analysis of the remainder of this poem is hardly feasible. All twenty-one words in lines 9 to 27 are commonly used as Predicate words in Indonesian. Then follow three words which, being N (*dunia,* 'world') and Pronouns (*kau,* 'you', *aku,* 'I') would fit well in a S slot. The word constituting the final one-word line again is a Predicate word.

Apparently also on the grammatical plane much is left to the reader's imagination. First of all as regards the choice of a S for all these Predicate words. Should we take them all to refer to the *aku* implied by *tanganku,* for instance? Or is *Dunia* (or *Kau* or *Aku*) or *1943,* i.e. the title of the poem itself, the S of all the preceding Predicates? If the latter is the case, do all these words in their jumbled and seemingly haphazard succession evoke the events of the time at which the poem was written? [40] Or is perhaps all attempt at grammatical analysis irrelevant for the greater part of the poem, as these words are simply catchwords, or expressionistic symbols which are supposed to function independently of any sort of grammatical structure? It is useful to point out also in this context that here again, in lines 18 and 19, two intransitive Verbs (*mengaum* and *mengguruh*) and two transitive ones (*menentang* and *menjerang*) are used indiscriminately together, without any functional differentiation. It is worthwhile taking the possibility of an expressionistic concatenation of symbols in preference to adherence to grammatical rules into consideration, as Chairil Anwar may have

applied the same technique in some of his other early poems such as, for example, *Diponegoro*, where this is less obvious at first glance. This poem may be compared to Marsman's *Fort,* which he similarly wrote in his early period (1919-1926) as a creative writer (Marsman, ²1963:22). In this connection we would also draw attention to the rich assonance in the poem, e.g. *darah-nanah* (line 3), *malam kelam-membelam* (whole of line 4), *lurus* and *putus* (line 5), *menadah-patah* (line 7), *luluh-lumpuh* (lines 9 and 12), *tegak* and *berderak (*lines 14 and 15), and *menentang* and *menjerang* (line 19). This is also typical of Marsman's early poems.

With the abovementioned considerations in mind, we would suggest as a possible translation of the poem:

1943

There is poison in the first slug
The lungs are felt decaying in the chest
Blood drowns in pus
The night dark (and) becoming dim
The road hard (and) straight. (It is) cut off
Opium.
Felled down
My hands are held up (but are) broken
Shattered
Drowned
Vanished
Paralyzed.
Born
Upright
Creaking
Collapsing
Destroyed
Roaring. Thundering
Challenging. Attacking
Yellow
Red
Black
Parched
Exhausted
Flat
Flat
Flat
The World
You
I
Nailed down.

7. ISA

Kepada Nasrani Sedjati

1 *Itu Tubuh*
2 *mengutjur darah*
3 *mengutjur darah*

4 *rubuh*
5 *patah*

6 *mendampar tanja: aku salah?*

7 *kulihat Tubuh mengutjur darah*
8 *aku berkatja dalam darah*

9 *terbajang terang dimata masa*
10 *bertukar rupa ini segera*

11 *mengatup luka*

12 *aku bersuka*

13 *itu Tubuh*
14 *mengutjur darah*
15 *mengutjur darah*

(*12 Nopember 1943*)

(*DTD*, 1949:11)

The title of the poem means 'Jesus (Christ)', and the poem is dedicated 'To A True Christian' [41]. It consists of fifteen lines grouped into eight stanzas, of which the last is a repetition of the first. The second stanza consists of two single-word lines, while the third, sixth, and seventh stanzas are all one-line stanzas. No punctuation is used apart from a colon and a question mark in the third stanza, and no capital letters except at the beginning of the first word and of words referring to 'Jesus', i.e. *Itu Tubuh* (line 1) and *Tubuh* (lines 7 and 13).

The first three lines, though seemingly very straightforward, pose some problems of analysis. Firstly, the sequence *Itu Tubuh* can be interpreted in two different ways:

1. *Itu,* 'That', is the S, and *Tubuh,* 'Body', the P; thus the translation becomes 'That is a Body'. In that case lines 2 and 3 are in apposition to P.

2. The whole line is S, consisting of a Noun + preceding attributive Demonstrative, analogous to the poet's characteristic use of *ini* which is also frequently pre-placed. In such an analysis lines 2 and 3 would be the P of the S in line 1.

In lines 2 and 3 (*mengutjur darah*) the *me-* form, combined with the word order, makes for ambiguity:

a. Formally speaking, the line can be regarded as an inverted S-P construction, *mengutjur,* 'to gush', being the P and *darah,* 'blood', the S; in this case the most obvious interpretation would be to take *Itu Tubuh* of line 1 as a separate sentence (no. 1 above), making the translation '(1) That is a Body (2) blood gushes (3) blood gushes'.

b. One might also consider the possibility of regarding lines 1 + 2 (and 3) as comprising a segmented S_1-P-S_2 construction with *-nja* (which is usually attached to the S_2 element; see Chapter I, Section 3), being left out (most probably for the sake of the rhyme). In prose we would expect to find *Itu Tubuh mengutjur darahnja,* 'That Body's blood is gushing forth'.

c. *Darah* can be regarded as the Pa of *mengutjur,* which would in that case be a variant of the normal prose form *mengutjurkan* (Vt); hence here the translation of line 1 should be in accordance with the second alternative suggested above, that is, '(1) That Body (2) is pouring forth blood (3) pouring forth blood', or '(1) That Body (2) bleeding (3) bleeding'.

In themselves all three alternatives are perhaps equally plausible. However, by choosing (a), we shall run into difficulty in determining the S of *rubuh,* 'fallen' (line 4), and *patah,* 'broken' (line 5). Within the context of Indonesian syntax it is usual for the last-mentioned S (in this case *darah*) to be the implied S of any following lines (4 and 5). However, here it is obvious that *Tubuh* should function as S rather than *darah*; therefore more likely the correct analysis of the first stanza is that suggested under either (b) or (c). It is also clear, however, that although grammatically the three alternatives are quite divergent, the differences in meaning are slight, so that one may well wonder whether the poet was aware of the distinctions made here when writing the poem. We should make allowance for the possibility that in this poem again the poet was resorting to the expressionistic use of symbolic words in preference to creating elaborate syntactic structures!

Strictly speaking, on a purely grammatic level, line 7 confirms the third of the above three alternatives: *// kulihat Tubuh mengutjur darah /* meaning '(7) I see the Body bleeding'; this line, together with line 8, */ aku berkatja dalam darah //*, 'I mirror myself in blood', poses no problems of interpretation otherwise.

Line 6, *// mendampar tanja: aku salah? //*, is also clear. *Mendampar* is an intransitive Verb normally found in S-P sentences (type IIb; see Chapter I, Section 3); *tanja,* 'question', is apparently the S of this P *mendampar,* the inversion of S and P being by now quite familiar. Theoretically, the possibility of *mendampar* standing for *mendamparkan,* the transitive Verb meaning 'to wash ashore', on the analogy of *mengutjur* standing for the *mengutjurkan* of normal prose, may be considered. In that case *Tubuh* would be the implied A, and *tanja* the Pa, rendering the translation 'That Body washes ashore a question'. However, the first solution seems simpler grammatically as well as more likely poetically. 'The Body washing ashore a question' would be a strange metaphor indeed! *Aku salah?,* 'Am I guilty?', is a simple S-P sentence.

In lines 9 and 10 we are again confronted with several alternatives with regard to both the syntactic and semantic interpretation. Before proceeding with our analysis we would draw attention to two variant readings of line 10. In the publication of the poem in *Pantja Raja,* Vol. II No. 1 (November 15, 1946), the line reads */ bertukar rupa ini segara /*; the same reading is found in the De Brug (Amsterdam) and Pembangunan-Opbouw (Djakarta) edition of *DTD* (published in 1949). In the Pembangunan-Opbouw (Djakarta) edition of *DTD,* which was also published in 1949, the line reads */ bertukar rupa ini segera /*, however; we find the same reading in subsequent reprints of *DTD* (5th printing, 1959) [42]. Since no handwritten manuscript of the poem is available to us we shall make an analysis of and suggest an interpretation for both versions before finally deciding which of the two we shall adopt.

Raffel translates line 9, */ terbajang terang dimata masa /*, as 'Reflected brightly in the eye of time'. Although this translation is quite plausible as a literal English rendering of the Indonesian, two questions arise, namely: *what* is being 'reflected brightly'?, and what does 'in the eye of time' mean? With regard to the first question three solutions are possible if we restrict ourselves to line 9:

1. The S of line 9 may have to be inferred from the immediately preceding line, and hence is *aku.* For semantic reasons, however, this is hardly a likely assumption (cf. Raffel's punctuation, which leaves us

uncertain as to whether the 'me' of line 8 should be connected with line 9. See Raffel, 1970:69).

2. The S of line 9 may be inferable from line 7, thus being *Tubuh.* Although semantically this connection is plausible enough, as the meaning in this case is 'the Body is reflected brightly', it is highly unusual for a speaker or writer of BI to ignore an immediately preceding S element (*aku* in line 8) in favour of another S which is further removed.

3. Grammatically *masa,* 'time', 'epoch', might be the S, *terbajang terang* being the P, while *dimata* is LAu, so that the translation would read 'time is reflected brightly in the eye(s)'. By this interpretation we are steering clear of the problem of interpretation of 'the eye of time', though it results in a meaning which is totally inappropriate in the wider context. By drawing attention to this alternative explanation we only wish to demonstrate once more how a purely grammatical analysis, though plausible in itself, may lead to utter absurdity.

Another possible interpretation of line 9 suggests itself when we take line 10 into consideration as well.

The first version of the latter, / *bertukar rupa ini segara* //, allows of only one grammatical interpretation, namely by considering it as comprising an inverted S-P construction where the S is *segara* preceded by *ini,* thus meaning 'this ocean', and *bertukar rupa,* 'to change shape', is the P. However, the interpretation based on this version does not seem to make sense at all: *what* 'ocean' is meant? And is it this 'ocean' that is 'being reflected brightly'? Or should we here interpret 'ocean' in the metaphorical sense of the word, meaning something like 'humanity' or 'life'?

The second version, / *bertukar rupa ini segera* //, is open to two possible grammatical interpretations:

a. *Ini* could be the S, and *bertukar rupa* the P; this is obviously Raffel's interpretation, in view of his translation 'This will change form, soon' (Raffel, 1970:69. Note that 'soon' is not the translation of *segara,* the version of line 10 of the Indonesian text adopted by him). Unfortunately, it is not clear from Raffel's translation whether he has taken line 9 as standing in apposition to this S *ini,* though coming before it, which would in itself be possible (cf. lines 10-12 of *Kenangan*), or as appositional to line 8. Nor does it become clear here what *ini,* 'this', refers to.

b. *Rupa ini,* 'This form', could be the S, and *bertukar* the P, the

sentence meaning 'this form immediately changes'. If we assume, partly on the basis of the typographical presentation of line 10, that the two lines form one syntactic unit, line 9 could be a pre-placed appositional phrase qualifying *rupa ini* (see above); the translation would then be '(9) reflected brightly in the eye of time, (10) this form immediately changes'.

This brings us to the second of the above questions, namely what does 'in the eye of time' mean? Does it mean 'in historical perspective', the implication being that 'at first one perceives the bleeding and suffering Jesus Christ', but later 'this Body changes into a bright and brilliant form'? Another possibility is to consider *mata* as an element of more typically Malay compounds of the type: *mata kaju, mata air,* where it means 'focus', 'kernel', 'crucial point'; *mata masa* would then mean lit. 'core of time', hence here 'at that very moment'.

There is, however, yet another possible interpretation of line 9 (and consequently of line 10) which we should discuss, viz.:

c. From the poems previously discussed we have learnt that Chairil Anwar occasionally transposes Adjectives to the category of Nouns simply by placing them in a syntactic slot characteristically occupied by Nouns. If *terang,* 'bright', is taken as yet another example of this practice, then *terang* would be the S of *terbajang,* so that the translation would be '(9) brightness is reflected at the crucial moment'. This possibility is all the more likely since *terang* (Aj 'bright') frequently occurs in its basic form in phrases such as *terang matahari,* 'the brightness of the sun', as a variation of *terangnja matahari* (cf. *luas sawah* for *luasnja sawah,* 'the vastness of the paddy-field') in prose as well. If this interpretation is correct, line 10 is perhaps best interpreted according to (a), namely '(10) this immediately changes form', where 'this' refers to 'brightness', hence indicating the metamorphosis of the 'bleeding Jesus' (line 7).

We find it extremely difficult to make a choice between (b) and (c), since grammatically both are equally plausible. Semantically (c) has a more direct implication of identification between the experience of *aku* while 'mirroring himself in blood ' (line 8) and what should be experienced by any 'true Christian' (dedication of the poem) on looking at the crucified Jesus Christ, namely a sensation of 'brightness reflected' (line 9). Interpreting line 10 within the context of Christianity 'this immediately changes form' presupposes the metamorphosis of the 'bleed-

ing Jesus Christ' (line 7) into 'brightness' which is 'reflected at the crucial moment' (line 9), namely the moment at which *aku* 'mirrors himself in blood' (line 8).

Whereas line 12, // *aku bersuka* //, meaning 'I rejoice', poses no problems (it is a straightforward S-P sentence), the preceding line, // *mengatup luka* //, again provides us with two alternatives:

a. It can be regarded as a S-P sentence made up of the inverted S-P construction *mengatup,* 'to close', plus *luka,* 'wound(s)', so that the translation of the two lines would be '(11) the wound(s) closes (or: close) (12) I rejoice'; or

b. *mengatup* may be another case of a Vt derived from a N or Aj (*katup* is both, meaning both 'a hatch' and 'closed'), which in ordinary prose is *mengatupkan.* In that case line 11 can be regarded as an Agent-directed construction, in which *luka* is the Pa and *ini* of line 10 the implied A, thus rendering the translation '(11) (this) closes the wound(s) (12) I rejoice'.

Though it is difficult to decide which alternative is the more likely, especially in view of the metaphorical meaning of *luka* — which might here be interpreted either as referring to the 'wound(s)' on Jesus' Body in particular or, interpreting it within the context of Christianity, as symbolizing 'sin' — we prefer the first alternative. This is also more relevant to the above interpretation of line 10 as suggesting the metamorphosis of the bleeding Jesus Christ into 'brightness reflected'.

The last stanza, which is identical with the first, needs no comment.

Keeping in mind the unsolved semantic problems and syntactic ambiguities discussed above, we suggest the following as a possible translation of the poem:

JESUS

To A True Christian

1 That Body
2 bleeding
3 bleeding

4 fallen
5 broken

6 cast up is a question: am I guilty?

I see the Body bleeding
I mirror myself in blood

brightness is reflected at the crucial moment
this immediately changes form

the wound(s) closes (close)
I rejoice

that Body
bleeding
bleeding

November 12, 1943

8. KEPADA PELUKIS AFFANDI

Kalau, 'ku habis-habis kata, tidak lagi
berani memasuki rumah sendiri, terdiri
diambang penuh kupak,

adalah karena kesementaraan segala
jang mentjap tiap benda, lagi pula terasa
mati kan datang merusak.

Dan tangan 'kan kaku, menulis berhenti,
ketjemasan derita, ketjemasan mimpi;
berilah aku tempat dimenara tinggi,
dimana kau sendiri meninggi

atas keramaian dunia dan tjedera,
lagak lahir dan kelantjungan tjipta,
kau memaling dan memudja
dan gelap-tertutup djadi terbuka!

(*1946*)

(*DTD,* 1949:20)

The poem consists of fourteen lines and is divided into four stanzas of 3, 3, 4, and 4 lines respectively, the final rhyme following the pattern AAB-CCB-AAAA-CCCC. The number and arrangement of the lines suggest an 'inverted' sonnet. No capital letters are used except at the beginning of the sestet and the octet; punctuation is applied carefully and consistently. There is a final full stop at the end of line 6, a semi-colon at the end of line 8, and an exclamation mark at the end of the closing line of the poem. A striking feature of the syntactic composition of the poem is that the first sentence extends through the whole of the sestet. After the semi-colon at the end of line 8 another long sentence follows, extending from line 9 to the final line of the poem. Thus this poem has more extensive sentences than the poems discussed so far. As compared to Chairil Anwar's earlier poetry, we can say with justification that his later poems not only contain longer and more intricate sentences, but are also made up of larger numbers of lines [43]. Whether this feature is accompanied by other special poetic features remains to be investigated.

The poem opens with the Conjunction *kalau,* 'if', which is followed by three Clauses, each comprising a complete sentence, with the *'ku* (short for *aku*) of the first line as the S, either explicit or implicit, viz.: (a) *'ku habis-habis kata,* 'I'm completely out of words', (b) *tidak lagi / berani*

memasuki rumah sendiri, 'no longer / dare to enter my own house', and (c) *terdiri / diambang penuh kupak, //,* 'standing / on the crumbling doorstep'. The reduplicated form of *habis,* 'finished' or 'gone', intensifies the meaning of the word into 'completely finished'. With regard to the construction of (b) and (c) we have already remarked often before that the Indonesian language admits of sentences or Clauses with implicit S as long as this can be inferred from the context or the general setting, in this case from Clause (a). What makes the present sentence worth noting is the asyndeton, the Clauses being marked by careful and accurate punctuation. The poet has even placed a comma after the Conjunction *kalau,* 'if', which introduces three consecutive statements, in order to compel the reader to absorb the statements one by one and to digest each one before proceeding to the next. The poetic effect of this construction is enhanced by the subtle use of enjambment at the end of each line, compelling the reader to share in the suspense created by the syntactic transition to the following line. Enjambment of this type is rare, if not totally absent, in Chairil Anwar's early poetry, but seems to have been consciously applied as a deliberate technique throughout this poem. There is even enjambment between stanzas, both the first and the third stanza being open stanzas.

With regard to *adalah* in line 4 we may note the following. Generally speaking *adalah* is perhaps best considered as a marker indicating the beginning of a Predicate in BI. As such it is often redundant, and it was probably introduced into BI under the influence of Dutch (or English), e.g., *bapak saja (adalah) seorang dokter,* 'my father (is) a doctor'. In longer, more complex sentences *adalah* is often no longer redundant, however.

Adalah may also occur at the beginning of a sentence, in principle with the same function as that indicated above, e.g., *adalah anak muda bernama Satria Kentjana,* 'there is (or: was) a boy called Satria Kentjana'. This can be regarded as a Subjectless sentence, the P of which is introduced by *adalah,* which is non-redundant here; it can be translated with 'there is', 'there was', 'there are', etc.

Another instance of the use of *adalah* is that in which the S and P each comprise a separate Clause; such Clauses may consist of, for example, a prepositional group or a group beginning with a Conjunction. Here again *adalah* marks the beginning of the predicate Clause, e.g., *anak itu sakit adalah karena makan buah mentah* ('the child is sick because he has eaten an unripe fruit', lit. 'the child's being sick is because . . . '), *sebabnja dia tidak datang adalah karena ibunja meninggal*

('the reason why he did not come was that his mother died'). It is this type of construction we are dealing with in the present case, viz.: 'If (line 1) . . . , it is because of (line 4) . . . '. The N *kesementaraan* is expanded into a phrase that extends into the next line. After the *Kalau . . . adalah karena . . .* construction there follows, in the same sentence, a construction which has the structure of a complete sentence in itself.

The NP *kesementaraan segala / jang mentjap tiap benda* does not pose any problems. The Noun *kesementaraan* is a derivative of the Aj *sementara,* meaning 'transitory', whereas the word *segala,* when occurring before a N, is usually attributive (e.g. no. *69 segala sypilis,* 'all kinds of syphilis'), but when coming after a N can have only a nominal function, and hence means 'everything'. Therefore, *kesementaraan segala* means 'the transience of everything'. From Raffel's translation of the poem it would seem that he was not aware of this difference between pre-placed and post-placed *segala* (cf. Raffel, 1970:91, 'The reason is the eternal transience'). *Jang* is a relative Pronoun introducing a Clause determining *segala.* The translation of the whole NP is 'the transience of everything / that brands every single object'.

The construction *lagi pula terasa / mati kan datang merusak* comprises a Patient-directed *ter-* form with an unspecified Agent, meaning 'it is felt', and a Pa, which in this case is formed by the whole of the S-P Clause *mati kan datang merusak* instead of but a single word. The *kan* here is the shortened form of *akan,* which is an aspectual Adjunct denoting futurity, and as such it is usually written *'kan,* as in line 7. Though it is homonymous with *'kan* from *bukan* (see the discussion of poem no. *18*), semantically there is no ambiguity. The Verb *merusak,* which is derived from the Aj *rusak,* 'destroyed', has to be taken in a transitive meaning; in prose we would normally expect to find *merusak-kan.* The intransitive meaning of 'to break' would not fit in in this context, however. The translation of this part of the sentence is 'moreover, it is felt / (that) death will come, destroying'.

Dan tangan 'kan kaku consists of a S-P construction; *menulis berhenti* functions as a second P to *tangan,* being asyndetically coordinated. The latter group is extraordinary for its inversion, this being an unmistakable case of poetic licence; such inversion would not be permissible in ordinary prose, where *berhenti menulis* would be required. The inverted order was most probably chosen for the sake of the final rhyme between *berhenti* and *mimpi* (lines 7 and 8; and also *tinggi* and *meninggi,* lines 9 and 10). This, incidentally, shows that for Chairil

Anwar *henti-mimpi* provided a more satisfactory rhyme here than *menulis-mimpi* (i.e., if the normal grammatical order had been used), even though phonemically the two *i*'s are identical. The translation of this phrase is: 'And the hand will be stiff, (it will) stop writing'.

The two *ke-an* forms in / *ketjemasan derita, ketjemasan mimpi;* / are unusual. *Tjemas* being an Adjective, this *ke-an* form may belong to one of two categories:

a. *Ke-an* with a N character; this type of derivative is wholly productive. A few examples of *ke-an* forms of this kind are *kemurahan,* 'cheapness', *kedatangan,* 'arrival', *kematian,* 'death', etc. In the poem under discussion we have three examples of this form, viz.: *kesementaraan,* 'transience' (line 4), *keramaian,* 'crowdedness' (line 11), and *kelantjungan,* 'illusiveness' (line 12).

b. *Ke-an* with a V character. This form is only partially productive; e.g. *kesusahan,* 'overcome by troubles' [44]. In some cases so far still ill-defined this form may be followed by a Noun which functions as a complement to the basic element of the *ke-an* form. The meaning of this particular *ke-an* + N sequence is 'being struck by (what the basic word plus the N complement express)', e.g., *kami kedatangan musuh,* 'we are (or: were) surprised by the enemy's approach', hence 'we are (or: were) attacked by the enemy'; *ia kematian anak,* 'she is bereft by the death of her child'; *saja kehabisan uang,* 'I have run out of money'.

In the case in point it is impossible for either *ketjemasan derita* or *ketjemasan mimpi* to belong to category (a), since nominal constructions of the type 'anxiety of suffering' and 'anxiety of dreams' do not fit in in the sentence or in the wider context. As verbal *ke-an* forms with complements (b), on the other hand, they fit in very well; in this sense they mean 'troubled by suffering' and 'troubled by dreams'. Grammatically, these forms then stand in an appositive relation to *tangan,* 'hand', (line 7), or by implication to the owner of the 'hand', which is *aku* (line 1) [45]. This is a good example of the creative use of Indonesian morphology by Chairil Anwar; although the verbal form *ketjemasan* ('troubled') by itself exists, probably no ordinary language user would add a Noun complement to it in the way Chairil Anwar has done here.

After the semi-colon in line 8, the next syntactic unit begins: / *berilah aku tempat dimenara tinggi,* /, which is a Patient-directed construction of the imperative type, where *aku* is the Pa. The translation is 'give me a place on a lofty tower'. The relative Pronoun *dimana,* 'where', intro-

duces a subordinate Clause covering at least lines 10-12, i.e. (10) *dimana kau sendiri meninggi* // (11) // *atas keramaian dunia dan tjedera,*/ (12) / *lagak lahir dan kelantjungan tjipta,* /. Line 10 explains who is the person addressed in the preceding line, namely *kau,* 'you', which must refer to the painter Affandi. Here again, we have an example of the functional role of the title of the poem, 'To the Painter Affandi'. The structure of lines 10-12 is basically that of a S-P sentence, viz. *kau ... meninggi,* to which lines 11 and 12 are added. *Meninggi* is an unequivocal example of an intransitive Verb derived from an Adjective (cf. *merusak,* line 6, which is equally clearly transitive). *Keramaian* has already been mentioned above. *Keramaian dunia dan tjedera* is syntactically ambiguous, since the grouping of the words into Clauses is not clearly defined: *dan* may be coordinating either *dunia* and *tjedera,* the phrase thus meaning 'crowdedness of the world and of perfidy', or *keramaian* and *tjedera,* meaning 'crowdedness (of the world) and perfidy'. Semantically, the second alternative is the more plausible. The translation is '(10) where you alone rise (11) above the crowdedness of the world and perfidy'. Line 12 is an obvious case of apposition, *lagak lahir* referring to *keramaian dunia,* and *kelantjungan tjipta* to *tjedera.* It should be observed, however, that this is typically 'literary' style, the use of appositives in this way not being found at all in ordinary BI. The translation is '(12) worldly vaunt and illusiveness of creation'.

Line 13, / *kau memaling dan memudja* /, is a S-P sentence, parallel to line 10 (*kau sendiri meninggi*). The question of whether syntactically lines 13 and 14 are still dependent on *dimana,* and thus are coordinate with *kau ... meninggi,* or whether the poet is introducing a new, principal Clause in the final two lines is probably irrelevant.

The final line, / *dan gelap-tertutup djadi terbuka!* ♯, has *gelap-tertutup,* 'closed darkness', as S and *djadi terbuka,* 'to open' as P. *Gelap* is another instance of the use of an Adjective in a nominal slot and with a nominal function; in ordinary prose we would probably find *kegelapan (jang) tertutup* instead of the above [46]. The question why Chairil Anwar in this case preferred this shorter form, whereas in three other instances in this same poem he uses the regular *ke-an* forms, viz. *kesementaraan, keramaian,* and *kelantjungan,* is an intriguing one. Is *gelap* a different sub-class of Adjective with an inherent potentiality for nominal use (like *terang, sepi, kuasa*)? Or is it the combination into a kind of compound form that enables him to use the shorter form (cf. *luka-terbuka* in no. *14*), since basic forms often are used instead of derived forms in compounds? Or are there phonaesthetic considerations involved here? It

is curious that in all the other cases mentioned above the *ke-an* form has a Noun modifier following it, viz. *kesementaraan segala, keramaian dunia* and *kelantjungan tjipta* respectively. However, this has not prevented Chairil Anwar from using the basic form in other cases, e.g. *ramai* in *kederasan ramai kota,* 'the hecticness of the city bustle' (in poem no. *64*).

The translation of the entire poem is:

TO THE PAINTER AFFANDI

If I'm completely out of words, no longer
dare to enter my own house, standing
on the crumbling doorstep,

it is because of the transience of everything
that brands every single object, moreover it is felt
(that) death will come, destroying.

And (my) hand will be stiff, (it will) stop writing,
(I'm) troubled by suffering, (I'm) troubled by dreams;
give me a place on a lofty tower,
where you alone rise

above the crowdedness of the world and perfidy,
worldly vaunt and illusiveness of creation,
you turn away and worship
and closed darkness opens!

(1946)

9. SENDJA DI PELABUHAN KETJIL

Buat Sri Ajati

Ini kali tidak ada jang mentjari tjinta
diantara gudang, rumah tua, pada tjerita
tiang serta temali. Kapal, perahu tiada berlaut.
menghembus diri dalam mempertjaja mau berpaut

Gerimis mempertjepat kelam. Ada djuga kelepak elang
menjinggung muram, desir hari lari berenang
menemu budjuk pangkal akanan. Tidak bergerak
dan kini tanah dan air tidur hilang ombak.

Tiada lagi. Aku sendiri. Berdjalan
menjisir semenandjung, masih pengap harap
sekali tiba diudjung dan sekalian selamat djalan
dari pantai keempat, sedu penghabisan bisa terdekap.

(*1946*)

(*DTD*, 1949:31)

The title of this poem means 'Twilight at a Little Harbour', while it bears the dedication 'For Sri Ajati'. Save for the third line of the first stanza which has a full stop that, in our opinion, is misplaced (see below) and for the fourth line, which is not marked by a full stop but is followed by a line beginning with a capital letter, the poem gives the impression of being carefully punctuated. A striking characteristic of this poem, immediately apparent from its presentation, is the enjambment in it: within the stanzas not a single line ends with a punctuation mark.

The first stanza consists of two sentences, the first beginning with the TAu *Ini kali,* 'This time' (with pre-placed *ini*), and ends with a full stop in line 3. The construction of this sentence is analogous to typically BI *ada jang* ... constructions, e.g. *ada jang sakit,* 'there are those who are sick', or 'some are sick'. In this particular case *ada* is preceded by *tidak,* whereas the *jang*-Clause consists of an Agent-directed transitive Verb construction with *jang* as A, and *tjinta,* 'love', as Pa. The construction also contains a LAu consisting of two asyndetically connected prepositional groups. In the first of these two prepositional groups we have yet another case of asyndeton, this time between two Nouns, namely *gudang,* 'shed(s)', and *rumah tua,* 'old house(s)'. The translation is '(1) This time there's no one looking for love (2) among the sheds,

old houses, near the tale (3) of masts and riggings.' *Tjerita* is obviously used figuratively here, the creaking of the wood (*tiang*) and rigging (*temali*) being represented as telling stories (*tjerita*). The sentence is characterized by a distinct richness of sound effects, as, in fact, is the entire poem, as is attested by such sequences as *tjari-tjinta-tjerita, gudang-rumah-tua, tiang-temali.*

The second syntactic unit is formed by the remainder of line 3, plus the whole of line 4, viz. *Kapal, perahu tiada berlaut / menghembus diri dalam mempertjaja mau berpaut //*, which poses the by now familiar difficulty of distinguishing between appositional Clauses and Predicates, as formal markers are lacking:

1. *tiada berlaut,* 'having no sea', or 'not sailing' (*berlaut* being used on the analogy of *berdjalan,* 'to walk', *berlajar,* 'to sail') may be the P of *kapal, perahu,* 'ship(s), boat(s)', in a S-P type sentence. In that case *menghembus diri,* an Agent-directed reflexive form (with *diri,* 'self', as Pa), is either a coordinate P or a phrase standing in apposition to the P *tiada berlaut,* in which case it should be translated as a present participle, viz. '(while) puffing themselves . . . '.
2. The other possibility is to take *tiada berlaut* as a Clause qualifying *kapal* and *perahu,* thus meaning 'ships (and) boats (that) have not gone to sea'. In that case we have to assume that a non-redundant *jang* has been omitted, as is the case with similar constructions in other poems. In that case *menghembus diri,* which is an Agent-directed transitive Verb construction with a reflexive Pronoun, is the P.

Semantically, the second alternative is perhaps the more satisfactory; this interpretation strengthens the above assumption that the full stop at the end of line 3 is misplaced.

Dalam . . . berpaut is a prepositional Clause in which the use of *mempertjaja* is interesting. *Pertjaja* is ambivalent and may be either a N (*pertjaja jang sia-sia*) or an Aj, and as such can be used both attributively (*orang jang pertjaja*) and predicatively (*saja tidak pertjaja*). The nominal form is usually *kepertjajaan.* Instead of using this nominal form after a Preposition (e.g. *dalam pertjaja,* or, *dalam kepertjajaan*), the poet uses the verbal form *mempertjaja.* This in itself is not impossible (cf. *dalam menimbang soal itu,* 'in weighing the problem'); however, the curious thing is that *mempertjaja* does not seem to occur as such in ordinary BI, where there are only the transitive forms *mempertjajai,* 'to trust someone', and *mempertjajakan,* 'to entrust

something to someone'. Chairil Anwar's choice of *mempertjaja* here may have been influenced by a propensity, also observed in other cases (e.g. *meninggi* in no. *43*), to employ *me-* forms as being suggestive of activity in contradistinction to basic forms. *Dalam mempertjaja mau berpaut* means something like 'in their having faith that they will be joined', *berpaut* obviously meaning something like 'to communicate', 'to become united'.

The use of long sentences, the effect of which is strengthened by enjambment, reinforces the suggestion of an atmosphere of dreariness pervading the 'Little Harbour' which has already been evoked by the vocabulary.

Gerimis mempertjepat kelam is an Agent-directed construction with *gerimis,* 'the drizzle', as A, *kelam,* 'darkness', as Pa, and *mempertjepat,* 'to accelerate', as Vt. The Vt *mempertjepat* also occurs in *Kupu Malam dan Biniku* (no. *14*), viz. *Kupertjepat langkah,* 'I quicken (my) pace'. In the present poem this Verb is used to describe the accelerating effect of the drizzle on the coming of darkness, hence the translation 'The drizzle speeds the darkness.' This is followed by a sentence consisting of two complete, asyndetically connected sentence constructions, viz.: (a) *Ada djuga kelepak elang / menjinggung muram,* and (b) *desir hari lari berenang / menemu budjuk pangkal akanan.* Again the enjambment is worth noting, as are all kinds of sound effects which are ingeniously combined with the effects of the enjambment to give force and significance to every single word in these lines. The *e-a* sequence in *tjepat-kelam* is repeated and reinforced by that in *kelepak elang* (and in the rhyme words *berenang, bergerak,* even though the latter also rhymes with *ombak*). There is also internal assonance, e.g. *kelam-muram, hari-lari, pangkal-akanan,* strengthening semantic connections and parallelisms.

With regard to Raffel's translation of lines 5, 6, and 7: '(5) ... There's an eagle flapping; (6) With a flick, the day brushes at the gloom, then swims silkily (7) To meet temptations yet to come...' (Raffel, 1970: 105), we would observe the following:

1. Disregarding the enjambment, which is a structural principle of this poem (cf. poem no. *43*), Raffel has evidently misinterpreted *kelepak elang* as a S-P construction, instead of seeing the whole of (a) as an Agent-directed transitive construction introduced by or dependent upon *ada djuga.* This, again, is a common sentence type in BI, even though in prose the relative Pronoun *jang* is usually added after the S, e.g.

Ada djuga orang (jang) menulis surat. Formally, it is therefore perhaps more correct to consider the whole sequence *kelepak . . . muram* as S and *ada* as P and to describe the structure of S as that of an Agent-directed transitive construction. This is quite common in BI, e.g. *orang tua memukul anaknja djarang terdapat di Indonesia,* 'parents hitting their children are rarely found in Indonesia'. Thus *kelepak elang,* 'the flapping of an eagle', is the A, *menjinggung,* 'to touch', is the Vt, and *muram,* perhaps another ambivalent Adjective of the same type as *sepi, ramai,* etc. (see Chapter III), is the Pa, meaning 'gloom' (*kemuraman*); *djuga* is an Av meaning 'also', 'even', 'yet', 'still'. In view of the utter desolateness of the 'Little Harbour', as described in the first stanza, and the darkness, we prefer translating *djuga* as 'still', so that the translation of (a) is 'There is still the flapping of an eagle / flicking the gloom'.

2. The comma between *muram* and *desir hari* has been ignored by Raffel, so that *hari* has been taken as S of this line. Having analysed (a) in the way described above, it is obvious that *desir hari* should be taken as the S of the second part of the sentence, 'the rustling (of the) day'. The P is a compound one, consisting of *lari,* 'to run' (P_1), *berenang,* 'to swim', here obviously used metaphorically (P_2), and *menemu,* 'to meet' (P_3; *menemu* here stands for the more regular form *menemui*), with *budjuk pangkal akanan* as Pa of P_3. We have already encountered several instances of the use of series of successive Predicates of a single S, and here again the question of whether there is a coordinate or a subordinate relation between these three Predicates is probably irrelevant.

The sequence *budjuk pangkal akanan* poses a semantic problem: *Budjuk* is the nominal base of the Vt *membudjuk,* 'to flatter', 'to coax'; *budjuk* means 'the lure', 'the temptation'. Evidently the image conjured up here is that of the day fleeting away, lured by the temptations of the *pangkal akanan. Pangkal* has a wide range of meanings, including 'trunk', 'root', 'base', 'beginning', 'starting point'. *Akanan* is an unfamiliar word, being probably a short from of the archaic word *keakanan,* a N derived from the auxiliary *akan,* 'shall', 'will', meaning something like 'the 'future' [47]. The translation of *pangkal akanan* as 'roots', or 'basis of the future' is not a very convincing description poetically of something that lures away the present day. In view of the fact that the subject of the poem is a 'Little Harbour', however, we might perhaps assume that *pangkal* stands for *pangkalan* which would here mean 'anchorage', 'harbour'. If this is the case, *budjuk pangkal(an) (ke)akan(an)* may mean 'the lures of a future harbour'. The translation of (b) would then

read 'The rustling (of the) day glides away / to meet the lures of a future harbour.'

The remainder of the third stanza consists of two Clauses connected by *dan*: (a) *Tidak bergerak,* (b) */ dan kini tanah dan air tidur hilang ombak //.* (a) is a P without a S, the implied S being comprised by the whole of the situation described in the preceding lines. (b) *dan kini tanah dan air tidur* is made up of a S-P construction, in which *tanah dan air,* 'the land and water', is S; *tidur,* 'to sleep', is P; and *kini,* 'now', is TAu. The syntactic function of *hilang ombak* is not clearly indicated by punctuation marks; it might be taken as a third Clause within this sentence, being one of the inverted S-P type with *hilang,* 'vanished', as P, and *ombak,* 'the waves', as S. However, it is more reasonable to take *hilang ombak* as appositional to *tidur,* thus meaning 'with all the waves gone', 'without any waves left'. Such short constructions are quite common in BI, e.g. *anak itu lalu tidur hilang takut,* meaning lit. 'that child then slept disappeared (his) fear'. The phrase emphasizes the total stillness, lifelessness and immobility of the 'Little Harbour'. The translation is '(7) ... Motionless (8) and now the land and water are asleep, the waves vanished.'

After this long sentence stressing the prevailing mood the poet summarizes the latter in two short sentences: *Tiada lagi,* 'Nothing is left', and *Aku sendiri,* 'I'm alone'. These, in their turn, most ingeniously take up again the image created by the opening line, 'There's no one looking for love'. The sentence following consists of at least four Clauses, all of which have an unusual structure. Grammatically they are coordinate, but semantically they form a complex structure of interrelated elements. Grammatically, the first Clause has as implied S *aku*: (*aku*) *berdjalan / menjisir semenandjung.* The Predicate consists of a *ber-* form with an appositional phrase consisting of an Agent-directed form of the Vt *menjisir,* 'to comb', plus a Pa, this being a common sentence type. *Semenandjung,* meaning 'cape', 'peninsula', probably a spit of land projecting into the sea near the harbour, is the Pa.

The second part, *masih pengap harap / sekali tiba diudjung,* poses some problems. It is most probably a S-P sentence in which the grouping of the elements is not clearly marked. Whereas (a) *harap,* 'hope(s)', (here a Noun, though in prose *harapan* is more common as such; the shorter form is evidently preferred here for the sake of the rhyme) may be the S and *pengap* the P, thus 'Hope(s) is (are) still stale'; (b) the whole of *pengap harap* might also be regarded as P (cf. *putus asa*) the S of which would have to be inferred from an earlier statement, and

hence may be *aku*. The meaning then would be 'with hopes stifled'. In either case *sekali tiba diudjung* is a subordinate Clause dependent on *harap* in accordance with the common Indonesian practice as regards constructions with words for hope, fear, etc.; e.g. *saja takut dia tidak mau datang*, 'I fear he/she/it doesn't want to come'. The entire Clause means, therefore, 'still with a stifled hope/of some time reaching the end' (*udjung*, being the opposite in meaning of *pangkal*, likewise has a wide range of meanings, such as 'end', 'tip', 'point', 'top'; evidently here it is the *udjung* of the *semenandjung*, thus the 'tip of the spit').

Dan sekalian selamat djalan / dari pantai keempat is not without grammatical and semantic problems either.

First we shall deal with *selamat djalan*. In Indonesian the phrase *selamat tinggal* is used as a farewell by a person going away to those remaining behind (*tinggal* meaning 'to stay'), whereas the words *selamat djalan* are said to persons going away, being something similar to the French *bon voyage*. Possibly *selamat djalan* is used here to suggest that *aku* himself has come to his journey's end, while the rest of mankind continue on their life's journey — and he wishes them goodbye (in the sense of the German *Lebewohl*), not without a sense of resignation. Even a conscious use of the phrase in its secondary ironical meaning is not out of the question here. For in colloquial usage (e.g. in the Moluccas) *selamat djalan*, when used in this sense, means something like 'to hell with it all!'. Since the colloquial use of words does not seem to be a characteristic feature of this poem, we shall translate *selamat djalan* simply as 'goodbye', taking *sekalian* ('all', 'all of you', 'others', from *kalian*) as the addressee.

In the second place there is the sequence *dari pantai keempat*. Now, Numerals with the prefix *ke-* have two functions: (1) after Nouns they are ordinal numbers, e.g. *rumah kedua*, 'second house'; (2) when preceding a Noun they indicate some sort of totality or collectivity, e.g. *keempat rumah itu*, 'all four of those houses'. So here *pantai keempat* literally means 'the fourth beach', though there has been no reference to a first, second, or third beach. As this part of the poem is about an *udjung* or 'tip', however, we might consider the translation 'all four beaches' (thus assuming a grammatical irregularity for *keempat pantai*) on the analogy of the 'four corners of the world'; thus upon 'reaching the tip (of the peninsula', line 11), the speaker is able to say 'goodbye' to 'everyone' from the four corners of the world.

Sedu penghabisan bisa terdekap comprises a Patient-directed construction in which *sedu penghabisan*, 'the last sob', is the Pa; *bisa*

terdekap, 'can be embraced', is the P; and *aku* is the implied A. The translation then reads: 'the last sob can be embraced (by me)', suggesting that in his extreme loneliness the *aku* can only find consolation for the last sob in his own arms.

By way of summary of the above we would suggest the following translation of the poem:

TWILIGHT AT A LITTLE HARBOUR

For Sri Ajati

This time there's no one looking for love
among the sheds, old houses, near the tale
of the masts and riggings. Ships (and) boats (that) have not gone to sea
are puffing themselves (out) in the belief (they) will be united

The drizzle speeds the darkness. There is still the flapping of an eagle
flicking the gloom, the rustling (of the) day glides away
to meet the lures of a future harbour. Motionless
and now the land and water are asleep, the waves vanished.

Nothing is left. I'm alone. Walking
(I) comb the peninsula, still with a stifled hope
of some time reaching the tip (of the peninsula) and (saying) goodbye to everyone
from all four beaches, the last sob can be embraced (by me).

(1946)

10. PUNTJAK

Pondering, pondering on you, dear . . .

Minggu pagi disini. Kederasan ramai kota jang terbawa
tambah penjoal dalam diri — diputar atau memutar —
terasa tertekan; kita berbaring bulat telandjang
Sehabis apa terutjap dikelam tadi, kita habis kata sekarang.
Berada 2000 m. djauh dari muka laut, silang siur pelabuhan,
djadi terserah pada perbandingan dengan
tjemara bersih hidjau, kali jang bersih hidjau

Maka tjintaku sajang, kutjoba mendjabat tanganmu
mendekap wadjahmu jang asing, meraih bibirmu dibalik rupa.
Kau terlompat dari randjang, lari ketingkap jang
masih mengandung kabut, dan kau lihat disana, bahwa antara
tjemara bersih hidjau dan kali gunung bersih hidjau
mengambang djuga tanja dulu, tanja lama, tanja.

(*1948*)

(*KT*, 1949:50)

The title means literally 'Summit', 'Mountain Top', or 'Peak'. However, there is also a mountain resort called *Puntjak* about sixty miles south of Djakarta. Which of the two is meant by the title cannot be determined precisely due to lack of biographical data, although the contents of the poem seem to indicate a mountain resort such as the *Puntjak* area. We shall therefore leave the title untranslated. The English subtitle 'Pondering, pondering on you, dear . . . ' is also printed in in the earlier versions of this poem [48]. Lines 1, 5, and 10 begin with a capital letter, as does line 4, although line 3 is not marked by a full stop at the end. Line 8 also begins with a capital letter, although the end of line 7 again has no full stop, but in this case line 8 opens a new stanza. A remarkable feature of this poem is the extraordinary length of the lines, at least in comparison with Chairil Anwar's earlier poems. Enjambment again is a distinct characteristic of this poem.

The short opening statement *Minggu pagi disini,* 'It is Sunday morning here', indicates the setting of the poem as regards time and place.

The second sentence is formed by the remainder of line 1 and runs on into line 3; it is divided into two parts, each of these with the construction of a complete sentence. The first part of this unit is made up of a Patient-directed construction with the basic word order of Pa-*ter*Vt, the Pa consisting of two nominal groups, coordinated by *tambah,* viz.:

kederasan ramai kota jang terbawa (= Pa_1) *tambah* ('plus') *penjoal dalam diri* etc. (= Pa_2), and *terasa tertekan* (= *ter*Vt).

Pa_1: The nominal group *kederasan ramai kota* contains yet another example of the transposition of an Aj to the N class without any formal characterization. Instead of the more usual *keramaian,* which would have been clumsy after *kederasan,* the poet has used the Aj *ramai,* 'noisy'. *Ramai kota* is parallel to *sepi malam,* 'the stillness of the night', or *dingin udara,* 'the coldness of the air', which are not uncommon in prose either. *Kederasan ramai kota* is therefore a group of three consecutive Nouns, the central one of which is *kederasan,* 'rapidity', here 'hecticness', with *ramai kota,* 'city noise', as modifier. The translation of this group is 'The hecticness of the city bustle'. *Jang,* as is usual in cases like this, refers to the whole of the preceding group; *jang terbawa* thus means '(The hecticness . . .) that is carried along'.

Pa_2: *Penjoal* displays an interesting feature. Raffel translates it as 'problems' (Raffel, 1970:139), which would be correct in the case of the *per-an* derivative, *persoalan,* being used. *Penjoal* as it appears in the poem, however, is an uncommon form. It consists of the prefix *pe-,* plus the N *soal,* 'matter', 'problem', with nasalization. The word is formed on the analogy of *madat,* 'opium', - *pemadat,* 'opium smoker'; *tanja,* 'question', - *penanja,* 'interrogator', etc. In other words the derivative forms are Nouns indicating the person (or thing) habitually making use of, or dealing with, the object referred to by the Noun. Thus *penjoal* would mean 'the worrying part (of oneself)'. The word *tambah,* 'plus', which usually coordinates Nouns, as well as *diri,* indicating an unspecified person ('you', 'oneself', 'me'), are by now familiar to us from Chairil Anwar's poetry. The *soal,* 'problem', which the person is worrying about is further qualified by the words between the dashes, viz.: *diputar atau memutar,* which means 'to be twisted or to twist'.

*ter*Vt: There is no formal indication to assist us in determining which of the two *ter-* Verbs is the principal Predicate word in this construction. We have come across several comparable instances of the use of *terasa* (cf. poem no. *43*) as well as other *ter-* forms. Grammatically it is more usual for the first word of such sequences (here *terasa*) to be the principal word of the Predicate, even though semantically the second word may have greater emphasis. The translation of the whole unit is '(1) The hecticness of the city bustle that is carried along (2) added to the worrying part of oneself — being twisted or twisting — (3) is felt to be subdued'.

The Patient-directed construction, here consisting of three *ter-* forms characteristically suppressing the A, arouses the curiosity of the reader as to the Agent's identity. In other words, apart from the indication provided by the subtitle we have still to be told to whom the poem refers. The next clue is given in the sequence following the semi-colon, viz.: *kita berbaring bulat telandjang.* This is a S-P sentence, where *kita,* 'we', is S, and *berbaring,* 'to lie', is P. *Bulat telandjang* is an extension of the Predicate and means 'stark naked'. The phrase is usually encountered with a different word order, hence *telandjang bulat.* The inversion as it appears in the poem was probably applied for the sake of alliteration between *berbaring* and *bulat,* as well as for the final rhyme between *telandjang-sekarang,* although final rhyme is not a structural principle of this poem.

Line 4, */ Sehabis apa terutjap dikelam tadi, kita habis kata sekarang, /,* constitutes the next sentence. *Sehabis* is a Conjunction introducing a SC, analogously to other *se-* forms, such as *sesudah, selagi, sebelum, selama,* etc.; it means 'after'. Just as in English, such a Conjunction may introduce either a N or a nominal group (e.g. 'After last night'), or a complete Cl, e.g. 'After we met last night, . . . '. In this particular case the complement of *sehabis* is *apa,* which is itself qualified by a Patient-directed verbal form plus PeP. The non-redundant element *jang* in its function of nominalizing the verbal *terutjap* has been omitted here; thus we have *apa (jang) terutjap,* 'that which is uttered', i.e. 'what was said'. *Dikelam tadi* is TAu and means 'last night'. *Kita habis kata sekarang* has *kita,* 'we', as S, *habis kata,* 'to be out of words', as P (cf. *habis-habis kata* in poem no. *43*), and *sekarang,* 'now', as TAu. The translation of line 4 is 'After what was said last night, we are out of words now'.

The next sentence is made up of the three lines concluding the first stanza; it contains two Clauses, the first covering line 5 (a), and the second lines 6 and 7 (b). Structurally (a) is a S-P sentence, of which the implicit S is *kita* (line 3), the P is *berada,* 'to stay', 'to be present', and the remainder of line 5 is LAu. The use of digits (such as *2000* here) and abbreviations (such as *m.* for 'meter' here) are typical of Chairil Anwar's later work [49]. *Djauh dari* is a poetic subtlety; by using *djauh dari,* rather than *diatas,* 'above', the poet emphasizes both the spiritual and the physical distance. *Muka laut* and *silang siur pelabuhan* are two nominal groups, asyndetically coordinated and both connected to the preceding words by the Preposition *dari.* The translation is '(We) Are 6,000 feet away from the level of the sea, (from) the criss-crossing of the harbour'. (b) is a Patient-directed construction introduced by *djadi,*

'thus', 'so', with *kita* as the implied Pa; *terserah,* 'to be given up (to)', is the P, and *pada perbandingan* is a prepositional group with another prepositional group (introduced by *dengan* . . . , 'with . . . ') added to it, partly running on into the next line. It is worth noting that line 7 consists of two asyndetically connected nominal groups the first of which lacks the relative Pronoun *jang* (*tjemara bersih hidjau*), while the second does have the *jang* (*kali jang bersih hidjau*). A possible explanation may be provided by the metrical pattern of the line, *tjemara* being trisyllabic, as is *kali jang.* A parallel to and almost identical variant of this line is provided by line 12: / *tjemara bersih hidjau dan kali gunung bersih hidjau* /, where *jang* is omitted in both of the nominal groups connected by *dan.* Here one might argue similarly that the first nominal group plus *dan* consists of eight syllables, and the remainder of the line consists of the same number of syllables. The translation of lines 6 and 7 is '(6) thus (we're) given up to comparison with (7) the pure green pines, the limpid green streams'. Although formally there is no reason to assume that there is any relationship of subordination between line 5 and lines 6 + 7, it is probable that line 5 is semantically subordinate to what follows, hence meaning something like 'As we are here now (or: being here now . . .) we are thus given up to . . . '.

The second stanza opens with the causal Adverb *maka* followed by the 'vocative' *tjintaku sajang,* the translation being 'so, my dear love, . . . '. This is followed by the Vt *tjoba,* 'to try', occurring in a Patient-directed form with the pronominally prefixed Agent which has as its Pa an Agent-directed form that is usual in connection with the Verb *tjoba* in BI, e.g. *kutjoba menulis karangan itu,* 'I am trying to write that composition'. The three coordinate *me-* forms, each with their own Pa, following *kutjoba* are simple and straightforward. The words *dibalik rupa* (line 9) pose a problem, however; three possibilities seem to present themselves:

1. The sequence may represent yet another Cl, i.e., it may be a Patient-directed construction with the *di-* prefixed form of the Vt *membalik,* 'to turn upside down', plus the Pa *rupa,* 'face', or 'form', 'shape'; the word order as it appears in the poem would thus be *di*Vt-Pa, the translation being '(your) face is turned (by me)'. For a number of reasons, however, this explanation is not very likely, as (a) *rupa* does not usually mean 'face', but rather 'shape', 'form', 'appearance'; (b) the switching over from an Agent-directed construction to a Patient-directed one, introducing a new Pa, is uncommon, so that in this case *membalik*

rupa would be much more usual; and (c) this interpretation does not make much sense semantically.

2. *Rupa* may be the A of the verbal form *dibalik,* and would as such be in apposition with *bibirmu* (in prose one would perhaps expect *jang* before *dibalik,* but this is certainly not essential in view of the poet's preference for omitting *jang*); the meaning would then be 'your lips, turned by a form'. This interpretation is quite plausible grammatically, but is close to nonsense semantically.

3. *Dibalik rupa* may have the function of an Adjunct qualifying *bibirmu,* in which *dibalik* is a Pe meaning 'behind', 'beyond', while *rupa* could then be taken in its ordinary meaning of 'form', 'shape'. The translation of the whole then becomes 'to reach your lips beyond (all) shape'. Grammatically, this interpretation is perfectly acceptable.

We tend to favour the third alternative also on the basis of the context determination, and more specifically in connection with the preceding *wadjahmu jang asing,* 'your alien face'. Since the 'face' has already been designated as 'alien' by the speaker, it would seem less probable that he should 'reach for the lips' (*meraih bibir*) by 'turning the face' (i.e., following the first alternative), than that he should try do so by reaching 'beyond shape', in the sense of 'appearance' in general. Yet, the third alternative has been chosen merely for want of a better solution! How Raffel arrived at the translation 'reluctant (lips)' is not altogether clear to us, however (cf. Raffel, 1970:139).

Lines 10 up to the end make up the final and at the same time longest sentence of this poem. Long and complicated as it may seem, it actually runs like a prose sentence and consists of three principal Clauses. The first two are asyndetically connected and have the same S *kau,* 'you', both being of the S-P type, viz.: (a) *Kau terlompat dari randjang,* where *terlompat,* 'to jump away', here 'to jump out (of bed)', is the P, and *dari randjang,* 'from the bed' is PeO; and (b) *lari ketingkap jang masih mengandung kabut,* in which *lari,* 'to run', is the P, and *ketingkap jang masih mengandung kabut,* 'to the tiny window that is still heavy with mist', is PeO, *jang ... kabut* itself being a common type of Agent-directed construction. The third Clause, connected to the previous ones by *dan,* 'and', should technically be interpreted as a Patient-directed form of a Vt, the A being *kau* (in prose it has to be written as one word together with *lihat,* thus *kaulihat*), and the Pa comprising the Clause introduced by *bahwa,* 'that'. With Verbs like 'to see' such *bahwa*-Clauses functioning as Pa are quite common, and the Cl introduced by *bahwa*

may have any type of sentence construction. Here the Cl opens with the LAu, *antara / tjemara bersih hidjau dan kali gunung bersih hidjau,* followed by an inverted S-P sentence in which *mengambang,* 'to float', is the P, and *tanja dulu,* 'the former question', is the S. The S is repeated three times in different forms: *tanja dulu, tanja lama, tanja,* 'the former question, the old question, the question.' There are several ways of translating the Av *djuga,* namely as 'also', 'even', 'still', or 'yet'; on the basis of the context determination we are in favour of translating it as 'still'.

The translation of the entire poem then is as follows:

PUNTJAK

Pondering, pondering on you, dear . . .

1 It is Sunday morning here. The hecticness of the city bustle that is carried along
2 added to the worrying part of oneself — being twisted or twisting —
3 is felt to be subdued; we are lying stark naked
4 After what was said last night, we are out of words now.
5 (We) Are 6,000 feet away from the level of the sea, (from) the criss-crossing of the harbour,
6 thus (we're) given up to comparison with
7 the pure green pines, the limpid green streams

8 So, my dear love, I try to shake your hands
9 to clasp your alien face, to reach your lips beyond (all) appearance.
10 You jump out of bed (and) run to the tiny window that is
11 still heavy with mist, and you can see there, that between
12 the pure green pines and limpid green mountain streams
13 the former question still floats, the old question, the question.

(1948)

11. AKU BERKISAR ANTARA MEREKA

Aku berkisar antara mereka sedjak terpaksa
Bertukar rupa dipinggir djalan, aku pakai mata mereka
pergi ikut mengundjungi gelanggang bersenda:
kenjataan-kenjataan jang didapatnja.
(bioskop Capitol putar film Amerika,
lagu-lagu baru irama mereka berdansa)
Kami pulang tidak kena apa-apa
Sungguhpun Adjal matjam rupa djadi tetangga
Terkumpul dihalte, kami tunggu trem dari kota
Jang bergerak dimalam hari sebagai gigi masa.
Kami, timpang dan pintjang, negatip dalam djandji djuga
Sandarkan tulang belulang pada lampu djalan sadja,
Sedang tahun gempita terus berkata.
Hudjan menimpa. Kami tunggu trem dari kota.
Ah hati mati dalam malam ada doa
Bagi jang batja tulisan tanganku dalam tjinta mereka
Semoga segala sypilis dan segala kusta
(Sedikit lagi bertambah derita bom atom pula)
Ini buktikan tanda kedaulatan kami bersama
Terimalah duniaku antara jang menjaksikan bisa
Kualami kelam malam dan mereka dalam diriku pula.

(*1949*)

(Jassin, [3]1968:73)

The poem consists of twenty-one lines all ending in *a*. Each line begins with a capital letter, except for lines 3, 4, 5 and 6; the two last-mentioned lines are in parentheses, as is line 18. There is a more liberal use of punctuation marks in the first fourteen lines than in the remainder of the poem. From the analysis of the poem it will be seen that the absence of punctuation marks in some cases makes for several alternative interpretations of the lines in question. Moreover, there is no division into stanzas. In short, the formal presentation of the poem is of less help for the interpretation than was the case with some of the other poems discussed so far.

A general feature of this poem in regard to the grammar is that the poet several times uses basic forms of transitive Verbs in such a way as to make it difficult to determine whether they are meant to be Agent-directed or Patient-directed forms. Sometimes he leaves out the prefix *me-* and the subsequent nasalization in cases where its inclusion would be obligatory in correct BI (e.g. *pakai* instead of *memakai* in line 2,

and *buktikan* instead of *membuktikan* in line 19); this irregularity seems to be colloquial. In other cases such forms can be interpreted as Patient-directed constructions using the prA, with, however, various elements coming in between the prA and the basic form of the Verb, e.g. *Kami... sandarkan tulang belulang* (lines 11 and 12). Some other cases are ambiguous, e.g. *aku pakai mata mereka* (line 2), *kami tunggu trem* (lines 9 and 14). In other cases still, however, the verbal forms are used quite unambiguously, either as Agent-directed constructions, e.g. *mengundjungi* (line 3), and *menjaksikan* (line 20), or as Patient-directed forms, e.g. *kualami* (line 21) and *didapatnja* (line 4).

The first line and the part of line 2 occurring before the comma is open to three different interpretations:

a. This part consists of two coordinate Clauses. Of these, line 1, ‡ *Aku berkisar antara mereka sedjak terpaksa* /, is a S-P type of construction with *aku* as S, *berkisar,* 'to go about', as P, *antara mereka,* 'among them', as LAu, and *sedjak terpaksa,* 'since forced to', as TAu; *bertukar rupa dipinggir djalan* is another S-P Clause, with *bertukar rupa,* 'to change shape', as P, and *dipinggir djalan,* 'on the sidewalk', as LAu. As the latter is coordinate with the former it has by implication as its S the *aku* of the preceding line. In other words, the assumption underlying this analysis is that a comma should be understood at the end of line 1, the translation thus being '(1) I go about among them after being forced to, (2) Changing shape on the sidewalk, ...'. Semantically *bertukar rupa* might be taken to be subordinate to the first line, and translated with an English present participle, viz. 'Changing shape ...'.

b. It consists of a single Cl with *aku* as S, *berkisar* as P, *antara mereka* as LAu, the remainder of the sentence up to the comma of the second line being TAu. Semantically, however, this interpretation is less plausible than the first, since the temporal relation between the *aku*'s being forced to change shape and his *berkisar antara mereka* does not seem to make much sense, viz.: 'I have gone about among them since I was forced to change shape ...'.

c. It would also be possible to take the first part of line 2 as being appositional to the second part of that line, viz.: 'Changing shape on the sidewalk, I use their eyes'. However, both the punctuation and the meaning are arguments against rather than in favour of this hypothesis.

The remainder of line 2 together with line 3 is a typically Indonesian

concatenation of elements with no explicit syntactic relationships between them. The first part consists of either a Patient-directed construction with *aku pakai* as a variant of the more usual *kupakai,* or an Agent-directed transitive Verb construction with the colloquial *pakai* instead of the regular *memakai.* There is very little difference in meaning here, as in both cases it is 'I use their eyes' (see further Chapter III, Section 1, ad 7d). *Aku* remains the S of the words following this. *Pergi ikut* can be regarded as the Predicate of *aku* to which *mengundjungi,* a Vt with as Pa *gelanggang bersenda,* may be appositional; thus the resultant translation is 'I come along (or, as Raffel suggests, 'tag along'), visiting (or: to visit) entertainment spots'. It is not even certain whether this *ikut* goes with *pergi* (hence *pergi ikut*) or with *mengundjungi* (hence *ikut mengundjungi*).

In view of the colon at the end of the line, line 4, / *kenjataan-kenjataan jang didapatnja.* /, should be considered as an explanation of, i.e. a phrase standing in apposition to, *gelanggang bersenda,* and as such a second Pa of *mengundjungi*; *jang didapatnja* is an Au qualifying the N *kenjataan-kenjataan,* in the form of a Patient-directed construction, with the affix-combination *di-nja* referring to *mereka,* 'they'. Another analysis of line 4 would be by taking it as an equational sentence type, of which one of the elements is a *jang*-group of the type *jang sakit guru* (= *guru jang sakit,* i.e. 'it is the teacher who is ill'). The meaning of the line would then be 'It is facts which they acquired.' Semantically, however, this is much less plausible than the first interpretation, which would render the translation 'the realities that they have acquired', or 'their acquired realities', i.e. 'the facts of *their* lives.'

Lines 5 and 6 are best explained as two separate sentences, although we lack formal corroboration of this assumption. Line 5, / *(bioskop Capitol putar film Amerika,* /, comprises an Agent-directed construction in which the Vt *putar,* 'to turn (here: to run)', lacks the *me-* prefix. *Bioskop Capitol,* 'the Capitol cinema', is the A, and *film Amerika,* 'an American film', the Pa.

Line 6, / *lagu-lagu baru irama mereka berdansa)* /, is an equational sentence in which *lagu-lagu baru,* 'new songs', 'new tunes', is S and the rest is P. This P displays a parallel construction to that of *gelanggang kami berperang* in the poem discussed before this (no. *25*). It consists of a N, a Pr, and a Vi. This construction commonly occurs with the word *tempat* in Indonesian, e.g. *rumah itu tempat kami bertemu,* 'that house is the place where we meet'. Chairil Anwar has extended this usage to other Nouns [50]. The translation of this line is 'new tunes are the

rhythm they dance to' in the sense that 'new tunes provide the rhythm they dance to'.

The next sentence is most probably formed by lines 7 and 8. The central construction is comprised by line 7, */ Kami pulang tidak kena apa-apa /*, which consists of a S-P construction plus PA. *Kami,* 'we' (the first person plural personal Pr excluding the person addressed, i.e. the reader, and here most probably used in opposition to *mereka*), is the S, *pulang,* 'to go home', the P, and *tidak kena apa-apa* an extension of the P meaning 'not afflicted by anything'. Such a loose extension of a Predicate without any formal characterization is by now a familiar characteristic of Chairil Anwar's poetry. Grammatically, and from a purely formalistic viewpoint, the Conjunction *sungguhpun,* 'although' (line 8), might be regarded as introducing a Cl that is subordinate to the one following in the next line, i.e. line 9, particularly in view of the absence of punctuation; the meaning, however, contradicts this interpretation, so that we may assume that line 8 constitutes a SC dependent on line 7, in which *Adjal matjam rupa,* 'Death in various forms' is the S, and *djadi tetangga,* 'to become (a) neighbour', the P; the possessive Pronoun *kami* is understood after *tetangga.* The translation would thus read 'Although Death in various forms is (our) neighbour'. Two points worth noting in this line are that *matjam* is not used in its reduplicated form indicating a variety (normally of things, here of death), and further that *jang* has been omitted before the construction; the normal prose equivalent is *jang bermatjam-matjam rupa.*

Line 9, */ Terkumpul dihalte, kami tunggu trem dari kota /*, comprises a construction that is by now rather familiar. In prose we would expect to find *sambil,* or, *ketika,* both meaning 'while', introducing *terkumpul dihalte,* 'gathered at the (tram) stop'. However, as we have observed above, Chairil Anwar has a marked preference for pre-placed appositions without formal characterization, the only unusual thing about this particular construction being that the appositional phrase *terkumpul dihalte* is connected with the prA *kami* while it itself consists of a Patient-directed construction. The translation of this line thus is 'Gathered at the (tram) stop we wait for the tram from Kota' [51] (cf. poem no. *18* for a comparable construction, i.e. */ Terhentak / Kembali diitu-itu sadja / Djiwa bertanja . . .*).

The word *jang* introducing line 10, */ Jang bergerak dimalam hari sebagai gigi masa. /*, turns it into an adjunctive Clause qualifying *trem dari kota* in the preceding line, and meaning '(10) That moves in the night like the tooth of time.' Whatever may be meant by *gigi masa,* which

is undoubtedly used metaphorically here, it certainly is not 'gold tooth' as Raffel suggests [52]. Probably *gigi masa* is a literal translation of the Dutch *de tand des tijds,* i.e. lit. 'the tooth of time', meaning the wear and tear of time or decay. In this poem the image of *gigi masa* may have been suggested by an ivory-coloured tram [53] moving through the night like a big tooth, destroying everything on its way.

The next syntactic unit is formed by lines 11 to 13 (final full stop), being basically an Agent-directed construction. Line 11, */ Kami, timpang dan pintjang, negatip dalam djandji djuga /,* consists of the A *kami* and the Adjuncts *timpang dan pintjang,* 'lame and crippled', and *negatip dalam djandji djuga,* 'negative also in promise', i.e. without promise for the future, qualifying this A; in prose *jang* would be normal either before *timpang* or *negatip,* or before both. Line 12, */ Sandarkan tulang belulang pada lampu djalan sadja, /,* again contains an Agent-directed Vt lacking the *me-* prefix plus nasalization, i.e. *sandarkan,* 'to lean something against . . . '; this is another instance of the colloquial use of words discussed above (see *aku pakai,* line 1). *Tulang belulang* 'dry bones' is the Pa, and *pada lampu djalan,* 'against the street-lamps' a LAu. Line 13, */ Sedang tahun gempita terus berkata. /,* forms a SC qualifying the preceding line and means 'While the tumultuous years keep on talking.'

Line 14 consists of two Agent-directed sentences, viz.: (a) *Hudjan menimpa,* in which *hudjan,* 'the rain', is the A, and *menimpa,* 'to fall upon', is the Vt, of which *kami* is the implied Pa; and (b) *Kami tunggu trem dari kota,* which is a repetition of the part of line 9 that occurs after the comma. This sentence may be interpreted either as a Patient-directed construction of the regular prA + Vt-Pa type, or as an Agent-directed construction lacking the *me-* prefix + nasalization. It is difficult to decide which is meant here (see the discussion above). The difference in meaning between the two is slight, the translation in either case being 'We wait for the tram from Kota.'

Line 15 opens with the interjection *Ah.* The sequence *hati mati dalam malam ada doa* is open to two different interpretations, depending on what function is ascribed to the word *ada* in this construction, as follows:

a. *Ada* may mean 'to be', 'there is'; *hati mati* should then be taken as a sort of vocative after *Ah,* so that the translation of line 15 would be 'Ah, dead heart(s), there is a prayer in the night'.

b. *Ada* may also function as a Predicate word meaning 'to have', 'to possess', e.g. (8) *Raju dan pelupa / Aku ada! Pilih sadja! /* ('Flattery

and oblivion / I have both! Just choose! /'). In that case *hati mati* would be the S of *ada,* while *dalam malam* again is a LAu; the translation of line 15 would then be 'Ah, dead heart(s) has (have) a prayer in the night'. An alternative interpretation, yielding the same ultimate result, would be by taking the sentence as a segmented construction with omission of *-nja* (*doanja*), thus 'dead heart(s) in the night has (have) its (their) prayer' (lit. 'there are prayers of them').

Grammatically, both interpretations are equally plausible. However, we tend to favour the second alternative, as it is probable that *hati* is connected with the *kami* of the preceding line, thus actually being '*our* dead hearts' [54].

Line 16 poses no problems as far as the grammatical analysis is concerned. *Bagi* is a Pe meaning 'for', 'on behalf of'. The *jang* without an antecedent introduces a nominalized group: 'he who . . . ', 'those who . . . '. *Batja* for *membatja* is a kind of form that has already been discussed. *Tulisan tanganku,* 'my handwriting', is the Pa of *batja,* 'to read', and *dalam tjinta mereka* is LAu. The literal translation of the line is therefore 'For those who read my handwriting in their love'. This line should most probably be connected with that immediately preceding, thus 'a prayer for those . . . '. The interpretation of this line is difficult, however. The main semantic problem is provided by *dalam tjinta mereka.* There is first of all the question of reference. At first sight it seems obvious that *mereka* should refer to the same persons as those referred to by the title and the first line, i.e. 'the others'. In this case there are two alternatives:

a. In view of *gelanggang bersenda* ('entertainment spots', line 3), *dalam tjinta mereka* can be assumed to refer to the erotic experiences of *mereka*; this assumption finds support in the reference to *sypilis,* 'syphilis', in line 17.

b. It may also be assumed that a non-redundant element has been eliminated here and that the possessive Pronoun has been used with an objective function (cf. *genetivus objectivus* in Latin), which in prose would have been expressed by a word like *pada,* e.g. *dalam tjinta pada mereka,* 'in love for them'; hence Raffel's interpretation '. . . what this hand writes, writes out of love for them' (Raffel, 1970:145). Such an objective use of Pronouns is rare in Indonesian, however.

There is another possibility with regard to *mereka. Mereka* here may

refer to people other than those understood in the first six lines (just as *kami* in line 7 should presumably be understood to be in opposition to the *mereka* of line 1). So whereas the first *mereka* refers to people who are opposed to *kami* (and *aku*), 'the others' of the present line — i.e. the *mereka* being referred to here (and later in line 21). — are the companions of *aku,* his sympathizers, 'those who read my handwriting'. The poetic advantage of this interpretation is obvious: at this point the speaker appeals to those who will read his writing with love, not with hatred, prejudice, indifference, or other similarly negative feelings, although the things he is going to say (of which he himself says *terimalah,* 'accept it', line 20) may be repulsive or disgusting to some ('syphilis', 'leprosy', and 'the sufferings caused by the atomic bomb', lines 17 and 18). We may perhaps go even further by assuming that all these sufferings are caused by the *mereka* of the first line, and that *aku* feels it this way, while in his heart sympathizing with the sufferings of his companions (line 21). However, the disadvantages of this interpretation can hardly be overlooked. The switching from one 'they' to another group of people, also referred to as 'they', is most confusing in a poem in which Pronouns play such a prominent role (as is also evident from the title!).

Lines 17 to 19 constitute the next syntactic unit. Again the grammatical analysis is fairly straightforward, though conversely the interpretation of these lines is again far from simple. Lines 17 and 18 form the A of an Agent-directed construction in which again the *me-* prefix of the Vt is omitted, viz.: *buktikan,* instead of *membuktikan. Kedaulatan kami bersama,* 'our joint sovereignty', is the Pa. The demonstrative Pronoun *ini* rounds off the A of lines 17 and 18 (this A continues on into line 18, where it is placed between brackets); literally *sedikit lagi* means 'a little more . . . '; here the word group functions as a TAu meaning 'a little later', 'shortly', 'soon', while the remainder of the sentence is P to *sypilis* and *kusta. Buktikan tanda* seems to be a stylistic error, in which two common expressions, namely *rupakan tanda,* 'to form the sign of', and *buktikan,* 'to prove', are mixed up together; 'prove the sign of' is strictly speaking a tautology. As a translation for these lines we would suggest '(17) May all syphilis and all leprosy (18) (Soon supplemented by the sufferings caused by the atomic bomb as well) (19) Be the token of our joint sovereignty'. The problem as regards the interpretation is whether *kami bersama* is the same as the above *kami,* or whether it also includes the *mereka* of line 16 (in which case the inclusive *kita* would perhaps have been more obvious).

Line 20 opens with the Imperative *terimalah,* meaning 'accept (it)!', followed by *duniaku,* 'my world', which is the Pa, and *antara jang menjaksikan bisa,* 'among those who bear witness to poison', which is an attributive phrase standing in apposition to *duniaku.* This latter interpretation assumes that the relative Pronoun *jang* has been omitted between *duniaku* and *antara . . .*, viz. *duniaku (jang) antara jang menjaksikan bisa.* Evidently the poet has avoided repetition of *jang* for poetic reasons. Even so, the construction is not very common. The only grammatically feasible alternative to our translation (which is taking *bisa* as a N meaning 'poison', in which meaning it is similarly used in poem no. *10*) would be by assuming *menjaksikan bisa* to be an inversion of *bisa menjaksikan* (since every line of this poem ends in *a*), and explaining *bisa* as 'can', although at that time this was still regarded as a colloquialism in BI. This use of *bisa* is by no means unlikely in Chairil Anwar's poetry (see e.g. poems no. *16, 25, 50,* and many others), however, and is most definitely not so in this poem, which teems with colloquialisms. The translation would then read 'Among those who can bear witness'. Should this be the case, we would have here an excellent example of poetic licence in the form of an unusual word order for the sake of final rhyme. If we prefer to translate line 20 as 'Accept my world (which is) among those who can bear witness to poison', our choice is based entirely on subjective criteria.

The last line is a Patient-directed construction in which *(a)ku* is prA, *kelam malam dan mereka,* 'the darkness of the night and them', is Pa (cf. Raffel, 1970:144 where *malam* has been omitted, viz. *kelam dan mereka*; see also note 54), *alami,* 'to experience', is Vt, and *dalam diriku,* 'within myself', is LAu (cf. Raffel, 1970:144, which reads *dalam hatiku*). The translation is: 'I experience the darkness of the night as well as them within myself.' Another alternative, though not very plausible grammatically, would be to take *mereka* as the S of a S-P sentence meaning 'I experience the darkness of the night, and they are within myself as well', instead of as the Pa of *kualami.* The difference in meaning from the former translation would be slight, however.

A possible translation of the entire poem is:

I GO ABOUT AMONG THEM

1 I go about among them after being forced to (,)
2 Changing shape on the sidewalk, I use their eyes
3 (and) tag along, visiting entertainment spots:
4 their acquired realities.

(the Capitol cinema is running an American film,
new tunes provide the rhythm they dance to)
We go home unafflicted by anything
Although Death in various forms is (our) neighbour
Gathered at the (tram) stop, we wait for the tram from Kota
That moves in the night like the tooth of time.
We, lame and crippled, negative also in promise
Just lean (our) dry bones against the street-lamps,
While the tumultuous years keep on talking.
The rain falls upon (us). We wait for the tram from Kota.
Ah, dead hearts have a prayer in the night
For those who, in their love, read my handwriting
May all syphilis and all leprosy
(Soon supplemented by the sufferings caused by the atomic bomb as well)
Be the token of our joint sovereignty
Accept my world (which is) among those who bear witness to poison
I experience the darkness of the night as well as them within myself.

(1949)

12. JANG TERAMPAS DAN JANG PUTUS

1 *Kelam dan angin lalu mempesiang diriku,*
2 *menggigir djuga ruang dimana dia jang kuingin,*
3 *Malam tambah merasuk, rimba djadi semati tugu*

4 *di Karet, di Karet (daerahku j.a.d.) sampai djuga deru angin*

5 *Aku berbenah dalam kamar, dalam diriku djika kau datang*
6 *dan aku bisa lagi lepaskan kisah baru padamu,*
7 *tapi kini hanja tangan jang bergerak lantang.*

8 *tubuhku diam dan sendiri, tjerita dan peristiwa berlalu beku*

(*1949*)

(Jassin, [3]1968:74)

The poem [55] consists of eight lines with the final rhyme following the pattern ABABCACA. Though the punctuation is elaborate, it is not as accurate as one would expect. The third line begins with a capital letter, despite the fact that it comes after a comma, and line 5 similarly begins with a capital letter without the preceding line ending with a full stop. Conversely, line 8, which follows a final full stop and forms a stanza by itself, does not begin with a capital letter. The title comprises two coordinate *jang*-groups, the first consisting of *jang* + a *ter-* form of a Vt (*jang terampas*), and the second of *jang* + Aj (*jang putus*), the complete title meaning 'those who (he who, that which) are (is) plundered (and) those who (he who, that which) are (is) broken', or 'The Ravaged and The Broken'.

The first line, ‡ *Kelam dan angin lalu mempesiang diriku,* /, comprises an Agent-directed construction in which *mempesiang* is Vt, and *diriku* is Pa. The multivalence of the word *lalu* makes this line syntactically ambiguous as it can be interpreted in two different ways:

a. *Lalu* is an Au qualifying *angin,* while *angin lalu* is coordinate with *kelam,* the phrase thus meaning 'darkness and the passing wind'.
b. *Lalu* may be an Av, so that the A is *kelam dan angin,* and *lalu* should be translated as 'then'.

The second alternative seems less likely than the first as *lalu* as an Av usually brings a second action in relation to an earlier one; in the present

case no preceding action can be implied from the context or the situation. An interesting morphological point is raised by the Vt *mempesiang.* The form is derived from the basic element *siang,* plus the transitive compound prefix *memper-,* which regularly would produce the derivative *mempersiang.* No explanation can be given for the absence of *-r-.* In everyday language the only verbal derivative of *siang* which is common is the *me-i* form with nasalization, thus *menjiangi,* usually meaning 'to clean (a garden)'. The meaning here is apparently figurative, being something like 'to weed out', 'to purify'.

The second line, */ menggigir djuga ruang dimana dia jang kuingin, /,* is ambiguous due to the morphological multivalence of the *me-* form which can be interpreted as either intransitive or transitive (cf. Nababan, 1966:185 ff.). This makes for more than one plausible grammatical interpretation:

a. If the *me-* prefixed Verb is intransitive, the sentence made up by this line is an inverted S-P sentence with *menggigir,* 'to shudder', as P, and *ruang,* 'room', as S. *Dimana* functions as a relative Pronoun referring back to *ruang* and meaning 'where', while at the same time functioning as P of the following S *dia* (= 3 rd. pers. sgl. personal Pronoun, 'he/she/it'). The Patient-directed construction *jang kuingin* with *jang* as Pa means 'the one I desire';

b. If the *me-* form is transitive, then *menggigir(kan)* would mean 'to make (one) shudder'. *Ruang* would then be the Pa and *kelam dan angin lalu* in the preceding line the implicit A.

In view of the context and of the fact that *menggigir* is listed only in the intransitive form in the dictionaries, the first alternative is preferable. The question of who is meant by *dia,* or whether this is the same person as the one referred to by the second person personal Pronoun in line 5 and line 6 is irrelevant at this point.

Line 3, */ Malam tambah merasuk, rimba djadi semati tugu //,* consists of two sentences, each with a S-P construction, viz.: (a) *Malam tambah merasuk,* with *malam,* 'the night', as S, and *merasuk,* 'to penetrate', as P, while *tambah* here is an Av meaning 'more' (cf. *tambah* in poem no. *20* and no. *64,* also note 37); and (b) *rimba djadi semati tugu,* with *rimba,* 'the woods', as S and *djadi semati tugu,* 'becomes as dead as a monument', as P. The latter is a regular, so-called comparative, *se-* form of an Aj (meaning 'as . . . as . . . '; cf. *setinggi itu* in poem no. *1*).

Line 4, *// di Karet, di Karet (daerahku j.a.d.) sampai djuga deru*

angin //, consists of an inverted S-P construction where *di Karet, di Karet* is LAu [56], *sampai djuga* is P, and *deru angin,* 'the howling of the wind', is S. The parenthesis *daerahku j.a.d.* further qualifies the LAu, meaning 'my future abode' (*j.a.d.* = *jang akan datang,* a common abbreviation for 'next', 'coming' in the sense of 'future'; cf. poem no. *64,* and note 49). The Av *djuga* means 'also'.

Line 5, // *Aku berbenah dalam kamar, dalam diriku djika kau datang* /, is a S-P construction plus LAu. Here *aku* is S, and *berbenah,* 'to tidy up', is P. The Au qualifying the Predicate consists of two LAu, namely *dalam kamar,* 'in the room', and *dalam diriku,* 'in myself', which are asyndetically coordinated, plus the conditional *djika kau datang,* 'if (or: in case) you (should) come' (cf. Nababan, 1966:186 ff.).

Line 6, / *dan aku bisa lagi lepaskan kisah baru padamu,* /, is connected to the preceding line by *dan. Dan* is used formally merely to coordinate words, phrases, Clauses, etc., meaning 'and'. It should perhaps be translated with a phrase giving greater emphasis, such as 'and then', 'so that', 'in order that', as *dan* often means more than simply 'and'. The construction is Agent-directed, *aku* being the A, *kisah baru,* 'new story', the Pa, *lepaskan,* 'to turn something loose', the Vt, and *padamu,* 'for you', a PeO. Here again Chairil Anwar uses the Vt form without *me-,* instead of the grammatically correct form *melepaskan.*

The Conjunction *tapi,* 'but', contrasts line 7, / *tapi hanja tangan jang bergerak lantang.* //, with the previous line, thus implying that instead of 'turning a new story loose' (line 6), 'only (my) hands are moving boldly' (line 7). *Lantang* is usually used in conjunction with *suara,* 'voice'; thus *suara lantang* means 'a shrill voice'. The construction is of a type we have encountered several times before, *jang* not being used to introduce an attributive phrase, as such an interpretation would leave us with a sentence construction that is unplausible; for 'but only boldly moving hands . . . ' would require a P, which is not available here. So we must conclude that there is a S-P relationship between *tangan* and the nominalized *jang*-group, the whole phrase thus meaning 'but it is only (my) hand which moves boldly'. This construction has the possibility of inversion, just as any other S-P construction, *jang bergerak lantang hanja tangan* being equally correct and normal Indonesian.

The last line, // *tubuhku diam dan sendiri, tjerita dan peristiwa berlalu beku* ♯, consists of two sentences, viz.: (a) *tubuhku diam dan sendiri,* where *tubuhku,* 'my body', is S, and *diam dan sendiri,* 'still and alone', is P; and (b) *tjerita dan peristiwa berlalu beku,* where *tjerita dan peristiwa,* 'narration and events', is S, and *berlalu beku* is P. *Berlalu*

means 'to pass', or 'past'; in traditional literature *berlalu* means 'to go', also 'to expire', i.e. more specifically, 'to die'. *Beku* means 'frozen', 'rigid'. With regard to the translation of this line we hesitate between the following possibilities:

a. 'narration and events pass by icily', and
b. 'narration and events are past, frozen'.

In the former case *beku* is taken as a kind of complement of *berlalu*; while in the latter case it is coordinated with *berlalu*. However, the resultant difference is probably rather one that arises in the English translation than a genuine linguistic difference in BI.

The translation of the whole poem is:

THE RAVAGED AND THE BROKEN

1 Darkness and the passing wind purify me
2 the room where the one I desire (is) shudders,
3 The night penetrating deeper, the woods as dead as a monument

4 at Karet, at Karet (my future abode) the howling of the wind also reaches

5 I'm tidying up in the room, in my heart in case you come
6 and then I can again turn a new story loose for you,
7 but now (it is) only (my) hands which are moving boldly.

8 my body (is) still and alone, narration and events are past, frozen

(1949)

13. DERAI-DERAI TJEMARA

1 *tjemara menderai sampai djauh,*
2 *terasa hari djadi akan malam,*
3 *ada beberapa dahan ditingkap merapuh,*
4 *dipukul angin jang terpendam.*

5 *aku sekarang orangnja bisa tahan,*
6 *sudah lama bukan kanak lagi,*
7 *tapi dulu memang ada suatu bahan,*
8 *jang bukan dasar perhitungan kini.*

9 *hidup hanja menunda kekalahan,*
10 *tambah djauh dari tjinta-sekolah-rendah,*
11 *dan tahu, ada jang tetap tidak diutjapkan,*
12 *sebelum pada achirnja kita menjerah.*

(1949)

(Jassin, [3]1968:75)

The poem [57] is divided into three stanzas, each consisting of four lines, with the final rhyme pattern ABAB, CDCD, CECE. There are no capitals at the beginning of lines, including those that come after a full stop and at the beginning of a stanza. Every line, except those at the end of a stanza, ends in a comma, which indicates that there is no enjambment here. The title means 'Whispering Pines'.

The first line, ‡ *tjemara menderai sampai djauh,* /, is a S-P sentence in which *tjemara,* 'the pine tree(s)', is S, and *menderai,* 'to whisper', is P. The Vi *menderai* is onomatopoeic, used also among other things for the twittering of birds, the rustling of leaves, and so on. *Sampai djauh,* 'into the distance', is PA.

The second line, / *terasa hari djadi akan malam,* /, confronts us with a problem which is no longer new to us — we found an exact parallel to this line in the poem *Kepada Pelukis Affandi,* line 6: *terasa mati kan datang merusak.* The alternatives are:

a. Regarding line 2 as a Patient-directed construction with an unspecified A, *terasa* thus meaning 'is felt . . . '; the Pa is then formed by the rest, i.e. *hari djadi akan malam,* 'the day will actually become night'; or

b. Taking this line as a S-P sentence of which *hari* is S, and the Predicate consists of two elements, viz. *terasa* (P_1) and *djadi akan malam* (P_2); of these, P_1 probably constitutes the principal element.

Both analyses produce the same translation: '(2) it feels as though day is in fact becoming night'.

The next syntactic unit is formed by the two concluding lines of the first stanza, */ ada beberapa dahan ditingkap merapuh, / dipukul angin jang terpendam. //*. This construction displays some interesting features. Theoretically, *ditingkap* could be the *di-* form of the Vt *meningkap,* meaning 'looking at something from a *tingkap* (= a tiny attic window)'. The possibility of the nominalized Predicate *jang terpendam,* 'that which is buried', being the Pa of the Patient-directed Verb *dipukul* ('to be struck by . . . ') is also strictly theoretical; *angin,* 'the wind', would then be the A of this construction.

Semantically, however, these possibilities do not make sense and the only grammatical analysis of line 3 which makes sense is by taking *beberapa dahan,* 'some branches', as S, *merapuh,* 'to be brittle', as P, and *ditingkap,* 'on the tiny window' (*di* here being Pe), as LAu; *ada* functions as a word introducing the indefinite S of the sentence here. The unusual order of *ditingkap merapuh* may well have been introduced for the sake of the rhyme. Another possibility is to regard *merapuh* as qualifying the *tingkap,* hence *ditingkap jang merapuh,* meaning 'on the crumbling tiny window'. For semantic reasons, especially with regard to the meaning of the next line (see below), we have to reject this interpretation, however. Line 4 should be interpreted as being made up of a Patient-directed construction, where *angin jang terpendam,* 'the wind that is buried', i.e. 'the unseen wind', is A, and *dipukul,* 'to be struck by . . . ' is Vt. Line 4 should thus be regarded as qualifying *dahan* of line 3 and, since it is not introduced by *jang,* as a loosely connected appositional phrase without a formal marker. The translation of the first stanza would thus be:

1 the pines whisper into the distance,
2 it feels as though day is in fact becoming night,
3 there are some brittle branches on the tiny window,
4 struck by an unseen wind.

The next syntactic unit is formed by the whole of the second stanza. It opens with *// aku sekarang orangnja bisa tahan, /* which constitutes a S-P sentence with two S elements, such as are frequently encountered in colloquial usage, e.g. *dia orangnja malas,* 'he/she/it, the person is lazy'. This line can thus be analysed as having *aku* as S_1, *orangnja* as S_2, *bisa tahan,* 'can endure', as P, and *sekarang,* 'now', as TAu.

Line 6, */ sudah lama bukan kanak lagi, /*, has *aku* of the preceding line as the implied S, *bukan kanak lagi,* 'no longer a child', as P, and *sudah lama,* 'for quite some time', again as TAu.

Lines 7 and 8, */ tapi dulu memang ada suatu bahan, / jang bukan dasar perhitungan kini. //*, are contrasted with the preceding statement, being introduced by *tapi.* Line 6 again poses the interesting, although by now familiar problem usually connected with *ada*:

a. *Ada* may be the P of line 7, with the colloquial meaning 'to have', 'to possess'. In that case *suatu bahan* 'something' is the complement of *ada,* while the implied S is *aku* of the preceding line. The translation would be '(7) but long ago (I) definitely had something, (8) which etc.';

b. *Ada* may have the same function as *ada* in line 3, which is that of introducing the indefinite S *suatu bahan*; thus the translation would be '(7) but long ago there was definitely something, (8) which etc.'.

In view of the context we prefer the first alternative for our translation, although the ultimate difference in meaning is slight.

Line 8 refers to the N in line 7, *jang* introducing an attributive phrase of a familiar type; *dasar perhitungan* literally means 'the basis of the calculation', but here means something like 'something (or: some material) which now (= *kini*) does not really enter into the calculation', i.e. 'something which now no longer essentially counts.' The translation of the second stanza is therefore:

5 now I (am the person who) can endure,
6 for quite some time (I've been) no longer a child,
7 but long ago (I) definitely had something,
8 which now no longer essentially counts.

The next syntactic unit is formed by line 9, *// hidup hanja menunda kekalahan, /*, which consists of an Agent-directed construction, where *hidup,* 'life', is the A, *menunda,* 'to postpone', is Vt, and *kekalahan,* 'defeat', is Pa.

In line 10, */ tambah djauh dari tjinta-sekolah-rendah, /*, the function of *tambah* is not quite clear. *Tambah* may be used to coordinate two Nouns (see, e.g., the discussion of poem no. *20*), but can also occur as an Av with the meaning of 'more' (see, e.g., poem no. *70*). If *tambah* is an Av here, then line 10 comprises a sentence with *hidup* of the

previous line as the implied S, thus meaning literally '(life) becomes more distant'. The remainder of line 10 forms the PeO and means 'from the love of school-days'. We might also consider the possibility of an implied S *aku* (or *kita*), however, hence: 'we become ever more distant . . . '. This is all the more likely in view of the following line.

Line 11, */ dan tahu, ada jang tetap tidak diutjapkan, /*, consists of two Clauses. The first is *dan tahu,* with *kita* (of line 12) as the implicit S, and *tahu,* 'to know', as P. The second comprises an *ada jang . . .* construction: 'there is something . . . '. *Jang* is Pa in a Patient-directed construction, meaning 'that remains untold'; the *ada*-Clause, though not formally subordinated, is semantically dependent on *tahu.*

The last line, */ sebelum pada achirnja kita menjerah.* ♯, is a subordinate Cl, in which *sebelum,* 'before', is a subordinating Conjunction, *pada achirnja,* 'in the end', 'finally', is TAu, *kita* is S, and *menjerah,* 'to surrender', 'to give up', is P.

The translation of the whole poem is:

WHISPERING PINES

1 the pines whisper into the distance,
2 it feels as though day is in fact becoming night,
3 there are some brittle branches on the tiny window,
4 struck by an unseen wind.

5 now I (am the person who) can endure,
6 for quite some time (I've been) no longer a child,
7 but long ago (I) definitely had something,
8 which now no longer essentially counts.

9 life only postpones defeat,
10 (we, or: it) become(s) ever more distant from the love of school-days,
11 and (we) know, there is something that remains untold,
12 before we finally surrender.

(1949)

CHAPTER III

CHAIRIL ANWAR'S LANGUAGE

1 PRELIMINARY REMARKS

From the discussion of some of Chairil Anwar's poems in the previous chapter it is clear that in many cases no unequivocal analysis is possible and that a number of sentences or sentence-like constructions are open to more than one grammatical interpretation. In many such cases we were able to make a more or less definite decision as to the correct interpretation of the poem or any of its parts on the basis either of the semantic combinability of the elements within sentences or of the broader linguistic context, or sometimes, though rarely so, with the aid of situational or other extralinguistic information which happened to be available, or by a combination of all these factors. Nevertheless, there were quite a few cases left in which we were unable to make a definite choice from two or more alternatives.

It seems useful, therefore, to give an outline of the different factors and stylistic elements giving rise to ambiguities in Chairil Anwar's poetry which make for difficulty of interpretation. Such an outline may be of help to us in trying to determine whether the difficulties encountered here are characteristic solely of Chairil Anwar's poetry, or whether they have something to do with the structure of the Indonesian language itself. This outline will also give us an opportunity to discuss in somewhat more detail the terminology and some of the concepts used thus far.

For our present purposes we have tried to restrict ourselves to the use of the terms 'ambiguity' and 'ambiguous' as a 'property of sentences' in the limited sense as defined by Kooy in his worthwhile and stimulating book on this subject (Kooy, 1971). Hence we have tried to avoid as much as possible the use of 'ambiguous' in the sense in which it is synonymous with such terms as 'obscure', 'polysemous', 'homonymous', etc. Ambiguity in the sense in which it is used here is thus a characteristic of sentences, or of linguistic constructs with sentence characteristics, or of sequences of sentences. This extended application is inevitable in view of the difficulties in delimitating sentences in Chairil Anwar's poems.

In this connection it should also be borne in mind that in poetry there may be certain specific factors making for ambiguity which are absent in ordinary language. Although these factors have already been partly discussed above (Chapter I, Prologue), we would add the following brief observations:

A. Poetry is written language, that is, language lacking the intonational characteristics which are an essential feature of spoken language (cf. Junus, 1970:65). On the one hand we are thus able to eschew a discussion of the difficult problem of the function of the phenomena of juncture and intonation in the avoidance of ambiguities in speech. On the other hand, it deprives us of the data for our analysis which may normally be provided by such phenomena. Amran Halim's investigations have shown how important such intonational features are for the analysis of Indonesian sentences (Halim, 1969). The indications given in the case of Chairil Anwar's poetry by punctuation, the use of capital letters, and the division of poems into stanzas and that of stanzas into lines are only poor substitutes for intonation; moreover, they are not always reliable.

B. Quite apart from the fundamental issue of how poetry should be interpreted and what role, if any, should be assigned to biographical, situational and other information, the simple fact arises that even if we admitted as much circumstantial evidence as possible in our analysis there is very little such information available for most of the poems. Our knowledge of the situation, which is of special importance even for the analysis of linguistic utterances in ordinary cases of linguistic use, here is in most cases a complete blank. Even in instances in which either the poem itself or its title or dedication contains references to persons or things outside the poem, such references are rarely of any direct relevance for the linguistic analysis.

C. We are unable, for the time being, to answer the question as to whether Chairil Anwar has purposely tried to create ambiguity in certain poems by making deliberate use of the abovementioned phenomena or by any other means. Of course it is not uncommon for poets to achieve some sort of intentional ambiguity (Empson, ²1961). In Indonesia, especially in Java, there are many examples of deliberate ambiguity in poetry, which is, moreover often used quite ingeniously (Slametmuljana, 1954). We should in any case be prepared for intentional ambiguity in Chairil Anwar's poetry in view of what we know of the great lengths he went to to exploit the linguistic means to the utmost (see Introduction, 'Biographical Data').

With these observations in mind we shall now proceed, on the basis of our analyses of Chairil Anwar's poems, to summarize the factors and stylistic elements which play a role in creating ambiguity in his poetry:

1. Homonymy: We are following Kooy's definition, describing a lexical element as homonymous 'where its different senses have no relevant components in common', such as in the English *bank* 'of a river' and *bank* as a 'place to deposit money' (Kooy, 1971:124). Some examples of such lexical elements in BI are *mereka* (which may mean 'they' or 'to invent', 'to imagine', 'to plan'; see Epilogue), *bisa* (which may mean 'poison' or 'to be able to'; see, e.g., the discussion of poem no. *69* in Chapter II), etc. It is worth noting, however, that such lexical homonymy plays only a minor role in creating ambiguity in Chairil Anwar's poetry [58].

2. Multivalence: This is a concept based on an observation in Uhlenbeck's study on Javanese word classes in which he points out that 'two *words* may have the same phonemic form and yet be distinguished from one another by their different possibilities of being combined with other words' (Uhlenbeck, 1953:330); in other words, such lexical elements have multivalence [59]. Two classes of multivalent words may be distinguished: (a) basic words such as *baru* (e.g., in poem no. *3*), *lalu* (e.g., in poem no. *70*), *benar* (e.g., in poem no. *1*), *sekali* (e.g., in poem no. *3*), etc.; and (b) affixed words, such as certain *ke-an* and *me-* derivatives (both will be discussed at greater length in the following paragraphs), certain *ter-* derivatives, such as *terapat* (see Epilogue), the *-an* forms, and *di-* derivatives (the last mentioned can be regarded as a border case, almost overlapping with homonymy — see, for example, the discussion of *direguk* in no. *32* or *ditingkap* in no. *71*).

We must immediately add, however, that the distinction between (1) and (2) is not always clear-cut (cf. Kooy, 1971:124 ff.). Whereas in respect of the examples given above we can say with relative certainty that *mereka* is a case of homonymy and *benar* a case of multivalence, we are not able to state with equal certainty that *dalam* (which may mean 'in' or 'deep'; see, e.g., the discussion of poem no. *3* in Chapter II) is a case either of homonymy or of multivalence.

3. Transposition without formal indication: One of the most important sources of ambiguity in Chairil Anwar's poetry is the frequency and ease with which he uses words belonging to one word class in places

where normally words of another class are used without giving them the formal characteristics of that class. One striking example of this is found in his poem no. *3*:

// Punah diatas menghamba /
/ Binasa diatas ditinda //

Such transposition by itself does not necessarily create ambiguity; in actual fact, it is a common characteristic of ordinary BI (see, e.g., the discussion of no. *3* in Chapter II). In quite a number of cases, however, and especially if this occurs in combination with any of the other features discussed in this outline, alternative analyses of sentences are quite possible. So we find Adjectives or even Verbs, for example, being used in nominal slots. An example of this in Chairil Anwar's poetry is *menanti* in poem no. *20* (see the discussion of this in Chapter II):

/ Tambah ini menanti djadi mentjekik /

4. Closely related to the above phenomenon, though not identical with it, is the phenomenon of BI containing groups of words which seem to belong to more than one word class, or perhaps more correctly, which display the specific characteristics of more than one word class (ambivalent words). The most obvious case is that of a number of words which seem to be primarily Adjectives, such as *ngeri, hidup, kuasa, terang,* etc., but which regularly admit of certain modes of nominal use. What we have here seems to be a sub-class of Adjectives having as sub-class characteristic this particular potentiality rather than individual cases of transposition. The practical effects of such sub-class ambivalence are not very different from those of transposition, and it may also give rise to syntactic ambiguity. Some examples from Chairil Anwar's poetry are:

14 */ Ngeri ini luka-terbuka sekali lagi terpandang //*
20 */ Tak satu kuasa melepas-renggut /*
33 *// terbajang terang dimata masa /*

(see the discussion of these poems in Chapter II)

In fact, the distinction between (2), (3), and (4) is not always clear-cut. Until an adequate description of word classes in BI becomes available, it will remain difficult to determine whether *sepi* in (*20*) *Sepi diluar* falls under (2), (3), or (4).

5. There are relatively few elements (words, morphemes) which

function as markers of phrases, word groups, etc., or which indicate that certain words belong together within a sentence. This may generally speaking be to some extent a typical shortcoming of BI as a written language, but in spoken BI it is more than compensated for by intonation and extralinguistic aids. In poetry, especially if punctuation is absent or it is unreliable, the effects of the absence of syntactic markers may be drastic. An additional difficulty in respect of Chairil Anwar's poetry is the tendency, whether or not intentional, of frequently omitting even those elements which are normally used as markers in written prose. The following factors — some of them characteristic of BI, others typical of Chairil Anwar's poetry — seem to be relevant in this connection:

a. A factor which is of great importance here is the lack of inflexion of Nouns, Adjectives and Verbs, and consequently of any kind of agreement such as between Subject and Predicate, or between Nouns and attributive Adjectives. This, in combination with other factors, often leaves us uncertain as to how words should be grouped.
b. BI makes sparing use of anaphoric Pronouns, especially of the third person personal Pronoun as Subject of a sentence; in this it differs markedly from, for instance, English. So the English translation of *Bapak saja belum ada. Masih sakit. Barangkali akan datang besok* is 'My father is not (t)here. He is still ill. Maybe he will come tomorrow'. In combination with other elements this is most apt to give rise to ambiguity, as it often does in Chairil Anwar's poetry, e.g.,

    68 // *Sepandjang djalan dia terkenang akan djadi satu* /
    / *atas puntjak tinggi sendiri* /
    / *berdjubah angin, dunia dibawah . . .* /,

    where *berdjubah angin* may refer to *puntjak,* 'peak', as well as to *dia,* 'he/she/it'.
c. BI lacks articles which often function in languages such as English, for example, as markers of nominal groups. In everyday Indonesian their function is partly fulfilled by the suffix *-nja* and by the Demonstratives *itu* and *ini,* which are always placed at the end of a nominal group. Some examples from Chairil Anwar's poetry are:

    31 / *Tuaknja tua, sedikit pula* /
    'The palm-wine is old (and it's) scarce too'
    46 / *Djuga dinegeri djauh itu surja tidak kembali?* ‡
    'Even in that far away country does the sun never go backward?'

33 / *bertukar rupa ini segera* //
'this immediately changes form'

However, probably for aesthetic reasons, Chairil Anwar rarely uses such elements with the function of articles. Moreover, as we have seen in the analyses of his poems (Chapter II), he often places *ini* and *itu* before the Noun elements (see further below, 3.1).

d. BI lacks an element such as the copula in Western languages. The problem which may be caused by the absence of copula is best illustrated by a sequence of the type *guru wanita,* which may be interpreted both as a Noun followed by a qualifying Noun, thus meaning '(the) woman teacher', and as an equational sentence '(the) teacher (is a) woman'. In speech, such features as intonation and juncture may indicate which of the two constructions is being used; in writing, however, both interpretations are equally plausible. The frequent use in written modern Indonesian of a word such as *adalah* as a copula, or rather, to be more precise, as a boundary marker between S and P, is not accidental. An example from Chairil Anwar's poetry is:

56 / *nasib adalah kesunjian masing-masing.* /
'fate is everybody's loneliness.'

However, this use of *adalah* is extremely rare in Chairil Anwar's poetry.

6. The rules of syntax in BI offer the user of the language a wide choice out of a range of alternative possibilities of word order and so on. Under certain circumstances, and in combination with any of the above-mentioned phenomena, such freedom may give rise to ambiguity. Here again, Chairil Anwar, without overstepping the boundaries of the language, sometimes stretches them a little further than usual. Two points deserve special mention in this connection:

a. There is the possibility of inversion, especially in sentences basically consisting of two elements (= Type II; see Chapter I, Section 3). Such inversion is a common phenomenon in BI; in spoken language it is accompanied by intonational characteristics which usually prevent such sentences from becoming ambiguous. In poetry, inversion in combination with any of the other stylistic elements discussed in this section, sometimes makes for ambiguity (for examples, see the discussion of the *me-* forms below).

b. Indonesian offers much scope for the use of segmented sentences with a concatenation of phrases, often without formal indications as to subordination or coordination. In certain cases this gives rise to ambiguities, especially where the absence of punctuation prevents us from determining where sentences begin or end. Chairil Anwar seems to have had a preference for such loosely connected phrases, such as, e.g.,

18 */ Ah! tertjebar rasanja diri / Membubung tinggi*
atas kini / Sedjenak / Sadja . . . /
50 */ . . . Ada djuga kelepak elang / menjinggung muram,*
desir hari lari berenang / menemu budjuk pangkal
akanan . . . /
69 */ . . . , aku pakai mata mereka / pergi ikut mengundjungi*
gelanggang bersenda: /

(see the discussion of these poems in Chapter II).

7. A final factor which may lead to ambiguity can be subsumed under the heading poetic licence. There are obvious instances of Chairil Anwar's taking licences of which normal BI does not seem to admit, although some of his stylistic peculiarities may coincide with colloquial or Djakarta Malay. But the very fact that such obvious instances occur should make us aware that there may be yet other instances of poetic licence which are not so easily discovered because the sentence in which they occur may admit of an interpretation in accordance with which it has kept just within the boundaries of the rules of ordinary usage. Some points which should be mentioned specifically in this regard are:

a. The use of *ini* and *itu* (see 3.1. below);
b. The omission of *jang* (see 3.2. below);
c. Deviations from the normal word order for the sake of final rhyme, as can be seen in, e.g.,

49 */ Dan tawa gila pada whisky tertjermin tenang. //* [60]
58 */ Sekali ini aku terlalu sangat dapat djawab kepingin: /* [61]

d. The use of transitive verbal base instead of *me-* prefixed forms, especially in his later poems. Note the following example:

(1) */ Terkumpul dihalte, kami tunggu trem dari kota /* (*69*)

Going strictly by the formal presentation and basing ourselves on the rules of Balai Pustaka Malay, we must assume that *kami tunggu*

trem represents a Patient-directed construction of the prA + Vt-Pa pattern, parallel to (*13*) *Kusérét ia.* However, in view of the poet's practice of replacing *me-* forms with bases in certain cases, especially in his later poems (against the rules of traditional grammar), the possibility that the above construction is intended as a variant of the Agent-directed construction cannot be excluded. In this particular instance the semantic difference between *kami tunggu trem* and *kami menunggu trem* is slight, so that here the syntactic ambiguity has no consequences for the interpretation of the poem. In other comparable cases the situation is different, however, as in:

(2) */ Sandarkan tulang belulang pada lampu djalan sadja, /* (*69*)
(3) */ Peluk kutjup perempuan, tinggalkan kalau meraju, /* (*55*)

At first sight (2) and (3) would seem to contain Patient-directed constructions, consisting of verbal bases, both with the transitive suffix *-kan* (*sandarkan, tinggalkan*) and without (*peluk, kutjup*), plus Pa. This impression is false, since the context of (2) reveals that an Agent (in this case *kami,* 'we') is to be inferred from an earlier statement (see the discussion of poem no. *69*); hence (2) represents a construction comparable with (1), consisting in this case most probably of a colloquial use of the transitive verbal base instead of the *me-* form, while (3) represents a construction with a Patient-directed imperative of a transitive Verb.

e. The loose expansion of syntactic structures without any formal indication, e.g.,

18 */ Ah! tertjebar rasanja diri / Membubung tinggi*
atas kini / Sedjenak / Sadja . . . /

69 */ pergi ikut mengundjungi gelanggang bersenda: /*

(For a discussion of these lines see Chapter II).

f. Transposition without formal indication, e.g., *halus rapuh* in poem no. *18* (see the analysis of this poem in the preceding chapter). Although it is not uncommon in BI (see ad 3 above), Chairil Anwar seems to use this whenever he sees fit to, sometimes stretching the limits of normal BI usage, and sometimes creating ambiguity for the reader, e.g.,

36 *// . . . malam dalam mendoa tiba /*
50 */ . . . dalam mempertjaja mau berpaut //*

For a discussion of the latter example the reader is referred to Chapter II. The example from no. *36* is similar to it, *mendoa* (which is formally a verbal form derived from the Noun *doa,* 'prayer', to which the prefix *me-* has been added) acquiring a nominal function as a result of the occurrence of the Preposition *dalam,* 'in', before it (for the nominal use of Adjectives see further Section 2.1. ad 3 of this chapter).

g. The expressionistic use of basic forms without any clear syntactic relevance (especially in some of his earlier poems). An excellent example of this is furnished by poem no. *32*.

It can be assumed *a priori* — while this becomes obvious from the discussion of Chairil Anwar's poems in the preceding chapter — that ambiguity is most often occasioned by a combination of two or more of the factors indicated above. But it is irrelevant to go into the problem of distinguishing the different kinds and types of ambiguity, such as inherent or non-inherent, type and token, and lexical and grammatical ambiguity, within the framework of the present book (cf. Kooy, 1971). It would seem of greater pertinence for this study, which is concerned more specifically with BI as a vehicle for modern poetry, to discuss in more detail some of the characteristics of this language and Chairil Anwar's use of it.

2 MORPHOLOGICAL MULTIVALENCE

2.1 *KE-AN* FORMS DERIVED FROM ADJECTIVES AND THE NOMINAL USE OF ADJECTIVES

In the discussion of the poem *Kepada Pelukis Affandi* (Chapter II) we discussed briefly some *ke-an* forms (p. 78). Leaving aside other *ke-an* forms in BI, we shall here go at somewhat greater length into the problems presented by these particular forms and the related problem of the nominal use of Adjectives in their basic form.

Ke-an derivations from Adjectives (including words usually translated into European languages as intransitive Verbs) are frequently found. They are of two different kinds:

A. Those possessing a verbal character, e.g.,

9 / *kekebalan terhadap debu dan nafsu.* /
'(Having become) immune to dust and desire.'

12 / *satu tak kehilangan lain dalamnja.* /
'the one won't lose the other in it.'
43 / *ketjemasan derita, ketjemasan mimpi;* /
'(I am) troubled by suffering, (I am) troubled by dreams;'

B. Those possessing a nominal character, e.g.,

7 / *Ditjekik kesunjian kamarnja* //
'Choked by the silence of his room'
9 / *dengan ketenangan selama bersatu* /
'with the tranquility during union'
47 / *Dalam diriku terbudjur keinginan,* /
'Desire is stretched within me,'
69 / *kenjataan-kenjataan jang didapatnja.* /
'the reality that they have acquired.'

There are other examples of this type of use, but the above should suffice for our present purpose.

In Chairil Anwar's poetry the Adjective-derived type of *ke-an* form often occurs, posing problems of ambiguity, both in the poems we have discussed, e.g., *kematian* (no. *1*), *kepertjajaan* (no. *3*), and *ketjemasan* (no. *43*), and in others not discussed by us, e.g., *kesedaran* (no. *37*), *kebuntuan* (no. *53*), *keenakan* (no. *59*), and others.

In prose the use of Adjective-derived *ke-an* forms as Nouns (such as case B, above) is extremely frequent; however, Chairil Anwar often uses Adjectives in their basic form rather than in the *ke-an* form as Nouns. This he achieves by simply placing Adjectives in syntactic slots where usually Nouns (or Pronouns) are found. He is encouraged in doing so partly by the structure of the language itself, since in BI there are a number of Adjectives with nominal characterictics, thus belonging to both word classes, e.g., *luas, sepi, kuasa,* etc. (see Section 1 ad 4). However, Chairil Anwar stretches this possibility far beyond common BI usage. The following instances of the use of Adjectives in nominal slots can be observed:

1. In N-N' sequences, the N' determining the N (of the type *angin malam,* 'night wind', or *pintu rumah,* 'house door'), Adjectives are placed in the position of the principal word of the construction, e.g. (*35*) *Harum rambutmu,* 'The sweetness of your hair'. This is also seen to be the case where the construction forms part of a prepositional Clause, e.g.

35 / *Dihitam matamu kembang mawar dan melati* /
'In the blackness of your eyes (there are) roses and jasmine'
47 / . . . , *hanja mati dibeku udara.* /
'. . . , only death (is) in the chill of the air.' [62]
48 // *Dalam sunji malam ganggang menari* /
'In the stillness of the night the seaweed dances'

There is one special case of such a N-N' construction itself being used as modifier of a third Noun (of the type *warna pintu rumah,* 'the colour of the house door'), e.g. (*64*) *Kederasan ramai kota,* 'The hecticness of the city bustle'.

2. In constructions in which a demonstrative Pronoun (*ini* or *itu*) marks a nominal slot. This is a very common practice, and Chairil Anwar often uses Adjectives in this manner. Now we have seen that, flying in the face of the rules of BI grammar, he often places *ini* and *itu* before the Noun. He uses Adjectives (in their basic form) even in this colloquial type of construction, e.g.

20 / *Ini sepi terus ada* . . . ‡
'This stillness remains . . . '
24 / *Ini renggang terus terapat* ‡
'This rift is immediately closed'

For a further discussion of *ini* and *itu* see 3.1. below.

3. Adjectives are also used in nominal slots without any modifying elements as S of sentences consisting of basically two elements, or as A or Pa in sentences consisting of basically three elements (for the different sentence types see Chapter I, Section 3). Some examples from Chairil Anwar's poetry are

3 // *Punah diatas menghamba/Binasa diatas ditinda* //
'Rather destruction than slavery / Rather annihilation than oppression'
20 ‡ . . . *Sepi menekan-mendesak.* /
'. . . Stillness squeezes (and) pushes.'
24 // *Gundul diselimuti tebal* /
'Baldness is covered by denseness'

(for the latter example see the Epilogue)

It is obvious that this 'liberal' use of Adjectives in non-adjectival slots, sometimes without any morphological or syntactic indications, will in certain cases give rise to grammatical and semantic ambiguities. There are instances of some such cases in our analysis of some of Chairil Anwar's poems in the preceding chapter, e.g.

18 /... Halus rapuh ini djalinan kenang /
33 // terbajang terang dimata masa /

In these cases we must consider the possibility of *halus rapuh* and *terang* being instances of the nominal use of Adjectives without the accompanying formal characteristics, though we have no means of either confirming or refuting such an interpretation [63].

In ordinary prose nominalization in cases such as the above would be characterized by either *ke-an* or *-nja*. The affixes *ke-an* have been discussed above. As for *-nja,* it is interesting to note that Chairil Anwar avoids its use for this purpose as much as possible, although the use of *-nja* for the purpose of forming Nouns is a wholly productive procedure (Teeuw, 1962:414). In many cases the addition of *-nja* would have prevented ambiguity, e.g.

18a. *Halus(-)rapuhnja ini djalinan kenang*
33a. *terbajang terangnja dimata masa* [64]

2.2 *ME*-FORMS

In Section 3 of Chapter I we distinguished two types of *me-* form that may be derived from Verbal bases, from Nouns, and from Adjectives:

A. *Transitive me- forms*:
1. Based on Verbs, e.g. *melihat,* 'to see'.
2. Based on Nouns, e.g. *menjapu,* 'to sweep', from *sapu,* 'broom'.
3. Based on Adjectives, e.g. *merusak(kan)*, 'to destroy', from *rusak,* 'damaged, broken, destroyed'.

B. *Intransitive me- forms*:
1. Based on Verbs, e.g. *menjanji,* 'to sing'.
2. Based on Adjectives, e.g. *meninggi,* 'to rise high', from *tinggi,* 'high'.
3. Based on Nouns, e.g. *melangkah,* 'to step', from *langkah,* 'step'.

The majority of the *me-* forms derived from Nouns and Adjectives are of this intransitive type.

To the above types we may add the following:

C. Quite often transitive forms are created by adding the suffix *-kan* or *-i* to the intransitive form, e.g.

menjanji (Vi)	*menjanjikan lagu,* 'to sing a song'.
melangkah (Vi)	*melangkahkan kaki,* 'to (make a) step (with) the foot'.
	melangkahi parit, 'to (make a) step (over) a ditch'.
melangkan (Vi)	*meninggikan kursi,* 'to (make) a chair higher'.

D. Sometimes a form with the prefix *per-* occurs as a transitive form alongside the above form with the suffix *-kan,* e.g. *mempertjepat - mentjepatkan,* 'to hasten, to quicken' [65].

All these forms which occur in normal BI can also be found in Chairil Anwar's language, e.g.

A1 *// Dan duka djuga menengadah/Melihat gajamu . . . / (38)*
A2 */ . . . angin terasa / Lalu menderu menjapu awan / (37)*
A3 */ mati kan datang merusak. // (43)*
B1 *♯ Sepi menjanji, . . . / (35)*
B2 */ Aku melangkah kedepan . . . / (60)*
B3 *// Suaranja pergi terus meninggi, / (46)*
C *♯ Melangkahkan aku bukan tuak menggelegak / (23)*
D *// Gerimis mempertjepat kelam . . . / (50)*

Especially with regard to the use of *me-* forms in Chairil Anwar's poetry the following should be noted:

E1. The poet frequently uses certain *me-* forms transitively, especially those derived from Adjectives and Nouns, where normal BI would require a form with *-kan* (or *-i*), or *-per-*; cases where no ambiguity results are, e.g.:

36 / Hudjan menebal djendela. //
65 / Kita terapit, tjintaku / — mengetjil diri, . . . /
25 // Ini ruang/Gelanggang kami berperang // Binasa-membinasa/

In these cases no ambiguity ensues because of the syntax. The three elements A-Vt-Pa are explicitly present, or, as in the case of no. *25,* the typically reciprocal construction of *binasa-membinasa* compels us to interpret *membinasa* as *membinasakan.*

E2. The form *menebal* (no. *36*) is especially interesting since in another instance the same form is used clearly (and in accordance with common usage) as an intransitive Verb, e.g.

26 // *Segala menebal, segala mengental* /
'Everything thickens, everything congeals'

E3. Other examples where the complete syntactic pattern A-Vt-Pa excludes ambiguity are:

21 / *Hudjan mengutjur badan.* //
37 / *Kita mengajun pedang ke Dunia Terang!* ‡
62 / *Ina Mia menekan tapak dihidjau rumput,* /

E4. Analogous to such cases are the *me-* forms of which the transitiveness is implicit, that is, where the Pa element is not explicitly mentioned, e.g.

7 // *Ia membentji . . .* /
47 ‡ *Aku menjeru — tapi tidak satu suara* / *membalas, . . .* /

In (7) the Pa element is not explicit, the sentence meaning 'He hates.' However, the context of the poem reveals that the Pa of the Vt *membentji,* 'to hate', is to be inferred from the sentence immediately following it, which is *Dirinja dari segala,* meaning 'Himself among all'. The translation of (*47*) is 'I shouted — but not one voice answered'; the Pa of the transitive Verb *membalas,* 'to answer', is similarly by inference *aku,* or 'me'.

E5. However, constructions such as E4 may develop into border-line cases such as, e.g.:

(1) *Sepi memagut* (*20*)
(2) *Sepi menjanji* (*35*),

where the Vt in the Agent-directed construction (1) is used without an explicit Pa, while (2) represents a S-P sentence with a Vi; in practice, however, the one cannot be distinguished from the other. In the analysis in Chapter II we have seen that Chairil Anwar frequently applies constructions such as (1) above, e.g. in nos. *3, 14, 18, 20, 25, 69,* as well as in other poems not discussed here, e.g. nos. *6, 7, 11, 21, 22, 37, 49, 51, 57,* and many others. In cases such as (1), where the V is understood as a Vt by the native speaker, the context will often make clear who or what should be understood as Pa or indicate whether such a *me-* form is being used without an implicit Pa. However, in other cases the situation is different, as set out below:

F1. In cases where the *me-* form is a derivative of a Noun or an Adjective, so that potentially it may be either a Vt or a Vi, the context

may be inadequate in helping us determine whether we are dealing with a Vt or a Vi, especially if according to the analysis the sentence can be regarded as a case of inversion. In such a case ambiguity will inevitably result, e.g.:

(1) *Melajang ingatan* (*14*)
(2) *Membusuk rabu terasa didada* (*32*)

(1) is a clear case of an inverted sentence with a Vi, since there is no alternative possibility; however, (2) may be regarded both as a similar case to (1), i.e. a *me-* form derived from the Adjective *busuk* possessing an intransitive character, and as an Agent-directed construction lacking the A and the suffix *-kan,* which in prose would be essential for a transitive Verb (comparable with E1-E4). As we have seen in the analysis of the poem (Chapter II), no definite choice between these two alternatives is possible. In other words, sentence constructions consisting basically of a *me-* form, especially when this is derived from a N or an Aj, followed by N, or Pr, or any other element that can function as such, may be analysed either as a Vt followed by a Pa, or as a Vi followed by a S. Such constructions are structurally ambiguous. Comparable cases to (2) above are, e.g.:

(3) *mengutjur darah* (*33*)
(4) *mengatup luka* (*33*)
(5) *menggigir djuga ruang* (*70*),

in which ambiguity is occasioned partly by the circumstance that in BI the S of a sentence is very often implied instead of being mentioned explicitly (see preceding Section, ad 5b). The reader is thus left with a choice out of several alternatives which are all grammatically possible (see Chapter II for the analysis of the above cases).

F2. Needless to say, in certain poems such factors as verse structure, assonance, rhyme, etc. may have influenced the poet's choice. If, however, there are other factors which make for ambiguity occurring in combination with multivalent *me-* forms, the interpretation becomes more difficult still. The following examples may illustrate this point more clearly:

6 ♯ *Ida / Menembus sudah tjaja / Udara tebal kabut /*
Katja hitam lumut / Petjah pentjar sekarang /
11 */ Pagi ini menjinar lain masa //*
32 ♯ *Ratjun berada direguk pertama / Membusuk rabu terasa didada /.*

In (*6*) the main problem arises from the word order of the second and third lines, which suggest a *me*Vt-N_1-N_2 sequence (Chapter I, Section 3, p. 21). Raffel, for instance, apparently has taken *tjaja* to be the A of *menembus* and has understood *udara tebal kabut* as its Pa, judging by his translation, viz. '(1) Ida (2) The sun has pushed through (3) The air that's thick with fog, (4) The mouldly black mirror (5) Has cracked and blown away.' (Raffel, 1970:13). However, it is also possible to regard line 3 not as a Pa of line 2, but rather as S (together with line 4) of the Predicate in line 5. In any case it seems quite plausible to assume that line 2 represents a complete, inverted S-P construction, whereas the following line forms the next syntactic unit, hence the translation '(1) Ida (2) The sun has pushed through. (3) The air (that's) thick with fog (4) (And) The mouldy black mirror (5) Have now cracked and blown away'. For a comparable instance of the use of the Vt *menembus* without Pa the reader is referred to the following line from no. *22*: *Biar surja 'kan menembus oleh malam diperisai,* 'Although the sun will push through (it) is shielded (here: hidden) by the night'. A regular instance of N_1-*me*Vt-N_2 with *menembus* is found in no. *30*: *Ini malam purnama akan menembus awan,* 'Tonight the moon will break through the clouds.'

(*11*) can be interpreted in two or even three different ways, viz.: (a) as an inverted S-P sentence preceded by the TAu *Pagi ini,* so that the translation would be 'This morning another era (or: time, phase) shines'; (b) as an Agent-directed construction in which the *me-* form without *-kan* is used instead of the transitive *menjinarkan,* suggesting the translation 'This morning radiates another era (or: time, phase)', on the assumption, however, that *pagi ini* is not a TAu but an Agent, which is of course perfectly possible since *pagi* is a Noun; and (c) as an Agent-directed construction in which the *me-* form without *-i* is used instead of the transitive *menjinari* (comparable to example E3, no. *21,* above), thus resulting in the translation 'The morning shines upon another era (or: time, phase)'. The ambiguity of this sentence is caused not only by the multivalence of the *me-* form, but also by the fact that Nouns indicating time and place can be used as principal words in TAu and LAu respectively without any preceding Preposition.

Of the above examples the analysis of (*32*) is probably the most difficult. In Chapter II we have described the case in point in full detail.

It is apparent from the above that when dubious *me-* forms occur in sentences which can be interpreted at least formally as possessing the basic structure of a nominal Subject plus a Predicate consisting of a

me- prefixed Vi (especially of the inverted type — see type IIB in Chapter I, Section 3), ambiguity may easily become a property of the sentence. As is clear from the examples, ambiguity is created especially in the case of *me-* forms derived from N and/or Aj, since they are potentially transitive as well as intransitive.

3 POETIC LICENCE AS A SOURCE OF AMBIGUITY

3.1 THE USE OF THE DEMONSTRATIVES *INI* AND *ITU*

In ordinary BI *ini* and *itu* are Demonstratives following a N (meaning 'this' and 'that' respectively). If other determinants follow the Noun the Demonstrative always comes as the last determinant at the end of such a nominal Clause, e.g. *orang tua jang kemarin datang i t u meninggal,* 'that old man who came here yesterday is dead'. Consequently they often function as boundary markers, losing their demonstrative value and functioning as some kind of a definite article. Because of the fact that they demarcate a nominal Clause they can also function as a means of turning a non-Noun into a Noun, e.g. *menanti itu mendjemukan,* 'Waiting is boring'.

There are many instances of Chairil Anwar using Demonstratives in their ordinary function, e.g.:

3 ‡ *Dimasa pembangunan ini* /
'In this time of building'
10 // *Tak perlu sedu sedan itu* //
'That sobbing is not necessary'
22 // *Terlalu kita minta pada malam ini.* //
'We've been asking too much from this night.'
44 / *mengikut djuga bajangan itu?* ‡
'is that shadow following?'

A variation of this use is found in the colloquial reduplicated form *itu-itu*:

18 / *Diantara djeridji itu itu sadja* /
'Between these very same trellises'

Although on the whole Chairil Anwar uses *ini* and *itu* not infrequently in his work, he uses them much less so than is the case in written prose. In the whole body of his (original) poetic works *itu* occurs only nineteen times (including the two occurrences in the colloquial *itu-itu*), and *ini* forty-one times. An interesting feature of Chairil

Anwar's language is that he conforms with ordinary BI usage by placing *itu* as a boundary marker in its usual position after the qualifying element(s) following a Noun (except in poem no. *33*), while violating standard usage in his use of *ini,* which in the great majority of cases he places before the N, e.g. in (*3*) *Ini barisan,* meaning 'This column' (whereas in standard BI it means 'This is a column'). However, in spoken Djakartan this placing of the Demonstratives *ini* and *itu* before the word they qualify is quite common. As we have seen in the analyses of some of his poems, there are many examples in Chairil Anwar's poetry of such colloquial use. To those already discussed the following may be added:

6 / *Kita djalani ini djalan* //
'We walk this road'
16 / *Ini dunia enggan disapa,* . . . /
'This world is reluctant to be addressed, . . . '
30 / *Ini malam purnama akan menembus awan.* ♯
'This night (or: Tonight) the moon will break through the clouds.'

Moreover, he also uses this construction for nominalizing Verbs, Adjectives, etc., as is done in ordinary BI with post-placed *ini* and *itu,* e.g.:

20 / *Tambah ini menanti djadi mentjekik* /
20 / *Ini sepi terus ada* . . . ♯
24 / *Ini renggang terus terapat* ♯

(for the discussion of the first two lines see Chapter II;
for the third line the reader is referred to the Epilogue).

It is clear that this deviation from ordinary BI may in some cases give rise to syntactic ambiguities. One particular source of such ambiguity may be uncertainty as to whether a pre-placed *ini* or *itu* is attributive, or whether in such a case a S-P sentence is intended. Difficulties of this type are not uncommon, especially if the remainder of the sentence contains other ambiguous element(s). Some examples are:

8 / *Ini batu baru tertjampung dalam gelita* /
20 / *Tambah ini menanti djadi mentjekik* /
25 // *Ini ruang/Gelanggang kami berperang* //.

Ini batu can be interpreted both as (a) 'This is a stone', and as (b) 'This stone'. *Baru,* being a multivalent word, may be translated

as either 'new' or 'just' (see Section 1). It is clear that the analysis of (*8*) above will reveal several alternatives as a result of the concatenation of more than one ambiguous element in the sentence. Semantic and/or contextual information may in such cases be inconclusive in suggesting a correct interpretation. Numbers (*20*) and (*25*) have been discussed in the preceding chapter.

3.2 THE OMISSION OF *JANG*

Jang has, among other things, the function of making constructions or parts of speech other than Nouns nominal. *Jang*-constructions are often used in apposition to Nouns (e.g. line 7 in poem no. *14*; see Chapter II), and the extent of the group following *jang* may vary from a single Adjective to complete sentences with *jang* acting either as S in a S-P construction, as A in respect of a *me-* form of a Vt, or as Pa in a Patient-directed construction of a Vt, e.g.

> *Orang jang sakit itu tidur,* '(the) man, (the) sick one, is sleeping (or: sleeps, slept, etc.)'. (In practice this construction here means 'the sick man is sleeping (or: sleeps, slept, etc.)', with a slight additional emphasis on *sakit* as compared with *orang sakit itu tidur.*
>
> *Orang jang kemarin datang itu guru saja*
> 'The man who came yesterday is my teacher'
>
> *Anak jang membatja buku itu radjin*
> 'The child who is reading a book is diligent'
>
> *Buku jang dibatja anak itu bagus*
> 'The book which is being read by the child is good'

In all the above cases except the first *jang* is compulsory. All of these *jang*-constructions can also occur without the preceding Noun:

> *Jang sakit itu tidur,* 'The sick person is asleep'.
> *Jang kemarin datang itu guru saja,* '(The person) Who came yesterday is my teacher'.
> *Jang membatja buku itu radjin,* '(The one) Who is reading the book is diligent'.
> *Jang dibatja anak itu bagus,* '(The book) Which is being read by the child is good'.

These various constructions in which *jang* is used in accordance with normal BI usage can also be found in Chairil Anwar's poetry, e.g.:

53 ǂ... *Jang hidup dalam diri* /
'... What is living in me'
69 / *Bagi jang batja tulisan tanganku ...* /
'For those who read my handwriting ...'
72 / *jang mengharap dan jang melepas.* //
'those who hope and those who let go.'

A striking feature of his language in this respect is his frequent omission of *jang* in places where it would normally be required in prose, e.g.:

7a. *(Jang) Satu tak kehilangan (jang) lain dalamnja*
'The one won't lose the other in it'
25a. *(Jang) Satu menista (jang) lain gila*
'The one cursing, the other mad'
48a. *Siapa (jang) mendekat*
'Whoever comes near'
57a. *Apa (jang) tinggal djadi tanda mata?*
'What is left as a reminder?'

Here, again, it is obvious that deviation from ordinary usage may sometimes lead to ambiguity, e.g.:

1a. *Keridlaanmu menerima segala (jang) tiba*
23a. *(Jang) Melangkahkan aku bukan tuak menggelegak.*

We have already discussed in the Prologue (Chapter I) (cf. Raffel's translation of this poem in Raffel, 1970:3) ambiguity as a property of the printed version of poem no. (*1*) as a result of the omission of *jang* in the line: *Keridlaanmu menerima segala tiba.* The omission of *jang* in its nominalizing function in the printed text of (*23*) has misled Raffel into translating it as 'I don't move along like bubbling palm-wine' (Raffel, 1970:47), instead of 'That which made me step (forward) was not the bubbling palm-wine'.

4 COLLOQUIALISM

The use of colloquialisms by Chairil Anwar in his poems both requires and merits a separate study. Within the scope of the present book we must confine ourselves to the following remarks, however.

It is obvious that in many cases Chairil Anwar has used both lexical and grammatical elements which were not generally accepted or used in the written form of standard BI at that time. Words such as *kasi* (meaning 'to give', in no. *60*), *bikin* (meaning 'to make', in nos. *47, 48, 49, 58* and *60*), *bisa* (meaning 'to be able to', in nos. *57, 65, 67, 70* and *71*), *buat* (meaning 'for', in nos. *26, 42, 46, 51, 54, 65* and *68*), *punja* (to denote explicitly a possessive relationship, in nos. *12, 21, 26, 48, 57* and *72*), and many others are typical of colloquial speech in the Djakarta area. Grammatical deviations from standard Balai Pustaka Malay are, for example, the use of *itu* and especially of *ini* preceding the Noun (or nominal construct; see 3.1 above), the use of *noléh* instead of *menoléh* in no. *14, njesak* instead of *menjesak* in no. *18, djalan* in *kami djalan* (no. *21*) or in *waktu djalan* (no. *63*) instead of *kami berdjalan* and *waktu berdjalan,* respectively, *gelandangan* instead of *bergelandang* in no. *57,* and so on.

The question that arises in the present context is whether this use of colloquialisms, as a form of poetic licence, gave rise to ambiguity or contributed towards the creation of ambiguities. There are not many obvious cases of this happening, however. *Sama* may be a clear case of lexical ambiguity arising from confusion as regards the use of BI vs. Djakartanese (see Epilogue). The use of *ini* and *itu* has already been discussed in some detail above. Another case of ambiguity that can be regarded at least as grammatical ambiguity, which occurs not infrequently in the later poems, is constituted by the use of non-nasalized, non-*me*-prefixed transitive Verbs such as *pakai, tunggu,* and many others in poem no. *69*. In these cases it is not certain whether the constructions in question are Agent-directed constructions using the basic form instead of the *me-* form, or Patient-directed constructions with the A element separated from the basic forms in contradiction with the rules of traditional grammar. Rarely, however, do such forms give rise to uncertainty on the part of the reader with regard to the poet's intention. The same is true of most other colloquialisms. A special case is constituted by the use of *banjakan* in no *18,* where we might consider either a Djakarta colloquial form with *-an,* indicating the comparative degree, or a poetic abbreviation of the regular form *kebanjakan* (see the discussion of no. *18* in Chapter II). Moreover, under certain circumstances and in combination with any of the other factors discussed by us ambiguity may arise as a property of the sentence. An example of this is to be found in no. *69,* in the *jang*-construction: *jang menjaksikan bisa* (see the discussion of this poem in Chapter II).

5 EPILOGUE

We commenced the study of some of Chairil Anwar's poems with a Prologue including a detailed analysis of the earliest poem written by Chairil Anwar. This provided us with an opportunity of discussing a large number of linguistic and other phenomena which are relevant for the analysis of his poetry in general. In Chapter II we discussed a number of other poems of Chairil Anwar's, with special emphasis on the linguistic problems involved in their analysis. Next we made a systematic survey of the linguistic peculiarities which came to light during the analysis of Chairil Anwar's poems, adducing material from the complete body of his poetic works wherever this was relevant. We would now like to conclude our study with an Epilogue in which, as in the Prologue, we shall make a detailed analysis of one short poem. The reasons for selecting this poem are not that it provides us with a neatly rounded off conclusion in which we are able to demonstrate on the basis of the above how a linguistic analysis, if properly conducted, will solve all the problems of understanding a poem. On the contrary, despite prolonged study of and constant preoccupation with it, in addition to numerous discussions with other scholars on its interpretation, this little poem has defied all our attempts at a satisfactory analysis. It contains so many ambiguities of the kinds we have discussed that we lack the means of reaching even the stage of being able to make a successful selection from among the available alternatives for the sake of giving a satisfactory interpretation. It is interesting to note that these difficulties, with one exception, are not of a semantic but mainly of a syntactic character.

The poem which we want to discuss here is called *Tjerita,* which means 'A Story'. It is dedicated to Darmawidjaja, a young Sundanese writer at the time, of the relationship between whom and Chairil Anwar but little is known (see Introduction, 'Biographical Data').

TJERITA

Kepada Darmawidjaja

1 *Dipasar baru meréka* [66]
2 *Lalu mengada-menggaja.*

3 *Meningkat* [67] *sudah kesal*
4 *Tak tahu apa dibuat*

5 *Djiwa satu teman lutju*
6 *Dalam hidup, dalam tudju.*

7 *Gundul diselimuti tebal*
8 *Sama segala berbuat-buat.*

9 *Tapi kadang pula dapat*
10 *Ini renggang terus terapat* [68]

9 Djuni 1943

(*KT,* 1949:28)

We observe that the poem consists of five stanzas of two lines each. Further, all the lines begin with a capital letter and every stanza ends with a full stop, except for the second and the last.

In the first line we are confronted with two main problems, the one of a syntactic and the other of a semantic nature. *Baru* after a N is commonly an Aj meaning 'new', and so *dipasar baru* would mean 'at the new market'. To the reader familiar with the Djakarta scene the street called *Pasarbaru* (or: *Pasar Baru*), which was the main shopping street in Chairil Anwar's time, immediately comes to mind, though the spelling as it stands in the text -- as two words, without capitals, and with the Preposition *di* joined onto the word *pasar* — does not support this idea. *Baru* can also be an Av, normally coming immediately before the principal word of the Predicate, and meaning 'just'. *Meréka* is a homonym, being both the third person plural personal Pronoun ('they'), and a *me-* form of a Vt, based on *réka,* thus meaning 'to invent', 'to imagine', 'to plan'. If we take *meréka* to be the Pr (which statistically is much more common than the Vt *meréka*), we would expect line 2 to provide us with some sort of a P; if we interpret *meréka* as a Vt, then we have to look for an A of some kind. The analysis of the first line yields the following possibilities:

(A) 'At the new market they...'
(B) 'At the market they just...'
(C) 'At the new market (Agent) inventing'
(D) 'At the market (Agent) just inventing'

Line 2 contains an unusual compound Verb *mengada-menggaja. Menggaja* is based on a N *gaja* which at present has the meaning 'style', 'manner', 'force', but which in 1943 perhaps was more commonly used as an Aj meaning 'beautiful'; in any case *menggaja* is known to occur with the meaning 'to put on airs', 'to show off'. *Mengada* as such is not found in the dictionaries; however, *mengada-ada* is listed, meaning 'to invent things', 'to boast', thus being close in meaning to *menggaja.*

There seems to be no doubt, therefore, that *mengada-menggaja* is a compound of two synonymous Verbs which in meaning is close to an offhandly devised reduplicated form meaning 'showing off and boasting' (for a comparable case see *melepas-renggut* in no. *20*). It should also be noted that this compound lies in the same semantic field as the Verb *meréka*. *Lalu* again is ambiguous; it may be an Av, meaning 'next' and coordinating Clauses or Predicates, as in *dia makan lalu tidur,* 'he/she/it eats (or: is eating, ate, has eaten, etc.) and then sleeps (or: slept, etc.)'; functionally this would fit in well between the two *me-* forms *meréka* and *mengada-menggaja*. However, *lalu* also fits in well in a slot occurring between a Pr and a V; in such a position it may have two different functions, either meaning 'next' as in the above case, or constituting the main word of the Predicate, meaning 'to pass'. For example *Siti lalu bernjanji-njanji* can be interpreted as (1) 'Next Siti sings (or: sang, etc.)', and (2) 'Siti passes (or: passed, etc.) while singing'. It is obvious that in the line under discussion none of these possibilities can be excluded on grammatical grounds. In combination with the alternatives mentioned above for line 1, there are now altogether eight alternatives resulting, viz.:

(1) 'At the new market they/Then show off and boast.'
(2) 'At the market they just/Then show off and boast.'
(3) 'At the new market inventing/Then showing off and boasting.'
(4) 'At the market just inventing/Then showing off and boasting.'
(5) 'At the new market they/Pass by, showing off and boasting.'
(6) 'At the market they just/Pass by, showing off and boasting.'
(7) 'At the new market inventing/Passing by, showing off and boasting.'
(8) 'At the market just inventing/Passing by, showing off and boasting.'

It is difficult to choose from among these alternatives. In the case of 3, 4, 7 and 8 there is no S to go with the Predicate. Moreover, it is difficult to discover a suitable S either in the title or in the dedication, or, since this line is the first of the poem, in the context. On the other hand, 'they' is not very helpful either. It is not clear from the remainder of the poem to whom the *meréka* or 'they' refers. Poetically, the interpretation of *meréka* as a Vt is more satisfactory, since it lies within the

same semantic sphere as *mengada-menggaja.* Moreover, *meréka,* being apparently intended as the final word of the line to rhyme with *menggaja,* would from that point of view be somewhat weak if intended as the Pronoun *meréka.*

Line 3 again confronts us with several alternative choices. First of all, we must stop to consider that there are two different readings of the first word of this line, namely *meningkat* (KT, 1949:28) and *mengikat* (Raffel, 1970:48). However, we shall base our analysis on the former, since Raffel gives no explanation for his deviation from the *KT*-text. *Meningkat* is a Vi based on *tingkat,* 'floor', 'level', 'step', 'phase'; *meningkat* means 'to ascend', 'to arise', but also 'to rise', 'to increase'. Constructions such as this are quite familiar, e.g. *menjanji sudah lelah,* which is an inversion of the more common construction *sudah lelah menjanji,* 'already tired of singing'; in this case line 3 would mean 'already annoyed (= *kesal*) with *meningkat*'. However, *sudah* can also occur after the main part of the Predicate, e.g. *menjanji sudah dia,* 'he/she/it has already finished singing'. In that case *kesal* can be taken in its nominal function; it belongs to the group of words expressing feeling, such as *sedih, takut,* and other Adjectives which even in prose can regularly have this nominal function besides their adjectival one. *Kesal* could then be the S of *meningkat,* so that the meaning would be 'Boredom has already arisen (or: increased)'. A third possibility, although not very probable semantically, is that the *me-* form here has been used in a nominal function without any formal indication. This is in itself not uncommon in BI, e.g. *menjanji sudah populér,* 'singing has become popular', and we have found many examples of this use in Chairil Anwar's poetry (e.g. in no. *20*). The problem then would be how to translate *kesal.* Perhaps it can be taken in the sense of *mengesalkan,* 'annoying', so that the translation then runs: 'Rising (or: To increase) is already annoying'; but this is not very probable.

Line 4, */ Tak tahu apa dibuat //,* seems fairly clear syntactically: *tak tahu* is a P without S. *Tahu* is followed by a complement (or Pa, if *tahu* is to be considered as an irregular Vt; see Chapter I note no. 13), which itself consists of a Patient-directed construction in which *apa,* 'what', is the Pa; no A is mentioned. The translation of this line is 'Not knowing what to do (or: is done)'.

Now taking these four lines together, it is clear that the main problem of interpretation is provided by the lack of a suitable frame of reference; in other words, we have no idea what or whom the poem is about. Although a translation such as, e.g.,

1 At the new market inventing
2 Passing by, showing off and boasting.

3 Boredom already arises
4 Not knowing what to do

is quite possible grammatically, and is in accordance with the meaning of the individual words, it does not really make 'sense'. There is no way of deciding whether any of the other alternatives would be preferable.

Lines 5 and 6, *// Djiwa satu teman lutju / Dalam hidup, dalam tudju. //*: Line 6 does not pose any especially difficult problems. *Tudju,* the base of the Vt *menudju,* which here occurs in the syntactic slot after the Pe *dalam,* is probably used as a N here. Instead of the more usual form *tudjuan,* 'target', 'view', 'purpose', *tudju* is used for poetic reasons in order to make it rhyme with *lutju,* 'funny', at the end of line 5 (cf. *kini* in poem no. *18*; see Chapter II). In theory *dalam* could also be an Aj meaning 'deep', thus 'Deep (is) life, deep (is) the target', but semantically this comes close to nonsense, especially in combination with line 5. This line is open to more than one interpretation, as follows:

1. *Djiwa,* 'soul', is S, and *satu teman lutju,* which means 'one funny companion', is P; in this case the translation would be 'The soul is one funny companion'.
2. *Djiwa satu,* 'one soul', is S, the rest P, the translation being 'one soul is a funny companion'. It is true that the post-placing of Numerals in BI is not in conformity with the most common usage, but in special cases, such as enumerations, etc., it is certainly possible, e.g. *sapi satu, kerbau dua,* 'one cow, two buffaloes'.
3. *Djiwa* is S, *lutju* is P, and *satu teman* a group consisting of a Numeral + Noun determining *djiwa,* making the translation 'The soul of one companion is funny'.
4. The whole line is a nominal group, meaning 'The soul of one funny companion'; however, this translation would be difficult to relate to line 6. If the absence of a full stop after line 4 is correct and intended by the poet, it would be possible to regard line 5 as the A of line 4, thus meaning '(4) Not knowing what is done (or: was done) (by) (5) The soul of one funny companion'.

It is difficult to decide which of these possibilities is closest to what was intended by the poet, but the lines definitely do not justify the

translation 'A clown: Nothing else in mind' as they are rendered by Raffel, no matter what the metaphorical meaning of line 5 may be.

Line 7, // *Gundul diselimuti tebal* /, is a Patient-directed construction with the regular Vt *diselimuti* meaning 'covered with (a blanket of . . .)'. *Gundul,* 'bald', and *tebal,* 'thick', are Adjectives, but in view of their position they may form the Pa and A element respectively. If this is the case we would have here yet another instance of the nominal use of Adjectives (= *kegundulan,* 'baldness', and *ketebalan,* 'denseness') without any formal indication. However, *tebal* can also be interpreted as qualifying the *selimut* element of *diselimuti* (thus meaning 'covered with a thick blanket'), *gundul* being appended to an implicit Pa, e.g. 'bald (as he is, he is) covered by a thick blanket'. Again the lack of a suitable frame of reference renders the interpretation difficult.

Line 8, / *Sama segala berbuat-buat.* //, is grammatically difficult to analyse. *Sama* may mean both 'equal', 'the same', and 'with', the latter being Djakartan for the Indonesian *dengan. Segala* means 'everything', 'everyone'. The form *berbuat-buat* is not found in any of the dictionaries; however, there is the form *dibuat-buat,* which means '(something) pretended or feigned'. Should we then interpret *berbuat-buat* as 'to make believe' (cf. *mengada* of line 2)? Taking the word order as it stands, two alternative interpretations are possible:

1. *Segala* is S and the remainder of the line is P, thus making the translation 'Everything (is) the same (or: all is the same) (and) make believe.'
2. *Sama segala* is an instrumental Adjunct and *berbuat-buat* is P, thus rendering the translation 'Making believe with everything (or: everyone).'

Syntactically, both analyses are equally plausible; semantically, however, we prefer the second alternative. We would then have to take *gundul* (line 7) as the implied S of line 8.

Line 9, // *Tapi kadang pula dapat* /, again contains an instance of the poet's special use of the TAu *kadang-kadang,* 'sometimes', in its unreduplicated form (cf. poem no. *18*; see Chapter II).

Line 10, / *Ini renggang terus terapat* ♯, again displays the special use of pre-placed *ini,* with an Aj *renggang* filling the slot of a N (= *kerenggangan,* 'rift'). *Terapat* is an interesting form, *rapat* being an Aj, so that *terapat* may be a superlative meaning 'closest'. However, much more likely *terapat* is a Patient-directed form derived from the causative

merapat(kan), 'to narrow down, to close'. According to this interpretation of the individual words, a S-P sentence construction results in which *ini renggang* is S, and the rest is P. Although we are unable to explain what is meant by *ini renggang*, 'this rift', we would suggest the following translation for the two concluding lines: '(9) But sometimes (it's) also possible (10) (For) This rift to be immediately closed' (i.e., taking into account the specific value that verbal forms with *ter-* often have; see Chapter II note 25). In any case, Raffel's translation, '(9) But that sort of gap (10) Is hard to paper over', is unacceptable since its implication is the exact reverse of what the text suggests.

It is clear from the above that the problems encountered in the analysis of this poem are by no means of a theoretical nature, nor are they far-fetched. Each one is fairly common and typical of the kinds of problem we face when confronted with the poetic use of BI. Together they comprise a series of ambiguities which are the specific property of the sentence structures. This accumulation of ambiguous elements, plus the absence of any kind of reference, either contextually or situationally, prevents us from arriving at a satisfactory interpretation.

In suggesting the following as a possible translation of the poem, we are quite aware that this is by no means a conclusive interpretation. It is hardly more than a kind of random selection from a number of alternatives which is in no way based on any general understanding of the meaning and intention of the poem and which has the distinct possibility of being 'wrong' in places:

A STORY

For Darmawidjaja

1 At the new market they
2 pass by, showing off and boasting.

3 Boredom already arises
4 Not knowing what to do

5 The soul is one funny companion
6 In life, in purpose.

7 Baldness is covered with denseness
8 Making believe with everything.

9 But sometimes (it's) also possible
10 (For) This rift to be immediately closed

June 9, 1943

NOTES TO PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION

1. We are limiting ourselves to the study of Chairil Anwar's poetic language as found in the written version. See further Chapter III. As regards the pronunciation of Indonesian words the reader is referred to the textbooks listed in note 17 of Chapter I. With respect to the recently introduced new spelling — that was made official on 17th August 1972 — we would further add that for the sake of consistency we have kept to the original spelling of the poems in this book.
2. For the importance of a theoretical foundation in any linguistic study, see e.g. Uhlenbeck, 1966:15 ff.
3. Because of the equivocality of the title (see e.g. Braasem, 1954:44; Teeuw, 1967:148 ff.), we shall leave it untranslated.
4. Cf. the Appendix, where only nine original poems as printed in *TMT* are listed; the tenth, *Krawang-Bekasi,* has been classified as an adaptation; see Jassin, ^{3}1968:37, and esp. p. 169.
5. The poem we have in mind here is *Sadjak buat Basuki Resobowo,* 'A Poem for Basuki Resobowo'. Cf. Jassin, ^{3}1968:13 notes 4 and 5, where he asserts that there are three poems which had not been published in any of the earlier collections.
6. For 'ambiguity' see Chapter III, Section 1. Cf. Empson, ^{2}1961, and Kooy, 1971:122 ff. to Empson's ^{2}1961.
7. It is known, however, that Chairil Anwar was already in the habit of writing poems for the news-sheets of his school in Medan (oral communication by Mr. Usman Effendi). See also Jassin, ^{3}1968:11; Raffel, 1970:xvii.
8. For the acceleration of change with regard to education in the Colony, see Van Niel, 1960:31-46; also Djajadiningrat, 1942; Van der Wal, 1961. On Balai Pustaka see Teeuw, 1972.
9. In the history of modern Indonesian literature, this consciousness is referred to as 'Universal Humanism'. See, e.g., Aoh, 1952:82-111; Jassin, 1954:189-202 and 209-212; Teeuw, 1967:126-129.
10. Although this took place under the direct influence of Willem Elsschot, whose novel 'Cheese' was translated into Indonesian by Idrus. In addition the influence of Hemingway, Steinbeck and Caldwell can also be clearly seen (Jassin, ^{2}1954:18; Teeuw, 1967: 160 ff.).
11. Sjamsulridwan described Chairil Anwar as 'a bad loser' in this context (Sjamsulridwan, 1966:22).
12. Chairil Anwar has translated Dutch as well as English and German poems into Indonesian. See Aoh, 1952:30; Jassin, ^{3}1968:15, and esp. pp. 170-171.

13. There is an article by B. B. Parnikel entitled 'Alexander Blok i Chairil Anwar' (Alexander Blok and Chairil Anwar) in *Narodz Azii i Afriki,* Akademia Nauk SSSR No. 4, Moskoa 1965, pp. 133-137 (*The Peoples of Asia and Africa,* U.S.S.R. Academy of Science), which was obtained in English translation from Prof. A. H. Johns of the Australian National University. We would like to express our thanks to Prof. Johns for bringing this article to our attention.
14. Hapsah later changed the name to Evawani Alissa as she felt that Evawane sounded like an Ambonese name.
15. She is now married to Achmad Tatang and is living in Djakarta; Eva is living with them.
16. In connection with the commemoration of Chairil Anwar's death much information on his life and poetry was published in various newspapers and magazines of April 1972. See among others: *Kompas,* Friday, 28th April 1972, pp. III + IX; *Kompas,* Saturday, 29th April 1972, p. III; *Yudha Minggu,* Vol. VII no. 18, pp. II + IV; *Suara Karya Minggu,* 30th April 1972, pp. III + IV; *Minggu Indonesia Raya,* 30th April 1972, p. I; *Mimbar,* Vol. II no. 13, 5th April 1972, pp. 29-35.
17. Jassin, 1947:545. See his letter to Jassin dated March 8, 1944, where he regarded the *Pudjangga Baru* writers as epigones of the Dutch *Tachtigers* (literary group of the 1880's): '... most of the Pudjangga Baru (writers) are epigones of the *Tachtigers* ..., epigones having no fixed aim.' (Original: '... *orang pudjangga baru kebanjakan epigones dari '80 ..., epigones jang tak tentu tudju.*'). This letter has not been published before. Cf. Raffel, 1970:185.
18. Jassin, 1947:546. As an example of Chairil Anwar's expressionistic poems Jassin has selected *1943* (Jassin, 1944:41, also Jassin, 1954: 154-157; Darmawidjaja, 1949b). See the discussion of this poem in Chapter II.
19. The Japanese Colonel Yamasaki was cited as the personification of the ideal.
20. Letter to Jassin: '*Prosaku, puisiku djuga, dalamnja t i a p k a t a akan kugali-korek sedalamnja, hingga ke kernwoord, ke kernbeeld.*' (Jassin, 1949:17; the words printed with spacing are underlined in the original).
21. Letter to Jassin: '*Jang kuserahkan padamu — jang kunamakan sadjak-sadjak! — itu hanja pertjobaan keperbandingan-perbandingan baru.*' etc. ('What I have submitted to you — which I have called poems! — are only experiments in new comparisons.' etc.). See also Raffel, 1970:185.
22. In the original: '*Bahasa Indonesia adalah bahasa jang berbahaja sekali; ia mudah sekali menjadjak.*' (Oral communication by R. Nieuwenhuys).

23. In *Berhadapan Mata* ('Looking in the Eyes', written August 25, 1943) he said that for him art 'is a matter of life and death.' (Jassin, [3]1968:137).
24. In the original: '*Ketakutan ruangan (ruimte vrees) moral inilah pengchianatan jang paling besar pada penghidupan.*'
25. Translation of the original: '*si seniman dengan tjaranja menjatakan harus memastikan tentang tenaga perasaan-perasaannja.*' (Jassin, [3]1968:150, where it is printed in italics).
26. Cf. Junus, 1970:65. He concludes that Chairil Anwar's poems are 'sentence poems' (*puisi kalimat*) and 'written poems' (*puisi tulisan*).
27. As he said to Hapsah and Mohammad Said.

NOTES TO CHAPTERS I-III

1. Or 'gravestones' and 'epitaphs', respectively. But it is clear from the poem itself that one specific gravestone is meant.
2. For the designation 'original' we would refer the reader to Jassin's study ([3]1968). See also Appendix.
3. It was not delivered by Chairil Anwar personally (he was arrested by the *Kempeitai*), but read by someone else (information supplied by Jassin). The poem meant is no. *30*. See further Jassin, [3]1968:165, no. 30 (for the numbers in italics see note 4).
4. The numbers in italics refer to Chairil Anwar's poems, which are arranged chronologically in the Appendix. The letter *a* coming after a number indicates a grammatical or other variant of a literal quotation from the relevant poem. For Chairil Anwar's complete works see Jassin, [3]1968:163-172.
5. *Nénék* can mean both 'grandmother' and 'grandfather, although for the latter *kakék* is more usual (see, e.g., H. C. Klinkert, *Nieuw Maleisch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek,* Leiden 1961, p. 1014, or J. L. v. d. Toorn, *Minangkabausch-Maleisch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek,* 's-Gravenhage 1891, p. 382). Our translation of *nénékanda* as 'grandfather' is based on biographical data supplied by Hapsah. *(a)nda* is an archaic bound-morpheme denoting endearment, similar to *chen* in German, as in *Mütterchen,* although *(a)nda* does not have the diminutive connotation.
6. According to biographical data supplied by Purnawan Tjondronagoro (via Jassin), this poem was written during Chairil Anwar's courtship of Soemirat, a daughter of R. M. Djojosepoetro, who lived in Paron (East Java). See also *Mimbar,* Vol. II no. 13, 5th April 1972, pp. 34-35.
7. For a different method of describing the aesthetical aspects of poems written in BI from a linguistic point of view see, e.g., Slametmuljana, 1954, esp. pp. 225-235, 'Een Aesthetische Beschouwing van de Moderne Indonesische Poëzie' ('An Aesthetical Study of Modern Indonesian Poetry'). Cf. Teeuw, 1955.

8. For further references to *pantun* see, e.g., Winstedt, 1969; Hooykaas, 1937; Braasem, 1950 and 1955.
9. Teeuw, 1952:10.
10. Stutterheim, 1947:32 ff.
11. Cf. Jakobson, 1960:370 ff.: 'Ambiguity is an intrinsic, inalienable character of any self-focused message, briefly a corrollary feature of poetry.' Also Empson, ^{2}1961:3: '. . . , and the machinations of ambiguity are among the very roots of poetry.'
12. In agreement with Reichling we are differentiating between '*betekenis*' or 'meaning' of lexical elements, '*inhoud*' or 'content' of phrases and sentences, and '*interpretatie*' or 'interpretation' in respect of the use of language (Reichling, ^{2}1967; ^{5}1969:25-33 and 52-60). See also Uhlenbeck, 1964:70 ff. For affixation in particular see Reichling, ^{2}1967:345 ff.; Uhlenbeck, 1953:326 ff.; 1955:288.
13. At first sight the form *kutahu* would appear to be a Patient-directed construction consisting of prA + Vt (see Section 3.1, IB2 of this Chapter), but the Agent-directed form *aku menahu* is non-existent. Other instances of such forms are *kulari* (19), *kuhendak* (29), and again *kutahu* (15). *Tahu,* 'to know', can be described as an irregular Verb in BI, inasmuch as it behaves partly as a transitive Verb and partly as an Adjective. The same is true of *hendak. Kulari,* on the other hand, is an instance of poetic licence, as *lari* never has a Patient (Vi), and in grammatically correct BI the use of the short pronominal prefix *ku-* before intransitive Verbs is not normally possible.
14. The translation of *Tuhan Jang Maha Esa* is difficult; probably 'God the Great and Only' is the closest approximation.
15. This is discussed in the Prologue.
16. Alisjahbana, ^{21}1960:31 ff., where he assumes that the use of 'active' sentences (the term he uses for sentences with transitive *me-* Verbs) is a distinctive feature of the language of modern Indonesian literature, as compared with the common use of 'passive' sentences in the Malay of pre-war literature. See also Emeis, 1945.
17. Also Fokker, 1951a; Kähler, 1956; Teeuw, 1971a. Cf. Payne, 1970. Draft plans for a more adequate description of BI have been presented and discussed in various Symposia and Seminars on BI, e.g. *Bahasa,* 1967; *Seminar,* 1971.
18. We are following Robins' definition of basic sentence structures: 'The sentence structures are describable as basic, in that all the elements in them are either obligatory, or else are involved in a specific relationship with the total structure and are thus peculiar to one or more basic structures and not possible members of all structures' (Robins, 1968:351). However, we shall not follow his classification of basic sentence structures (in Sundanese), since it is not altogether applicable to BI, or at any rate not to Chairil Anwar's poetry. For one thing, there is no need to discuss basic sentence structures containing three Noun elements (i.e. those with di-transitive Verbs), since they are not relevant for our study of

Chairil Anwar's language. Moreover, Robins in his approach regards Adjectives 'as a subclass of (intransitive) Verbs' (Robins, 1968:352), whereas for our purposes the distinction between monomorphemic Adjectives and intransitive Verbs characterized by the prefixation of *me-* is definitely important.

19. Instead of using the traditional terms 'active' and 'passive' (see Alisjahbana, [28]1960:67-68; [21]1960:21-22; Poedjawijatna-Zoetmulder, [3]1964(I):50) we shall use the terms 'Agent-' and 'Patient-' directed constructions respectively. (See Mees, 1946:190, esp. 225-226; Teeuw, 1971a:64-65). Cf. Payne, 1970:19 notes 1 and 2, and p. 86 note 1).
20. Teeuw, 1971a:69. For this very reason we can expect to find constructions such as *Ajam itu ditangkap oleh engkau, Ajam itu ditangkap oleh saja,* and *Ajam itu ditangkap oleh dia* (for the first two examples see Alisjahbana, [21]1960:33). Although such constructions are theoretically possible, the first two are usually represented by the construction *Ajam itu kautangkap,* and *Ajam itu saja tangkap,* whereas for the third person singular the form *Ajam itu ditangkapnja* (or *Ajam itu ditangkap olehnja*) is more common.
21. Poedjawijatna-Zoetmulder, [3]1964(I):46-52.
22. Teeuw, 1971a:69.
23. We are limiting ourselves to those Vt and Vi prefixed by *me-*, since these pose the principal problem in our study of Chairil Anwar's language. Cf. Payne, 1970.
24. It is also curious that Chairil Anwar should have cited this sentence as an example of the effective use of language in his *Pidato 1943* (Untitled Speech of 1943), saying: '*Dalam kalimat ketjil seperti: Sekali berarti, sudah itu mati — kita bisa djalin-anjamkan seluruh tudjuan hidup kita*' (Jassin, [3]1968:132), meaning 'Into a short sentence such as: to be meaningful once, and then die — we can weave all the goals of our life.'
25. The difference between *ter*Vt and *di*Vt Patient-directed forms *may* be explained by the action being definitely completed in the former, whereas in the latter the action is still going on (Teeuw, 1971a:72).
26. In an earlier version the third stanza contained as second line: / *Zola terharu waktu memahat «Nana»* //, i.e. 'Zola was touched when he carved «Nana»', which would have provided an excellent rhyme with line 5. It is beyond the scope of the present work to explain why the poet — or was it the editor/printer? — deleted the 'Zola-line' in the later impression. The fact that this line was deleted may strengthen the above assumption, however. Cf. Junus, 1970:56 and 59.
27. The earlier version meant here (see note 26 above) was published in *Pembangoenan* 1.12, May 25, 1946, p. 165.
28. Cf. Raffel, 1970:29, where he translates it as 'Dust got into my eyes'.

29. An example of its use in prose is found in the following passage of Buang *alias* Ibrahim's short story '*Sa-choret kesah Dharurat*'. ('An Emergency Story'): '*Ku-lihat bergenang ayer mata kaseh di-bendongan mata-nya, berderai jerneh di-pipi yang empok gebu*' ('I see tears of love falling from her eyes onto her soft and tender cheeks') in *Cherita Pendek DBP* (DBP Short Stories, Kuala Lumpur 1965, p. 58). An example from poetry is A. Samad Said's ‡ *Daerah kelabu ada-lah gadis*[2] *bertuboh gebu* /, ('A grey territory is girls with plump figures'), in his poem *Hasrat-nya* ('His Desire'), in *Liar di-Api* (Wild in the Fire, Kuala Lumpur 1969 (?), p. 157).
30. *Abu,* 'ash', and *debu,* 'dust', are frequently occurring words in Chairil Anwar's poetry. They are obviously used metaphorically in poems nos. *1, 9, 14, 16, 45, 52* and *63.* In no. *74* both words occur together, coordinated by *dan*: // ... *Menginjam abu dan debu* /; for *menginjam* see note 58.
31. Since a printing error in line 8 has remained uncorrected through several reprints of *KT* (Jassin, [3]1968:43), we have adopted the version of the poem as printed in Jassin, [3]1968:51.
32. Cf. Poem no. *43,* and further note 43 below.
33. This interpretation is given by, e.g., Nababan, 1966:172.
34. Etymologically *rasanja* is a Noun with *-nja* added, meaning 'the feeling of it', 'the taste of it', and in many cases in which *rasanja* is used, the construction allows of an analysis as a segmented S_1-S_2-P construction of the type *buah itu rasanja enak.* In the present case, however, the word order, which would be impossible in a truly segmented sentence, is an indication that *rasanja* has developed into an Adjunct: *tertjebar rasanja diri,* 'I feel *tertjebar*'.
35. Here *renggut* is another instance of a Vt with omission of the prefix *me-;* see further Chapter III.
36. Cf., e.g., poem no. *70*: / *dan aku bisa lagi lepaskan kisah baru padamu,* /, where *lepaskan* is a Vt without the prefix *me-*.
37. It is clear from this example that *tambah* means 'plus', since that same meaning has already been expressed earlier on in the line by the use of the algebraic symbol for 'plus'. Other poems using such symbols are nos. *42* and *59.* For yet another instance of the use of *tambah* in the sense of 'plus', see the discussion of poem no. *64.*
38. We have based our text on that in Jassin, [3]1968:54, because it contains the corrected version of line 6, which had hitherto always been misprinted (see Jassin, [3]1968:43, cf. Raffel, 1970:50). It should be noted, however, that the date printed below the poem in Jassin's book is incorrect. Cf. Jassin, [3]1968:165, no. 25.
39. Cf. Raffel, 1970:50, where the last line has a full stop.
40. This poem was written towards the end of 1943. See Appendix.
41. Or 'True Christians'. From the biographical data supplied by Jassin, however, we know that Chairil Anwar dedicated this poem to W. J. S. Poerwadarminta, who was a Catholic. See also Jassin, [3]1968:45.

42. Jassin regarded *segera* as a misprinting of *segara*; see his letters to the editors of Pembangunan dated 28th April, 1958, and 9th March, 1960, the copies of which were sent to us with his accompanying letter of 27th July 1972.
43. Chronologically the year 1946 marks the division between Chairil Anwar's early and later poems. Cf. Biographical Data, and Appendix.
44. Another category of *ke-an* forms derived from Adjectives is that of words with the meaning of 'too (+ what the basic word expresses')', e.g., *kebesaran* ('too big'), *kesempitan* ('too narrow'), etc. Such *ke-an* derivatives are regarded as colloquialisms and/or as being formed on the analogy of *ke-an* derivatives of the type found in some regional languages (such as Javanese).
45. This interpretation is corroborated by the fact that the handwritten manuscript originally read */ ketjemasan derita, daku ketjemasan mimpi; /*. The word *daku,* i.e. an archaic form of *aku,* has been omitted here.
46. The handwritten manuscript has *dan jang gelap-tertutup djadi terbuka,* that is, with the *jang*-nominalizer preceding *gelap-tertutup.* The nominalizer *jang* was already omitted in the first publication of this poem (in *Pantja Raja,* Vol. II no. 3-4, January 1, 1947, p. 105), however. Since this publication appeared while the poet was still alive we may conclude that on second thought he regarded *jang* as poetically unsatisfactory and virtually redundant in this line.
47. This is strengthened by the original *keakanan* instead of *akanan* in the manuscript.
48. *Internasional,* Vol. I no. 3, January 3, 1949, and *Siasat,* Vol. III no. 97, January 9, 1949.
49. Cf. note 37. See further, for example, poems nos. *42, 45* and *60.*
50. We have found only one instance of the use of such a construction with *tempat* in Chairil Anwar's poetry, namely in poem no. *12*: */ . . . taman kita / tempat merenggut dari dunia dan 'nusia* ♯ ('. . . our garden / is the place where we withdraw from the world and people')'.
51. Misled by the small initial *k* of *kota,* Raffel has translated it as 'city', thus rendering *trem dari kota* as 'city bus' (Raffel, 1970:145). Our knowledge of the geography of Djakarta and of the location of the Capitol Cinema here, however, have led us to interpret *kota* more specifically as *Kota* (the Chinatown of Djakarta so called by Djakartans), from the direction of which the tram should come. Moreover, *trem* does not mean 'bus', but is similar to the German *Strassenbahn.* See also note 56 below for the relevance of situational references for the interpretation.
52. Evidently misreading it as *gigi mas,* which is the actually Indonesian for 'gold tooth'. Ibid.
53. Formerly Djakartan trams were painted ivory, which may have given rise to this image of *gigi masa.* According to Miss Paramita Abdurrachman, who was with Chairil Anwar on the Capitol

dancing-terrace listening to the music and watching the dancers at the time, Chairil Anwar did mention something about trams, although she remembers only vaguely what exactly he was talking about ('Frankly speaking I just could not follow what he was talking about,' she said). (Oral communication by Miss Paramita Abdurrachman).

54. Cf. Raffel, 1970:144, where line 15 reads */ Ah hati kami dalam malam ada doa /*. When we asked Jassin which of the two available versions of the poem contains the correct reading, he replied that the version which appeared in Jassin, [3]1968:73, did; here the punctuation is more elaborate and consistent than in Raffel's version, furthermore. Presumably Raffel based his version on an earlier printing of this poem in *Horison,* Vol. III no. 4 (April 1968), p. 107. Jassin's version is based on the original publication of the poem in *Ipphos Report* no. 9, February 1949 (Jassin, [3]1968: 169, no. 69, and his letter to the present author dated 26th December, 1971).
55. We have based our text on Jassin, [3]1968:74, because of the printing errors that occurred in the poem, and were never corrected in subsequent reprints (Jassin, [3]1968:43). It is worth noting that the handwritten manuscript, which is reproduced in *DTD* (1953; 1959), has *dingin* ('cold') as the last word of line 4; the same reading occurs in other publications of this poem, e.g. in *Indonesia* (Djakarta, 1949, p. 259), and *Mutiara* (Vol. I no. 2, 15th May 1949), as well as in *KT* (1949:51). The different reading does not alter the interpretation of the poem as a whole, however. Furthermore we have observed that the handwritten manuscript displays greater consistency than Jassin's version with regard to the use of punctuation marks and of small letters at the beginning of each line.
56. *Karet* here is the name of a cemetery in Djakarta. This is an excellent example of the relevance of situational reference. Cf. Epilogue.
57. Our version of the poem is based on the original manuscript as reproduced in Jassin, [3]1968:75, whereas the title is drawn from *TMT,* 1950:15 (see Jassin, [3]1968:169, nos. 71 and 71a). The punctuation, however, is based on the *KT*-version (1949:52).
58. Chairil Anwar sometimes uses words the meaning of which is not certain to the present author or other Indonesian informants consulted by her; e.g. *mengebu* (14), *mereksmi* and *tertjebar* (18), *terbelam* (32), *menginjam* (47), etc. Such words may be either dialectical or neologies devised by the poet, or even outright errors. The effect of their use should not be termed 'ambiguous', but rather 'obscure' or 'uncertain'.
59. The term 'valence' itself was introduced by Reichling ([2]1967) and De Groot (1949).
60. A more usual word order is *Dan tawa gila tertjermin tenang pada whisky,* or even *Dan tawa gila tertjermin pada whisky tenang,*

depending on how *tenang* is interpreted. Raffel, for instance, interprets the line on the basis of the second construction (Raffel, 1970:103).

61. The usual word order is *Sekali ini aku terlalu sangat kepingin dapat djawab.*
62. Although here again we might consider the theoretical possibility of *dibeku* standing for the *di-* prefixed form of the Vt *membeku-(kan)*, 'to freeze something', thus making the meaning 'death is frozen by the air', for semantic reasons this possibility must be rejected.
63. Even in his prose-writing Chairil Anwar seems to use Adjectives in their nominal function while omitting the formal characteristics of a Noun, e.g. in his *Pidato 1943* (Untitled Speech of 1943): *Sudah berdesing-desing dikuping dahsat-hebat suara meneriakkan: Berhenti!* etc. (Jassin, ^{3}1968:131) 'The horror and violence of the voice is already whistling in the ear, shouting: Stop!' etc. However, we have no means of either confirming or refuting this theory, since the line can also be read as 'The voice is already whistling in the ear, shouting horrifyingly and violently: Stop!' etc.
64. Here the addition of *-nja* does not remove all ambiguity from the text, since *-nja* may also be a third person singular possessive suffix referring to a N preceding it.
65. The combination *per-* + *-kan* or *-i* is also possible (*memperlengkapi, memperisterikan*), but no examples of this are found in Chairil Anwar's poems.
66. In Raffel, 1970:48 it is written *mereka.*
67. In Raffel, 1970:48 it is written *mengikat.*
68. In Raffel, 1970:48 the final line has a full stop.

APPENDIX

LIST OF CHAIRIL ANWAR'S ORIGINAL POEMS

DTD = *Deru Tjampur Debu* (1949)
KT = *Kerikil Tadjam dan Jang Terampas dan Jang Putus* (1949)
TMT = *Tiga Menguak Takdir* (1950)
J = Jassin, ^{3}1968

This list is based on Jassin, ^{3}1968:163-169.
The numbers following the abbreviations refer to the page numbers.

1	*Nisan,* 'Gravestone' *Untuk nénékanda,* 'For Grandfather'	Oct.	1942	KT 5	
2	*Penghidupan,* 'Life'	Dec.	1942	KT 6	
3	*Diponegoro*	Feb.	1943	KT 7	
4	*Tak Sepadan* (= *Lagu Siul II*), 'Inequality' (= Whistling Song II)	Feb.	1943	KT 8	
5	*Sia-Sia,* 'In Vain'	Feb.	1943	KT 9	DTD 9
6	*Adjakan,* 'Invitation'	Feb.	1943	KT 20	
7	*Sendiri,* 'Alone'	Feb.	1943	KT 11	
8	*Pelarian,* 'A Fugitive'	Feb.	1943	KT 10	
9	*Suara Malam,* 'Voices of The Night'	Feb.	1943	KT 12	
10	*Aku* (= *Semangat*), 'Me' (= Spirit)	Mar.	1943	KT 13	DTD 5
11	*Hukum,* 'The Law'	Mar.	1943	KT 14	
12	*Taman,* 'A Garden'	Mar.	1943	KT 15	
13	*Lagu Biasa,* 'An Ordinary Song'	Mar.	1943	KT 16	

14	*Kupu Malam dan Biniku,* 'A Whore and My Wife'	Mar.	1943	KT 17	
15	*Penerimaan,* 'Acceptance'	Mar.	1943	KT 18	DTD 26
16	*Kesabaran,* 'Patience'	Apr.	1943	KT 19	DTD 13
17	*Perhitungan,* 'A Reckoning-Up'	Apr. 16,	1943	KT 23	
18	*Kenangan,* 'Memories' *Untuk Karinah Moordjono,* 'For K.M.'	Apr. 19,	1943	KT 21	J 51
19	*Rumahku,* 'My House'	Apr. 27,	1943	KT 24	
20	*Hampa,* 'Empty' *Kepada Sri (jang selalu sangsi),* 'To Sri (who always doubts)'	May 14,	1943	KT 22	DTD 6
21	*Kawanku dan Aku,* 'My Friend and I' *Kepada L. K. Bohang,* 'To L. K. Bohang'	Jun. 5,	1943	KT 25	DTD 14
22	*Bertjerai,* 'Parting'	Jun. 7,	1943	KT 29	
23	*Aku,* 'Me'	Jun. 8,	1943	KT 27	
24	*Tjerita,* 'A Story' *Kepada Darmawidjaja,* 'To D.'	Jun. 9,	1943	KT 28	
25	*Dimesdjid,* 'At the Mosque'	Jun. 29,	1943	KT 26	
26	*Selamat Tinggal,* 'Goodbye'	Jul. 12,	1943	KT 30	DTD 8
27	(*Mulutmu mentjubit dimulutku*), (Your Mouth is Pinching Mine)	Jul. 12,	1943	KT 35	
28	*Dendam,* 'Vengeance'	Jul. 13,	1943	KT 31	
29	*Merdeka,* 'Freedom'	Jul. 14,	1943	KT 32	
30	(*Kita gujah lemah*), (We are Shaky, Weak)	(Jul. 22,	1943)	KT 33	
31	?	Jul. 24,	1943	KT 34	

32	*1943*		1943	J 55	
33	*Isa,* 'Jesus' *Kepada Nasrani Sedjati,* 'To A True Christian'	Nov. 12,	1943	DTD 11	
34	*Doa,* 'A Prayer' *Kepada Pemeluk Teguh,* 'To the truly Faithful'	Nov. 13,	1943	DTD 12	
35	*Sadjak Putih,* 'Blank Verse' *Buat Tunanganku Mirat,* 'For My Fiancee Mirat'	Jan. 18,	1944	DTD 15	TMT 11
36	*Dalam Kereta,* 'In the Train'	Mar. 15,	1944	J 56	
37	*Siap Sedia,* 'To Arms' *Kepada Angkatanku,* 'To My Generation'		1944	J 57	
38	*Kepada Penjair Bohang,* 'To the Poet Bohang'		1945	DTD 27	
39	*Catastrophe* (in Dutch)	Sep. 23,	1945	J 58	
40	*Lagu Siul I, II* 'Whistling Song I, II': (I) *Lagu Siul. Kepada Ida jang ke-20,* Whistling Song. 'To Ida on Her 20th Birthday'; (II) = no. 4	Nov. 28,	1945	DTD 18, 19	
41	*Malam,* 'Night'		1945	KT 42	
42	*Sebuah Kamar,* 'A Room'		1946	DTD 21	
43	*Kepada Pelukis Affandi,* 'To the Painter Affandi'		1946	DTD 20	
44	*Orang Berdua (= Dengan Mirat),* 'Together' (= With Mirat)	Jan. 8,	1946	DTD 7	
45	*Tjatetan Th. '46,* 'Notes on 1946'		1946	DTD 23	TMT 7
46	*Buat Album D.S.,* 'For D.S.'s Album'		1946	DTD 24	

47	*Nocturno* (Fragment)	1946	DTD 25	
48	*Tjerita buat Dien Tamaela,* 'A Story for Dien Tamaela'	1946	DTD 28	TMT 14
49	*Kabar dari Laut,* 'News from the Sea'	1946	DTD 30	
50	*Sendja di Pelabuhan Ketjil,* 'Twilight at a Little Harbour' *Buat Sri Ajati,* 'For Sri Ajati'	1946	DTD 31	TMT 9
51	*Tjintaku Djauh Dipulau,* 'My Love is Far Away on An Island'	1946	DTD 34	TMT 10
52	*'Betina'-nja Affandi,* 'Affandi's «Female»'	1946	J 64	
53	*Situasi,* 'Situation'	1946	J 65	
54	*Dari Dia,* 'From Him' *Buat K.,* 'For K.'	1946	J 66	
55	*Kepada Kawan,* 'To My Friends'	Nov. 30, 1946	J 35, 36	
56	*Pemberian Tahu,* 'An Announcement'	1946	J 68	
57	*Dua Sadjak buat Basuki Resobowo,* 'Two Poems for Basuki Resobowo'	Feb. 28, 1947	J 67	
a.	*Sadjak buat Basuki Resobowo,* 'A Poem for Basuki Resobowo';		TMT 8	
b.	*Sorga,* 'Paradise' *Buat Basuki Resobowo,* 'For B. R.'		DTD 33	
58	*Malam di Pegunungan,* 'A Night in the Mountains'	1947	DTD 22	
59	*Tuti Artic*	1947	DTD 32	

60	*Persetudjuan dengan Bung Karno,* 'Agreement with Bung Karno'	1948	KT 45	
61	(*Sudah dulu lagi terdjadi begini*), (It Has Happened and Is Happening Again)	1948	KT 46	
62	*Ina Mia*	1948	KT 47	
63	*Perdjurit Djaga Malam,* 'A Night Sentry' *pro Bahar + Rivai,* 'For Bahar + Rivai'	1948	KT 48	TMT 13
64	*Puntjak*	1948	KT 50	
65	*Buat Gadis Rasid,* 'For Gadis Rasid'	1948	KT 49	
66	(*Selama bulan menjinari dadanja . . .*), (While the Moon Shines on Her Breast . . .)	1948	J 69	
67	*Mirat Muda, Chairil Muda,* 'Mirat's Young, Chairil's Young'	1949	J 71	
68	*Buat Njonja N.,* 'For Mrs. N.'	1949	J 72	
69	*Aku Berkisar Antara Mereka,* 'I Go About among Them'	1949	J 73	
70	*Jang Terampas dan Jang Putus,* 'The Ravaged and the Broken'	1949	KT 51	TMT 16
71	*Derai-Derai Tjemara,* 'Whispering Pines'	1949	KT 52	TMT 15
72	(*Aku berada kembali*), (I Am Back Again)	1949	J 76	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alisjahbana, Sutan Takdir

1957 *Dari Perdjuangan dan Pertumbuhan Bahasa Indonesia* (On the Struggle and Growth of the Indonesian Language). Djakarta. 224 pp.

[28]1960 *Tatabahasa Baru Bahasa Indonesia I* (A New Bahasa Indonesia Grammar I). Djakarta. 94 pp.

[21]1960 *Tatabahasa Baru Bahasa Indonesia II* (A New Bahasa Indonesia Grammar II). Djakarta. 94 pp.

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G.

1961 *Some Aspects of Indonesian Politics under the Japanese Occupation: 1944-1945.* Interim Reports Series. Modern Indonesia Project. Southeast Asia Program Department of Far Eastern Studies. Cornell University. Ithaca, New York. IX + 126 pp.

1966 'Japan: "The Light of Asia"', in *Southeast Asia in World War II: Four Essays,* ed. by Josef Silverstein, Monograph Series No. 7, Southeast Asia Studies, Yale University. IV + 86 pp.; pp. 13-51.

Aoh Kartahadimadja

1952 *Beberapa Paham Angkatan 45. Himpunan* (Some of the Concepts of the Generation of 1945. An Anthology). Djakarta. 175 pp.

Bahasa

1967 *Bahasa dan Kesusastraan Indonesia sebagai Tjermin Manusia Indonesia Baru.* Simposium Bahasa dan Kesusastraan Indonesia 25-28 Oktober 1966 (Indonesian Language and Literature as a Reflection of the New Indonesian). Edited by Lukman Ali. Djakarta. 289 pp.

Benda, Harry J.

1958 *The Crescent and the Rising Sun. Indonesian Islam under the Japanese Occupation 1942-1945.* The Hague-Bandung. XV + 320 pp.

Bloomfield, Leonard

[2]1950 *Language.* London. IX + 566 pp.

Braasem, W. A.

1950 *Pantuns.* Djakarta-Amsterdam-Surabaja. 109 pp

1954 *Moderne Indonesische Literatuur. Doorbraak uit oude Bedding.* Met een bio-bibliografie van Indonesische Letterkundigen (Modern Indonesian Literature. A Breaking Away from the Old Banks. With a bio-bibliography of Indonesian Authors). Amsterdam. 97 pp.

1955 'De Pantun. Het Indonesische Volkskwatrijn en zijn Varianten over de Wereld' (The Pantun. The Indonesian Popular Quatrain and its universal Variants). *Kongo-Overzee* 21.3-4. Antwerp. pp. 193-211.

Darmawidjaja

1949a 'Kenang-Kenangan pada Pudjangga Chairil' (Reminiscences of the Poet Chairil). *Merdeka,* April 30.

1949b 'Kenang-Kenangan pada Pudjangga Chairil II' (Reminiscences of the Poet Chairil II). *Merdeka*, May 2.
1949c 'Kenang-Kenangan pada Pudjangga Chairil III' (Reminiscences of the Poet Chairil III). *Merdeka*, May 3.

Djajadiningrat, Raden Loekman
1942 'From Illiteracy to University. Educational Development in the Netherlands Indies' *Bulletin 3 of the Netherlands and Netherlands Indies Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations.* 68 pp.

Elsbree, Willard H.
1953 *Japan's Role in Southeast Asian Nationalist Movements 1940 to 1945.* Cambridge (Mass.). V + 182 pp.

Emeis, M. G.
1945 *Vorm en Functie in Klassiek en Modern Maleisch. De Verbale Constructies* (Form and Function in Classical and Modern Malay. Verbal Constructions). Ph. D. diss. Utrecht. XII + 168 pp.

Empson, William
[2]1961 *Seven Types of Ambiguity.* Harmondsworth. XVI + 256 pp. First Published 1930.

Fokker, Dr. A. A.
1951a *Inleiding tot de Studie van de Indonesische Syntaxis* (Introduction to the Study of Indonesian Syntax). Groningen-Djakarta. X + 242 pp.
1951b *Bahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Daerah* (Bahasa Indonesia and the Regional Languages). Inaugural Address Djakarta. Groningen-Djakarta. 27 pp.

de Groot, A. W.
1949 'Structural Linguistics and Word-Classes'. *Lingua* 1.4, pp. 427-500.

Halim, Amran
1969 *Intonation in Relation to Syntax in Bahasa Indonesia.* Unpublished Ph. D. diss. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. X + 258 pp.

Hooykaas, Dr. C.
1937 *Over Maleische Literatuur* (On Malay Literature). Leiden. XII + 282 pp.

Hrushovski, Benjamin
1960 'On Free Rhythms in Modern Poetry'. In Sebeok, [2]1968: 173-191.

Jakobson, Roman
1960 'Concluding Statement: Linguistics and Poetics'. In Sebeok, [2]1968: 350-377.

Jassin, H. B.
1944 'Beberapa Sadjak Ekspresionistis' (Some Expressionistic Poems). *Pandji Pustaka* 22.1-2, pp. 51-53.
1947 'Chairil Anwar. Penjair Revolusioner Indonesia' (Chairil Anwar. An Indonesian Revolutionary Poet). *Pantja Raja* 2.16, pp. 545-548.
1949 'Chairil Anwar Pelopor Angkatan '45' (Chairil Anwar, A Pioneer of the Generation of 1945). *Mimbar Indonesia* 3.20, May 14, pp. 17 and 21.
[2]1954 *Kesusastraan Indonesia Dimasa Djepang* (Indonesian Literature during the Japanese Period). Djakarta. 184 pp. First published 1948.
1954 *Kesusastraan Indonesia Modern dalam Kritik dan Essay* (Modern Indonesian Literature in Reviews and Essays). Djakarta. 238 pp.

1962 *Amir Hamzah. Radja Penjair Pudjangga Baru* (Amir Hamzah, Prince of the Pudjangga Baru Poets). Djakarta. 223 pp.
1963 *Pudjangga Baru. Prosa dan Puisi* (Pudjangga Baru. Prose and Poetry). Djakarta. 393 pp.
[3]1968 *Chairil Anwar Pelopor Angkatan 45* (Chairil Anwar, A Pioneer of the Generation of 1945). Djakarta. 175 pp. First published 1956.

Johns, A. H.
1964 'Chairil Anwar: An Interpretation.' *B.K.I.* 120, pp. 393-405.

Junus, Umar
1965 'Dasar-Dasar Interpretasi Sandjak. Pendekatan Linguistik' (Principles of the Interpretation of Poetry. A Linguistic Approach). (Mimeographed). Malang. 68 pp.
1968 'Bahasa dalam Sandjak' (Language in Poetry). In *Seminar,* 1971: 284-316.
1970 *Perkembangan Puisi Melayu Moden* (The Development of Modern Malay Poetry). Kuala Lumpur. XIII + 161 pp.
1971 'Ke-an Construction in Indonesian'. *Linguistics* 76, pp. 24-44.

Kähler, Hans
1956 *Grammatik der Bahasa Indonesia.* Mit Chrestomathie und Wörterverzeichnis (Bahasa Indonesia Grammar. With Chrestomathy and Vocabulary). Wiesbaden. VII + 160 pp.

Kooy, Jan G.
1971 *Ambiguity in Natural Language.* An Investigation of Certain Problems in Its Linguistic Description. Ph. D. diss. Amsterdam. Amsterdam-London. XII + 160 pp.

Macdonald, R. Ross and Soenjono Darjowidjojo
1967 *A Student's Reference Grammar of Modern Formal Indonesian.* Washington. XIX + 278 pp.

Marsman, H.
[3]1963 *Verzameld Werk, Poëzie, Proza en Critisch Proza* (Collected Work. Poetry, Prose and Critical Prose). Amsterdam. 861 pp.

Mees, Dr. C. A.
1946 *Maleise Spraakkunst* (A Malay Grammar). The Hague-Semarang-Surabaja-Bandung. 291 pp.

Moeliono, Anton M.
1967 'Suatu Reorientasi dalam Tatabahasa Indonesia' (A Reorientation in Indonesian Grammar). In *Bahasa,* 1967: 45-69.
1971 'Aspek Etno-Linguistik dalam Terdjemahan' (Ethno-Linguistic Aspects of Translation). *Basis* 20.8, May, pp. 226-236.

Nababan, Sri Utari
1966 'A Linguistic Analysis of the Poetry of Amir Hamzah and Chairil Anwar'. Unpublished Ph. D. diss. Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. VI + 233 pp.

Oemarjati, Boen S.
1971 *Bentuk Lakon dalam Sastra Indonesia* (Drama in Indonesian Literature). Djakarta. 246 pp.

Payne, E. M. F.
1970 *Basic Syntactic Structures in Standard Malay.* Kuala Lumpur. XII + 152 pp.

Poedjawijatna, I. R. and Zoetmulder, P. J.
[3]1964 *Tatabahasa Indonesia untuk Sekolah Landjutan Atas* (Indonesian Grammar for High Schools). Djakarta. I. Bentuk Kata (Morphology). 135 pp. II. Bentuk Kalimat (Syntax). 135 pp. First published 1955.

Polemik
[2]1950 *Polemik Kebudajaan* (Polemics on Culture). Pokok Pikiran: St. Takdir Alisjahbana, Sanusi Pané, Dr. Purbatjaraka, Dr. Sutomo, Tjindarbumi, Adinegoro, Dr. M. Amir, Ki Hadjar Dewantara. Kata Pengantar: Achdiat Karta Mihardja. Djakarta. 146 pp. First published 1948. (Pre-War *Pudjangga Baru* Essays, collected and edited by Achdiat Karta Mihardja).

Raffel, Burton
1970 *The Complete Poetry and Prose of Chairil Anwar.* Albany, New York. XXII + 208 pp.

Reichling, Dr. Anton
[2]1967 *Het Woord. Een Studie omtrent de Grondslag van Taal en Taalgebruik* (The Word. A Study of the Foundations of Language and Linguistic Usage). Zwolle. 460 pp. First published 1935.
[5]1969 *Verzamelde Studies over hedendaagse Problemen der Taalwetenschap* (Collected Studies on current Problems in Linguistics). Zwolle. 111 pp.

Robins, R. H.
1968 'Basic Sentence Structures in Sundanese'. *Lingua* 21, pp. 351-358.

Sebeok, Thomas A. (Ed.)
[2]1968 *Style in Language.* Cambridge (Mass.)-New York-London. XVII + 470 pp.

Seminar
1971 *Seminar Bahasa Indonesia 1968.* Dalam Rangka Panca Windu Sumpah Pemuda 1928-1968. Jakarta, 26-28 Oktober, 1968 (Seminar on Bahasa Indonesia 1968. In Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Pledge of Youth, 1928-1968). Edited by Harimurti Kridalaksana and Djoko Kentjono. Ende (Flores). 366 pp.

Sjamsulridwan, Drs.
1966 'Kenang-Kenangan: Chairil Anwar Semendjak Masa Kanak-Kanak' (Reminiscences: Chairil Anwar From Early Childhood). *Mimbar Indonesia* 20.3-4, March-April, pp. 20-26.

Slametmuljana, R. B.
1951 *Bimbingan Seni-Sastra* (A Guide to Literary Art). Groningen-Djakarta. 196 pp. Second edition 1953. 232 pp.
1954 *Poëzie in Indonesia. Een Literaire en Taalkundige Studie* (Poetry in Indonesia. A Literary and Linguistic Study). Bibliothèque du Muséon 36. Leuven. XVI + 248 pp.
1956 *Peristiwa Bahasa dan Sastra* (Linguistic and Literary Affairs). Bandung-Djakarta-Amsterdam. 164 pp.

Stutterheim, Dr. C. F. P.
1947 *Stijlleer* (Stylistics). The Hague. 134 pp.

Sutherland, Heather
1968 'Pudjangga Baru: Aspects of Indonesian Intellectual Life in the 1930s.' *Indonesia* 6, October, pp. 106-127.

Teeuw, A.
1952 *Taal en Versbouw* (Language and Versification). Inaugural Address Utrecht. Amsterdam. 27 pp.
1953 Review of Slametmuljana, 1951 (2nd. ed. 1953). *B.K.I.* 109, pp. 382-386.
1955 Review of Slametmuljana, 1954. *B.K.I.* 111, pp. 309-315.
1959 'The History of the Malay Language. A Preliminary Survey.' *B.K.I.* 115, pp. 138-156.
1961 *A Critical Survey of Studies on Malay and Bahasa Indonesia.* The Hague. 176 pp. (With the Assistance of H. W. Emanuels).
1962 'Some Problems in the Study of Word-Classes in Bahasa Indonesia.' *Lingua* 10, pp. 409-421.
1967 *Modern Indonesian Literature.* The Hague. XV + 308 pp.
1971a *Leerboek Bahasa Indonesia* (A Bahasa Indonesia Textbook). Groningen. 144 pp. (With Key to the Exercises, 20 pp.).
1971b 'Modern Indonesian Literature Abroad.' *B.K.I.* 127, pp. 256-263.
1972 'The Impact of Balai Pustaka on Modern Indonesian Literature' in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* Vol. XXXV Part 1, 1972, pp. 111-127.

Uhlenbeck, E. M.
1953 'The Study of Wordclasses in Javanese.' *Lingua* 3, pp. 322-354.
1955 'Over Woordvorming in het Javaans' (On Word-Formation in Javanese). *B.K.I.* 111, pp. 286-307.
1964 'Betekenis en Syntaxis' (Meaning and Syntax). *Forum der Letteren* 5.2, pp. 67-82.
1966 'Enige Beschouwingen over Amerikaanse en Nederlandse Linguistiek' (Some Observations on American and Dutch Linguistics). *Forum der Letteren* 7.1, pp. 1-22.

Van Niel, Robert
1960 *The Emergence of the Modern Indonesian Elite.* The Hague-Bandung, 314 pp.

Wal, Dr. S. L. van der
1961 *Some Information on Education in Indonesia up to 1942.* With a Bibliography. The Hague. 23 pp.

Wertheim, W. F.
1956 *Indonesian Society in Transition. A Study of Social Change.* The Hague-Bandung. XI + 360 pp.

Winstedt, Sir Richard
1969 *A History of Classical Malay Literature.* Kuala Lumpur-Singapore-New York-London-Melbourne. X + 323 pp.