



Research Article

Heliuss Jamsuddin and Suhartono W. Pranoto in Indonesian Historical Methodology: Conceptual Critique of Method and Methodology

Sugeng Priyadi*

Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto, Indonesia

Abstract

This article examines how Heliuss Jamsuddin and Suhartono W. Pranoto conceptualized historical methodology in comparison with the methodological legacy of Sartono Kartodirdjo and Kuntowijoyo. Kartodirdjo's pioneering contribution lay in distinguishing historical methodology from historical method and in developing a multidimensional social-science approach rooted in the first National History Seminar and his dissertation research. Using the historical method (heuristics, criticism, interpretation, and historiography), this study treats Jamsuddin's *Metodologi Sejarah* (2007) and Pranoto's *Teori & Metodologi Sejarah* (2010) as intellectual-history sources. The findings show that both works combine historical method and historical methodology within single reference books, thereby obscuring the distinction between practical research procedures and theoretical reflection. Although both historians contributed to the teaching of historical studies, their works give limited attention to historical theories, concepts, and approaches derived from auxiliary sciences. This article argues for a clearer separation between historical method as practice and historical methodology as theory.

Article History

Submitted	25/02/2026
Revised	18/03/2026
Accepted	26/06/2026
Published	29/06/2026

Keywords

historical methodology; social science approach; historical method; historical terminology; metahistory.

*Corresponding Author

sugengpriyadi@ump.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, the discussion of historical methodology was pioneered by Sartono Kartodirdjo through his writings in *Lembaran Sejarah*, a journal of the Faculty of Letters and Culture, Gadjah Mada University (Kartodirdjo, 1970). These ideas were later consolidated in *Pemikiran dan Perkembangan Historiografi Indonesia: Suatu Alternatif*, which became an important foundation for Indonesian historical methodology and historiography (Kartodirdjo, 1982, 2014a). In this work, Kartodirdjo laid the foundations for historical methodology through a multidimensional and structural approach. Nearly a decade later, this framework was further developed in *Pendekatan Ilmu Sosial dalam Metodologi Sejarah*, which emphasized the contribution of the social sciences to historical explanation (Kartodirdjo, 1992, 2014b).

Kartodirdjo's ideas stimulated responses from his students and colleagues, producing dissertations, theses, and other research projects that employed social science approaches. For Kartodirdjo, historical methodology concerns the theoretical question of "knowing how to know," whereas historical method concerns the practical question of how historians acquire historical knowledge. Thus, historical methodology operates in the theoretical realm, while historical method operates in the practical realm. One of Kartodirdjo's students, Kuntowijoyo (1994, 2003), described historical methodology as the science of methods. Several Indonesian historians have attempted to clarify the distinction between historical methodology and historical method, two concepts that have often been understood as overlapping. The distinction developed by Kartodirdjo and Kuntowijoyo was further clarified by Heliuss Jamsuddin and Suhartono W. Pranoto, who differentiated historical method as the realm of practice from historical methodology as the realm of theory.

The study of historical methodology also belongs to the field of intellectual history because it examines historical theories derived from auxiliary disciplines, especially the social sciences (Kartodirdjo, 1992, 2014b; Kuntowijoyo, 1994, 2003). These auxiliary disciplines provide conceptual tools and theoretical approaches for historical explanation. This article therefore examines the

methodological thought of Helius Sjamsuddin and Suhartono W. Pranoto by asking two main questions: What social science theories and concepts can be identified in their methodological works? What historical themes emerge from their methodological thinking?

METHOD

This research employs a four-step historical method: heuristics, criticism, interpretation, and historiography. The heuristic stage was used to identify works on historical methodology written by senior Indonesian historians, especially Helius Sjamsuddin and Suhartono W. Pranoto. The main sources are Sjamsuddin's *Metodologi Sejarah*, published by Ombak in Yogyakarta in 2007 (Sjamsuddin, [2007](#)), and Pranoto's *Teori & Metodologi Sejarah*, published by Graha Ilmu in Yogyakarta in 2010 (Pranoto, [2010](#)). These works were selected as research objects because they have become important references in Indonesian historical studies and can be treated as historical documents or bibliographic sources in the study of intellectual history.

Both works were used as primary research materials because they represent historiographical products in the form of methodological and intellectual reflection. Their position as historical and bibliographic sources is supported by the methodological perspectives of Kartodirdjo ([1992](#), [2014b](#)) and Kuntowijoyo ([1994](#), [2003](#)). In addition, Kuntowijoyo's *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah* was used as a comparative source because it discusses historical method, historical explanation, historical categories, and historical prediction in a systematic way (Kuntowijoyo, [1995](#), [2013](#)).

After the sources were collected, the research proceeded to the stage of source criticism. External criticism was used to examine the authenticity of the works by considering authorship, publication data, edition history, and institutional context. Internal criticism was conducted by comparing the works of Sjamsuddin and Pranoto with those of Kartodirdjo and Kuntowijoyo (Kartodirdjo, [1992](#), [2014b](#); Kuntowijoyo, [1994](#), [1995](#), [2003](#), [2013](#)). This comparison helped establish the credibility of the sources and produced historical facts, especially mentifacts, namely mental or intellectual facts contained in the methodological works under study. These mentifacts became the object of analysis in relation to the history of mentality, intellectual history, and the history of ideas (Kartodirdjo, [1992](#), [2014b](#); Priyadi & Hamid, [2007](#); Priyadi, [2009](#), [2013](#), [2021](#)). The interpretation stage then examined these mentifacts through concepts from auxiliary disciplines, especially the social sciences. The results are presented in the form of historiography, specifically intellectual history (Gottschalk, [1983](#); Notosusanto, [1978](#); Pranoto, [2010](#); Sjamsuddin, [2007](#)).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Intellectual Backgrounds of Helius Sjamsuddin and Suhartono W. Pranoto

Helius Sjamsuddin was born in Bima, Sumbawa, on April 7, 1938. He is a professor of history at Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung. He earned his bachelor's degree from IKIP Bandung, his master's degree from Northern Illinois University, United States, in 1974, and his doctorate from Monash University, Australia. His doctoral dissertation was titled *Fighting Dutch Rule in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries: The Social, Political, Ethnic, and Dynastic Roots of Resistance in South and Central Kalimantan, 1859–1906* (Sjamsuddin, [1989](#)). This work was later translated and published by Balai Pustaka under the title *Pegustian dan Temenggung: Akar Sosial, Politik, Etnis, dan Dinasti Perlawanan di Kalimantan Selatan dan Kalimantan Tengah, 1859–1906* (Sjamsuddin, [2001](#)). His methodological work, *Metodologi Sejarah*, was published in 2007 by Ombak (Sjamsuddin, [2007](#)).

Suhartono W. Pranoto is a professor at the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Gadjah Mada University. He was born in Boyolali on August 12, 1941. He graduated from the Faculty of Letters and Culture, Gadjah Mada University, in 1966 and earned his doctorate in 1989 with a dissertation titled *Apanage dan Bekel: Perubahan Sosial di Pedesaan Surakarta, 1830–1920*, written under the supervision of Sartono Kartodirdjo. The dissertation was later published by Tiara Wacana with the same title (Pranoto, [1991](#)). His other works include *Sejarah Pergerakan Nasional: Dari Budi Utomo sampai Proklamasi*,

1908–1945; *Bandit-Bandit Pedesaan di Jawa: Studi Historis, 1850–1942*; *Revolusi Agustus: Nasionalisme Terpasung dan Diplomasi Internasional*; *Serpihan Budaya Feodal*; and *Teori & Metodologi Sejarah* (Pranoto, [1994](#), [1995](#), [2001a](#), [2001b](#), [2010](#)).

Historical Terminology and Methodological Orientation

Sjamsuddin's *Metodologi Sejarah* consists of nine chapters. Chapter I, "Terminologi 1," and Chapter II, "Terminologi 2," correspond in several respects to Kartodirdjo's discussion of historical concepts, historical perspectives, and historical reconstruction in *Pendekatan Ilmu Sosial dalam Metodologi Sejarah* (Kartodirdjo, [1992](#), [2014b](#); Sjamsuddin, [2007](#)). Pranoto's *Teori & Metodologi Sejarah* consists of thirteen chapters. Chapter 1 discusses the nature, meaning, and value of history, which can be compared with Kartodirdjo's discussion of the concept and perspective of history and with Kuntowijoyo's "Apakah Sejarah Itu?" in *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah* (Kartodirdjo, [1992](#), [2014b](#); Kuntowijoyo, [1995](#), [2013](#); Pranoto, [2010](#)).

A comparison of these works shows that Sjamsuddin's discussion tends to remain at the terminological level. He explains basic concepts but does not continue the discussion toward the broader theoretical level developed by Kartodirdjo. In Chapter I, Kartodirdjo discusses historical theory and methodology, contemporary historical consciousness, the meaning and function of history, historical perspectives, conventional history, new political history, and social history (Kartodirdjo, [1992](#), [2014b](#)). By contrast, Sjamsuddin's discussion gives more attention to historical method, especially in Chapters III, IV, and V (Sjamsuddin, [2007](#)).

Pranoto's Chapter 2, "Teori dan Metodologi," is the core of his methodological discussion. This chapter discusses terminology, method, methodology, theory, philosophy, facts, concepts, forms of generalization, hypotheses, and models (Pranoto, [2010](#)). These themes are close to Sjamsuddin's Chapter II, which discusses method and methodology, the nature of facts, the nature of concepts, the nature of generalization, hypotheses, theories, and models (Sjamsuddin, [2007](#)). Like Sjamsuddin, however, Pranoto explains these issues largely at the terminological level and does not substantially develop theories drawn from the social sciences. He also shifts quickly to historical method in Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6. Unlike Sjamsuddin, Pranoto places interpretation after explanation and causality, making interpretation Chapter 6 and explanation and causality Chapter 5.

Table 1. Comparison of Historical Terminology

Helius Sjamsuddin (2007)		Suhartono W. Pranoto (2010)	
Chapter I Terminology 1	development of historical terms	Chapter 1 The nature, meaning, and value of history	what is history?
	definition and semantics		historical values
	history as <i>res gestae</i> and <i>historia rerum gestarum</i>		
	historical terminology in Indonesia		
Chapter II Terminology 2	method and methodology	Chapter 2 Theory and Methodology	method
			methodology
	the nature of facts		theory
	the nature of concepts		philosophy
	the nature of generalization		fact
	hypotheses		concept
	theories		forms of generalization
	models		hypothesis
			model
Chapter III Heuristics: source collection		Chapter 3 Heuristics	
Chapter IV Criticism: external and internal		Chapter 4 Criticism of historical sources	
Chapter V Writing history: historiography interpretation, explanation, presentation		Chapter 5 Explanation and causality	
Chapter VI Auxiliary sciences, sister disciplines		Chapter 6 Interpretation	
Chapter VII History: as a humanity and as a social science		Chapter 7 Fallacies	

Sjamsuddin devotes three chapters to historical research procedures: Chapter III, “Heuristics: Source Collection”; Chapter IV, “Criticism: External and Internal”; and Chapter V, “Writing History: Historiography, Interpretation, Explanation, and Presentation” (Sjamsuddin, 2007). In Chapter III, Sjamsuddin follows Kuntowijoyo’s discussion of historical research in *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah* (Kuntowijoyo, 1995, 2013). Kuntowijoyo proposes five stages of historical research, while Sjamsuddin expands them by separating explanation and presentation within the process of historical writing. Chapter V combines interpretation, explanation, and historiography in a single discussion.

Kartodirdjo’s Chapter III, “Sejarah dan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial,” appears to have influenced Sjamsuddin’s Chapter VI, “Ilmu-Ilmu Bantu dan Ilmu-Ilmu Serumpun,” and Chapter VII, “Sejarah sebagai Ilmu Kemanusiaan dan sebagai Ilmu Sosial” (Kartodirdjo, 1992, 2014b; Sjamsuddin, 2007). In this discussion, the humanities and cultural sciences are positioned as important approaches to historical science (Priyadi, 2015). Pranoto’s Chapter 3, “Heuristik”; Chapter 4, “Kritik Sumber Sejarah”; Chapter 5, “Eksplanasi dan Kausalitas”; and Chapter 6, “Interpretasi” are closely related to Sjamsuddin’s discussion of heuristics, criticism, interpretation, explanation, and presentation (Pranoto, 2010; Sjamsuddin, 2007). Both Sjamsuddin and Pranoto distinguish between historical method and historical methodology, but their works still combine these two domains. Ideally, historical method and historical methodology should be discussed separately so that each can be developed with greater focus and depth.

Chapter 7 of Pranoto’s work discusses fallacies in historical research. These include fallacies in topic selection, heuristics, verification, interpretation, and exposition or historiography (Pranoto, 2010). This discussion is aligned with Kuntowijoyo’s explanation of historical research procedures (Kuntowijoyo, 1995, 2013). Sjamsuddin, by contrast, discusses fallacies mainly in relation to interpretation (Sjamsuddin, 2007). Fallacies in historical science are closely related to all stages of the historical method, from heuristics to historiography (Priyadi, 2022, 2026). They may appear in the form of anachronism involving figures, space, and time. Such errors indicate a weak mastery of the science of methods, or historical methodology (Kuntowijoyo, 1994, 2003).

Historical Themes and Categories

Chapter VIII, “Tema-Tema Sejarah,” in Sjamsuddin’s work is relevant to Renier’s discussion of historical themes and to Kartodirdjo’s Chapter IV, “Kategori-Kategori Sejarah” (Kartodirdjo, 1992, 2014b; Renier, 1997; Sjamsuddin, 2007). It can also be compared with Kuntowijoyo’s discussion of historical categories in *Metodologi Sejarah* (Kuntowijoyo, 1994, 2003). Pranoto’s Chapter 8, “Kategori Sejarah,” contains twenty-two categories, compared with Kartodirdjo’s seven categories, Kuntowijoyo’s fifteen categories, and Sjamsuddin’s eleven themes.

Sjamsuddin lists eleven historical themes: social history, economic history, demographic history, political history, cultural history, the history of folk culture, intellectual history, psychological history and psychohistory, family history, ethnic history, and the history of education (Sjamsuddin, 2007). Pranoto includes these themes but adds several others, including religious history, the history of mentality, oral history, local history, national history, women’s history, quantitative history, agrarian history, village history, urban history, and maritime history (Pranoto, 2010).

Pranoto’s detailed categorization appears to have been influenced by Kartodirdjo and Kuntowijoyo. Kartodirdjo discusses categories such as social history, political history, the history of mentality, intellectual history, agrarian history, and cultural history (Kartodirdjo, 1992, 2014b). Kuntowijoyo discusses national history, oral history, social history, urban history, rural history, rural economic history, women’s history, cultural history, local history, religious history, political history, the history of thought, quantitative history, the history of mentality, and biography (Kuntowijoyo, 2003).

Table 2. Comparison of Historical Themes and Categories

Helius Sjamsuddin (2007)		Suhartono W. Pranoto (2010)	
Chapter VIII Historical Themes	Social history	Chapter 8 History Category	Social history
	Economic history		Political history
	Demographic history		Economic history
	Political history		History of psychology
	-		Demographic history
	Cultural history		History of culture and art
	History of folk culture		History of folk culture
	-		History of religion
	Intellectual history		History of thought
	History of psychology and psychohistory		History of mentality
	-		Oral history
	-		Local history
	-		National history
	Family history		Family history
	Ethnic history		Ethnic history
	-		History of women
	History of education		History of education
	-		Quantitative history
	-		Agrarian history
	-		Village history
	-		History of the city
	-		Maritime history

One notable point in Pranoto's categorization is the inclusion of maritime history. This theme is not explicitly emphasized by Kartodirdjo, Kuntowijoyo, or Sjamsuddin. Maritime history developed more prominently in Indonesia through the works of A. B. Lopian, particularly *Pelayaran dan Perniagaan Nusantara Abad ke-16 dan 17* and *Orang Laut, Bajak Laut, Raja Laut* (Lopian, 2008, 2009). This field was later expanded by scholars influenced by Lopian's maritime historical perspective, including Susanto Zuhdi, whose works include *Nasionalisme, Laut, dan Sejarah, Integrasi Bangsa dalam Bingkai Keindonesiaan*, and *Sejarah Buton yang Terabaikan: Labu Rope Labu Wana* (Zuhdi, 2014, 2017, 2018). Kuntowijoyo, meanwhile, includes biography as a historical category, but this idea has not been fully embraced by Indonesian historians because biographies have often been written by non-historians, including journalists and popular writers.

Table 3. Comparison of the Final Sections

Helius Sjamsuddin (2007)	Suhartono (2010)
Chapter IX Metahistory & Historical Poetry (Post-modernist Historiography)	Chapter 9 Generalization and Specification of History
	Chapter 10 New Scientific History and the Social Sciences
	Chapter 11 History, Arts, and Sciences
	Chapter 12 Historical Research
	Chapter 13 Academic Honesty

Metahistory, Narrative, and Historical Imagination

Chapter IX, "Metahistory and Historical Poetics: Postmodernist Historiography," is a distinctive addition in Sjamsuddin's work (Sjamsuddin, 2007). Discussions of metahistory are absent from the works of Kartodirdjo, Kuntowijoyo, and Pranoto. Sjamsuddin's Chapter IX reflects the influence of postmodernist historiography, especially its concern with language, narrative, and the literary structure of historical writing. Narrative history was one of the earliest forms of historiographical achievement, while non-narrative history later emerged as a second achievement through the development of

structural and social-scientific history. Postmodernist historiography reopened the question of narrative by emphasizing the role of language, plot, and imagination in historical writing.

Metahistory is associated with theoretical and philosophical reflection on language, aesthetics, and moral assumptions in historiography. Hayden White's *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* became an important reference for discussing the relationship between historical fact and fiction (White, 1985). Historical facts are produced through external and internal criticism of historical sources. However, the limitations of historical sources often require historians to use imagination in reconstructing past events. It is at this point that narrative and fiction become difficult to separate completely. White emphasizes the literary nature of historical writing, especially the narrative strategies used to transform events into meaningful historical accounts.

This issue is also relevant to the use of philological and literary sources in historical research. Philological works are not automatically historical works, but they can function as historical sources when subjected to critical analysis. Hoesein Djajadiningrat's *Critische Beschouwing van de Sadjarah Banten* is an important example because it applied source criticism to the *Sajarah Banten* and compared it with external sources, including Portuguese sources (Djajadiningrat, 1913, 1983). Babad sources, as internal historical traditions, should not be ignored in historical writing, although they must be examined critically (Priyadi, 2015). Narrative history, which can sometimes resemble novels or romances, was later challenged by non-narrative history, especially the new scientific history promoted by Kartodirdjo (Kartodirdjo, 1982, 2014a). Nevertheless, non-narrative history also has limitations. Therefore, a convergence of narrative and non-narrative history is needed. This convergence may be understood as a third historiographical achievement because it allows historical writing to become both analytically rigorous and narratively meaningful (Priyadi, 2015).

Historical Generalization, Prediction, and the Limits of Historical Knowledge

Chapter 9, "Generalisasi dan Spesifikasi Sejarah," in Pranoto's work appears to refer to Kuntowijoyo's discussion of historical generalization in *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah* (Kuntowijoyo, 1995, 2013; Pranoto, 2010). Pranoto adds a discussion of Indonesia and future projection, but this addition is highly speculative. Historical inquiry is grounded in sources from the past, whereas the future has no historical sources and therefore no historical facts. The future is an uncertain field that cannot be reconstructed in the same way as the past (Romein, 1989).

To state that historians can predict the future is to move beyond historical method and methodology. However, historical interpretation may produce limited projections when it is based on patterns, tendencies, and generalizations derived from historical evidence (Gardiner, 1985). Historians cannot act as seers or mystics; they must think critically and academically based on data and facts. In this sense, historical prediction is different from the prophetic or mystical traditions associated with figures such as Jayabaya, Ranggawarsita, Sabda Palon, or Nostradamus (Any & Ajie, 1984; Kartodirdjo, 1984, 1986; Sharma, 2005; Suwarno, 1983). If historians make projections based on present phenomena, such projections remain general and should be understood as historical generalizations rather than precise predictions.

The section on Indonesia's future in Pranoto's work seems to draw on Kuntowijoyo's discussion of "Ramalan Sejarah" in *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah* (Kuntowijoyo, 1995, 2013; Pranoto, 2010). Historians cannot predict the future in the same way as the natural sciences, which often seek general laws through experimental and nomothetic procedures. Historical knowledge is idiographic and based on particular events, although repeated patterns may allow historians to formulate cautious generalizations (Renier, 1997). Toynbee's challenge-and-response thesis is one example of historical generalization developed from broad comparative studies of civilizations. This thesis has influenced discussions of the rise, growth, decline, and collapse of civilizations (Diamond, 2014; Gazalba, 1981; Gottschalk, 1983; Kuntowijoyo, 2008; Toynbee, 1988, 2006).

From Cassirer's philosophical anthropology, the distinction between animal reaction and human symbolic response helps explain how humans respond to their environment through culture,

language, and meaning (Cassirer, [1987](#)). Toynbee's challenge-and-response thesis similarly emphasizes that history and culture emerge from human responses to challenges posed by natural, social, and cultural environments (Toynbee, [1988](#), [2006](#)). When a society fails to respond creatively to these challenges, it may experience decline or collapse. This framework also resonates with Huntington's discussion of civilizations and world politics, especially regarding the dynamics of civilizational encounter, conflict, and transformation (Huntington, [2002](#)).

New Scientific History, Social Sciences, and Academic Honesty

Chapter 10, "New Scientific History and the Social Sciences," in Pranoto's work is similar to Kuntowijoyo's Chapter 7, "Sejarah dan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial," in *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah* (Kuntowijoyo, [1995](#), [2013](#); Pranoto, [2010](#)). Pranoto's discussion of new scientific history also appears to be related to Kuntowijoyo's discussion of the history of historical writing, especially the transition from nineteenth-century romanticism, nationalism, and liberalism to critical history and new history in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In this context, Pranoto's account can be read as an attempt to connect historical methodology with the development of modern historiography and the social sciences.

Chapter 11, "History, Art, and Science," and Chapter 12, "Historical Research," in Pranoto's work correspond to Kuntowijoyo's discussion of history as both science and art, as well as his discussion of historical research (Kuntowijoyo, [1995](#), [2013](#); Pranoto, [2010](#)). Chapter 13, "Academic Honesty," is a relatively new addition compared with earlier books on historical methodology. This chapter is significant because it addresses plagiarism, citation practices, and ethical responsibility in historical scholarship.

Plagiarism is an academic problem that can arise from intellectual stagnation, weak writing discipline, or the deliberate appropriation of another scholar's work. In historical scholarship, plagiarism can often be detected because historiography carries the distinctive mark of the historian, including style, method of presentation, research interest, and specialization. Each historian has a particular intellectual signature. At the same time, historical scholarship always depends on previous works. Historians need assistance from sources, fellow historians, and scholars from other disciplines. Therefore, when historians use the findings, arguments, or words of others, they must acknowledge them through proper citation, whether in footnotes, body notes, or endnotes.

Citation is not merely a technical requirement; it is an ethical acknowledgment of intellectual debt. No scholarly work emerges in complete isolation because every work is part of a longer chain of knowledge. Proper citation, including the author's name, year of publication, and page number when necessary, allows readers to trace the sources used and helps prevent plagiarism. However, citation alone does not guarantee academic honesty. The most serious form of plagiarism occurs when an author claims another person's work as their own or deliberately conceals the source of borrowed ideas. Academic honesty therefore requires both technical accuracy in citation and ethical awareness in the production of knowledge.

CONCLUSION

Published books on historical methodology, including works by Helius Sjamsuddin and Suhartono W. Pranoto, have been widely accepted as important references in Indonesian historical studies. However, persistent confusion remains because historical methodology and historical method are often discussed together without a clear conceptual separation. Although their books are intended to discuss historical methodology, the discussion frequently shifts toward historical method. The sections on historical method should ideally be developed separately so that both historical method and historical methodology can be discussed with greater focus, depth, and clarity.

Sjamsuddin opens his work with Chapter I, "Terminologi 1," which defines basic historical terms through definitions and semantics. Chapter II, "Terminologi 2," discusses method and methodology, facts, concepts, generalizations, hypotheses, theories, and models. Chapters III to V, which discuss heuristics, source criticism, and historical writing, represent the practical domain of

historical method. Interpretation is included in the discussion of historical writing, but it is not developed as a separate and systematic methodological problem. Chapter VI, “Ilmu-Ilmu Bantu dan Ilmu-Ilmu Serumpun,” and Chapter VII, “Sejarah sebagai Ilmu Kemanusiaan dan sebagai Ilmu Sosial,” are more closely related to Kartodirdjo’s historical methodology. Chapter VIII, “Tema-Tema Sejarah,” and Chapter IX, “Metahistory and Historical Poetics,” expand the discussion toward historical themes and postmodernist historiography.

Pranoto’s methodological thought is most visible in Chapter 2, “Teori dan Metodologi”; Chapter 5, “Eksplanasi dan Kausalitas”; Chapter 7, “Fallacies”; and Chapter 10, “New Scientific History and the Social Sciences.” Chapter 1 serves as an introduction to historical concepts and terminology. Chapters 3, 4, 6, 8, and 12 shift the focus toward historical method, including heuristics, source criticism, interpretation, historical categories, and historical research. Chapters 9, 11, and 13 move into broader discussions of historical generalization, the relationship between history, art, and science, and academic honesty.

A comparison of Sjamsuddin and Pranoto shows that both contributed to Indonesian historical methodology in practical and pedagogical terms. However, their discussions of historical methodology remain limited. Pranoto’s methodological discussion is concentrated mainly in Chapters 2, 8, and 10, while Sjamsuddin’s is concentrated mainly in Chapters VI, VII, and VIII. Their main limitation is that they do not sufficiently elaborate historical theories derived from auxiliary disciplines, especially the social sciences, which form the theoretical basis of historical methodology. They discuss terminology more extensively than theory. In addition to theory, historical methodology also requires a discussion of historical approaches that help historians produce explanation through social science concepts. This dimension, which was strongly demonstrated by Kartodirdjo and further developed by Kuntowijoyo, remains insufficiently explored in the works of Helius Sjamsuddin and Suhartono W. Pranoto.

Acknowledgement

Not applicable.

Author contributions

The author has read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

The author has given approval for the publication of this manuscript.

Competing interests

Not applicable.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, T. (Ed.). (1985). *Sejarah lokal di Indonesia*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Any, A., & Ajie, S. S. (1984). *Rahasia ramalan Jayabaya, Ranggawarsita & Sabda Palon*. Aneka Ilmu.
- Cassirer, E. (1987). *Manusia dan kebudayaan: Sebuah esei tentang manusia* (A. A. Nugroho, Trans.). Gramedia.
- Diamond, J. (2014). *Collapse: Runtuhnya peradaban-peradaban dunia*. Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Djajadiningrat, H. (1913). *Critische beschouwing van de Sadjarah Banten: Bijdrage ter kenschetsing van de Javaansche geschiedschrijving*. Joh. Enschedé en Zonen.
- Djajadiningrat, H. (1983). *Tinjauan kritis tentang Sajarah Banten: Sumbangan bagi pengenalan sifat-sifat penulisan sejarah Jawa*. Djambatan.
- Gardiner, P. (1985). Filsafat sejarah. In T. Abdullah & A. Surjomihardjo (Eds.), *Ilmu sejarah dan historiografi: Arah dan perspektif*. Gramedia.
- Gazalba, S. (1981). *Pengantar sejarah sebagai ilmu*. Bhratara Karya Aksara.
- Gottschalk, L. (1983). *Mengerti sejarah* (Nugroho Notosusanto, Trans.). Universitas Indonesia Press.
- Huntington, S. P. (2002). *Benturan antarperadaban dan masa depan politik dunia*. Qalam.
- Kanumoyoso, B., Farid, H., Ahsan, I. A., & Fauzi, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Kembara bahari: Esei kehormatan 80 tahun Adrian B. Lapien*. Komunitas Bambu.
- Kartodirdjo, S. (1970, Desember). Beberapa masalah teori dan metodologi sejarah Indonesia. *Lembaran Sejarah*, 6.
- Kartodirdjo, S. (1982). *Pemikiran dan perkembangan historiografi Indonesia: Suatu alternatif*. Gramedia.
- Kartodirdjo, S. (1984). *Ratu Adil*. Sinar Harapan.
- Kartodirdjo, S. (1986). *Ungkapan-ungkapan filsafat sejarah Barat dan Timur: Penjelasan berdasarkan kesadaran sejarah*. Gramedia.
- Kartodirdjo, S. (1992). *Pendekatan ilmu sosial dalam metodologi sejarah*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Kartodirdjo, S. (2014a). *Pemikiran dan perkembangan historiografi Indonesia: Suatu alternatif*. Ombak.
- Kartodirdjo, S. (2014b). *Pendekatan ilmu sosial dalam metodologi sejarah*. Ombak.
- Kuntowijoyo. (1994). *Metodologi sejarah* (Edisi pertama). Tiara Wacana.
- Kuntowijoyo. (1995). *Pengantar ilmu sejarah* (Edisi pertama). Bentang Budaya.
- Kuntowijoyo. (2003). *Metodologi sejarah* (Edisi kedua). Tiara Wacana.
- Kuntowijoyo. (2008). *Penjelasan sejarah*. Tiara Wacana.
- Kuntowijoyo. (2013). *Pengantar ilmu sejarah* (Edisi ketiga). Tiara Wacana.
- Lapien, A. B. (2008). *Pelayaran dan perniagaan Nusantara abad ke-16 dan 17*. Komunitas Bambu.
- Lapien, A. B. (2009). *Orang laut, bajak laut, raja laut: Sejarah kawasan Laut Sulawesi abad XIX*. Komunitas Bambu.
- Notosusanto, N. (1978). *Masalah penelitian sejarah kontemporer: Suatu pengalaman*. Yayasan Idayu.
- Pranoto, S. W. (1991). *Apanage dan bekel: Perubahan sosial di pedesaan Surakarta, 1830–1920*. Tiara Wacana Yogya.
- Pranoto, S. W. (1994). *Sejarah pergerakan nasional: Dari Budi Utomo sampai Proklamasi, 1908–1945*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Pranoto, S. W. (1995). *Bandit-bandit pedesaan di Jawa: Studi historis, 1850–1942*. Aditya Media.
- Pranoto, S. W. (2001a). *Revolusi Agustus: Nasionalisme terpasung dan diplomasi internasional*. Laper Pustaka Utama.
- Pranoto, S. W. (2001b). *Serpihan budaya feodal*. Agastya Media.
- Pranoto, S. W. (2010). *Teori & metodologi sejarah*. Graha Ilmu.
- Priyadi, S. (2009). *Sejarah mentalitas Brebes*. Ombak.
- Priyadi, S. (2013). *Sejarah mentalitas Banyumas*. Ombak.
- Priyadi, S. (2015). *Historiografi Indonesia*. Ombak.
- Priyadi, S. (2021). *Babad Banyumas versi Wirjaatmadjan dan dinamika kebudayaan Banyumas*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Priyadi, S. (2022). *Klirumologi sejarah Banyumas*. Satria Indra Prasta Publishing.

- Priyadi, S. (2026). Sartono Kartodirdjo and Kuntowijoyo in Indonesian history methodology. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 36(1), 124–137.
<https://doi.org/10.15294/paramita.v36i1.12350>
- Priyadi, S., & Hamid, A. R. (2007). *Sejarah intelektual Banyumas*. Aksara Indonesia.
- Purwanto, B. (2006). *Gagalnya historiografi Indonesiasentris?!*. Ombak.
- Renier, G. J. (1997). *Metode dan manfaat ilmu sejarah* (Muin Umar, Trans.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Romein, J. (1989). *Dalam pesona Prambanan: Indonesia di tengah gejolak dunia*. Pustaka Utama Grafiti & KITLV.
- Sharma, A. K. (2005). *Nostradamus: Tanda-tanda perang dan bencana abad XXI*. Delphi Publisher.
- Sjamsuddin, H. (1989). *Fighting Dutch rule in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: The social, political, ethnic, and dynastic roots of resistance in South and Central Kalimantan, 1859–1906* [Doctoral dissertation, Monash University].
- Sjamsuddin, H. (2001). *Pegustian dan Temenggung: Akar sosial, politik, etnis, dan dinasti perlawanan di Kalimantan Selatan dan Kalimantan Tengah, 1859–1906*. Balai Pustaka.
- Sjamsuddin, H. (2007). *Metodologi sejarah*. Ombak.
- Suwarno, M. H. (1983). *Ramalan Jayabaya versi Sabda Palon*. Yudha Gama Corporation.
- Toynbee, A. J. (1988). *Menyelamatkan hari depan umat manusia* (N. B. Sumanto, Trans.). Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Toynbee, A. J. (2006). *Sejarah umat manusia: Uraian analitis, kronologis, naratif, dan komparatif*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- White, H. (1985). *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Zuhdi, S. (2014). *Nasionalisme, laut, dan sejarah*. Komunitas Bambu.
- Zuhdi, S. (2017). *Integrasi bangsa dalam bingkai keindonesiaan*. Wedatama Widya Sastra.
- Zuhdi, S. (2018). *Sejarah Buton yang terabaikan: Labu rope labu wana*. Wedatama Widya Sastra.