

Some Problems in the Study of Old Javanese as a Linguistic System

by Thomas M. Hunter

Revised Abstract The primary purpose of this paper is to address the question of Old Javanese (or: Kawi) as a linguistic system. I begin by addressing a critique of my use of the term “hybrid language” in a description of the Old Javanese language (cf. Teeuw and Robson 2005, Hunter 2001) and develop a picture of Old Javanese as a language that represents the formalization of an important representative of the Western AN family of languages that ensured the preservation of its morpho-syntactic patterns over an exceptionally long time span (ca. 700-1900 CE). In order to shed light on the sociolinguistic context of this formalization I discuss Old Javanese in terms of the history of a contrast between “perfected” (*samskṛta*) and “natural” (*prākṛta*) languages that dominated South Asian discourses on language, and had a profound effect on how language was conceived in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago during the period of the “Sanskrit cosmopolis” (ca. 300-1500 CE). I argue that we should understand (later) Old Javanese, as well as ‘Middle Javanese’ in terms of processes of “literization” that accentuate formalism in textual discourses, but at times allow us to catch sight of patterns of linguistic organization that may be closer to the spoken idiom of the past.

In the second half of this paper I summarize some of the findings of the Working Paper that accompanies this address. I focus first on the deletion (or non-presence) of undergoer voice marking in the irrealis mode, claiming that this phenomena can be linked to “perfective” or “telic” features of undergoer voice in Old Javanese, and that from this we can understand voice marking in Old Javanese to “bundle” features of aspect and voice. After looking briefly at one form of Old Javanese imperative that also is notable for its (unusual) absence of voice-marking I summarize briefly some of my findings around a particle *n/an* that I postulate has the function of a complementizer in Old Javanese, illustrating my claims with examples of the function of this functional morpheme in control-verb and cleft constructions.

Part I: Old Javanese as a linguistic system: sociolinguistic and historical background

Introduction I like to think that criticisms are an important part of the way that we move our knowledge forward, even if they may be very painful when first encountered. In terms of what I would like to discuss today the first of these that has had a major effect on my thinking is an objection raised by Professors Teeuw and Robson (2005:2) to my use of the term “hybrid” with reference to the Old Javanese (OJ) language.¹ The second is an objection raised by Arlo Griffiths to my description of a particular syntactic structure represented in the

¹ In their discussion of the OJ language Teeuw and Robson (2005:2) note that “the qualification of Old Javanese literary language as a ‘hybrid language’ is somewhat misleading.” They are reacting here to a line from Hunter (2001:65) that reads:

“Rather than subjecting local languages to a rigorous grammatical analysis, the stylists of ancient Java enriched the Javanese of their era with Sanskrit lexical and textual materials. In the process they produced a hybrid language that almost from the start was accepted as a language of record whose role and status were nearly identical with that of Sanskrit in South Asia.” (emphasis mine)

kakawin *Arjunawiwāha* (AW).² In that case I had claimed that the poets of OJ consciously developed a series of required sandhi-junctures based on Indian models (which is true), including a set that requires a sound change to the initial nasal segments of certain verbal prefixes following several function words ending in the segment –n. The problem here is that the extension of the idea of the development of sandhi-junctures in OJ to the phonological changes triggered by –n is not true, since this is a regular sound change that is required within the constraints of OJ morphosyntax.

It is the combination of these two criticisms that informs much of what I would like to discuss today, including both sociolinguistic aspects of my talk, and the nuts-and-bolts sections that relate to the Working Paper distributed in preparation for this address. What links these two criticisms together is that both relate to the status of Old Javanese (or Kawi) as an autonomous linguistic system. It may seem to some that this question was settled long ago, and indeed we proceed in general as if there is no question of the status of OJ as a source of linguistic data. It is not my purpose here to rewrite the history of Old Javanese studies, but simply to suggest that the time is ripe for a careful appraisal of the historical and sociolinguistic factors that have ensured the remarkable consistency of morphological and syntactic form that is reflected in the greater majority of OJ textual sources, including the data set provided with the Working Paper that accompanies this address.

In order to make a start on this task I will make some comparisons here between the history of Sanskrit and Prakrit in India and the career of OJ and related languages in the archipelago. My purpose in this is not to suggest that the linguistic system of OJ was somehow affected by the norms of Pāṇinian syntax, but rather to suggest that the South Asian history of a dynamic relationship between “perfected” (*sams-kṛta*) and “natural” (*prā-kṛta*) languages had a profound effect on how language was understood in the Southeast Asian states that fall within what Pollock (1996) has famously referred to as a “Sanskrit ecumene” or “Sanskrit cosmopolis”.

Pollock’s various works draw heavily on sociolinguistic theory, especially formative works on the study of diglossia (Fishman: 1959, Ferguson: 1964) I don’t think it is necessary here to expound on diglossia, except to note that Pollock uses this term to describe a sociolinguistic state in which one variety of language “which is no one’s mother tongue” is superposed on another, which is presumed to be a spoken or vernacular language. I believe that we might want to term this “external diglossia” and use the term “internal diglossia” to refer to situations where one isolect among several in a given dialect area has attained the status of an elaborated code whose mastery is an important key to achieving political and economic success in some form of centralized (perhaps incipient) system of statehood.³ I believe that

² Personal communication, Arlo Griffiths, Feb 2009. Griffiths was kindly responding as a reader of one of two chapters in preparation on the relationship of the Indian *kāvya* and the Javano-Balinese *kakawin*, two closely related genres that have might be termed “lyrical court epics”.

³ It may be important to note here that Geoffrey Benjamin (1993), argues against using “elaborated” (as opposed to “restricted”) in descriptions of the differences between “everyday” and formal dialects, since the “everyday” mode (which he terms the “condensed mode”) is often capable of greater elaboration of contextual detail than

both “external” and “internal” diglossia can be factors that support the development of highly differentiated systems of “language registers” like those of Java and Bali, but would resist referring to these systems with the term “internal diglossia”. (In any case we would need to speak in terms of Pollock’s “hyperglossia”, since more than two registers are involved in both the Javanese and Balinese cases.)

I would like now to return to a short review of the history of Sanskrit and Prakrit in South Asia, and how this dynamic played out in ancient Java and Bali. We are accustomed to accepting Sanskrit as a source of linguistic data largely because we know with some certainty that when Pāṇini composed his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (ca. 600-400 BCE), and “set in stone” the rules for Sanskrit morphology and syntax, he was describing the spoken language of his time, a learned (*śiṣṭa*) Old Indo-Aryan (OIA) dialect of the north-western Gangetic plain. It was not long after this that the Ashokan inscriptions began to appear, composed in the Ardha-Māgadhī form of Prakrit. Here we must pause for a moment to consider the importance of the term “learned (*śiṣṭa*)” at this period in Indian history. For according to the hermeneutic system of the Mīmāṃsā philosophy (and generally accepted wherever Sanskrit was in use), the link between the sound and meaning of all words is guaranteed by their inherent “power” (*śakti*), but only utterances in Sanskrit can produce religious merit (*dharma*).

This view of language supported a continual effort to “refine” the use of Sanskrit in poetic and philosophical speech, producing those and only those derived lexemes that were authorized by the rules of Pāṇinian grammar, and arranging them in complex patterns assumed to reflect a higher symbolic order. This concept of language appears to have had a profound influence on how the isolects of Old and Middle Indo-Aryan that found their way into the Prakrit inscriptions were understood. Here we begin to see a process of literization that was to have profound influences all throughout the history of Sanskrit and Prakrit, and was not without its effects in insular Southeast Asia.

I will not attempt to trace the history of the various Prakrit languages of India, except to say that all of them appear to have gone through some degree of literization as they became the instruments of public discourse. It is also important to note that the earlier commentators on Pāṇini take a more-or-less pejorative view of the Prakrit languages, referring to them as *apabhraṃśa*, or “fallen” languages with respect to the “learned (*śiṣṭa*)” language they sought to preserve within the brahmanical heartland of the Gangetic plain. At the same time literary Prakrits had already achieved considerable local status, a fact that comes out clearly in the high regard paid to the celebrated *Sattasaī*, a collection of ‘rustic’ poems composed in Maharashtrian Prakrit as early as the first century CE, and attributed to the Śatavahana king

the higher status mode that he refers to as the “articulated” mode. The point is well taken, but perhaps need not mean abandoning the term “elaborated” if we read it in the sense of “articulated” and do not oppose it (as is too often the case) to a “restricted” mode of everyday speech. Some of the distinctions Benjamin makes are neatly summarized in the following citation (1993:366):

“The Malay dialect-continuum ranges between the more ‘condensed’, insider-orientated, event-salient varieties and the more ‘articulated’, outsider-orientated, participant-salient ones.”

As Benjamin makes clear the “articulated” mode of Malay shares with (formal) OJ a high development of voice-marking and related derivational morphology.

Hāla. By time that Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha had composed the first important critical works of Sanskrit poetics on the “lyrical court epics” (*kāvya*) and the Sanskrit theatre (ca. 700 CE), literized Prakrit languages had achieved a place of importance within the total range of literary forms, especially important in providing contrasts among character types in the Sanskrit dramas.⁴

In looking at the effects of this dynamic between “perfected” and (literized) “natural” languages in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago I have often used the term *em-bhāṣā-ment* to refer to a process whereby languages like Old Malay, Old Javanese, Old Balinese and Old Sundanese were “enriched” through an infusion of lexemes drawn from Sanskrit. This term has its problems, since *bhāṣā* has come to mean “vernacular language” in modern India, but it can be retained so long as we recall that what I intend here is a process whereby local, vernacular languages of the archipelago were “raised” to a status equal, or nearly equal to that of a “perfected language” (*saṃskṛta-bhāṣā*). It is interesting—and no doubt significant—that from the OJ poets themselves speak of their “transcreations” of Indian narratives in terms of a process of “Prakritization”. Composing in the mid-thirteenth century CE, Mpu Monagūṇa, for example describes his work as a “prakritization” of the story of Aja and Indumatī as told in the *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa:

The story of the *Sumanasāntaka* in Raghu’s book ends in the Nandana grove.
It was rendered into the vernacular in the form of a *kakawin* and offered as holy water at the feet of the king in poetic form.

ring Nandanawana wēkas ing kathā Sumanasāntaka ring aji Raghu
p-in-rākṛta rasa kakawin tinīrthakēn i jōng nrpati rasa langō [Sum 182.3]

While this term may seem to point to a “lowering” of a Sanskrit original to a “vernacular” form, I would argue that every evidence we have from the corpus of *kakawin* literature points rather to an understanding of Prakrit based on its later history in South Asia as an important category of literized languages deemed appropriate to the domains of philosophical and poetic creativity. Thus, the poets of ancient Java, could characterize themselves as producing works that partook of the higher status of Sanskrit (and the literary Prakrits), but brought the language of their works into a form that was more accessible—and therefore more attractive—to their contemporary audiences.

⁴ The cosmopolitan outlook that led to the acceptance of the Prakrit literary languages as a legitimate part of the literary culture of India was carried even further in the work of Rājaśekhara, who wrote his *Kāvyaṃimāṃsā* ca. 900 CE. Deshpande (1993:94) has summarized the great changes that had taken place in South Asia between the age of the grammarians and the heyday of the aesthetic theorists:

“While for Patañjali and Mānu the Āryavārta alone was the holy land, and all the outer regions were inhabited by fallen, impure and mixed populations, this view is no longer held by the time of Rājaśekhara. Rājaśekhara appreciates Sanskrit of the Gauḍas, poetry of the Kashmirians, Apabhraṃśa of Punjab, Prakrit of the Lāṭas and the recitation of the poets of Saurāṣṭra.”

What does this mean for our understanding of OJ as an autonomous linguistic system? Before suggesting an answer to this question I would like to first suggest a refinement to Pollock's use of sociolinguistic theory, which I believe may be pitched too much towards the influence of a superposed variety of language (Sanskrit), and therefore fails to take into account the more incremental changes that are currently studied in the field of contact linguistics (Winford: 2003) and in related sociolinguistic studies in "accommodation theory" (Giles et al: 1987). To oversimplify a complex issue, the long-term effects of language contact in insular Southeast Asia may be said to have developed along two distinct paths. In one of these, which might be termed "trade-route contact", sociolinguistic accommodation was of the "convergent" type favoured whenever two parties are seeking to maximize their return in economic exchanges. The effects on language that grow out of this kind of contact are exemplified in a language like Malay, which has adopted—but naturalized—a great number of lexemes from diverse ethno-linguistic partners in the ancient sea trade.

Languages like Old Javanese, Old Malay and Old Balinese exemplify a more complex type of language contact. In my model of this type of language contact the first stage was one of "convergent accommodation" initiated by South Asian priests and monks whose goal was to find a place for their religious doctrines and practices in the economically attractive lands of Southeast Asia. From the 'native' side a similar practice of "convergent accommodation" may have developed due to the close association in early Southeast Asia between the cultural capital of the ancient religions (Buddhism and 'Hinduism') and its embodiment in precious art objects. In this model (which I propose as an alternative to "legitimation theory") the practice of "convergent accommodation" in the linguistic sphere led to the creation of "prestige dialects". These were associated with local centres of economic and political influence that were open to, and indeed welcome, enrichment with lexical items—as well as poetic meters, figures and tropes—derived from the high status languages of South Asia, particularly Sanskrit and Pali (for Sri Lanka, Burma and Thailand).

A second (but early) step in the history of language contact of what might be termed the "learned" type can be understood as the stage at which "divergent accommodation" comes into play as users of the "prestige dialect" begin to see the advantages of increased social distance. Giles et al (cited in Winford 2003:119-120) speak of this type of accommodation as follows:

"[T]he notion of inter-group distinctiveness comes into play when speakers employ distinctive linguistic markers of their own group to emphasize their own group membership and disassociate themselves from their interlocutor. Divergent accommodation is therefore a strategy for maintaining social and psychological distance."

The long-term result of divergent accommodation is likely to be the development of a distinction between everyday speech and an elaborated code, which I have maintained earlier in this address represented "an important key to achieving political and economic success [...] in some form of (perhaps incipient) statehood." I would like to refine that definition somewhat here by pointing out that religious institutions—and the literary practices they fostered and

maintained—were not just “tolerated” by the state in ancient Southeast Asia, but were central to the very existence of the state. This comes out most clearly, perhaps, in Victor Liebermann’s term “charter state” (2003), which emphasizes the role played by the ecclesiastical institutions that framed the public inscription of economic arrangements that were central to the foundation and administration of the state.

With this we can finally return to the question of OJ as an autonomous linguistic system. My proposal here is that the conditions by which a “prestige dialect” are formulated means, first that a particularly robust local idiolect will emerge as the basis of the elaborated code, and second that once the process of formation of this prestige dialect is under way, there will arise a corresponding linguistic conservatism aimed at ensuring the continuing reproduction of the prestige dialect as a marker of high status social identities. It seems to me that this is the key to understanding the exceptionally long vitality of both the lexical base of OJ, and its repertoire of morphological and syntactic forms. For the linguist this is a fortuitous development, in that OJ appears to represent a stage in the development of the Western AN idiolects when there were still close correspondences with the types of linguistic system we find exemplified today in the Philippine languages. It is also fortuitous in that it means we can make general statements about syntactic and morphological patterns of OJ with some degree of certainty that they held good over a long historical period, with the caveat that we should always be prepared to develop a corpus of examples that covers a long time span, and includes information from inscriptional, prose and poetic forms of the Old Javanese language.

A view of the linguistic conservatism of OJ as founded in the emergence of a “prestige dialect” can also be useful in helping us to keep in sight the degree to which the structure of OJ may have been kept in place through the efforts of the religious and pedagogical institutions that supported the literary arts, and at the same time obscured changes in everyday speech that must have been proceeding apace all throughout the period of the ascendancy of OJ as an elaborated code. If we look at the materials analyzed in the Working Paper that accompanies this address, we find a few points at which it appears that an alternative form of linguistic organization is visible that diverges to some extent from the normal pattern. In the angry speech of Bhīma taken from an excerpt of the Parwa literature, for example, we find several uses of unmarked monomorphemic bases that fall outside the patterns typical of the more formal standards evident elsewhere (where voice-marking affixes and cliticization of pronominal forms are the norm).⁵ We find a similar pattern, but more pronounced, in an angry exchange between a crab and a heron in one of the animal stories of the *Tantri Kāmandaka*.⁶

These two instances of what appears to be an alternative mode of linguistic organization that appears to reflect the patterns of everyday speech, may help us to better understand the status

⁵ See Item 45 of the Working Paper accompanying this address. The lines reproduced there are from the *Wirāṭaparwa* as given in Zoetmulder (1963 [*Sēkar Sumawur* II], p. 33). See also Junyboll (1912).

⁶ See items 49-52 of the Working Paper for this address. These examples are cited from Mardiwarsito (1983: 30-31).

of the so-called ‘Middle Javanese’ language of the metrical *kidung* genre, and works in a related prose idiom like the *Pararaton*. I will not elaborate too much on this point today, but would like to call attention to a few points related to the basic claims of this address.

First, it is by no means certain that the language of the *kidung* genre is best described in terms of a single phenomenon. The framing of narrative in works like the *Kidung Harśawijaya*, for example, appears to me to be heavily influenced by the conventions of the *kakawin*, and stands in clear contrast to that of works like the *Kidung Rangga Lawe* or *Kidung Pamañcangah*, which may perhaps represent a “Gelgel style” in the composition of *kidung*. As I have noted elsewhere (Hunter 2007:41-45) we find in works like the *Pararaton* a curious retention of the OJ form of the (dependent) honorific 3rd person pronoun (*-nira*) in framing sections of the narrative, but a shift of usage of this pronoun to 2nd person reference in quoted speech. I have argued that the latter development can only represent a shift in the pronominal paradigm through a process of historical change, and that this would not have been possible within the context of the more formal structures of the *kakawin*. I have further argued (contra Berg 1927 and Vickers 2005) that this shift could only have taken place in Java (where vestiges of the latter usage are still found in the speech register of the Javanese *kraton*), and reflect a change in the patterns of Javanese speech.⁷

However, given the fact that the *kidung* were produced as literary works, and thus through processes of literization like those that gave rise in India to the literary and stage Prakrits, I would thus caution that we cannot speak of the language of the *kidung* as “spoken Javanese” at a later stage of development than the language of the *kakawin*. This does not mean that we cannot find evidence for the everyday language(s) of Java and Bali during the period of production of the *kidung*, especially if we look at the patterns of quoted speech that are found wherever dialogue is featured as a way to move forward the narrative. But we must always keep in mind that in all cases we are looking not directly at everyday speech itself, but its refraction in a literary dialect.

I close this section of my address by returning to the question of hybridity. I hope my discussion has shown that the formation of a “prestige dialect” is not about a hybrid formation, a term that perhaps more suitable to the study of pidgin languages, where the underlying syntactic forms of one language structure a lexicon largely derived from another language, usually one in a dominant socio-economic position. I believe that my mistake in using the term “hybrid” grew out of an incorrect assessment of the role played by Sanskrit lexical items in the derivational processes of OJ. These do give the appearance of something that could be compared in botanical terms to a fruit tree that can yield lemons oranges and limes through a process of grafting. But in the case of OJ it is the trunk of the tree that we must consider: while the lexical fruits of the tree may reflect the enrichment of grafting from Sanskrit sources, the system by which they are ordered (and a significant percentage of the lexical base) is Austronesian, and remained so for a period of over 1,000 years.

⁷ Note that this does not necessarily mean a shift in the patterns of ‘everyday speech’, since it is quite possible that the idiom of dialogue in early ‘Middle Javanese’ reflects the patterns of the “articulated” mode of a court milieu.

Part II: Old Javanese as a linguistic system: irrealis, imperative mode and complementation in Old Javanese syntax

I should begin this nuts-and-bolts part of my address by noting that I am to some extent “playing catch-up” in my work on Old Javanese syntax and semantics. While I received my early training in linguistics it was during the period of “the linguistics wars” and conducted in an atmosphere of intense rivalry between those who espoused some form of universal grammar and those who favoured “particularism” in the study of linguistic systems.⁸ I believe that it is fortunate that since that time studies in the typology of Austronesian voice systems, and a variety of forms of binding theory have offered several promising routes away from the earlier impasse that seemed to dominate American schools of linguistics in the 1970s and 1980s. In my case, since I had begun my studies of Old Javanese inspired by an exemplary generation of translators and critics including Professors Zoetmulder, Teeuw, Robson, Worsley and Supomo it was only natural that upon completion of my dissertation (1988) I turned to the problems of translation and to studies of the sociolinguistics and literary history of the corpus of works in Old Javanese language. At the same time, given my background in linguistics it was inevitable that when I took on the tasks of a translator I thought first in terms of a constituent analysis of the material at hand. This meant that I continued to pay attention to theoretical issues, but largely motivated by a desire to develop a consistent system of analysis that would support my work as a translator.

With this as background I can point out here that my analysis of the OJ undergoer voice forms in irrealis mode as based on a derivational “pathway” that includes the affixation of the UV marker (-)in- was first and foremost an analysis I developed as an aid to translation. For me the value of this approach is that it meant that once I had marked an irrealis form as based on a UV affix “under erasure” I would then perforce have to seek a subject (or Pivot) of that UV predicate that would be in some form of undergoer relationship to the VP. This might best be demonstrated with an example drawn from the Working Paper for this address.

[See Handout, page 1; Power Point slide 1]

This is an example that illustrates the abundant use of irrealis forms in a passage that might be characterized overall as representing the type of irrealis Oglobin (2005b: 620) refers to as “urged action”, but which also includes conditional and hortative uses of irrealis mode. The important thing to be noted from the point of view of my methodology is that the series of undergoer voice predicates that I have marked “under erasure” (and using bold face type) must refer to a single undergoer argument as subject. But what is that argument? If we attempt a translation first, prior to making certain to identify this subject of the several undergoer voice predicates in irrealis form we might propose (as I did originally) that the initial phrase of the second hemistich (*lit ny ālāya nikāna*) be translated “when the tendrils

⁸ See Yengoyan (1998) for a discussion of “particularity” as a linguistic methodology, Becker (1995b) and Foley and Van Valin (1984) for works that reflect the “particularist” and “universalist” views that enlivened debate and discussion at the University of Michigan during the 1970s and early 1980s.

are small”. This may, in fact, be a good way to phrase things in translation, but it obscures the fact that it is the phrase *lit ny ālāya nikāna* that is the subject of a series of undergoer voice predicates, and so should be understood in its (true) form as the NP: “the smallness of the shoots of those (trees)”. We can then understand exactly what it is that needs to be “picked out, uprooted and weeded out”.⁹

This example is also important for my analysis since it illustrates all three conditions under which a VP unmarked for voice appears in OJ, and suggests a refinement on the hypothesis I put forward in the Working Paper accompanying this address. These are illustrated as follows:

- four UV predicates in irrealis form: *pipilana*, *ḍawutana*, *watuněn*, *tamtāmana*
- one “direct imperative” form: *sapwani*
- one predicate unmarked for voice following *n/an*, a particle I have analyzed as having complementing functions (COMP): *watuněn*

There are some interesting observations that can be made about this set of predicates unmarked for voice:

- The UV predicates in irrealis form stand in clear contrast with an AV predicate in the fourth hemistich that does not lose its voice-marking morpheme in irrealis mode: *pipilana*, *ḍawutana*, *watuněn*, *tamtāmana* vs. *mamubura*.
- Direct imperative forms also ‘lose’ their voice-marking affixes, but in this case this is true of all the voice-marking affixes, whether stative, AV or UV.
- As it happens all of the unmarked predicates following COMP that I have examined in the Working Paper for this address are in that form not because of their following COMP, but because they are UV₂ predicates in irrealis mode.
- This means that, at least at this stage of analysis, there are two conditions under which a transitive VP is unmarked for voice: (1) when it is a UV₂ form in irrealis mode; (2) when it is a “direct imperative” form of any intransitive or VP normally taking voice-marking

I will turn briefly now to the question of whether it is justified to assume the “loss” of the UV₂ prefix/infix under conditions of irrealis. First, let us look at a portion of Oglobin’s paradigmatic analysis of the “indicative” and “irrealis” forms of the OJ verb.

[See Handout, page 2; Power Point slide 2]

⁹ The figure here is actually quite complex, since the small tendrils of trees that eventually destroy temples are revealed in the third hemistich to be comparable to the drunkenness and confusion of the mind that result from attachment to sense objects. The philosophical orientation is that of the Javanese Shaiva schools who take Samkhya-Yoga philosophy as basic; the figure is *arthāntara-nyāsa*, an “illustration of a particular case by a general proof, or a general truth by a particular case” (cf. Monier Williams 1981:91). See also Gerow (1971) for a more complete discussion of the figure *arthāntara-nyāsa*.

It should be clear here that the ONLY forms of the OJ verb that appear without a voice-marking prefix or infix are the “passive irrealis” forms, those that I refer to with the abbreviation UV₂, which refers to undergoer voice marking in (-)in. I analyze these undergoer voice forms as having a higher “transitivity” or “volitionality” than those marked with ka-, which I thus refer to as UV₁ forms—which not incidentally remain present in irrealis mode). My contention is that, at the very least, we should mark Oglobin’s “passive irrealis” forms in the form Ø-R-(+/- suffix). This marking might have the advantage of bringing out the contrastive aspect of the undergoer voice irrealis forms, without implying a judgement on a possible “cycle” of derivation.

This brings to mind comments of Kroeger that I have noted in the Working Paper for this address. Kroeger’s objections (1998:5) to some parts of Foley’s (1998) argument for a “cross-linguistic correlation between [...] two properties, i.e. pre-categorial roots and symmetric voice systems” might also be applied to OJ, especially in view of the presence of transitive VPs unmarked for voice, which I have identified in two passages that appear to reflect that patterns of everyday speech, rather than the formal patterns of literary OJ:

“It is tempting to assume that the stem prefixes themselves are a kind of derivational affix which determines the alignment between thematic roles and macro-roles, specifically the choice of Undergoer. However, this assumption would make it very difficult to account for the forms which have no stem prefix, e.g. *itaak* [...] especially since these forms are subject to the same semantic constraints as forms which do bear the relevant stem prefix, e.g. *pa-taak*, *pa-taak-an*. The only way around this problem would be to assume that the stem prefixes are first added, then deleted just in case the Undergoer is selected as Pivot. This proposal is so dubious that almost any other analysis would be preferable. Thus we are driven to the conclusion that the configuration of the argument structure is not derived by affixation. Rather, both of the possible argument structures, i.e. both possible alignments of thematic roles to macro-roles, are present in the lexicon before any affixation takes place.”

I believe that it may ultimately be more parsimonious to arrive at an understanding of the contrast of realis and irrealis modes in OJ that does not require postulating the addition of voice-marking affixes which are then deleted. However, for the present an analysis that retains reference to a prior state of undergoer marking, which is then deleted in irrealis mode has two advantages. First, it helps to reveal the complexities of derivation that will need to be accounted for in any thorough-going theoretical account of the OJ lexico-syntactic system. Second, it helps to highlight aspectual consequences of voice-marking in OJ that I have proposed are an important corollary of its voice-marking system as early as the work of my dissertation (1988).

To briefly summarize my work there I began by citing the cross-linguistic role of PAN *-in-* in the formation of “static words” (Bloomfield 1917), “passive substantives” (van der Tuuk 1971) or “the N affected by V-ing” (Starosta, Pawley and Reid: 1982). I then cite discussions of the aspectual consequences of AN voice system noted early on for Tagalog (Bloomfield:

1917), Samoan (Milner: 1973) and Bahasa Indonesia (Kana: 1983), calling special attention to Milner's (1973) description of what he terms the "telic" features of the perfective form:

"[A] perfective verb expresses the action as a total event summed up with reference to a single specific juncture." (1973: 629)

I enlist further support for linking undergoer voice and perfective aspect from the work of Hopper and Thompson (1980) on "transitivity", citing for example their linking of "telic action" with the patient:

"An action viewed from its endpoint, i.e. a telic action, is more effectively transferred to a patient, than one not provided with such an endpoint. In the telic sentence *I ate it all up*, the activity is viewed as complete, and the transferral carried out in its entirety, but in the atelic *I am eating it*, the transferral is only partially carried out." (1980:252)

I further cite Comrie's works (1976, 1981) on the recognition of analysts of Indo-European of certain "correlations between aspect and voice, in particular between perfect (resultative) aspect and passive voice" (1981:65), which he has found also are linked in languages like Modern Eastern Armenian and Nivkh. Comrie claims that while languages in general have a marked bias towards "A-orientation" (active voice, Actor Focus) under certain conditions this bias can be weakened in favour of "P-orientation" (passive, Goal Focus). He argues that "with the perfect one is interested in a state resulting from an earlier situation" and that in such cases "the resultant change of state is attributed primarily to P rather than A". Thus, "the perfect would be more likely than other aspects to correlate quite highly with the passive-ergative" (1981:7).

I will pass over the associated linkages of perfect or punctual aspect/undergoer voice with the definiteness of undergoer arguments, first noted for OJ by Zoetmulder and Poedjawijatna (1961:76). For my purposes today the important point is that a significant body of information and analysis exists to support the proposal that the UV₂ predicates of OJ should be understood as "bundling" voice-marking features with related features of transitivity that can be described under terms like "telic", "punctual" or "perfective". It follows logically from this that if the UV₂ markers bundle both undergoer valence in voice-marking and "perfective" aspectual features then—unlike their AV and (lower agency) UV₁ counterparts—they are incompatible with irrealis mode, which by definition can never be "telic, punctual or perfective" in aspect.

I will close this address by drawing attention to new information on the role of the morpheme *n/an* that I provisionally identified as a complementizing morpheme (COMP) in the Working Paper for this address. It has become evident during my search of the OJ verbal predicates that appear without a voice-marking prefix or infix (which represents the statistical majority of OJ verb forms). That COMP is often present in contexts where there has been deletion of an undergoer voice prefix or infix. As noted above, it turns out that at this stage in the analysis it cannot be said that COMP triggers loss of UV morphology, since for all the examples of post-COMP predicates that have come to light so far the loss of a voice-marking affix has resulted (as usual) under conditions of irrealis.

However, attention to this possibility has brought out a very revealing feature of the COMP. As Uhlenbeck claimed in his brief notes on the morpheme *n/this* affix is used where a pronoun or NP with pronominal clitic is “syntactically connected with the verb or verbal group which follows it” (1986:337). He further notes that “[t]his verb or verbal group has either as agent or as patient the person to whom the pronoun of pronominal suffix refers”. Beyond the fact that not all examples of the use of COMP fit this model, it is surprising that Uhlenbeck failed to draw the obvious conclusion from the set of conditions he describes for the use of *n/an*: if the agent or patient of the clause following COMP can only be located prior to COMP and nothing can intervene between COMP and a following “verbal group”, then we must be seeing equi-NP-deletion here, with all that that implies about syntactic operations that in one or another have to do with embedding, ‘raising’ or subordination. Since every language must provide mechanisms supporting recursiveness, and to date we have only been aware of (1) sentential)nominalizations in *ka-R*, *ka-R-an*, *pa-R* or *paN-R* and simple relative clauses formed with *ng*, *sang* or *ikang*, then an understanding of the role of *n/an* in complementation might add a new dimension to our study of OJ syntax and semantics.¹⁰ Two examples from a single passage in the 19th century kakawin *Abhimanyuwīwāha* (AbhiW) give evidence of the kinds of complex of syntactic phenomena that come into play around *n/an*.

[See Handout, page 2; Power Point slide 3]

The first of these examples, from the second hemistich of AbhW 69.1, is straightforward: here we find a case where a control verb (*ang-utus*, “command”) has triggered equi-NP-deletion of the subject (*sira*, “she/the princess”) of the AV predicate in the ‘downstairs’ clause that follows the complementizer;

The second example, from the third hemistich of the same verse, is less amenable to an easy analysis. In my first attempt at an analysis I assumed that this might be a case where uses of COMP that follow Uhlenbeck’s pattern might be judged to form complex relative clauses. In this reading the third hemistich of AbhiW 69.1 might be understood as a relative clause:

<i>lěnglěngnyāngaděg ing natar yaya</i>	
<u>her entrancing beauty as she stood in the courtyard (?)</u>	which
HEAD	COMP/REL
<i>amāryakěna kalangěn ing niśākara</i>	
<u>might put an end to the beauty of the moon</u>	
REL CLAUSE (AV subject coreferential with Head)	

¹⁰ See Hunter (1988: 73-5) for examples of nominalization of sentential units in OJ based on *ka-R-an*, Hunter (1988: 80-82) for sentential nominalizations based on *pa-/paN-*. For a case of a simple relative clause formed with the ‘definite’ morpheme *ng* see Item 24 of the Working Paper, the first line of *Hariwangśa* 4.4 (*sira ng utusěn lumampaha*, “he [+ resp] **who** [REL] was to be commissioned to go forth (in the service of Abhimanyu’s mission)”).

But this analysis does not account for *yaya*, a word that can be translated “in any case, even so, certainly; it looks as if, like, as” (cf. OJED 2362). This reading, moreover, results in the conclusion that this line (which does not depend on either the preceding or following line for further information) is one long relative clause, and hence not a complete sentence—something that is extremely rare, if not impossible, in the kakawin. Taking *yaya* into consideration—especially a possible gloss as “it looks like” that is suggestive of a reading of this lexeme as one form of existential—I propose to reanalyze this sentence as a cleft (emphatic focus) construction, and hence to be more accurately represented as:

lěnglěngnyângadĕg ing natar yaya
(It is) certainly her entrancing beauty standing in the courtyard
EXISTENTIAL CLAUSE

n
that
COMP

amāryakĕna kalangĕn ing niśākara
might put an end (surpass) the beauty of the moon.
COMPLEMENT CLAUSE

I hope that these two examples of the complex syntactic operations that are rendered possible through use of the complementizing morpheme *n/an* will lead to further enquiry into this important form of recursiveness in OJ.

I close this address with the hope that I may have raised some points that can suggest new directions in the study of the syntax and semantics of the Old Javanese language. As I noted in the first section of this address I would like to suggest an extension of the scope of this endeavour to take in the larger field of the literized languages that includes works in the ‘Middle Javanese’ language, as well as intermediary forms between Old and Middle Javanese and the modern languages of Java and Bali for which we have as yet no convenient identifying term.

Example 1: voice-marked predicates of *Arjunawiwāha* 35.8

akweh	caṇḍi	rēbah	ka-ton-a	tēkap
			UV ₁ -see-IRR	
many	temples	collapse	can-be-seen (future)	by the action
i-ng	waringin	athawa	bodhi hambulu	
LOC-DEF	banyan			
of	banyan	or	<i>bodhi</i> and <i>ambula</i> trees	
<u>lit</u>	<u>ny</u>	<u>ālāya</u>	<u>nikāna</u>	yan
				pipilaneka
				p- in -pipil-an
small	OBL	shoots	OBL-DIS ₂	COND
small	of	shoots	of-them	that
				should be picked up
				DIS ₁
				those
ḍawutana		kapāna	yan	hanā
ḍ- in -awut-an-a				
UV ₂ -weed out-LV-IRR		when-IRR	COND	EXIST
should be weeded out		whenever	that	exist
hīnganya	n	watunēn		tikang
		w- in -atu-nēn		
limit-pro3	COMP	UV ₂ -pluck-out-IRR		D.PRTCL-DIS ₁ -DEF
to-the-extent	that	should be plucked out		those things (to follow)
<u>mada</u>	<u>wimoha</u>	<u>t-um-uwuh</u>	<u>i</u>	<u>manah-ta</u>
		AV ₂ -grow	LOC	mind-pro2 (HON)
Drunkenness	confusion	grow	in	your mind
				sapw-ani
				Ø-broom-Tr ₁ (IMP)
				sweep away!
yan	tamtāmana	wiṣṭi	yan	pangawaśanya
	t- in -amtam-LV-IRR			paN-awaśa-nya
COND	UV ₂ -be overcome		COND	AV ₂ Nom-power-pro3
if	yielded to (future)	danger	then	their irresistible dominion
basama	<u>mamubura</u>	ng	parākrama	
	AV ₂ -bubur-IRR	DEF		
dangerous	will crush	the/your	valour (victory over opponents)	

Many are the *candi* that can be seen (future) to crumble from the action of *banyan*, *bodhi* and *ambulu* trees,

It is **the smallness of the tendrils** they should be uprooted carefully, plucked out one by one whenever they appear,

To that point too you should uproot the intoxication and sensual confusion that grow in the heart—sweep them away!

If you yield to their dangers, they will have irresistible force and their power will crush your fortitude and valour.

Illustration 1: Portion of a paradigm for OJ indicative and irrealis verbs, reproduced (and translated) from Oglobin (2005a:9)

c. Verbs taking the suffix *-i*: *-weh-i* “give” (someone, something), *-tinghal-i* “gaze at”

	Indicative	Irrealis
Active 1	<i>ameh-i</i> <i>aninghal-i</i>	<i>ameh-an-a</i>
Active 2	<i>t-um-inghal-i</i>	<i>t-um-inghal-an-a</i>
Passive	<i>w-ih-eh-an</i> <i>t-in-inghal-an</i>	<i>weh-an-a</i> <i>tinghal-an-a</i>

Example 2: Uses of complementizer *n/an* with a control-verb (*utus*) and a cleft-construction

Abhimanyu Wiwāha 69.1

[2nd hemistich]

ngkā	prāpteña		-nirâ	(a)ngutus	ri	sira
DEF-DIS ₁	prapta arrive	iña duenna	-pro3	aN-utus AV ₂ .order	DAT	pro3 HON

n	a-hyas-a	tēhēr	a-salin	nṛpātmaja
COMP	ST-attive-IRR	at the same time	ST-change clothing	prince

“There/then her (+resp) duenna arrived, ordering **that** (she) put on festive attire, (for) at the same time the prince was changing his clothing.”

[3rd hemistich]

lēnglēngnyâ	(a)ngadēg	i-ng	natar	yaya
enchanted beauty-pro3	aN-adēg AV ₂ -stand	LOC-DEF	houseyard	certainly

n	amāryakēna	kalangēn	i-ng	niśākara
COMP	aN-[ma(a)-ary]-akēn-a AV ₂ -[ST-cease]-Tr ₂ -IRR	beauty	LOC-DEF	moon

“Certainly (it was) her (+resp) enchanting beauty as she stood in the courtyard **that** might bring to an end (surpass) the beauty of the moon.”

Abbreviations and Works Cited

Note This list includes abbreviations and works cited in: (1) “Some Problems in the Study of Old Javanese as a Linguistic System”, and (2) “Working Paper on Irrealis, Imperative Mode and Complementation in Old Javanese Syntax”, both written for the Second International Conference on the Languages of Java, Senggigi, Lombok, 4-5 June 2009.

I. Abbreviations

a. general

AbhW	<i>Abhimanyuwīwāha</i> (kakawin)
AN	Austronesian family of languages
AW	<i>Arjunawīwāha</i> of Mpu Kaṇwa (kakawin)
BY	<i>Bhāratayuddha</i> Mpu Sēḍan and Mpu Panuluh (kakawin)
GK	<i>Ghaṭotkacāśraya</i> of Mpu Panuluh (kakawin)
HW	<i>Hariwangśa</i> of Mpu Panuluh (kakawin)
KY	<i>Kṛṣṇāyana</i> of Mpu Triguna (kakawin)
OB	Old Balinese Language
OIA	Old Indo-Aryan languages
OJ	Old Javanese, or Kawi, language
OJR	Old Javanese <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> or <i>Kakawin Rāmāyaṇa</i>
OM	Old Malay language
OJED	<i>Old Javanese-English Dictionary</i> (Zoetmulder and Robson, 1982)
PYn	<i>Pārthayajña</i> (kakawin, anonymous authorship)
SD	<i>Smaradahana</i> of Mpu Dharmaja (kakawin)
SS	<i>Sēkar Sumawur</i> (Zoetmulder 1958, 1963)

b. glossing conventions

ACT	Actor
AV	Actor-voice
AV ₁	Actor voice marking (1): lower volitionality
AV ₂	Actor voice marking (2): higher volitionality
COMP	complementizer
COND	conditional
D.PTCL	discourse particle
DAT	dative (preposition in OJ; also carries meaning “with reference to”)
DEF	definite
DIST	distal (marked as DIST ₁ for the basic distal deictic of the tripartite deictic system of OJ (ika), DIST ₁₊₁ for the first derived form (<i>ikana</i>))
EMPH	emphatic
EXIST	existential
FUT	future
HON	honorific

IMP	imperative
INTSF	intensifying morpheme (in OJ)
IRR	irrealis
LK	linker, ligature
LOC	locative (preposition in OJ)
LV	locative voice (a subcategory of undergoer in OJ)
MED	medial
NEG	negation
Nom	nominalizing prefix or verb-stem marker
NP	noun phrase
OBL	oblique (preposition in OJ)
pp	prepositional phrase
pro	pronoun
PRX	proximate
REL	relative marker
RDP	reduplication
ST	stative
SUB	subject (or: Pivot)
Tr ₁	Transitivizing suffix (1): applicative indicating “locative roles” Wechsler and Arka (1998), or “stationary” goals (Oglobin 2005b)
Tr ₂	Transitivizing suffix (2): applicative indicating goals that are moved (themes) or strongly affected (Oglobin 2005b)
UV	undergoer voice
UV ₁	Undergoer voice marking (1): weakening volitional or agentive
UV ₂	Undergoer voice marking (2): strongly volitional; obligatorily agentive
VP	verb phrase

II. Works Cited

Acri, Andrea

2006 “The Sanskrit-Old Javanese Tutar Literature from Bali. The Textual Basis of Shaivism in Ancient Indonesia.” *Rivista di Studi Sudasiatici*, 1, pp. 113-143.

Adelaar, Sander and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.)

2005 *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London and New York: Routledge

Becker, Alton with I Gusti Ngurah Oka

1995a “Person in Kawi: Exploration of an Elementary Semantic Dimension.” In Becker, Alton *Beyond Translation, Essays Toward a Modern Philology*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, pp. 109-136. [First published *Oceanic Linguistics* 13, 1974, pp. 229-55; see also *Bulletin Yaperna* No. 8, Tahun II, Augustus 1975, pp. 17-35].

1995b *Beyond Translation, Essays toward a Modern Philology*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Benjamin, Geoffrey

1993 "Grammar and polity: the cultural and political background to Standard Malay." In: Foley, William A. (ed.), *The role of theory in language description* [= *Trends in linguistics, Studies and monographs* 69], Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 341–392.

Bloomfield, Leonard

1917 *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Boechari (ed.)

1985-6 *Prasasti Koleksi Museum Nasional, Jilid I*. Jakarta: Museum Nasional.

C. C. Berg

1927 *De middlejavaansche historische traditie*. Santpoort: Mees.

Comrie, Bernard

1976 *Aspect: an Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.

1981 "Aspect and voice: some reflections on perfect and passive" In Tedeschi, Philip J. and Annie Zaenen (eds.) *Tense and Aspect*. [*Syntax and Semantics* 14]. New York: Academic Press, pp. 65-78.

Deshpande, Madhav M.

1993 *Sanskrit and Prakrit: Sociolinguistic Issues*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Ferguson, C.A.

1959 "Diglossia." *Word*, Vol. 15, pp. 325-40.

Fishman, Joshua A.

1964 "Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry." *Linguistics* 9, pp. 32-70.

Foley, William A.

1998 "Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in Philippine languages. Seminar paper for the 3rd LFG Conference, Brisbane 30 June - 3 July, 1998.

Foley, William A. and Robert D. VanValin

1984 *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gerow, Edwin

1971 *A Glossary of Indian Figures of Speech*. The Hague: Mouton.

Giles, Howard, Miles Hewstone, Ellen Bouchard Ryan, and Patricia Johnson (eds.)

1987 "Research on Language Attitudes." In U. Ammon, N., Dittmar and K. Mattheier (eds.) *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, Vol. I, pp. 585-597.

Himmelmann, Nikolaur P.

- 2205a “The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar: typological characteristics.”
In Adelaar, Sander and Nicolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.) *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 110-181.
- 2005b “Tagalog.” In Adelaar, Sander and Nicolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.) *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 350-376.

Hooykaas, C.

- 1931 *Tantri Kāmandaka: Een Oudjavaansche Pañtjatantra-Bewerking, in tekst en vertaling uitgegeven door C. Hooykaas*. Bandoeng: A. C. Nix & Co.

Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra Thompson

- 1980 “Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse.” *Language* 56, pp. 251-299.

Hunter, Thomas M.

- 1987 “Kajian Ringkas Masalah Valensi Morfologi dalam Bahasa Djawa Kuna.”
Majalah Linguistik Indonesia, Vol. 5.2. Jakarta: Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia, pp. 1-61.
- 1988 “Participant Marking in Old Javanese.” [Chapter Two of Hunter 1988: “Balinese Language: Historical Background and Contemporary State.” Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Michigan]
- 2001 “Wrttasancaya Reconsidered.” In *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde*, Vol. 157-1, pp. 65-96.
- 2007 “The Body of the King, Reappraising Singhasari Period Syncretism.” *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 27-53.
- 2009 “Yati, a Structural Principle in Old Javanese Poetics.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52 (August), pp. 1-52.

Irwin, Michael C.

- 2005 “Colloquial Indonsian.” In Adelaar, Sander and Nicolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.) *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London and New York: Routledge, pp.227-258.

Juynboll, H.H.

- 1912 *Wirāṭaparwa. Oudjavaansch prozageschrift*. The Hague.

Kana, Marit

- 1983 “The Syntax and Semantics of Verbal Prefixes in Bahasa Indonesia.” In Amran Halim (ed.) *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Vol. II Tracking the Travlers*. [Pacific Linguistics, Series C, No. 77] Canberra: Australian National University, pp.21-34.

Kroeger, Paul R.

- 1998 “Nouns and Verbs in Tagalog: a reply to Foley.” Seminar paper for the 3rd LFG Conference, Brisbane 30 June - 3 July, 1998.

Liebermann, Victor

2003 *Strange Parallels: Volume 1, Integration on the Mainland: Southeast Asia in Global Context, c. 800-1830*. [Cambridge Studies in Comparative World History]. Cambridge University Press.

Mardiarsito, L.

1983 *Tantri Kāmandaka, naskah dan terjemahan dengan Glosarium*. Ende-Flores: Penerbit Nusa Indah and Yogyakarta: Yayasan Kanisius.

Masica, Colin

1976 *Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Milner, George P.

1973 "Is it Aspect (not Voice) that is marked in Samoan?" *Oceanic Linguistics* 14, pp. 12-79.

Monier-Williams, Monier

1981 *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Second Impression, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [First Impression Oxford, 1851]

Oglobin, Alexander K.

2005a "Irrealis in Old Javanese." A Seminar paper presented for the Seminar Internasional Jawa Kuna, Mengenang Jasa-Jasa Prof. Dr. P.J. Zoetmulder S.J., Kajian Bahasa, Sastra dan Budaya Jawa Kuna, diselenggarakan oleh Progam Studi Jawa, Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 8-9 Juli 2005.

2005b "Notes on Old Javanese and Structural Changes in the History of Old Javanese." In Adelaar, Sander and Nicolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.) *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 615-621.

2000c "Javanese." In Adelaar, Sander and Nicolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.) *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 590-624.

Pollock, Sheldon

1996 "The Sanskrit cosmopolis, 300-1300 CE; Transculturation, vernacularization, and the question of ideology." In Houben (1996), pp. 197-248.

1998 "The Cosmopolitan Vernacular." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 57, no. 1 (February), pp.6-37.

Ricklefs, M.C.

1998 *The Seen and Unseen Worlds in Java 1726-1749: History, Literature and Islam in the Court of Pakabuwana II*. Melbourne: Asian Studies Association of Australia.

Sarcar, Himamsu Bhusan

1971 *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java (Corpus Inscriptionum Javanicarum, up to 928 A.D.)* [2 Volumes] Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay.

Singhal, Sudarshana Devi

1957 *Wrhaspati-tattwa, an Old Javanese philosophical text*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

1958 *Ganapati-tattva*. [Śata-piṭaka Series 4]. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley and Lawrence A. Reid (eds.)
 1982 "The Evolution of Focus in Austronesian." In Amran Halim (ed.) *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Vol. II Tracking the Travellers*. [*Pacific Linguistics*, Series C, No. 77] Canberra: Australian National University, pp. 145-170.
- Supomo, S.
 1993 *Bharatayuddha; an Old Javanese poem and Indian sources*. [Śata-Piṭaka Series 373.] New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture / Aditya Prakashan.
- Supomo, S and Thomas M. Hunter
 [In preparation] "Sekar Iniket; an Anthology of Old Javanese Kakawin Literature."
- Teselkin, A.S.
 1972 *Old Javanese (Kawi)*. [Translated from the Russian original by J.M. Echols; Translation Series, Modern Indonesia Project, Southeast Asia Program] Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- van der Tuuk, Hermanus Neubronner
 1971 *A grammar of Toba Batak*. [Edited by A. Teeuw dan R. Roolvink; translated from the original Dutch by J. Scott-Kemball; first published in Dutch in 1864-1867.] The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Uhlenbeck, E.M.
 1986 "Clitic, Suffix and Particle: Some Indispensable Distinctions in Old Javanese Grammar." In Hellwig, C.M.S and S.O. Robson (eds.) *A Man of Indonesian Letters, Essays in Honour of Professor A. Teeuw*. [Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 121] Dordrecht, Holland/Cinnaminton, USA: Foris Publications, pp. 334-341.
 1987 "Sentence Patterns in the Old Javanese of the Parwa Literature." In Laycock, Donald C. And Werner Winter (eds.) *A world of languages, papers presented to Professor S.A. Wurm on his 65th birthday*. [*Pacific Linguistics*, C-100], pp. 695-708.
- Vickers, Adrian
 2005 *Journeys of desire: A study of the Balinese text Malat*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Wechsler, Stephen. and I Wayan Arka
 1998 "Syntactic Ergativity in Balinese: an Argument Structure Based Theory." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, pp. 387-442.
- Winford, Donald
 2003 *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Yengoyan, Aram
 1998 "Lyotard and Wittgenstein and the Question of Translation." A seminar paper presented for the Wenner-Gren Conference on Translation in Anthropology, Barnard College, New York, 10-12 November, 1988.
- Zoetmulder, P.J.

- 1958 *Sěkar Sumawur. Bunga rampai bahasa Djawa Kuno I Dewamānuṣarākṣasādi.* Djakarta.
- 1963 *Sěkar Sumawur. Bunga rampai bahasa Djawa Kuno II Korawapāṇḍawacarita.* Djakarta
- 1983 *De tall ven het Ādiparwa, een grammaticale stuide van het Oudjavaans.* [Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde *Indonesische Herdrukken*] Holland/USA: Foris Publications. [Originally published 1950 in the *Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen*, number 79; Bandung: Nix & Co.]

Zoetmuder, P.J. and Poedjawijatna, I.R.

- 1961 *Bahasa Parwa. Tatabahasa Jawa Kuna I, Bentuk kata.* [First publisehd in Jakarta, 1954] Gadjah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta.
- 1967 *Bahasa Parwa. Tatabahasa Jawa Kuna II, Bentuk kalimat.* [First publisehd in Jakarta, 1955] Gadjah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta.