CHAPTER SIX

OLD MALAY

Waruno Mahdi

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Sources

Old Malay (OM) is the conventional designation for the language of the earliest Malay epigraphy (seventh to tenth centuries AD). The language of Malay inscriptions of the subsequent period, though also preceding Classical Malay (CM), the language of Malay classical literature, is usually not considered OM (see e.g. Kridalaksana 1991:168). In this chapter, comparisons will be made with corresponding items in CM, in modern Indonesian Malay (IM), or in both of these (C/IM).

The known OM inscriptions are limited in number (see Table 6.1) and dialectally not uniform. Several (Kota Kapur, Karang Brahi, Palas Pasemah, and the Sabokingking Naga stone) have a non-OM introductory formula. Its language, called ‘language B’ by Damais (1968), bears similarities with Malagasy (Aichele 1954, Damais 1968, Adelaar 1989:36–37 who also compared Maanyan, Dahl 1991:49–55 who proposed to call it ‘Old Maanyan’).

Many inscriptions are damaged, or rather short. Three long ones, Karang Brahi, Palas Pasemah, and Kota Kapur are practically identical (wherefore only the latter will be quoted here). The fragmentary Sabokingking B and incomplete Kedukan Bukit inscriptions represent partly overlapping passages of the same text. OM texts abound with Sanskritisms retaining original Sanskrit spelling. In all, the available non-Sanskrit OM vocabulary covers barely 150 basic lexical units (Vikør 1988:81–83 lists 144). All this sets certain limits to a description of the language.


1.2 Archaeological and historiographic data on chronology and distribution


The bulk of OM inscriptions are from Sumatra and immediately neighboring Bangka island, being typically set up by rulers of Sriwijaya (Śrī-Vijaya). This thalassocracy was first identified by Çördës (1918), and its location in Palembang has now been archaeologically confirmed (Manguin 1987, 1993). With exception of the Laguna copper plate found in the Philippines (Postma 1992), the remaining OM inscriptions were discovered in Java.
The development of OM before the seventh century AD is not documented, but archaeological studies (Solheim 1980:334) and other data (Mahdi 1994:188–191, 1995:162–165) suggest that Malay-speaking seafarers became involved in sea trade with China, India, and the Near East between 200 BC and AD 200.

The apparently Malay polity of Yavadvipa emerged in the second century AD, being mentioned as Yavadvipa (Sanskrit dvipa ‘island’) in Valmiki’s Rāmāyana, as labadiou and Sabadeība in Ptolemy’s Geography, and as Ye⁴diao⁴ with 132 AD dating in the Later Han Annals (Hou⁴han’shu’), subsequently sometimes misspelled Si’diao⁴ (Mahdi 1994:173, 204–205 nn. 25–26, 215 n. 93, 469–470 n. 111, 1995:165–166). Historiographic data imply a location on the east coast of Sumatra between the latitudes of Bangka and Singapore (Mahdi 1994:206 n. 27, 1995:167–170, cf. also Obdeyn 1941: map 3 at back of issue), i.e. in the region of later Malayu (whence C/IM Malayu ‘Malay’).

Consequently, Malays and places they inhabited or ruled were referred to as Jāvaka in Pali, Cavakam in Tamil, (az-)Zābağ in Arabic, and as either Še⁴po² ~ Še⁴po² (< *jaba) or Še⁶bo² ~ Zho⁶bo² (< *jabak[a] ~ *jobak[a]) in Chinese (Mahdi 1994:205–206 n. 26, 214 n. 84, 474 n. 138, 1995:170–171). Middle Khmer had Cvä (Çedèes and Dupont 1943:106 fn.1), from Old Khmer Javā ~ Jvä. The Modern Khmer reflex Cvī means ‘Malay[an]’ as well as ‘Java[nese]’ (Headley et al. 1977:264) but in fixed expressions it only refers to the former, e.g. Srokovcvie ‘Malaya’ (srok ‘land’, ‘country’). Malay itself has Jawi ‘Malay[an]’ borrowed from the Arabic (Wilkinson 1901–1903:218).

Since the third century AD, Chinese sources referred to Malay-speaking sailors as Gu³lun² ~ Ku¹lun² ~ Jue²lun² (the latter a misspelling). By the seventh century, one also finds the non-cognate Kun¹lun² as reference to Malay language and people (Mahdi 1999a:163–165). Yijing reports that three pilgrims visiting Sriwijaya (Shi³li²fo²shi⁴) learned the Kun¹lun² language (I-Tsing 1894:63, 159, 183), thus identifying this as OM (the language of Sriwijaya).

### 1.3 Dialectal variety

The precise relationship between OM and CM is still subject to discussion (Ronkel 1924:16, 21, Aichele 1942–1943:45–46, Teeuw 1959:141–144, Adelaar 1985:191 and in press, Ross in press). The most conspicuous contrast involves the prefixes of the passive voice and of the stative verb forms, being respectively di- and bar- (bar-in early documents) in CM, but ni- and mar- (read mœr-) in the original official OM dialect of Sriwijaya epigraphy. Later OM inscriptions from outside Sumatra typically feature di- and bar- or var- respectively, being in agreement with the CM.

Dialectal variety is thought to have existed at the time of OM epigraphy, and non-standard dialects featuring di- and bar- must have existed parallel to the official OM dialect having ni- and mar- (Aichele 1942–1943, Teeuw 1959). Appearance of the former prefixes in later inscriptions is seen as influence of non-standard dialects. The latter also played an important role in the transition to CM (Adelaar in press).

There is indeed evidence that the two dialects coexisted at the time Sriwijaya arose in the second half of the seventh century. The dialect with mœr- is attested by the name of the West-Sumatran volcano Merapi (< mœr-prefix + api ‘fire’) – apparently having ritual significance for Yavadvipa – subsequently also conferred to a volcano in Central Java by a ruler originating from, or affiliated to, Yavadvipa. Meanwhile, the dialect with bar- is attested to by the original coining of C/IM pohon børningin ‘willow fig (Ficus benjamina L., often treated as sacred)’ (pohon ‘tree’, ingin ‘wish’; Aichele 1928:28 fn. 4). This tree
name corresponds to Sanskrit kalpavrksa ‘wishing tree, a mythical banyan tree (Ficus indica L., resembling the willow fig in many features)’, and was borrowed into Javanese as waringin ‘willow fig’. The \( b > w \) shift in the latter suggests very early borrowing, apparently before the seventh century (cf. Mahdi 1999b: 196–197, 210–212).

Although OM ni- and mar- reflect relatively widespread Austronesian proto-affixes \(*<in>/ni-\) and \(*maR-/\), they are unique within the Malayic group. All other Malayic isolects have di- and b[ar]-ba- respectively. Three alternative treatments of this situation have been proposed:

1. Proto-Malayic had *di- and *baR-, so that OM is not a descendant of Proto-Malayic (Ross in press);
2. Proto-Malayic had *ni- and *maR-, the former was replaced by di- and the latter shifted to b[ar] in colloquial dialects of OM, subsequently determining the prevalent dialect and influencing all other Malayic isolects (Adelaar in press); and
3. Proto-Malayic had *di- and *vaR-, retained in OM colloquial dialects that subsequently became prevalent, while mar- (and ni-) were borrowed from Batak (Aichele 1942–1943:45–46, cf. also Ronkel 1924:16, 21). Aichele had simply too automatically taken the situation in CM as ‘standard’, thus requiring an external source as explanation for the deviant prefixes of OM (Teeuw 1959:141–144). In my opinion, it is nevertheless quite likely that the ruling elite in second-century Yavadvipa was at least partly of Batak extraction, which would explain Batakisms in the court language. Considering the numerous megalithic and early Hinduist monuments of Central Sumatra (see Schnitger 1939–1943, 1964), the adjacency to Barus, and other circumstances, Bataks must have played an important role in the late prehistoric period of the region.

What is undisputed, however, is that one must distinguish an original nuclear OM epigraphy featuring the verbal prefixes ni- and mar-, and a later dialectally contaminated OM with di- and var-/bar-. Another distinctive feature of later inscriptions is the appearance of retroflex \( d \) in many indigenous words, whereas in the nuclear inscriptions of Sumatra it only occurred in a few honorific words (see 2.2).

For the sake of dialectal uniformity, the further discussion will be based on inscriptions featuring the prefixes mar- and ni-, and not having \( d \) in non-honorific indigenous words. This nuclear OM corpus encompasses inscriptions BS, KB, KK, SKB, SKN, and TT as indicated in Table 6.1. One dialectally divergent inscription, SHW, will be quoted for comparative data. Cited passages will be identified by the abbreviated inscription name and the line number.

2 SPELLING AND PHONOLOGY

2.1 Basic characters for consonants

OM phonology can only be inferred from the spelling. An overview was provided by Vikør (1988:67–84). The Later Pallava script developed from an earlier South Indian version (see Casparis 1975:20–25) and was used in the nuclear corpus of OM epigraphy – in which usage it is often referred to as Old Sumatran script. It is illustrated in a table by Boechari in Kridalaksana (1982:xxi).

The script is syllabic, with basic characters (aksara-s) denoting syllable-initial consonants with \( a \) as a default vowel, and with additional marks placed above, before, behind, or under a basic character, mainly in order to replace the default vowel by another syllabic element, or to suppress it. There are special basic characters for syllables without consonant initial. Various ligatures are used for consonant clusters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Prefix*</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Source references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bukateja</td>
<td>c. 840</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td>Casparis (1956:207–211 #8), Suhadi (1983:76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BS = Bukit Seguntang</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dang Puhawang Glis</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>ni-, mar-</td>
<td>Palembang</td>
<td>Casparis (1956:2–6 #1a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieng – Namaçazıwa</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td>Brandes (1913:227–228 #96), Suhadi (1983:75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwadrawya</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Lampung</td>
<td>Damais (1955:130–133 #E.5), Damais (1960a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hujung Langit (Bawang)</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karang Brahi (similar to Kota Kapur)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ni-, mar-</td>
<td>Jambi</td>
<td>Krom (1920:426–431 #XVI), Çedès (1930:45 #3), Boechari (1979), Suhadi (1983:78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebon Kopi (similar to Kota Kapur)</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>bar-/</td>
<td>West Java</td>
<td>Bosch (1941), Suhadi (1983:70, 76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna copper plate</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>di-, bar-</td>
<td>Luzon</td>
<td>Postma (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjucirgrrha</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td>Boechari unpublished (Suhadi 1983:68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palas Pasemah (similar to Kota Kapur)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>Lampung</td>
<td>Boechari (1979), Suhadi (1983:78–79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKB = Sabokingking B</strong> (Telaga Batu)**</td>
<td></td>
<td>— e</td>
<td>Palembang</td>
<td>Casparis (1956:11–15 #1e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKN = Sabokingking</strong> (Telaga Batu)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHW = Sang Hyang Wintang (Gandasuli)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojomerto</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td>Boechari (1966), Suhadi (1983:74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulu Belu</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Lampung</td>
<td>Damais (1960b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Critical prefix variants for dialect identification (*ni-* versus *di-*; *mar-* versus *var-/bar-*).

*b* References to a Gandasuli (also Kedu) inscription usually imply Sang Hyang Wintang rather than Dang Puhawang Gils.

*c* The Kebon Kopi – Rakryan Juru Pangambat (also Bogor, or Buitenzorg) inscription should not be confused with King Purnawarman’s Sanskrit inscription also referred to as the Kebon Kopi-, Bogor-, or Buitenzorg inscription.

*d* Archaeologists have recently re-allocated sites near Telaga Batu to Sabokingking as new location referent. References to a Telaga Batu inscription typically imply the Sabokingking Naga stone rather than the lesser inscriptions of Sabokingking/Telaga Batu, of which only SKB is clearly OM.

*e* The only fragmentarily preserved SKB does not feature any of the diagnostic prefixes, but the text seems to coincide with that of the likewise incomplete KB which does feature the prefixes in complementary passages.

*f* SHW has *var-* repeatedly, and *mar-* only once (in a possibly fossilized form).
Basic characters occur for syllable-initial consonants listed in Table 6.2 (classified according to place and mode of articulation in Sanskrit). Entries in parentheses only occur in Sanskrit loanwords. Alternative transcriptions in the literature are in square brackets.

The OM inventory of consonants suggested by the spelling mainly differs from that of C/IM in featuring the retroflex consonants \( d \) and \( j \), and the voiced fricative \( v \). These are the problematic initial consonants in reading OM texts.

In the nuclear OM corpus, \( d \) and \( j \) in indigenous words are restricted to the honorific article \( d \)- and enclitic \( -d \)-. Casparis (1956:208) suggested that this ‘exotic’ spelling merely served to stress the honorific character of special words without implying actual retroflex articulation (see also Vikør 1988:73).

The interpretation of written \( v \) either as \( b \) or \( w \) remained a problem (Kern 1931:509, Ferrand 1932:283–284, Aichele 1942–1943:40 fn. 1) until Damais (1968:527) indicated that the original Pallava script had a distinct character for \( b \), hence written \( v \) could only represent \( w \). With few exceptions (e.g. Kähler 1983:23), this remained the accepted treatment even after Vikør (1988:74) noted a decisive weakness of the argumentation: the Old Sumatran script evidently did not have a distinct character for \( b \), because even a \( b \) in Sanskritisms was spelled \( v \) (e.g. TT-9 \textit{vodhi}– for Skt. \textit{bodhi}–, TT-13 \textit{vrahma}– for Skt. \textit{brahma}–). That written \( v \) could indeed be read as \( b \) rather than \( w \) in OM is suggested by renderings of \textit{Śrī-Vijaya} in Chinese as \textit{Shī\text{\small 4}li\text{\small 4}fo\text{\small 2}shi\text{\small 4}} (\textless \textit{s\text{\small h\text{-li-but-jay}} < \textit{s\text{\small ori baji}\text{\small ay[a]}}}) and \textit{Shī\text{\small 4}li\text{\small 4}pi\text{\small 2}shi\text{\small 4}} (\textless \textit{s\text{\small h\text{-li-bit-jay}} < \textit{s\text{\small ori baji}\text{\small ay[a]}}}), and in Arabic as \textit{Sribuza} (\textless \textit{s\text{\small ri baji}\text{\small ya[a]}}), see Ferrand (1929:294–297).

Therefore, one cannot generally determine whether a written \( v \) spelled \( b \) or \( w \). The only reliable mode of transcription is retaining the \( v \), leaving the concrete reading unspecified. For less exacting purposes, the C/IM cognate provides some guidance, but as the name of Sriwijaya demonstrates, this is not reliable. In India, the use of the same character to write both \( b \) and \( v \) was a widespread feature of Prakrit manuscripts (Cowell 1962:xii–xiii) to which belonged Buddhist scriptures (Sriwijaya was Buddhist, later OM epigraphy featuring distinct \( b/w \) spelling was perhaps Hinduist). As Malayic historical phonology excludes an inherited word-initial \( w- \) (see Adelaar 1985:67–69, 85–86), I will provisionally assume wordbase-initial \( v- \) to represent a voiced stop rather than a glide.

The script has no character for glottal stop. Proto-Malayic \( *k \) in final position is reflected in C/IM as final glottal stop (spelled with Jawi-script \textit{qaf}) that alternates with \( k \) (Jawi \textit{kaf}) before vowel-initial suffix. In OM cognates it is rendered \( k \) in both final and prevocalic position. This possibly reflected the actual pronunciation (Vikør 1988:77).

**Table 6.2: Consonants Nominaly Implied by Old Sumatran-Script Basic Characters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voiceless stop</th>
<th>Aspirated voiceless stop</th>
<th>Voiced stop</th>
<th>Aspirated voiced stop</th>
<th>Nasal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>( k )</td>
<td>( (kh) )</td>
<td>( g )</td>
<td>( ŋ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatal</td>
<td>( c )</td>
<td>( j )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( ŋ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retroflex</td>
<td>( d )</td>
<td>( (d) )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( ŋ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>( t )</td>
<td>( (th) )</td>
<td>( d )</td>
<td>( ŋ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilabial</td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>( (b) )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( ŋ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuants</td>
<td>( y )</td>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>( l )</td>
<td>( v )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilants</td>
<td>( (s{\text{\small ç}}) )</td>
<td>( (s) )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( s )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic characters occur for syllable-initial consonants listed in Table 6.2 (classified according to place and mode of articulation in Sanskrit). Entries in parentheses only occur in Sanskrit loanwords. Alternative transcriptions in the literature are in square brackets.
A C/IM word-final glottal stop that does not reflect an original *k is not reflected in the spelling of OM cognates, e.g. *tida ‘no’, ‘not’ (C/IM Jawi-script tidaq, Latin-script tidak). One can only speculate whether final glottal stop indeed did not occur, or whether merely a means to write it was missing.

2.2 Consonant alternations

The situation in OM with regard to prefixes ending in a homorganic nasal, i.e. maN- and paN-, is for the greater part similar to that in C/IM, but the data is very limited. Table 6.3a lists the relevant forms (verb bases not explicitly attested by an OM form without nasal-final prefix are given with an asterisk). Note that no examples involving initial d-, j-, and g- are attested.

A major difference between OM and C/IM involves base-initial l and r, where the nasal is apparently retained as ˘ (spelled Å, see next section) in OM, rather than being dropped as in C/IM. See Table 6.3b.

With regard to the final r of the prefixes mar- and par-, OM apparently agrees with C/IM in dropping it before base-initial r, but there is only one diagnostic example: rüpa- → SKN-13 makäryya ‘perform transactions’ (cf. Casparis 1956:348), which is in agreement with C/IM korja → bokorja ‘work’.

A base-initial stop is often spelled geminated after prefixal r, in OM (SKN-10 pardatuan ‘kingship’; KK-7 marjihat ‘do evil to’; KK-4, SKN-17 marppädaĥ ‘report’, ‘relate’; TT-9 marvvaňuň ‘rise, get up’), but this was not followed consistently (SKN-15 parvvä = nda ~ KB-2, TT-2 parvä = nda ‘their auspices’, ‘the auspices of’, and textually duplicate Karang Brahi-9 marpädaĥ ~ KK-4 marppädaĥ). Adelaar (1992:400) is probably right in reading SHW-13 parttakan as *parụtakan ‘bean field’, and written -rCC- seems

---

**TABLE 6.3A: OM NASAL SANDHI SIMILAR TO THAT IN C/IM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base-initial segment</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>*alap → KB-3 manałap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SKN-3 [ni]jjar → KK-3 mañujäri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>*caru → SKN-11 mañćaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>*hidup → TT-6 mañhidadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>*kalit → SKN-11 mañalit (see Adelaar 1992:399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>TT-5,12 mañćak → BS-13 mañmańćak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>SKN-21 [ni]suruh → KK-6/7 mañsuruh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>KK-4 tāpik → KK-10 mañāpik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>*vali (C/IM balik ~ {kom}balik) → SKN-25 pamvalya=ňku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6.3B: OM NASAL SANDHI DIFFERENT FROM THAT IN C/IM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base-initial segment</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>SKN-6 larī → SKN-9 mamlarī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>SKN-8 [ni]rakaša → SKN-18 mamraša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*ruru → SKN-10 mamruruň</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>SKN-26 [ni]vava → SKN-9 mamvā (C/IM bawa → mombawa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indeed to have been a means of spelling \(-r\mathfrak{C}\). Apparently, an anaptyctic schwa was optionally inserted between prefixal \(r\) and base-initial stop.

### 2.3 Vowels and other segments of the syllable rhyme

The basic characters (aksara-s), discussed in 2.2, are complemented by additional marks that mainly serve to replace the default vowel \(a\) by another vowel, or to suppress it. Additionally, the anusvāra mark, conventionally transcribed as \(m\), indicates nasalization of the vowel in Sanskrit, and the visarga, transcribed \(h\), spelled a syllable-final spirant. Table 6.4 lists all these items; those only occurring in Sanskritisms are in parentheses; alternative transcriptions in the literature are in square brackets.

By comparing OM words with C/IM cognates, Vikør (1988:76) inferred that anusvāra is used for non-prevocalic \(y\) and for part of the instances of non-prevocalic \(m\), but not for \(n\). A visarga is only used for word final \(h\), alternating with the basic character for \(h\) in suffixed forms: SKN-5 sumpah ‘curse’ → KK-2 parsumpahan ‘invocation of the curse’. Examples of such alternation with anusvāra were not detected.

Assuming a similar vocalism as in C/IM, Casparis (1975:26–27) and Vikør (1988:71) noted three modes of handling schwa /\(a/\), which is not provided for in the script: (1) as short \(a\); (2) as zero vowel – the flanking consonants appear as consonant cluster; and (3) as short \(a\) with doubling of the subsequent consonant. Adelaar (1992:400) established another one: (4) as zero vowel with doubling of the subsequent consonant (see 2.2 above).

Alternation of spelling modes (1) and (2) is attested, e.g. KK-5, SKN-8 makalanit ~ BS-20 makalhiti ‘cause to disappear’ (see Adelaar 1992:394, 397–398). Mode (3) occurs only once, TT-3 pattum ‘k.o. bamboo’ (C/IM potung, Javanese putung), but is widespread in later periods (Poerbatjaraka 1957, Vikør 1988:71–72). One additional contemporaneous example is the name of the last king of Yavadvipa, spelled Sōna in the Sundanese chronicle Carita Parahiyan, and Sanna in the 732 AD Canggal inscription (see Poerbatjaraka 1958:256–257).

The \(r\) transcribes a syllabic rhotic in Sanskrit, not a retroflex consonant. The regular C/IM rendering is \(\mathfrak{r}\), and the same probably applied for Sanskritisms in OM. Thus, TT-6 vrddhi ‘growth’ is spelled as in Sanskrit, but SKN-20 nisamvardhī=ku ‘be empowered by me’ has \(ar\) for the \(r\) in Sanskrit samvrddhi ‘power’, ‘might’ (see Casparis 1956:351).

Symbols for the two diphthongs only occur in a single Non-Sanskrit word each: SKN-6, TT-5 lai ‘other’ (Casparis 1956:21–24, Ogloblin 1998), and KB-3 sāmvau ‘ship’. The only word with a diphthong was spelled differently: TT-2 hanāu ‘toddy palm’ (C/IM hanau). The vowels \(e\) and \(o\) only occur in Sanskritisms. The only exception, SHW-5,6 sapopo ‘first degree relative in collateral line’ (C/IM sapupu), is in a dialectally divergent inscription, probably reflecting local substrate influence (Teeuw 1959:146).

| TABLE 6.4: SYLLABLE-NUCLEUS AND SYLLABLE-FINAL SEGMENTS INDICATED BY ADDITIONAL MARKS |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Short V | Long V | \(a+V\) fused | \(a+V\) diphthong |
|\(a\) | \(\ddot{a}\) | | |
|\(i\) | \(i\) | \((e)\) | \(ai\) |
|\(u\) | \(\ddot{u}\) | \((o)\) | \(au\) |
|\(r\) | | | |
| Syllable-final segments | \(-m\ [-\mathfrak{m}, -\mathfrak{m}'-\mathfrak{y}]\) | | \(-h\) |
2.4 Vowel length, word stress, and word structure

The remaining three vowels, \( a \), \( i \), and \( u \), are spelled either as short or long vowel. Vowel quantity is not a phonological feature in IM, nor is it reconstructed for Proto-Malayic. Means for noting vowel length however serve to indicate place of stress in Jawi-script spelling, and this is apparently also the case in Old Sumatran-script spelling (Kern 1913:399, Çœdès 1930:62, Casparis 1975:26, Vikør 1988:70–71, Tadmor 2000:157–158). A noteworthy feature, first noted by Blagden (1913:70), is that spelled vowel length (i.e. stress) shifts to the following syllable upon suffixation or before an enclitic: \( dātu – kā-datū-an; dīrī – dirī=ñā. \) Long (i.e. stressed) vowels typically stand in the penultimate syllable, otherwise in the ultimate syllable. In a large number of words, however, no vowel length (stress) was indicated at all.

The OM basic lexical unit was typically bisyllabic. Consonant (C) clusters had either a nasal (N) or an \( r \), as first segment. With the sole exception of the reduplicated monosyllable \( mammam \) (read \( mą̄m̃̄m̃̄ \)), all NC-clusters were homorganic. Based on a corpus that also included texts with \( bãr- \) and \( dĩ- \), Vikør (1988:81–83) made the following inventory of observed structures: 61 CV(C)V, 42 CV(C)V, 12 VC(C)V, 6 VC(C)V, 8 (C)VNCV(C), 2 CVrCV(C), altogether 131 bisyllabic basic words. Monosyllabic words numbered 6, all having the structure CV (Vikør seems to have missed the two monosyllabic prepositions \( di \) and \( ka \) with structure CV). There are 7 trisyllabic basic words, encompassing 4 CV(C)V(C), and one each CV(C)V(C), CVNCV(C), CVVCVC.

3 BASIC MORPHOSYNTAX

3.1 Word classes

The limited size of the OM corpus and interpretational uncertainties in the decipherment set limits to a morphosyntactic analysis. Analogy to C/IM remains an important aid for studying OM morphosyntax but this has its obvious problems.

Open word classes distinguished apriorically on a semantic basis can only be confirmed by distinctive morphosyntactic features in some individual examples. The open word classes of noun and verb are contrasted among others in combinations with prepositions, locatives, numeration, and in the active-passive voice alternation exclusive to verbs. One must bear in mind that apparent contrasts may be due to lack of data. Thus, OM data includes examples of quantification of nouns, but not of verbs, suggesting the rule: ‘nouns can be quantified, verbs not’. In C/IM, verbs can be quantified too, but require the mediation of \( kali \) ‘times’. Something similar probably existed in OM, but is simply not reflected in the available material.

It is difficult to distinguish adjectives from verbs in C/IM, and the same situation probably existed in OM. There are a few words that could be adjectives, but could also be intransitive verbs, e.g. \( bhakti \) ‘submissive’, ‘be submissive’ (KK, SKN), \( mātī \) ‘dead’, ‘be dead’, ‘die’ (SKN), \( sākit \) ‘hurt’, ‘sick’, ‘be sick’ (SKN). A semantically likely example of an adjective is perhaps \( jāhat \) ‘evil’, ‘wicked’ in SKN-14 \( yam\ vuat jāhat \) which could be glossed as ‘that does/causes evil’, but also as ‘that is an evil deed’. The OM corpus does not include obvious examples of degrees of comparison.

A number of closed word classes can be tentatively identified. Personal pronouns, demonstratives and locatives will be dealt with in 3.3, prepositions in 3.4, while numerals and conjunctions follow here.
The following numerals are attested: sa = ‘1, all/whole’ (KB, SKN), dua = ‘2’ (BS, KB, SKB), tua = ‘3’ (KB), sa = pulu, sa = puluh, ‘10’ (KB, SKB), sa = pulu dua = puluh dua = ‘12’ (KB, SKB), dua – ratus = ‘200’ (KB), tua – ratus = ‘300’ (KB), sa = rivu = ‘1000’ (KB), dua – laksa = ‘20,000’ (KB, SKB). An example of a lengthy composed numeral is KB-6/7 sa = rivu tua dua = ‘1312’. Sanskrit lakṣa means ‘100,000’, but the C/IM borrowed cognate (sa=)lakṣa means ‘10,000’ and Čeđes (1930:76) plausibly assumed the same for OM lakṣa. Noteworthy is tua = ‘3’ (C/IM tiga), and the formation of teens with a preposed sa = pulul[h] (C/IM has postpositioned –bôlas).

Unlike C/IM, OM does not feature quantifiers (classifiers), see Ferrand (1932:294). Numerals were placed immediately before a noun (BS-14 dua tanda ‘two officers’) or behind it (KB-5-6 kośa dua – ratus ‘two hundred containers’).

The interrogative numeral, BS-10 pira ‘how much/many’, appears only once. The indefinite numeral vañak ‘much/many’ only occurs in combination with the oblique-genitive form of a personal pronoun: SKN-5 vañak=māmu ‘[all] the lot of you’; KK-2 kita sa-vañak=ta devata ‘ye all of ye gods’; KB-7 tua – ratus sa = pulu dua vañak=ṇa dātam (3 100 1 102 many 3s,GEN come) ‘three hundred and twelve in number arrived’. Ordinal numbers are only attested in statements of the day of the Śāka-calendar month: TT-1 dvitīya ‘2nd’, KB-8 pañcamī ‘5th’, KB-3 saptamī ‘7th’ (also partly illegible SKB-3 ..pi/am), and KB-1 ekadāśī ‘11th’, all being Sanskritisms. The following words can be identified as conjunctions:

SKN-6, passim, 27 athavā ‘or’ (C/IM atau ‘or’);
SKN-22,25 graṃ [kadāci] ‘if [on the contrary]’ (CM gōrang ‘might it be’)
KK-3,4, SKN-5, passim, 25 kadāci ‘if’, ‘when’, ‘whenever’;
KK-5,6, SKN-12, TT-3,7,10,12 tathāpi ‘and’, ‘moreover’ (C/IM tōtapi ‘but’).

### 3.2 Basic clause structure

In spite of a surprising variety of clause structures, the corpus does not include specimens of the interrogative or imperative moods (though the proclamatory imperatives in TT and SKN have been interpreted to be in the imperative, see Kridalaksana 1991:171).

As in C/IM, transitive clauses occur in active and passive voice. Verb fronting seems to be frequent in OM, and particularly passive verbs often occur clause-initially. The following word orders are attested for passive transitive clauses.

**UG – Vpass – ACT:**

SKN-5 vañak=māmu uram ni-vunuḥ sumpah
many = 2p,GEN person PASS-kill curse
‘all of you people will be killed by the curse’

TT-1 parlak śrikseta ini ni-par-vuat
garden NAME PRX PASS-CAU-make
parvā=nda punta hiyam
auspices = 3s/hon,GEN TITLE NAME
‘this Sriksetra garden was made under auspices of the noble Punta Hiang’

Note that the actor argument in the passive clause in OM is not introduced by an instrumental or other preposition (in C/IM a preposition is optional).

**Vpass – UG – ACT:**

KK-7 tuvi ni-vunuḥ ya sumpah
verily PASS-kill 3s curse
‘verily will he be killed by the curse’
The latter clause is repeated at least 23 more times in the same SKN inscription, while *nivunu̍h ya sumpah* ‘he will be killed by the curse’ occurs altogether 4 times in KK.

There do not appear to be examples of this construction with a noun as UG, so that the latter position in this highly unusual construction is perhaps restricted to pronouns. Note that the corresponding structure in C/IM is Vpass–ACT–UG, for example in the CM *Malay Annals* (Situmorang and Teeuw 1958:245):

CM: *hondak di-bunuh baginda =lah anak=ku ini*  
want PASS-kill majesty EMPH child=1s.GEN PRX  
‘shall then this child of mine be killed by his majesty’ (i.e. his majesty must apparently be wanting to kill my child)

The following example suggests an even more unusual word order, namely the ACT argument preceding a verb in the passive voice and its UG argument:

SKN-25 *tida iya akan – ni-mākan kāmu*  
NEG 3s towards PASS-eat 2p  
‘you will not be devoured by it’

But we probably have two clauses here, the first of which is a negated existential clause with a zero copula where *iya* ‘3s’ functions as complement of the existential operator. It is thus not an argument of the passive verb and a more literal translation would be ‘it will not [be] that you will be devoured’. This is also how it was apparently understood by Casparis (1956:45). The second clause at the same time illustrates instances of a passive verb immediately followed by the UG argument without there being an overt actor expression.

In active transitive clauses, the actor often precedes the verb and its undergoer argument, hence ACT–Vact–UG:

SKN-9 *jana ma-māva dravya*  
people ACT-carry property  
‘people transport property’

SKN-20 *kāmu maṁ-raksā=ṅa*  
2p ACT-protect=3s.OBL  
‘you protect them’

But verb fronting is attested here too. In this case, the actor argument precedes the undergoer in postverbal position.

Vact–ACT–UG

SKN-25 *tida mar-vuat kāmu doṣa ini*  
NEG ST-make 2p crime PRX  
‘you do not commit these crimes’

For this construction too there are no certain examples with a noun as actor argument, and the corresponding construction in C/IM again has a different order of arguments, i.e. Vact–UG–ACT, as in the following line (from the CM *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, Balai Pustaka 1956:70):

CM: *Bor-mula ... akan bor-buat istana raja itu*  
ST-beginning... FUT ST-make palace king DIST  
‘At first...the king will have a palace built’
In intransitive clauses, the subject is in clause initial position. Clear examples with the verb in initial position, which is possible in C/IM, were not found. (In the following example and a few others further down, Ø indicates a formally unmarked verb form.)

KB-2/3  
\[
\text{da \ punta \ hiyam \ nāyik \ di \ sāmvau} \\
\text{ART \ TITLE \ NAME \ ascend.Ø \ at \ ship}
\]
‘the noble Punta Hiang boarded ship’

SKN-11  
\[
\text{tida \ kāmu \ mar-ppādah \ dari \ huluntuhā=ńku} \\
\text{NEG \ 2p \ ST-report \ from \ vassal-chief=1s.GEN}
\]
‘you do not report from my vassal chiefs’

SKN-5/6  
\[
\text{ya \ mar-vuddhi \ lavan} \\
\text{REL \ ST-mind \ adversary}
\]
‘who is hostilely disposed’

The examples also show that the negation tida can stand immediately before the verb as in SKN-25, or before the subject when this precedes the verb, as in SKN-11.

The OM cognate of C/IM jangan ‘don’t’ seems to be jānān, cf.:

TT-6  
\[
\text{ya \ jānān \ ya \ ni-knā-i \ sa=vañak=ńa \ ya \ m upasargga} \\
\text{oh \ don’t \ 3s \ PASS-hit-APP \ one=many=3s.GEN \ ART calamity}
\]
‘and may they not be afflicted by all kinds of calamities’

Whereas C/IM bukan ‘be not’ is a negative existential-clause copula, the OM cognate vukan (SKN, TT) corresponds to C/IM lain ‘other’ (Kridalaksana 1991:170, Adelaar 1992:392–393). Its apparent synonym lai ‘other’ (SKN, TT) could however stand before as well as after the nucleus, and was perhaps cognate with C/IM lain (see Ronkel 1924:16, Casparis 1956:21–22, but also Çœdès 1930:77, Adelaar 1988:71). The semantic shift from ‘other’ to ‘be not’ is reported for Sundanese and Javanese (Adelaar 1985:168, Ogloblin 1998).

### 3.3 NP-structure

SKN presents a number of paratactic listings without copulative conjunction (SKN-5 mar-si-haji hulun–haji ‘the king’s countrymen, the king’s vassal subjects’; SKN-20 yuvārāja pratiyuvārā rājakumāra ‘crown prince, second crown prince, [other] prince’), and one even lists at least 21 coordinate items, denotations of officials and professionals (SKN-3/4; some items are illegible, some have uncertain meaning). On the other hand, in TT the preposition diān ‘with’ serves as copulative conjunction (in C/IM it has been compressed to dan ‘and’ in this function):

TT-9  
\[
\text{vodhicitta \ diān \ maitri} \ ‘\text{Bodhi-thoughts and friendship’}
\]

In a longer listing it appears only between the last two items:

TT-2/3  
\[
\text{niyur \ pina} \ ha\text{nāu} \ rumviya \ diān \ samiśrā=ńa \ ya \ kāyu} \\
\text{coconut \ areca \ toddy \ sago \ [palms] \ and \ mixed=3s.GEN \ ART tree}
\]
\[
\text{ni-mākan \ vuah=ńa} \\
\text{PASS-eat \ fruit=3s.GEN}
\]
‘coconut palms, areca palms, toddy palms, sago palms and all varieties of trees whose fruit are eaten’
The combination of two nouns denoting different species of a common genus as collective term for the genus (e.g. IM sendok garpu ‘cutlery’, lit. spoon fork) is apparently productive:

TT-4 parlak vukan dian tavad talāga
garden other with embankment pond
‘other gardens complete with hydraulic installations [that belong in a garden]’

TT-5 sa=vañak=ña vuat=ña huma parlak
one=many=3s.Gen make.Ø=3s.Obl swidden garden
‘he set up a great deal of horticultural sites’

SKN-11 ma-nilit mas mani
ACT-steal gold gems
‘steal treasures’.

Combinations of two nominals, of which the first serves as generic determinator of the second, are relatively frequent, but the second component is often a proper name: KB-2 vulan vaisākha ‘the month of Vaisaka’; KK-4,8, SKN-15,20 sanyāsa datīa ‘office of regent’; KK-10 bhūmi jāva ‘the land of Java’; TT-10 hyām ratnātraya ‘the divinity Three-Jewels’. C/IM nouns denoting fish, snakes, birds, trees, days of the week, months, rivers, mountains, islands, and countries normally do not appear independently in nominal function, but only as descriptive attribute. In the former function, they require a preceding ‘empty’ target of attribution, a noun serving as generic determiner (cf. Mahdi 1993:191–192). The limited data suggests that this applied in OM for months (KB-2,4,8, KK-9, SKN-28, TT-1), but apparently not for trees (cf. TT-2/3 niyr pinām hanāu rumvīya ‘coconut palms, areca palms, toddy palms, sago palms’). Country and place names usually occur as attribute, e.g. Śrī-Vijaya ‘Sriwijaya’ modifies: KK-2 kadat-uan ‘palace/kingdom’; KK-4/5 dātu ‘king’; KK-10 vala ‘army’. However, there is also a counter-example in KK-10 tīda bhakti ka śrī-vijaya ‘is not submissive to Sriwijaya’.

Personal pronouns are widely represented in OM texts, but the paradigm shown in Table 6.5 is perhaps a simplification.

While there is only one enclitic form respectively for 2p and 3s, one finds two variants for each of the three other pronouns: with and without nasal linker. The variants once possibly represented different morphological forms (e.g. genitive with nasal linker, oblique without it) but this is not strictly followed anymore in the inscriptions.

The enclitic form of āku ‘1s’ without nasal linker typically appears in the oblique case: SKN-20,21,22 ni-samvarddhi=ku ‘empowered by me’, KK-4, SKN-18,19 nigalar=ku ‘named [by] me’. In the genitive, the enclitic apparently does include an underlying nasal linker which only surfaces after a vowel, not after a consonant: SKN-6 satru=ňku ‘my

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Enclitic (oblique/genitive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>āku (KK, SKN)</td>
<td>=ku (KK, SKN) ~=ńku (SKN, TT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>kāmu (SKN)</td>
<td>=māmu (SKN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>iya (BS, KK, SKN) ~</td>
<td>=ña (BS, KK, SKN, TT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ ya (KK, SKN, TT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p/honorific</td>
<td>sida (BS)</td>
<td>=da (BS) ~=nda (BS, KK, SKN, TT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2p)/divine</td>
<td>kita (KK),</td>
<td>=ta (KK) ~=nta (TT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enemy’, SKN-9 hulunthuḥā=ṅku ‘my vassal chiefs’ versus SKN-8 kādātuḥan=ṅku ‘my royal residence’, TT-4 vuat=ṅku ‘my making’. But there is one exception with nasal in the oblique case: SKN-8 ni-rakṣā=ṅku ‘be protected by me’. Thus, the distinction between oblique and genitive modes seems to be inconsistent, and free variation may have existed between uses with or without nasal after a vowel.

The independent form for 3p/honorific also occurs with retroflex d in SHW-3 sidā, but the inscription is dialectally divergent. It is possible that the alternatively spelled modes refer to plural (sidāl=da) and honorific (sidāl=ṅda) implementations respectively, but the material is too meagre for drawing reliable conclusions. Beside the enclitic, the honorific third person pronoun also seems to have a monosyllabic prosthetic article mode da, as in KB-4 da pu=ṅta hiyaṃ ‘the noble’ master of gods [?]’ (see below).

For enclitic forms of sidā ‘3p/honorific’ and kita ‘2p/divine’, only examples for the genitive are found. Appearance of the nasal linker seems to be governed by a similar morphophonological rule as described above for 1s, but there is too little data. For 3p/honorific the situation is complicated by alternative spellings with d or d, and possible semantic shift between plural and (singular?) honorific (BS-3 anak=da ‘their children’ versus TT-2 par-vā=ṅda ~ KK-4 par-vvā=ṅda ‘auspices of the noble...’).

For the divine second person there is KK-2 kita sa=vahāk=tā devata (2p/divine one many 2p/divine.GEN gods) ‘ye all of ye gods’ versus TT-2 pu=ṅta hiyaṃ ‘master of gods[?]’. However, the latter interpretation is questionable, and Çœèèes (1930:72–73) cites convincing comparative data from Khmer, Mon, and Thai suggesting that pu=ṅta was a title meaning ‘our master’, implying that =ṅta was 1p rather than 2p. It occurs twice in the cited line: TT-2 par-vā=ṅda pu=ṅta hiyaṃ srī jayanāṣa ‘auspices of the noble Punta Hiang Sri Jayanasa’, and TT-2 pranidhānā=ṅda pu=ṅta hiyaṃ ‘provision of the noble Punta Hiang’. Note also KK-4/5 par-vvā=ṅda dātu śrī–vijaya ‘auspices of the noble king of Sriwijaya’.

Remarkable is the use of the genitive enclitic=[n]da, perhaps also=[n]ta, as possessive copula analogously to 3s=ṅa (e.g. SKN-12 sthānā=ṅa śatru=ṅku ‘position/residence of my enemy’, TT-4 punya=ṅa sarvva–satva ‘benefit of all beings’) also occasionally used this way in C/IM. Mediation of such a possessive copula in possessive attribution is optional, and two nouns of which the second denotes the possessor can follow each other directly: KB-1/2, KK-9 suklapakṣa vulan ‘bright half of the month’; SKN-4 vatak–vuruḥ ‘groups of workmen’, SKN-5 hulun–hajī ‘vassal subjects of the king’. In such cases, however, it is difficult to differentiate between possessive attribution (‘group of workmen’) and a qualitative or descriptive one (‘workmen group’).

Only two demonstratives are attested in OM, inī ‘this (PRX)’ (BS, KK, SKB, SKN, TT), and inan ‘that (DIST)’ (KK), while a cognate of C/IM itu ‘that’ is not found. Their attributive use is well attested: SKB-8 vihāra inī di vanua ini ‘this monastery in this country’; KK-10 māmāṃ sumpah ini ‘this curse imprecation’; KK-4 urāṃ inan ‘those people’. Their pronominal use is less clearly documented, e.g. SKN-13 ini makanāṇit–prana urāṃ (PRX CAU-disappear mind person) ‘these [who] take away people’s minds’.

Two definite article-like words have been identified: iyāṃ ~ yaṃ (neutral) and dam (honorific), thought to derive from combinations of iya ~ ya and da with a nasal linker y (Kähler 1983:24). The use of the honorific one as article is relatively unproblematic: BS-20 dam svāmi ‘the master’; TT-10 dam hiyaṃ ratnatraya ‘the divinity Three-Jewels’.

The use of iyāṃ ~ yaṃ, of which the C/IM cognate yaṅ is a relative marker, is more diversified and one can distinguish three constructions (this is based on an earlier analysis
by Kridalaksana 1991:172):

(a) as a relative pronoun followed by the verbal predicate of a relative clause:

TT-2  
\[ sa=\text{vañak}=\hat{n}a \ \text{yan} \ \text{n-i-tāna}=\hat{n} \ \text{di} \ \text{sini} \ \hat{n}i-yur \ \text{pi=}n\hat{a}m \ldots \]
\text{one}=\text{many}=3\text{.GEN} \ \text{REL} \ \text{PASS-plant} \ \text{at} \ \text{D\text{.PRX}} \ \text{coconut} \ \text{areca} \ldots \]
‘all of the coconut, areca, etc. palms \text{that} \ \text{are} \ \text{planted} \ \text{here}’

KK-4  
\[ \text{d}h\hat{a}n \ \text{di} \ \text{i=}yan \ \text{n-i-galar}=\hat{k}u \ \ \text{sanyāsa} \ \text{dat}\hat{n}a \]
\text{at} \ \text{REL} \ \text{PASS-name}=1\text{.OBL} \ \text{office} \ \text{regent} \ ‘\text{with} \ \text{regard} \ \text{to} \ \text{those} \ \text{who} \ \text{have} \ \text{been} \ \text{named} \ \text{by} \ \text{me} \ \text{to} \ \text{the} \ \text{office} \ \text{of} \ \text{regent}’

(b) as an article followed by a noun that is the head of a clause with predicate:

KK-10  
\[ \text{di} \ \text{vela}=\hat{n}a \ \ \text{yan} \ \text{vala} \ \text{št}r \text{-vijaya} \ \text{ma-nā}=\hat{p}ik \ \text{yan} \ \text{bh}ūmi \ jāva \]
\text{at} \ \text{time}=3\text{.GEN} \ \text{ART} \ \text{army} \ \text{NAME} \ \text{ACT-attack} \ \text{ART} \ \text{land} \ \text{NAME} \ ‘\text{at} \ \text{the} \ \text{time} \ \text{that} \ \text{the} \ \text{army} \ \text{of} \ \text{Sriwijaya} \ \text{attacked} \ \text{the} \ \text{land} \ \text{of} \ \text{Java}’

(c) as an article followed by a noun that is the head of an NP group with attribute:

KB-5  
\[ \text{ma}=\text{mā}\hat{a}v\text{a} \ \text{yan} \ \text{vala} \ \text{dualaksa} \]
\text{ACT-lead} \ \text{ART} \ \text{army} \ \text{20000} \ ‘\text{lead} \ \text{an} \ \text{army} \ \text{of} \ \text{20000}’

KK-2  
\[ \text{ma}=\text{m}raksa \ \text{yan} \ \text{ka}d\hat{a}tu\text{a} \ \text{št}r \text{-vijaya} \]
\text{ACT-protect} \ \text{ART} \ \text{palace} \ \text{NAME} \ ‘\text{protect} \ \text{the} \ \text{palace} \ \text{of} \ \text{Sriwijaya}’

In the function under (c), \text{yan} cannot be literally translated into IM as \text{yang}, whereas in the function under (b), such a translation would sound awkward, as pointed out by Kridalaksana. The use of a relative marker was apparently optional, compare:

KK-10  
\[ \text{manā}=\text{pik} \ \text{yan} \ \text{bh}ūmi \ jāva \ \text{tīda} \ \text{bhakti} \ \text{ka} \ \text{št}r \text{-vijaya} \]
\text{ACT-attack} \ \text{ART} \ \text{land} \ \text{NAME} \ [ \ ] \ \text{NEG} \ \text{submit.Ø} \ \text{to} \ \text{NAME}
\ ‘attacks the land of Java \text{that} \ \text{is} \ \text{not} \ \text{ submissive} \ \text{to} \ \text{Sriwijaya}’

TT-3  
\[ \text{kāyu} \ \text{ni}=\text{mā}\hat{k}an \ \text{va}u\text{h}=\hat{n}a \]
\text{tree} \ [ \ ] \ \text{PASS-eat} \ \text{fruit}=3\text{.GEN} \ ‘\text{trees} \ \text{whose} \ \text{fruit} \ \text{are} \ \text{eaten}’

SKN-25  
\[ \text{ni}=\text{vunu}\text{h} \ \text{kāmu} \ \text{sumpa}h \ \text{ni}=\text{minu}[\text{m}]=\text{mā}mu \ \text{ini} \]
\text{kill.PASS} \ 2\text{p} \ \text{curse} \ [ \ ] \ \text{PASS-drink}=2\text{p.OBL} \ \text{PRX}
\ ‘\text{you} \ \text{will} \ \text{be} \ \text{killed} \ \text{by} \ \text{this} \ \text{curse} \ \text{which} \ \text{is} \ \text{drunk} \ \text{by} \ \text{you}’

In C/IM, \text{yang} would have been expected in these environments.

3.4 Prepositional phrases

In OM, the prepositions \text{di} ‘in’, ‘at’, \text{ka} ‘to’, \text{dari} ‘from’, can apparently precede various subgroups of nominals:

(a) common nouns and proper names: SKB-8 \text{di} \text{vau}\text{h}\text{a} \text{ini} ‘in this country’; SKN-6 \text{dari} \text{šatru}=\text{ń}k\text{u} ‘from my enemy’; KB-6 \text{di} \text{sā}\text{mvau} ‘on ship’; KB-4 \text{dari} \text{minā}=\text{ń}h\text{a} \text{tā}\text{mvan} ‘from Minanga Tamban’; TT-10 \text{di} \text{dā}\text{m} \text{hy}a\text{m} \text{rat}\text{n\text{a}r\text{a}r\text{a}y\text{a} ‘at the divinity Three Jewels’; KK-10 \text{ka} \text{št}r\text{-vijaya} ‘to Sriwijaya’;
(b) personal pronouns: SKN-8 dari kämu ‘from you’; SKN-9 ka kämu ‘to you’, SKN-12 dy-âku ~ KK-9 di-yâku ‘at/to me’; KK-6 ka iya ‘to him’;
(c) locatives (a closed class of relational space nominals also occurring in languages of mainland Southeast Asia and South China) being in turn always followed by a possessive attribute: KK-7 di dalam=ña bhûmi (at inside=3s.gen earth) ‘inside the earth’; TT-5 di antara mârgga ‘in the midst of the way/journey’; SKN-9 di luar huluntuhã=ñku (at outside vassal-chief=1s.gen) ‘outside [the territory] of my vassal chiefs’;
(d) pro-locatives: TT-2 di sini ‘here’; TT-9 di sâna ‘there’; SKN-28 ka-mâna ‘where to’;
(e) temporal nominals (e.g. TT-5 di âsannakâla ‘in time-of-stopover’; KK-10 di velâ=ña ‘at the time of’).

Another preposition, dînân ~ dañân ‘with’, mainly combines with a noun: SKN-12 dañan darâh ‘with blood’; SKN-20 dînân šatru=ñku ‘with my enemy’; KB-5/6 dañan kôsa dua-ratus ‘with two hundred [supply] containers’; KB-6 dañan jâlat ‘by road’. In one example that noun is preceded by yam serving as article: SKB-21 dînân yam urâm pradhâna (with ART person high-ranking) ‘with high-ranking persons’. (On dînân as an NP-conjunction, see §3.3.)

The probable preposition akan ‘to’, ‘into’, ‘as’, is attested before a noun three times in the identical phrase SKN-20,21,22 ni-samvaridhî=ku akan–datiâ ‘empowered by me as regent’. However, it also occurs before verbs, seemingly as future tense modifier (as in C/IM). But it is conceivable that akan in these examples functions as a conjunction meaning ‘in order to’, ‘with the aim of’ instead: SKN-22 akan–ni-mulan āsânâ=ña ‘will/in-order-to be determined by his orders’; SKN-25 akan–ni-mâkan ‘will/in-order-to be devoured’. In one further example it is followed by a preposition, but here too it perhaps functions either as temporal modifier or as conjunction: SKN-22/23 akan–dari kâmu ni–muhâ=ña ‘will/in-order-that from you be made available by him’ (the translation is very uncertain).

C/IM has numerous temporal-aspectual modifiers (e.g. C/IM perfective tâlah, durative sôdang, etc.) and temporal adverbs (e.g. d[lah]ulu ‘previously’, tâdi ‘just now’, nantî ‘later’, kôlak ‘in future’, esok ‘tomorrow’, etc.). No obvious equivalents of these are found in the OM corpus. Whenever temporal circumstance is expressed, this is either done with an elaborate statement of the date, or with a phrase like ‘that was the time when...’.

4 MAJOR VERBAL ALTERNATIONS

The OM verb is the word class with the most comprehensive paradigm of forms. However, as in C/IM, OM verbs differ quite strongly as to which formations they allow. The exact grammatical meanings of the respective verb forms are difficult to determine purely from the inscription texts, and interpretation often relies on analogy with C/IM or related languages. The present treatment will therefore be mainly concerned with listing attested combinations of affixes and comparing OM with C/IM on this point.

PAn had an active voice marker which appeared as an infix *
<um> in bases with initial consonant, and as a prefix *um- before bases with initial vowel. OM has only one possible reflex of this affix: BS-16 um-âmgap ‘devour’, ‘swallow’. (There is a C/IM cognate <om> which is not productive.) But in fossilized items with a reflex of this historical *um-/*um- affix, OM has m- (not um-), cf. SKN-24 minum ‘drink’ < *<um> + *inum (C/IM minum ‘id.’, majû ‘advance’ ← <om> + aju ‘forward’). It seems likely, therefore, that BS-16 um-âmgap is a contamination from ‘language B’/‘Old Maanyan’ for which (in KK-2) a form um-entem ‘?’ is attested.
The two C/IM transitivizing verbal suffixes -i (locative applicative) and -kan (causative, benefactive applicative) are also attested in OM where, as a rule, they appear in combination with the prefix maN- or ni-. But they also transitivize stative mar- verbs (as they do with bar- verbs in CM, though not in IM): KK-7 mar-jihałat-i ‘do evil unto’ (SKN-14 jāhat ‘[be] evil’). There is one example of such a suffixed form without prefix: TT-4 prayojanā-kan ‘intending/aiming to/towards’ (Sanskrit prayojana ‘cause’, ‘intention’, ‘aim’). Two examples seem to provide evidence of -akan as variant mode of -kan. One is SKN-9/10 larty-ākan ‘run off with, take away’ (cf. SKN-6 larti ‘run’), but the double accentuation, and the split location (lari- at the end of line 9, yākan on line 10), strongly diminishes its significance as evidence for -akan. In the other example, SKN-20 ni-par-sumpah-akan–kāmu ‘you shall be cursed[?]’ (cf. SKN-5 sumpah ‘curse’), the scribe seems to have simply written together three words (ni-par-sumpah, akan, and kāmu) in a row. Compare SKN-20,21 ni-samvaddhi=ku akan–datīla ‘be empowered by me as regent’.

The comparison of OM and C/IM verbal prefixes in Table 6.6 reveals other discrepancies beside the much discussed mar-/bar- and ni-/di- contrasts. Thus, OM has maka- for which there is no C/IM cognate. Kähler (1983:28f) compared it with C/IM mam-por-, but C/IM semantic correspondents of the OM forms have maN-X-kan (where X is the verb base). In a single example of the accidental perfective, normally formed in C/IM with tar-, OM has ka-, corresponding to C/IM ka- which in this function only appears in some fossilized forms as far as IM is concerned (e.g. ka-tomu ‘meet’). For C/IM bar-X-an forms denoting joint action, OM has an equivalent mar-sti-X in one instance: SKN-5 mar-sti-hajji ‘[those who] share the same king’, ‘the king’s own countrymen’ (see Adelaar 1992: 393–396). No OM correspondents have been found for C/IM reciprocal-voice X-maN-X.

The active-passive voice opposition is perhaps the best documented verbal alternation in OM. Attested maN-/-ni- pairs are: SKN-18 mam-raksā ‘protect’ – SKN-8 ni-raksā [=ńku] ‘be protected [by me]’; KK-6/7 mañuruḥ ‘order’ – KK-4 ni-suruḥ ‘be ordered’; SKN-26 ma-nāpik ‘attack’, ‘invade’ – SKN-26 ni-tāpik ‘be attacked[?]’; SKN-7 mañ-ujār-i

---

**TABLE 6.6: OM PREFIXED VERB FORMS AND PROBABLE CORRESPONDING PREFIX IN C/IM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C/IM</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>Formant of: /examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bar-</td>
<td>mar-</td>
<td>Stative (also with -i, see above), possessional: TT-9 maN-vañj ‘rise’, ‘get up’; SKN-5 maN-vuddhi ‘have mind/character’ (C/IM bar-budi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di-</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>passive voice (also with -kan, -i): TT-2 ni-tānam ‘be planted’ (C/IM ditanam); BS-19 ni-kāryyā-kan ‘be processed/formed’ (C/IM di-kōrja-kan); TT-6 ni-kāñ- ‘be afflicted’ (C/IM di-kōna-i).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di-por-</td>
<td>ni-par-</td>
<td>passive causative: TT-1 ni-par-vuat ‘be made’ (C/IM di-por-buat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maN-</td>
<td>maN-</td>
<td>active voice (also with -kan, -i): KK-6/7 mañuruḥ ‘order’ (C/IM mañyuruḥ); TT-6 mañ-hipu- ‘raise [cattle]’ (C/IM mañg-hidup-i).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tør-</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>coincidental perfective: KK-10 ka-ñvat ‘was passed through’ (C/IM tør-ñvat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maka-</td>
<td>causaive stative: KK-5, SKN-14,15 maka-lanit ~ BS-20 maka-ñhit ‘cause to disappear’ (C/IM mañg-ñhilang-kan); SKN-14 maka-giñ ‘make crazy’ (C/IM mañg-giñ-kan).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some C/IM verbs are active transitive in their basic form, adding the passive prefix to this basic active voice form (C/IM minum ‘drink’ → di-minum ‘be drunk’). OM apparently also has such verbs: SKN-24 minum ‘drink’ → TT-5 ni-minum[=ñã] ‘be drunk [by them]’; perhaps also SKN-8 muah ‘there be [?]’, ‘have [?]’ → SKN-22/23 ni-muah[=ñã] ‘be made available [?] [by him]’, but the translation is uncertain.

There are OM verb forms with the suffix -a, identified by Kern (1913: 399) as formant of the subjunctive (SUBJ) by analogy to the same suffix in Javanese, Malagasy, and Bisaya (reflecting the Pan projective suffix *-a).

5 NOMINALIZATIONS AND NOMINAL MORPHOLOGY

C/IM features a number of derivational means to form nouns denoting action, actor, or undergoer (i.e. paN-, paN-...-an, par-...-an, ka-...-an, -an), but the same affixation occasionally leads to attributive or nominal forms within the paradigm of the verb (i.e. participles, infinitives, etc. which differ morphosyntactically from “true” nominalizations; cf. Mahdi 1993:202). Furthermore, the basic form of a verb can also be converted into a noun without explicit affixation. The situation in OM was probably similar. The following will take benefit of the doubt by provisionally assuming nominal derivation. When the base word itself is a noun, there is greater certainty that the derivation is nominal. Base words with an asterisk in Table 6.7 are not explicitly evidenced in the inscriptions.

In C/IM, deverbal nouns with -an typically name the act of the verbal denotatum, its target, or product, and the available data does not contradict a similar function of -a and -an in OM. When the basic word is a noun, the derivation with -an in C/IM typically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Derivations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>dātu ‘king (n)’ → KK-4, SKN-15 datu-a ‘regent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vuat ‘make, do (v)’ → SKN-15, TT-6/7 vuat-ã [=ñã] ‘[their] action’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an</td>
<td>*kasih ‘love (v)’ → KK-6 kasih-an ‘love potion’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vuat ‘make, do (v)’ → *vuat-an (→ ka-vuat-an-ã=ñã, see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*vuat-an ‘deed (n)’ → SKN-26 ka-vuat-an-ã [=ñã] ‘[their] undertakings’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ka-...-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dātu ‘king (n)’ → KK-2, SKN-8 ka-datu-an ‘royal residence’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*vali ‘return (v)’ → SKN-25 pam-valy-ã [=ñã] ‘[my] recompense’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*avis ‘be finished (v?)’ → BS-7 par-avis ‘all’, ‘without exception’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*va ‘carry, lead (v)’ →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>par-...-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vuat ‘make, do (v)’ → SKN-17 par-vuat-ã [=ñã] ‘[their] machinations’ [?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dātu ‘king (n)’ → SKN-10 par-ddatu-an (BS-1 par-ddatu-an[n])? ‘kingship’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sumpah ‘curse (n)’ → KK-2 par-sumpah-an ‘invocation of the curse’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6.7: LIKELY NOMINAL DERIVATIONS FROM NOUNS (N) AND VERBS (V) IN OM
refers to an image, imitation, or analogue of the original signified, which agrees with the derivation dātu ‘king’ → dātī-a ‘regent (territorial governor)’, further obscuring any differences between the two suffixes.

In SKN-21 ni-minu=māmu ‘be drunk by you’ there is fusion of the final nasal of minum ‘drink’ and the initial nasal of =māmu ‘your’ (but TT-5 ni-minumī=ŋa ‘be drunk by them’). It is possible that the assumed suffix -a in vuat-ā=ŋa ‘their action’, ka-vuat-ā=ŋa ‘their undertakings’, ka-vuat-an-ā=ŋa ‘id.’, and in pam-valy-a=ŋku ‘my recompense’, was actually -an with similar fusion of final -n with the nasal of the pronominal enclitic. That would still leave the suffix in datī-a ‘regent’ which is too widely represented to suspect an error in either writing or reading.
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