

# 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.

Major works on decipherment and on the language, with source texts and wordlists, are Çœdès (1930), Ferrand (1932), and Casparis (1950, 1956). Suhadi (1983) provides a collection of source texts. Various aspects of the language are dealt with by Kern (1931), Aichele (1942–1943), Teeuw (1959), Kähler (1983:22–31), Vikør (1988:67–84, 88), Kridalaksana (1991), Adelaar (1992 and in press), Ogloblin (1998), Tadmor (2000), and Wolff (2001).

### 1.2 Archaeological and historiographic data on chronology and distribution

Reviews on archaeological, palaeographic, and historiographic aspects of the epigraphy of the Malayan Archipelago, including OM inscriptions, have been made by Damais (1952, 1955), Wolters (1967), Casparis (1975), Boechari (1977), Edwards McKinnon (1985), Hall (1985:78–102), and Manguin (1987, 1993).

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 Çœdès (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 *dvīpa* ‘island’) in Valmiki’s *Rāmāyaṇa*, as *labadiou* and *Sabadeība* in Ptolemy’s *Geography*, and as *Ye<sup>4</sup>diao<sup>4</sup>* with 132 AD dating in the Later Han Annals (*Hou<sup>4</sup>han<sup>4</sup>.shu<sup>1</sup>*), subsequently sometimes misspelled *Si<sup>1</sup>diao<sup>4</sup>* (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 *Məlayu* ‘Malay’).

Consequently, Malays and places they inhabited or ruled were referred to as *Jāvaka* in Pali, *Cavakam* in Tamil, (*az-*)*Zābaḡ* in Arabic, and as either *She<sup>2</sup>po<sup>2</sup> ~ She<sup>4</sup>po<sup>2</sup>* (< \**jaba*) or *She<sup>4</sup>bo<sup>2</sup> ~ Zhu<sup>4</sup>bo<sup>2</sup>* (< \**jabak[a] ~ \*jəbak[a]*) in Chinese (Mahdi 1994:205–206 n. 26, 214 n. 84, 474 n. 138, 1995:170–171). Middle Khmer had *Cvā* (Çædès and Dupont 1943:106 fn.1), from Old Khmer *Javā ~ Jvā*. The Modern Khmer reflex *Cvie* 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. *Srokcvie* ‘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 *Gu<sup>3</sup>lun<sup>2</sup> ~ Ku<sup>1</sup>lun<sup>2</sup> ~ Jue<sup>2</sup>lun<sup>2</sup>* (the latter a misspelling). By the seventh century, one also finds the non-cognate *Kun<sup>1</sup>lun<sup>2</sup>* as reference to Malay language and people (Mahdi 1999a:163–165). Yijing reports that three pilgrims visiting Sriwijaya (*Shi<sup>4</sup>li<sup>4</sup>fo<sup>2</sup>shi<sup>4</sup>*) learned the *Kun<sup>1</sup>lun<sup>2</sup>* 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 *bər-* (*bar-* in early documents) in CM, but *ni-* and *mar-* (read *mər-*) 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 *mər-* is attested by the name of the West-Sumatran volcano Merapi (< *mər-* 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 *bər-* is attested to by the original coining of C/IM *pohon bəringin* ‘willow fig (*Ficus benjamina* L., often treated as sacred)’ (*pohon* ‘tree’, *ingin* ‘wish’; Aichele 1928:28 fn. 4). This tree

name corresponds to Sanskrit *kalpavṛkṣa* ‘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[aə]r-/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 *bər-* 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 \*baR-, 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 *ḍ* 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 *ḍ* 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 (*akṣara*-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 6.1: LIST OF OLD MALAY INSCRIPTIONS (INCL. DIALECTALLY DEVIANT ONES; INSCRIPTIONS USED HERE ARE HIGHLIGHTED)**

Inscription name	Year	Prefix <sup>a</sup>	Region	Source references
Bukateja	c. 840	—	Central Java	Casparis (1956:207–211 #8), Suhadi (1983:76)
<b>BS=Bukit Seguntang</b> Dang Puhawang Glis (Gandasuli) <sup>b</sup>	827	<i>ni-</i> , <i>mar-</i> —	Palembang Central Java	Casparis (1956:2–6 #1a) Brandes (1913:3–4 #3), Damais (1955:133–136 #A.11), Suhadi (1983:74)
Dièng – Namaççiwaya Déwadrawya Hujung Langit (Bawang)	997	—	Central Java Lampung	Brandes (1913:227–228 #96), Suhadi (1983:75) Damais (1955:130–133 #E.5), Damais (1960a)
Karang Brahi (similar to Kota Kapur)		<i>ni-</i> , <i>mar-</i>	Jambi	Krom (1920:426–431 #XVI), Çœdès (1930:45 #3), Boechari (1979), Suhadi (1983:78)
<b>KB=Kedukan Bukit</b>	683	<i>mar-</i>	Palembang	Ronkel (1924:19–21), Çœdès (1930:33–37 #1), Ferrand (1932:273), Poerbatjaraka (1952:33–34), Suhadi (1983:76)
Kebon Kopi <sup>c</sup> – Rakryan Juru Pangambat <b>KK=Kota Kapur</b>	942 686	<i>bar-/</i> <i>/mar-</i> <i>ni-</i> , <i>mar-</i>	West Java Bangka	Bosch (1941), Suhadi (1983:70, 76) Kern (1913), Çœdès (1930:46–50 #4), Ferrand (1932:280–281), Poerbatjaraka (1952:39–41), Suhadi (1983:77)
Laguna copper plate Manjuçriçrha	900 793	<i>di-</i> , <i>bar-</i> not seen	Luzon Central Java	Postma (1992) Boechari unpublished (Suhadi 1983:68)
Palas Pasemah (similar to Kota Kapur) <b>SKB=Sabokingking B</b> (Telaga Batu) <sup>d</sup>		<i>ni-</i> — <sup>e</sup>	Lampung Palembang	Boechari (1979), Suhadi (1983:78–79) Casparis (1956:11–15 #1e)
<b>SKN=Sabokingking</b> <b>Naga stone</b> (Telaga Batu) <sup>d</sup> <b>SHW=Sang Hyang</b> <b>Wintang</b> (Gandasuli) <sup>b</sup>	c. 840 832	<i>ni-</i> , <i>mar-</i> <i>di-</i> , <i>var-/</i> <i>/mar-</i> <sup>f</sup>	Palembang Central Java	Casparis (1956:15–47 #2), Suhadi (1983:79–81) Brandes (1913:236–238 #105), Casparis (1950:50–73 #4), Suhadi (1983:74–75)
Sojomerto		—	Central Java	Boechari (1966), Suhadi (1983:74)
<b>TT=Talang Tuwo</b>	684	<i>ni-</i> , <i>mar-</i>	Palembang	Ronkel (1924:12–19), Çœdès (1930:38–44 #2), Ferrand (1932:276–277), Poerbatjaraka (1952:35–38), Suhadi (1983:76–77)
Ulu Belu		—	Lampung	Damais (1960b)

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 Glis.

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).

**TABLE 6.2: CONSONANTS NOMINALLY IMPLIED BY OLD SUMATRAN-SCRIPT BASIC CHARACTERS**

	Voiceless stop	Aspirated voiceless stop	Voiced stop	Aspirated voiced stop	Nasal
Velar	<i>k</i>	( <i>kh</i> )	<i>g</i>		<i>ṅ</i> [ <i>ng, ŋ</i> ]
Palatal	<i>c</i>		<i>j</i>		<i>ñ</i>
Retroflex			<i>ḍ</i>		<i>ṇ</i>
Dental	<i>t</i>	( <i>th</i> )	<i>d</i>	( <i>dh</i> )	<i>n</i>
Bilabial	<i>p</i>			( <i>bh</i> )	<i>m</i>
Continuants	<i>y</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>v</i> [ <i>b ~ w</i> ]	<i>h</i>
Sibilants		( <i>ś</i> [ <i>ç</i> ])	( <i>ṣ</i> )	<i>s</i>	

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 *ḍ* and *ṇ*, and the voiced fricative *v*. These are the problematic initial consonants in reading OM texts.

In the nuclear OM corpus, *ḍ* and *ṇ* in indigenous words are restricted to the honorific article *ḍa-* and enclitic *-ḍa ~ -ṇḍa*. 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 *vodhi-* for Skt. *bodhi-*, TT-13 *vrahma-* for Skt. *brahma-*). That written *v* could indeed be read as *b* rather than *w* in OM is suggested by renderings of *Śri-Vijaya* in Chinese as *Shi<sup>4</sup>li<sup>4</sup>fo<sup>2</sup>shi<sup>4</sup>* (< \**shə-li-but-jay* < \**səri bəjay*[*a*]) and *Shi<sup>4</sup>li<sup>4</sup>pi<sup>2</sup>shi<sup>4</sup>* (< \**shə-li-bit-jay* < \**səri bijay*[*a*]), and in Arabic as *Sribuza* (< \**sri bəja*[*ya*]), 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 *qāf*) that alternates with *k* (Jawi *kāf*) 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).

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 *ŋ* (spelled *m̄*, 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: *rūpa-* → SKN-13 *marūpa-* ‘apply forms’. In another single example, the prefixal *r* is dropped due to the presence of a final *r* in the following syllable: *kāryya* → SKN-27 *makāryya* ‘perform transactions’ (cf. Casparis 1956:348), which is in agreement with C/IM *kərja* → *bəkərja* ‘work’.

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

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

Base-initial segment	Examples
V	<i>*alap</i> → KB-3 <i>mañalap</i> KK-3 [ni]ūjar → KK-3 <i>mañujāri</i>
c	<i>*caru</i> → SKN-11 <i>mañcaru</i>
h	<i>*hidup</i> → TT-6 <i>mamhidupi</i>
k	<i>*kalit</i> → SKN-11 <i>mañalit</i> (see Adelaar 1992:399)
m	TT-5,12 <i>mañcak</i> → BS-13 <i>mamañcak</i>
s	SKN-21 [ni]suluh → KK-6/7 <i>mañuruh</i>
t	KK-4 <i>tāpik</i> → KK-10 <i>manāpik</i>
v	<i>*vali</i> (C/IM <i>balik</i> ~ [kəm]bali) → SKN-25 <i>pamvalya</i> = <i>nku</i>

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

Base-initial segment	Examples
l	SKN-6 <i>larī</i> → SKN-9 <i>mañlarī</i>
r	SKN-8 [ni]rakša → SKN-18 <i>mañrakša</i> <i>*ruru</i> → SKN-10 <i>mañruruā</i>
v	SKN-26 [ni]vava → SKN-9 <i>mamāva</i> (C/IM <i>bawa</i> → <i>məmbawa</i> )

indeed to have been a means of spelling *-rəC-*. 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 (*akṣara-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 *m̐*, indicates nasalization of the vowel in Sanskrit, and the *visarga*, transcribed *h̐*, 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 *ŋ* 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 *sumpaḥ* ‘curse’ → KK-2 *parsumpahān* ‘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 /ə/, 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 *makalanīt* ~ BS-20 *makalñit* ‘cause to disappear’ (see Adelaar 1992:394, 397–398). Mode (3) occurs only once, TT-3 *pattum* ‘k.o. bamboo’ (C/IM *bətung*, Javanese *pətung*), 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 *Səna* in the Sundanese chronicle *Carita Parahiyangan*, and *Sanna* in the 732 AD Canggal inscription (see Poerbatjaraka 1958:256–257).

The *r̥* transcribes a syllabic rhotic in Sanskrit, not a retroflex consonant. The regular C/IM rendering is *ər*, and the same probably applied for Sanskritisms in OM. Thus, TT-6 *vṛddhi* ‘growth’ is spelled as in Sanskrit, but SKN-20 *nisamvarddhi*=*ku* ‘be empowered by me’ has *ar* for the *r̥* in Sanskrit *samvṛddhi* ‘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 other word with a diphthong was spelled differently: TT-2 *hanāu* ‘toddy palm’ (C/IM *ənau*). The vowels *e* and *o* only occur in Sanskritisms. The only exception, SHW-5,6 *sapopo* ‘first degree relative in collateral line’ (C/IM *səpupu*), 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	<i>a</i> +V fused	<i>a</i> +V diphthong
<i>a</i>	<i>ā</i>		
<i>i</i>	<i>ī</i>	( <i>e</i> )	<i>ai</i>
<i>u</i>	<i>ū</i>	( <i>o</i> )	<i>au</i>
( <i>r̥</i> )			
Syllable-final	segments	<i>-ṃ</i> [ <i>-m̐</i> , <i>-m/-ŋ</i> ]	<i>-h̐</i>

## 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* – *ka-datū-an*; *dirī* – *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 *maymay*), all NC-clusters were homorganic. Based on a corpus that also included texts with *bar-* and *di-*, Vikør (1988:81–83) made the following inventory of observed structures: 61 CVCVC, 42 CVCV, 12 VCVC, 6 VCV, 8 (C)VNCV(C), 2 CVrCV(C), altogether 131 bisyllabic basic words. Monosyllabic words numbered 6, all having the structure CVC (Vikør seems to have missed the two monosyllabic prepositions *dī* and *ka* with structure CV). There are 7 trisyllabic basic words, encompassing 4 CVCVCV, and one each CVCVCVC, CVNCVCV, CVCVNCVC.

## 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), *māti* ‘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 *yamī 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), *tlu* '3' (KB), *sa=pulu* ~ *sa=puluḥ* '10' (KB, SKB), *sa=pulu dua* ~ *sa=puluḥ dua* '12' (KB, SKB), *dua-ratus* '200' (KB), *tlu-rātus* '300' (KB), *sa=rivu* '1000' (KB), *dua-lakṣa* '20,000' (KB, SKB). An example of a lengthy composed numeral is KB-6/7 *sa=rivu tlu-rātus sa=pulu dua* '1312'. Sanskrit *lakṣa* means '100,000', but the C/IM borrowed cognate (*sə=*)*lakṣa* means '10,000' and Çœdès (1930:76) plausibly assumed the same for OM *lakṣa*. Noteworthy is *tlu* '3' (C/IM *tiga*), and the formation of teens with a preposed *sa=pulu[h]* (C/IM has postpositioned *-bālas*).

Unlike C/IM, OM does not feature quantifiers (classifiers), see Ferrand (1932:294). Numerals were placed immediately before a noun (BS-14 *dua tāṇḍa* '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 *tlu-rātus sa=pulu dua vañak=ñā dātam* (3 100 1 10 2 **many** 3s.GEN come) 'three hundred and twelve **in number** arrived'. Ordinal numbers are only attested in statements of the day of the Śaka-calendar month: TT-1 *dvitiya* '2nd', KB-8 *pañcamī* '5th', KB-3 *saptamī* '7th' (also partly illegible SKB-3 *.ptamī*), 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 *gram* [*kadāci*] 'if [on the contrary]' (CM *gərang* '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 *tətapi* '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 imprecations 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 śrikṣetra 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'

SKN-5 *ni-vunuḥ kāmu sumpah*  
 PASS-kill 2p curse  
 ‘you will **be killed** by the curse’

The latter clause is repeated at least 23 more times in the same SKN inscription, while *nivunuḥ 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: *həndak 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 maṃ-rakṣā=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: *Bər-mula ... akan bər-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 *da punta hiyaṃ nāyik di sāmvaṃ*  
 ART TITLE NAME **ascend**.Ø at ship  
 ‘the noble Punta Hiang **boarded** ship’
- SKN-11 *tida kāmū mar-ppādaḥ dari huluntuhā=ñku*  
 NEG 2p ST-**report** from vassal-chief=1s.GEN  
 ‘you do not **report** from my vassal chiefs’
- SKN-5/6 *yaṃ mar-vuddhi lavan*  
 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 *jānian*, cf.:

- TT-6 *ya jānian ya ni-knā-i sa=vañak=ñā yaṃ upasargga*  
 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 *yuarāja pratiyuarāja 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 *dñan* ‘with’ serves as copulative conjunction (in C/IM it has been compressed to *dan* ‘and’ in this function):

- TT-9 *vodhicitta dñan maitri* ‘Bodhi-thoughts **and** friendship’

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

- TT-2/3 *ñiyur pinaṃ hanāu rumviya dñan samiśrā=ñā yaṃ kāyu*  
 coconut areca toddy sago [palms] **and** mixed=3s.GEN ART tree  
*ni-mākan vuah=ñā*  
 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 dnian 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-ñalit 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 vaiśākha* ‘the month of Vaisaka’; KK-4,8, SKN-15,20 *sanyāsa datūa* ‘office of regent’; KK-10 *bhūmi jāva* ‘the land of Java’; TT-10 *hyam ratnatraya* ‘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 determinator (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 *ñiyur pinam hanāu rumviya* ‘coconut palms, areca palms, toddy palms, sago palms’). Country and place names usually occur as attribute, e.g. *Śrī-Vijaya* ‘Sriwijaya’ modifies: KK-2 *kadatuan* ‘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 *śatru=ñiku* ‘my

**TABLE 6.5: OM PERSONAL PRONOUNS**

Person	Independent	Enclitic (oblique/genitive)
1s	<i>āku</i> (KK, SKN)	= <i>ku</i> (KK, SKN) ~= <i>ñiku</i> (SKN, TT)
2p	<i>kāmu</i> (SKN)	= <i>māmu</i> (SKN)
3s	<i>iya</i> (BS, KK, SKN) ~ ~ <i>ya</i> (KK, SKN, TT)	= <i>ña</i> (BS, KK, SKN, TT)
3p/honorific (2p)/divine	<i>sida</i> (BS), <i>kita</i> (KK),	= <i>da</i> (BS) ~= <i>nda</i> (BS, KK, SKN, TT) = <i>ta</i> (KK) ~= <i>nta</i> (TT)

enemy', SKN-9 *huluntuhā=ñku* 'my vassal chiefs' versus SKN-8 *kadātuan=ku* 'my royal residence', TT-4 *vuat=ku* 'my making'. But there is one exception with nasal in the oblique case: SKN-8 *ni-rakṣā=ñku* '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 *ḍ* in SHW-3 *siḍa*, but the inscription is dialectally divergent. It is possible that the alternatively spelled modes refer to plural (*sida/=da*) and honorific (*siḍa/=ṇḍa*) 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 *ḍa*, as in KB-4 *ḍa pu=nta hiyaṃ* 'the noble master of gods [?]' (see below).

For enclitic forms of *sida* '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 *ḍ*, and possible semantic shift between plural and (singular?) honorific (BS-3 *anak=da* 'their children' versus TT-2 *par-vā=ṇḍa* ~ KK-4 *par-vvā=ṇḍa* 'auspices of the noble...').

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

Remarkable is the use of the genitive enclitic=*[n]ḍa*, perhaps also=*[n]ta*, as possessive copula analogously to 3s=*ñā* (e.g. SKN-12 *sthānā=ñā śatru=ñku* 'position/residence of my enemy', TT-4 *puṇya=ñā 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 *śuklapakṣa vulan* 'bright half of the month'; SKN-4 *vatak-vuruh* 'groups of workmen', SKN-5 *hulun-haji* '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, *ini* '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 ini di vanua ini* 'this monastery in this country'; KK-10 *maṃaṃ sumpaḥ ini* 'this curse imprecation'; KK-4 *uraṃ inan* 'those people'. Their pronominal use is less clearly documented, e.g. SKN-13 *ini makalanit-prana uraṃ* (PRX CAU-disappear mind person) 'these [who] take away people's minds'.

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

The use of *iyam* ~ *yaṃ*, of which the C/IM cognate *yang* 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=vañak=ña     **yaṃ**    ni-tānaṃ    di    sini    ñiyur    pinam...*  
 one=many=3S.GEN    REL    PASS-plant    at    D.PRX    coconut    areca...  
 ‘all of the coconut, areca, etc. palms **that** are planted here’

KK-4     *dñan    di    **iyaṃ**    ni-galar=ku            sanyāsa    datūa*  
 with    at    REL    PASS-name=1S.OBL    office    regent  
 ‘with regard to [those] **who** have been named by me to the office of regent’

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

KK-10    *di vela=ña     **yaṃ**    vala    śrī-vijaya    ma-nāpik    **yaṃ**    bhūmi    jāva*  
 at time=3S.GEN    ART    army    NAME    ACT-attack    ART    land    NAME  
 ‘at the time that **the** army of Sriwijaya attacked **the** land of Java’

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

KB-5     *ma-māva    **yaṃ**    vala    dualakṣa*  
 ACT-lead    ART    army    20000  
 ‘lead **an** army of 20000’

KK-2     *maṃ-raksa    **yaṃ**    kadatuan    śrī-vijaya*  
 ACT-protect    ART    palace    NAME  
 ‘protect **the** palace of Sriwijaya’

In the function under (c), *yaṃ* cannot be literally translated into IM as *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    *manāpik    yaṃ    bhūmi    jāva            tida    bhakti    ka    śrī-vijaya*  
 ACT-attack    ART    land    NAME [ ]    NEG    submit.Ø    to    NAME  
 ‘attacks the land of Java **that** is not submissive to Sriwijaya’

TT-3     *kāyu    ni-mākan    vuah=ña*  
 tree [ ]    PASS-eat    fruit=3S.GEN  
 ‘trees **whose** fruit are eaten’

SKN-25    *ni-vunuḥ    kāmū    sumpaḥ    ni-minu[m]=māmu    ini*  
 kill.PASS    2p    curse [ ]    PASS-drink=2p.OBL    PRX  
 ‘you will be killed by this curse **which** is drunk by you’

In C/IM, *yang* would have been expected in these environments.

### 3.4 Prepositional phrases

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

(a) common nouns and proper names: SKB-8 *di vanua ini* ‘in this country’; SKN-6 *dari śatru=ñku* ‘from my enemy’; KB-6 *di sāmvaū* ‘on ship’; KB-4 *dari mināna tāmvan* ‘from Minanga Tamban’; TT-10 *di daṃ hyaṃ ratnatraya* ‘at the divinity Three Jewels’; KK-10 *ka śrī-vijaya* ‘to Sriwijaya’;

- (b) personal pronouns: SKN-8 *dari kāmū* ‘from you’; SKN-9 *ka kāmū* ‘to you’, SKN-12 *dy-āku* ~ KK-9 *diy-āku* ‘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 bhūmi* (at inside=3s.GEN earth) ‘inside the earth’; TT-5 *di antara mārgga* ‘in the midst of the way/journey’; SKN-9 *di luar huluntuḥ=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 sāna* ‘there’; SKN-28 *ka-māna* ‘where to’;
- (e) temporal nominals (e.g. TT-5 *di āsannakāla* ‘in time-of-stopover’; KK-10 *di velā=ña* ‘at the time of’).

Another preposition, *dian* ~ *dañan* ‘with’, mainly combines with a noun: SKN-12 *dañan darah* ‘with blood’; SKN-20 *dian śatru=ñku* ‘with my enemy’; KB-5/6 *dañan kośa dua-ratus* ‘with two hundred [supply] containers’; KB-6 *dañan jālan* ‘by road’. In one example that noun is preceded by *yaṃ* serving as article: SKB-21 *dian yaṃ uraṃ pradhāna* (with ART person high-ranking) ‘with high-ranking persons’. (On *dian* 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-samvarddhi=ku akan-datūa* ‘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-mulañ śāsanā=ña* ‘will/in-order-to be determined by his orders’; SKN-25 *akan-ni-mākan* ‘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 kāmū ni-muaḥ=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 *təlah*, durative *sə dang*, etc.) and temporal adverbs (e.g. *d[ah]ulu* ‘previously’, *tadi* ‘just now’, *nanti* ‘later’, *kəlak* ‘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-aṃgap* ‘devour’, ‘swallow’. (There is a C/IM cognate *<əm>* 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.’, *maju* ‘advance’ ← *<əm>* + *aju* ‘forward’). It seems likely, therefore, that BS-16 *um-aṃgap* is a contamination from ‘language B’/‘Old Maanyan’ for which (in KK-2) a form *um-entem* ‘?’ is attested.

The two C/IM transitivity 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 transitivity verbal suffixes *mar-* verbs (as they do with *bər-* verbs in CM, though not in IM): KK-7 *mar-jjahāt-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 *larīy-ākan* ‘run off with, take away’ (cf. SKN-6 *larī* ‘run’), but the double accentuation, and the split location (*larī-* 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-samvarddhi=ku akan-datūa* ‘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-/bər-* and *ni-/di-* contrasts. Thus, OM has *maka-* for which there is no C/IM cognate. Kähler (1983:28f) compared it with C/IM *məm-pər-*, but C/IM semantic correspondents of the OM forms have *məN-X-kan* (where *X* is the verb base). In a single example of the accidental perfective, normally formed in C/IM with *tər-*, OM has *ka-*, corresponding to C/IM *kə-* which in this function only appears in some fossilized forms as far as IM is concerned (e.g. *kə-təmu* ‘meet’). For C/IM *bər-X-an* forms denoting joint action, OM has an equivalent *mar-si-X* in one instance: SKN-5 *mar-si-haji* ‘[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-məN-X*.

The active-passive voice opposition is perhaps the best documented verbal alternation in OM. Attested *maN-/ni-* pairs are: SKN-18 *maṃraksā* ‘protect’ – SKN-8 *ni-rakṣā* [= *niku*] ‘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**

C/IM	OM	Formant of: /examples
<i>bər-</i>	<i>mar-</i>	Stative (also with <i>-i</i> , see above), possessional: TT-9 <i>mar-vvañun</i> ‘rise’, ‘get up’ SKN-5 <i>mar-vuddhi</i> ‘have mind/character’ (C/IM <i>bər-budi</i> ).
<i>di-</i>	<i>ni-</i>	passive voice (also with <i>-kan</i> , <i>-i</i> ): TT-2 <i>ni-tānam</i> ‘be planted’ (C/IM <i>ditanam</i> ); BS-19 <i>ni-kāryyā-kan</i> ‘be processed/performed’ (C/IM <i>di-kərja-kan</i> ); TT-6 <i>ni-kñā-i</i> ‘be afflicted’ (C/IM <i>di-kəna-i</i> ).
<i>di-pər-</i>	<i>ni-par-</i>	passive causative: TT-1 <i>ni-par-vuat</i> ‘be made’ (C/IM <i>di-pər-buat</i> ).
<i>məN-</i>	<i>maN-</i>	active voice (also with <i>-kan</i> , <i>-i</i> ): KK-6/7 <i>mañuruḥ</i> ‘order’ (C/IM <i>mənyuruḥ</i> ); TT-6 <i>mañ-hidup-i</i> ‘raise [cattle]’ (C/IM <i>məng-hidup-i</i> ).
<i>tər-</i>	<i>ka-</i>	coincidental perfective: KK-10 <i>ka-livat</i> ‘was passed through’ (C/IM <i>tər-livat</i> ).
	<i>maka-</i>	causative stative: KK-5, SKN-14,15 <i>maka-lanit</i> ~ ~ BS-20 <i>maka-lñit</i> ‘cause to disappear’ (C/IM <i>məng-hilang-kan</i> ); SKN-14 <i>maka-gila</i> ‘make crazy’ (C/IM <i>məng-gila-kan</i> ).



‘speak to’ – SKN-23 *ni-ujār-i* ‘be spoken to’; SKN-9 *mamāva* ‘lead (army)’, ‘bring’, ‘carry’ (things) – SKN-26 *ni-vava* ‘be led’, ‘be sent’ (army).

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*[=*ña*] ‘be drunk [by them]’; perhaps also SKN-8 *muaḥ* ‘there be [?]’, ‘have [?]’ → SKN-22/23 *ni-muaḥ*[=*ña*] ‘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*).

TT-6/7	<i>varam</i>	<i>vuat-ā=ña</i>			
	whatever	make-SUBJ=3S.GEN			
		‘whatever they should do’			
SKN-10	<i>athavā kāmu</i>	<i>larīy-a</i>	<i>maḥ-larīy-a</i>	<i>lai</i>	<i>kāmu</i>
	or 2p	run-SUBJ	ACT-run-SUBJ	other	2p
		‘or should you flee or let others of you flee.’			

## 5 NOMINALIZATIONS AND NOMINAL MORPHOLOGY

C/IM features a number of derivational means to form nouns denoting action, actor, or undergoer (i.e. *pāN-*, *pāN-...-an*, *pār-...-an*, *kə-...-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 6.7: LIKELY NOMINAL DERIVATIONS FROM NOUNS (N) AND VERBS (V) IN OM**

Affix	Derivations
<i>-a</i>	<i>dātu</i> ‘king (n)’ → KK-4, SKN-15 <i>datū-a</i> ‘regent’ <i>vuat</i> ‘make, do (v)’ → SKN-15, TT-6/7 <i>vuat-ā</i> [= <i>ña</i> ] ‘[their] action’
<i>-an</i>	* <i>kasih</i> ‘love (v)’ → KK-6 <i>kasih-an</i> ‘love potion’ <i>vuat</i> ‘make, do (v)’ → * <i>vuat-an</i> (→ <i>ka-vuat-an-ā=ña</i> , see below)
<i>ka-...-a</i>	<i>vuat</i> ‘make, do (v)’ → KK-8 <i>ka-vuat-ā</i> [= <i>ña</i> ] ‘[their] undertakings’ * <i>vuat-an</i> ‘deed (n)’ → SKN-26 <i>ka-vuat-an-ā</i> [= <i>ña</i> ] ‘[their] undertakings’
<i>ka-...-an</i>	<i>dātu</i> ‘king (n)’ → KK-2, SKN-8 <i>ka-datu-an</i> ‘royal residence’
<i>paN-...-a</i>	* <i>vali</i> ‘return (v)’ → SKN-25 <i>pam-valy-a</i> [= <i>ñku</i> ] ‘[my] recompense’
<i>par-...-a</i>	* <i>avis</i> ‘be finished (v?)’ → BS-7 <i>par-avis</i> ‘all’, ‘without exception’
<i>par-...-an</i>	* <i>va</i> ‘carry, lead (v)’ → → SKN-15 <i>par-vvā</i> [= <i>nda</i> ] ~ KB-2 <i>par-vā</i> [= <i>nda</i> ] ‘auspices [of]’ <i>vuat</i> ‘make, do (v)’ → SKN-17 <i>par-vuat-ā</i> [= <i>ña</i> ] ‘[their] machinations’ [?] <i>dātu</i> ‘king (n)’ → SKN-10 <i>par-ddatu-an</i> (BS-1 <i>par-dāt-v-a[n]?</i> ) ‘kingship’ <i>sumpah</i> ‘curse (n)’ → KK-2 <i>par-sumpah-an</i> ‘invocation of the curse’

refers to an image, imitation, or analogue of the original signified, which agrees with the derivation *dātu* 'king' → *datū-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-minum=ña* 'be drunk by them'). It is possible that the assumed suffix *-a* in *vuat-ā=ña* 'their action', *ka-vuat-ā=ña* 'their undertakings', *ka-vuat-an-ā=ña* 'id.', and in *pam-valy-a=ñku* '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 *datū-a* 'regent' which is too widely represented to suspect an error in either writing or reading.

## REFERENCES

- Adelaar, K.A. (1985) *Proto-Malay, the reconstruction of its phonology and parts of its lexicon and morphology*, PhD thesis, Leiden University [rev. ed. 1992, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics].
- (1988) 'More on Proto-Malayic', in Mohd. Thani Ahmad and Zaini Mohamed Zain (eds), *Rekonstruksi dan cabang-cabang Melayu Induk*, 57–99. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- (1989) 'Malay influence on Malagasy: Linguistic and culture-historical implications', *Oceanic Linguistics*, 28:1–46.
- (1992) 'The relevance of Salako for Proto-Malayic and for Old Malay epigraphy', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 148:381–408.
- (in press) 'On the classifiability of Malayic', in D. Gil (ed.), *Malay/Indonesian linguistics*, London: Routledge-Curzon.
- Aichele, W. (1928) 'Oudjavaansche bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van den wenschboom', *Djāwā* 8:28–40.
- (1942–1943) 'Die altmalaiische Literatursprache und ihr Einfluß auf das Altjavanische', *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen*, 33:37–66.
- (1954) 'Sprachforschung und Geschichte im indonesischen Raum', *Oriens Extremus*, 1:107–122.
- [Balai Pustaka] (1956) *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, tjet. ke-3, Djakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Blagden, C.O. (1913) 'The Kota Kapur inscription', *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 64:69–71, 65:37.
- Boechari (1966) 'Preliminary Report on the Discovery of an Old-Malay Inscription at Sodjomerto', *Madjalah Ilmu-ilmu Sastra Indonesia*, 3:241–251.
- (1977) 'Epigrafi dan Sejarah Indonesia', *Majalah Arkeologi*, 1/2:1–40.
- (1979) 'An Old Malay inscription of Sriwijaya at Palas Pasemah (South Lampung)', in Satyawati Suleiman (ed.), *Pra Seminar Penelitian Sriwijaya (Jakarta, 7–8 Desember 1978)*, 18–42. Jakarta: Pusat Penelitian Purbakala dan Peninggalan Nasional.
- Bosch, F.D.K. (1941) 'Een Maleische inscriptie in het Buitenzugsche', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 100:48–53.
- Brandes, J.L.A. (1913) *Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden* (uitgegeven door N.J. Krom), Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen 60/1, Batavia: Albrecht's-Hage: M. Nijhoff.
- Casparis, J.G. de (1950) *Prasasti Indonesia*, I, *Inscripties uit de Çailendra-tijd*, Bandung: A.C. Nix.
- (1956) *Prasasti Indonesia*, II, *Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th Century A.D.*, Bandung: Masa Baru.
- (1975) *Indonesian palaeography. A history of writing in Indonesia from the beginning to c. A.D. 1500*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, 3. Abt. Bd. 4, Lieferung 1, Leiden/Köln: E.J. Brill.

- Çœdès, G. (1918) 'Le royaume de Çrīvijaya', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 18/6:1–36.
- (1930) 'Les inscriptions malaises de Çrīvijaya', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 30:29–80.
- Çœdès, G., and P. Dupont (1943) 'Les stèles de Sdok Kak Thom, Phnom Sandak et Prah Vihar', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 43:56–154.
- Cowell, B.E. (1962) *The Prākṛta-Prakāśa, or the Prākṛt grammar of Vararuchi*, 3rd edn. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak [1st ed. 1854].
- Dahl, O.C. (1991) *Migration from Kalimantan to Madagascar*, Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Serie B: Skrifter 82. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Damais, L.-C. (1952) 'Études d'épigraphie indonésienne III. Liste des principales inscriptions datées de l'Indonésie', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 46:1–105.
- (1955) 'Études d'épigraphie indonésienne IV. Discussion de la date des inscriptions', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 47:7–270.
- (1960a) 'Études soumatranaises I; La date de l'inscription de Hujung Langit ('Bawang')', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 50:275–288.
- (1960b) 'Études soumatranaises II; L'inscription de Ulu Bəlu (Soumtra méridional)', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 50:289–311.
- (1968) 'Études soumatranaises III; La langue B des inscriptions de Sṛī Wijaya', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 54:523–566.
- Edwards McKinnon, E. (1985) 'Early Politics in Southern Sumatra: Some Preliminary Observations Based on Archaeological Evidence', *Indonesia* (Ithaca), 40:1–36.
- Ferrand, G. (1929) 'Le K'ouen-louen et les anciennes navigations interocéaniques dans les mers du sud', *Journal Asiatique* 11<sup>e</sup> série 13:239–333, 431–492, 14:5–68, 201–241.
- (1932) 'Quatre textes épigraphiques malayo-sanskrits de Sumatra et de Baŋka', *Journal Asiatique*, 221:271–326.
- Hall, K.R. (1985) *Maritime trade and state development in early Southeast Asia*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Headley, R.K. Jr., K. Chhor, Lam K.L., Lim H.K., and Chen C. (1977) *Cambodian–English Dictionary*, Washington (D.C.): Catholic University of America Press.
- I-Tsing [=Yijing] (1894) *Les religieux éminents qui allèrent chercher la Loi dans les pays d'occident*, Mémoire composé à l'époque de la grande dynastie T'ang, traduit en français par Édouard Chavannes. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Kähler, H. (1983) *Grammatik der Bahasa Indonésia*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Kern, H. (1913) 'Inscriptie van Kota Kapoer (eiland Bangka; 608 çāka)', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 67:393–400.
- Kern, R.A. (1931) 'Enkele aanteekeningen op G. Çœdès' uitgave van de Maleische inschriften van Çrīvijaya', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 88:508–513.
- Kridalaksana, H. (1982) *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- (1991) 'Peri Hal Konstruksi Sintaksis Dalam Bahasa Melayu Kuna', in H. Kridalaksana (ed.), *Masa Lampau Bahasa Indonesia: sebuah bunga rampai*, seri ILDEP, 166–174. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- Krom, N.J. (1920) 'Épigraphische Aanteekeningen (XIV–XVI)', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Afdeling Letterkunde, 59:420–431.
- Mahdi, W. (1993) 'Distinguishing homonymic word forms in Indonesian', in G.P. Reesink (ed.), *Topics in Descriptive Austronesian Linguistics*, Semaian 11, 181–216. Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië.
- (1994) 'Some Austronesian maverick protoforms with culture-historical implications', *Oceanic Linguistics*, 33:167–229, 431–490.
- (1995) 'Wie hießen die Malaien, bevor sie "Malaien" hießen?', in A. Bormann, A. Graf, M. Meyer, M. Voss (eds), pp. 162–176 *Südostasien und wir*, Austronesiana: Studien zum austronesischen Südostasien und Ozeanien 1. Hamburg: Lit.

- (1999a) ‘The dispersal of Austronesian boat forms in the Indian Ocean’, in Roger Blench and Matthew Spriggs (eds), *Archaeology and Language III: Artefacts, languages and texts*, 144–179. London: Routledge.
- (1999b) ‘Linguistic and philological data towards a chronology of Austronesian activity in India and Sri Lanka’, in Roger Blench and Matthew Spriggs (eds), *Archaeology and Language IV: Language change and cultural transformation*, 160–242. London: Routledge.
- Manguin, P.-Y. (1987) ‘Études Sumatranaises I. Palembang et Sriwijaya: Anciennes hypothèses, recherches nouvelles’, *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient*, 76:337–401.
- (1993) ‘Palembang and Sriwijaya: an early Malay harbour-city rediscovered’, *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 66/1:23–46.
- Obdeyn, V. (1941) ‘Zuid-Sumatra volgens de oudste berichten, I. De geomorfologische gesteldheid van Zuid-Sumatra in verband met de opvatting der ouden’, *Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap* 2e reeks 58:190–216.
- Ogloblin, A.K. (1998) ‘On the history of negation in Malayo-Javanic languages’, Paper: North-Western International Academic Session on South-East Asia, St. Petersburg.
- Poerbatjaraka (1952) *Riwayat Indonesia*, djil. I. Djakarta: Jajasan Pembangunan.
- (1957) ‘Swara e (pepet)’, *Bahasa dan Budaya*, 5(3):18–23.
- (1958) ‘Çrīvijaya, de Çailendra- en de Sañjayavaṃça’, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 114:254–264.
- Postma, A. (1992) ‘The Laguna copper-plate inscription (LCI). A Javanese connection?’, *Philippine Studies*, 40:183–203.
- Ronkel, P.S. van (1924) ‘A preliminary notice concerning two Old Malay inscriptions in Palembang (Sumatra)’, *Acta orientalia*, 2:12–21.
- Ross, M.D. (in press) ‘Notes on the prehistory and internal subgrouping of Malayic’, in J. Bowden and N.P. Himmelmann (eds), *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics*, Canberra: Pacific linguistics.
- Schnitger, F.M. (1939–1943) ‘Monuments mégalithiques de Sumatra-septentrional’, *Revue des arts asiatiques*, 13:23–27 and plates VI–VIII.
- (1964) *Forgotten Kingdoms in Sumatra*, with contributions by C. von Führer-Haimendorf and G.L. Tichelman. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Situmorang, T.D. and A. Teeuw (1958) *Sedjarah Melaju. Menurut terbitan Abdullah (ibn Abdulkadir Munsji)*, tjet. ke-2. Djakarta: Djambatan.
- Solheim, W.G. II (1980) ‘Neue Befunde zur späten Prähistorie Südostasiens und ihre Interpretation’, *Saeculum*, 31:275–317, 319–344.
- Suhadi, M. (1983) ‘Seven Old-Malay inscriptions found in Java’, in *SPAFA Final Report: Consultative Workshop on Archaeological and Environmental Studies on Srivijaya (T–W3)* Bangkok and South Thailand, 67–81. Bangkok: Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization.
- Tadmor, U. (2000) ‘Rekonstruksi Aksent Kata Bahasa Melayu’, in Bambang Kaswanti Purwo and Yassir Nasanius (eds), *Pertemuan Linguistik (Pusat Kajian) Bahasa dan Budaya Atma Jaya Ketiga Belas*, 153–171. Jakarta: Pusat Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya Unika Atma Jaya.
- Teeuw, A. (1959) ‘The history of the Malay language. A preliminary survey’, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 115:138–156.
- Vikør, L.S. (1988) *Perfecting Spelling. Spelling discussions in Indonesia and Malaysia 1900–1972*, Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 133, Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Wilkinson, R.J. (1901–1903) *A Malay–English Dictionary*. Singapore: Kelly & Walsh.
- Wolff, J.U. (2001) ‘A historical account of the origin of the Malay verbal affix *di-nya*’, Paper: Fifth International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics, Leipzig.
- Wolters, O.W. (1967) *Indonesian Commerce. A Study of the origins of Srivijaya*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.