INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17″ × 23″ black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6″ × 9″ black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI
Accessing the World's Information since 1938

300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Order Number 8821586

Balinese language: Historical background and contemporary state

Hunter, Thomas Marshall, Jr., Ph.D.

The University of Michigan, 1988

Copyright ©1988 by Hunter, Thomas Marshall, Jr. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy __✓__
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✓__
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____
16. Other _____

U·M·I

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BALINESE LANGUAGE:

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CONTEMPORARY STATE

by

Thomas M. Hunter, Jr.

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philospophy
(Linguistics)
in The University of Michigan
1988

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Alton L. Becker, Chairperson
Professor Madhav Deshpande
Professor Peter E. Hook
Professor Judith Becker

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

RULES REGARDING THE USE OF

MICROFILMED DISSERTATIONS

Microfilmed or bound copies of doctoral dissertations submitted to The University of Michigan and made available through University Microfilms International or The University of Michigan are open for inspection, but they are to be used only with due regard for the rights of the author. Extensive copying of the dissertation or publication of material in excess of standard copyright limits, whether or not the dissertation has been copyrighted, must have been approved by the author as well as by the Dean of the Graduate School. Proper credit must be given to the author if any material from the dissertation is used in subsequent written or published work.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

© Thomas M.Hunter,Jr. 1988
All Rights Reserved

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While I alone take full responsibility for the shortcomings of this thesis, its accomplishment has been possible only with the aid of a number of individuals and institutions who, each in their own way, provided aid and encouragement along the way. Those of my friends who go umentioned here will, I hope, not feel slighted, for indeed I acknowledge a great debt to all of you. Suffice to say that my sense of gratitude is keenly felt, both to those mentioned here, and to those unnamed individuals who have been no less important to my progress.

The research that lies behind this thesis was conducted under a Fulbright-Hayes Doctoral Dissertation Grant, for which I am most grateful. Sponsorship of my field work in Indonesia was kindly provided by the Indonesian Academy of Sciences (Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia), and by the Faculty of Letters of Gadjah Mada University. I would especially like to thank Ibu Sumarti Suprayitna and Prof. Dr. Sulastin Sutrisna of the latter institution for their many efforts on my behalf, and to Dr. Mochtar Buchori of LIPI, for his advice and encouragement.

I am grateful to the U.S. Office of Education for support of my graduate work, and to the Horace Rackham

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

School of Graduate Studies at the University of Michigan for providing the initial assistance for the write-up of my dissertation. For continual moral and financial support during the remainder of my thesis write-up I am especially indebted to Barbara Moskowitz, and to my wife Alison, without whose patience and unfailing support this project could never have reached fruition.

The conduct of my field work in Java and Bali was greatly benefitted through contact with Indonesian teachers and colleagues, and indeed much of what I learned during the research period must be credited as much to those teachers and friends as to my own efforts.

First of all I am grateful to Ki Padmapuspita of Yogyakarta for his willingness to guide me during the initial months of the research period, and for his encouragment of my efforts to uncover the thread of tradition that connects ancient and modern in the literary life of Java and Bali. For my initiation into the world of the *bebasan* I am grateful to I Gusti Sumung, to Jero Dalang Ewer and to Jero Mangku Kertha, all of the Ubud area. Further details on their repsective contributions are given in Appendix A following the thesis.

Further progress in my work on *mabasan* and other aspects of Balinese language and literature was made possible through the kind auspices of Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa of Geriya Taman, Sanur. I am grateful to Dr. Stephen

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Lansing for introducing me to this remarkable scholar and teacher. I owe Ida Bagus a continuing debt of gratitude, not only for his patient instruction on important aspects of Balinese life and literature, but also for his friendship and generous advice.

It was also through the kindness of Ida Bagus Sudiyasa that I came to know the members of the various *sekaha bebasan* in the area of of Sanur. My work in Bali was greatly enriched through contact with the members of these *sekaha*, and I would like to thank each of them personally for their contribution. Since space does not allow mention of individual names, I will simply express my gratitude here to the members of *Pesantian Kekawin Lingsir* and *Anom* of Sanur-Intaran, and to the members of *Pesantian Kidung "Dharma Suara" Suka Duka Umat Hindu Hotel Sanur Beach*. I will always remember the friendships developed during the many wonderful hours I spent with these Balinese students of traditional literature.

I am also indebted to Ida Bagus Oka of Jero Sanur for doing me the honor of inviting me to the *bebasan* activities conducted in his household. I would as well like to thank his son Ida Bagus Paramartha who showed great kindness and regard for my family while we resided in his guest house in Sanur.

For my work in Bali I am also indebted to Dr. Michel Picard and to Bruce Carpenter for their collaboration on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

efforts to arrange and record *mabasan* sessions in the Ubud area. I also with to thank Stephen Manteit for his great help in recording *bebasan* sessions and seeking additional information after I had left the field. I wish also to thank Mary Zurbuchen for her inspiration and encouragement, as well as her pioneering efforts that indeed led me to the study of *mabasan* in the first place. For advice and comments in the final stages of preparation of the thesis I am indebted to Agung Gede Dwiputra and to his wife Rucina.

The members of my doctoral committee have been crucial to every aspect of my study, and have each had a profound influence on the development of my scholarly interests. Each of them has shown profound patience and understanding, without which my efforts would have faltered long ago. I am especially grateful to my chairman, A.L. Becker, not only for his generous support and guidance, but also for his example as a compassionate and generous human being.

Finally, I would like to thank two individuals who have had a profound influence on the development of my work. The first of these is my father, without whose inspiration I would have faltered long ago.

The second is the late I Dewa Putu Dani of Peliyatan who in word and deed first impressed upon me the philosophical values implicit in the Balinese language levels. This thesis is dedicated to his memory.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF FIGURES vii

LIST OF GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS viii

LIST OF APPENDICES xi

CHAPTER

ONE: LANGUAGE VALUES IN A "STEADY STATE" 1

PART I:

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF BALINESE LANGUAGE (OLD JAVANESE, OLD MALAY AND OLD BALINESE)

TWO: PARTICIPANT MARKING IN OLD JAVANESE 57

THREE: EVIDENCE OF OLD MALAY AND OLD BALINESE . . 118

PART II:

MODERN BALINESE: FROM SYNTAX TO DISCOURSE

INTRODUCTION 155

FOUR: BASIC STRUCTURES OF MODERN BALINESE 157

FIVE: DERIVATIONAL MORPHOLOGY OF MODERN BALINESE 182

SIX: 'PASSIVE' IN MODERN BALINESE 216

SEVEN: BALINESE LOOK AT OLD JAVANESE: *KAWI* IN THE CONTEXT OF *MABASAN* 272

EIGHT: CODA - LANGUAGE VALUES IN A STEADY STATE 336

APPENDICES 368

BIBLIOGRAPHY 430

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

1. The Tagalog Pronominal System 96

2. The Old Javanese Pronominal System 97

3. The Old Malay Verb 122

4. The Old Malay Pronominal System 129

5. The Old Balinese Verb 139

6. Major Deictic Forms of Balinese 164

7. The Balinese Pronominal System . . . . . 167 - 168

8. The Balinese Prepositional System 169

9. Balinese Modal Verbs 170

10. Balinese Temporal and Sequential Adverbs . . 171 - 172

11. Balinese Interrogative Pronouns 173

12. Major Balinese Conjunctions . . . . . 174 - 175

13. Negativizing Morphemes in Balinese 176

14. Balinese Stative and Intransitive Bases 184

15. Balinese *ma*-R Statives and Intransitives . . . . . 209 - 210

16. Verbal and Substantive Morphology of Balinese . . . . . 210 - 211

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABBREVIATIONS FOR GRAMMATICAL TERMS

The following are abbreviations for grammatical terms used in the glosses for examples found in the text.

R	lexical base
R2	full reduplication of lexical base
R_2	partial reduplication of lexical base
AF	Actor Focus
AF1...$_n$	First Actor Focus affix, Second Actor Focus Affix....$_n$
GF1	Goal Focus One (agentive/volitional)
GF2	Goal Focus Two (non-volitional)
GF(-vol)	Goal Focus Two (specifically non-volitional)
IF	Instrumental Focus
A2F	'Mediate Action' Focus, mediate Actor morpheme
LF	'Locative Focus' (for *-an* as locative or goal-marking affix)
sta	stative morpheme
nom	nominal analog of stative, AF, or IF morpheme
Tr1	first transitivizing suffix: "affected" complement
Tr2	second transitivizing suffix: "domain" complement
top	topic marker
pro1	first person pronoun

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pro2	second person pronoun
pro3	third person pronoun
(top)	topical/subject pronoun
(-top)	non-topical/non-subject pronoun
(-resp)	non-respectful pronoun (where system has a contrast of respectful and non-respectful pronouns)
loc	locative preposition
dat	directional preposition (includes: dative, allative, and ablative cases)
gen	genitive/indirect preposition
source	source preposition ('from')
alla	(specifically) allative preposition ('to')
instr	instrumental preposition
agent	agentive preposition*
scope	'scope' preposition (locative or "core, but non-nuclear argument")
accomp	preposition of accompaniement ('with')
deic1	first deictic article/pronoun (if binary system = 'close'; if trinary = 'close to speaker')
deic2	second deictic article/pronoun (if binary system = 'far'; if trinary = 'close to hearer')
deic3	third deictic article/pronoun ('far from either speaker or hearer')
mannerdeic1	first manner deictic ('close')
mannerdeic2	second manner deictic ('far')
det	determiner
def	definite noun marker

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

irr	irrealis marker
rel	relativizing morpheme
sub	subordinating conjunction
cond	conditional conjunction
opt	optative conjunction
emph	emphatic
lig	ligature
prop	term of address/definite marker for animate NP
hon	honorific term of address/definite marker for animate NP
exist	existential verb
class	classifier or counter
+accomp	modal of positive accomplishment
-accomp	modal of negative accomplishment
+prog	progressive modal
+incomp	modal for incomplete action
fut	future modal
[B]	*basa biasa* lexeme
[A]	*basa alus* lexeme
[Asor]	*basa alus sor* lexeme
[Ami]	*basa alus mider/madia* lexeme
[Asi]	*basa singgih* lexeme
[Skt]	Sanskrit lexeme

* 'by' is used to gloss agentive uses of prepositions that have multiple functions or meanings

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

A. Mabasan Texts 369

B. Satua Texts 401

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER ONE

LANGUAGE VALUES IN A "STEADY STATE"

1.0 Introduction

One of the figures who looms large at the beginnings of anthropological study of Bali is Gregory Bateson, who conducted research in Bali beginning in the late 1930s, much of it in collaboration with Margaret Mead. In 1949 Bateson produced a challanging essay titled "Bali: The Value System of a Steady State". In this essay Bateson claimed that Balinese society is "non-schismogenic", that is that it has developed social mechanisms preventing the development of "regenerative" or "vicious" cycles leading to violent or destructive behaviour.

Bateson's hypothesis was based on observation of a number of key features of Balinese behavior. He noted, for example, the Balinese preoccupation with balance, both in physical and psychological terms, and the corresponding importance for Balinese of being sure of their orientation in both physical and social space.

> "The Balinese are markedly dependent upon spatial orientation. In order to be able to behave they must know their cardinal points, and if a Balinese is taken by motor car over twisting roads so that he loses his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sense of directions, he may become severely disoriented." (Bateson [1949] 1972:117)

The 'cardinal points' described by Bateson for Bali are more than a physical set of coordinates. Zurbuchen (1987) describes them as a 'compass rose' composed of nine directional coordinates and termed *nawasanga* in the Balinese system of linguistic mysticism.[1] The *nawasanga* can be thought of at one level as a kind of cosmological map oriented towards *Gunung Agung*, the great volcanic peak that is the spiritual center of the island of Bali:

> "The nawasanga's origins as a directional index may go back to early historic times when the Balinese, primarily agriculturalists rather than seafarers, revered the volcanic heights as the source of fertility-bearing irrigation waters and the sea as the home of more dangerous, chthonic forces." (1987:52)

Studies by scholars like Swellengrebel (1976), Lansing (1974) and I Made Bandem and de Boer (1981) have shown that the Balinese *nawasanga* system of spatial orientation is a crucial element of structure in the Balinese world, manifesting in such diverse phenomena as the arrangement of temples and house-yard shrines, the orientation of the self in space, and the choreography of traditional dance forms. Zurbuchen (1987) has shown that the *nawasanga* is a crucial element in the Balinese system of 'linguistic mysticism' associated there with the *dasaksara*, or "ten sacred letters":

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> "The nine directional points may be divided into two groups of four-plus-center (the cardinal and intermediate points are grouped separately and the center is counted twice), giving a total of ten elements. When a written symbol is assigned to each point, we find the cornerstone of Balinese mysticism, the *dasaksara* (from *dasa* 'ten' plus *aksara* 'letter')." (1987:53)

The mystical science associated with the dasaksara says Zurbuchen, links the psychological immediacy of the physical act of speech with chirographic symbols that themselves stand for transcendental entities:

> "The Balinese concept of the dasaksara links the physio-logical fact [of speech production] with a multitude of linguistic symbols, each of which reiterates the relation between language and various levels of universal truth. In Burke's (1970) terms, there is a 'logological' relation between Balinese metaphysics and linguistics, in that the nature of transcendent reality is expressed as an analogue of written symbols." (1987:62)

The degree to which the *nawasanga* are embedded in Balinese conciousness is reflected at the most mundane level in terms relating to physical location and motion. For example, the words for the four cardinal points of the nawasanga are used to describe what western observers think of in terms of 'right' and 'left':[2]

(1) Kauh-*ang* a-bedik

'*west*'-Tr1 *a little bit*

'Move (it) <u>to</u> <u>the</u> <u>west</u> a bit !

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(2) Blakas-é dapet-*ang*-*a* be-dauh
heavy knife-pro3 *find*-Tr1-Ag3 loc-*west*

tèmbok paon-é
mortar wall *kitchen*-pro3

'(He) found his machete <u>to the west of</u> the kitchen wall.'

(3) -kal ki je Madé
future '*to where*' 2nd-born

Tiang, **ng**elod-**ang** (ka pasar)
pro1 AF-'*south*'-Tr1 (*to market*)

'Where ya goin, Madé ? Me ? I'm headed south (to the market).'

(4) Uli ditu rurung-é **n**uju **ng**alér-**ang**
from there road-pro3 AF-'*heads*' AF-'*north*'-Tr1

'From there the road heads north (towards Gunung Agung)'.

For the westerner 'compass points' refer to an external dimension, culturally given and independent of the self. At the same time the terms identifying the spatial coordinates of objects in relation to ego are based on a shifting internally-located axis (dividing 'right' and 'left'). For Balinese both of these dimensions are conceived of in terms a system that is both external and internal to the self, since the *nawasanga* is also well-known as a map of 'inner space' useful for the adept in mystical lore and practice. Thus for Balinese the physical and psychological orientation of the self in space overlaps with the external, acculturated semantic system

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

organizing geographical space.

Location in social space is a concern of equal importance for Balinese with physical orientation. This is another point that Bateson brought out in his (1949) article:

> "There is a comparable dependence upon social orientation, but with this difference: that where the spatial orientation is in a horizontal plane, social orientation is felt to be, in the main, vertical. When two strangers are brought together, it is necessary, before they can converse with any freedom, that their relative caste positions be stated. One will ask the other, 'Where do you sit ?' and this is a metaphor for caste. It is asking, essentially, 'Do you sit high or low ?' When one knows the caste of the other, each will then know what etiquette and what linguistic forms he should adopt, and conversation can then proceed. Lacking such orientation, a Balinese is tongue-tied." (1972: 117)

The question "Where do you sit ?" is still frequently heard in Bali, and, in traditional households at least, inter-caste seating arrangements still follow the hierarchical pattern, lower status persons taking care to sit at a lower level than persons of higher status.

Bateson also stressed the importance of the "sociological organization of the individual" in maintaining the "steady-state" of the Balinese system:

> "It is of great interest to note that many Balinese actions are articulately accounted for in sociological terms rather than in terms of individual goals or

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

values." (1987: 118)

An important manifestation of this principle, found Bateson, is the treatment of the village as a distinct entity with its own rights:

> "This is most conspicuous in regard to all actions related to the village council, the hierarchy which includes all full citizens. This body in its secular aspects, is referred to as *I Desa* (literally, 'Mr. Village'), and numerous rules and procedures are rationalized by reference to this abstract personage. Similarly, in its sacred aspects, the village is deified as *Betara Desa* (God Village) to whom shrines are erected and offerings brought... In particular all money transactions which involve the village treasury are governed by the generalization, 'The village does not lose' *(Desanne sing dadi potjol)*." (1987: 118)

A major consequence of this treatment of the village as a corporate and sacred entity with its own personality, said Bateson, is the constraints placed on public language, especially in the context of meetings of the *banjar*, the social entity he termed the "town council":

> "When they speak as members of the village council, the players... are interested in maintaining the steady state of the system - that is, in preventing the maximization of any simple variable the excessive increase of which would produce irreversible change. In daily life, however, they are still engaged in simple competitive strategies." (1972: 125)[3]

This dichotomy between the constrained behaviour of the town council assembly and that of daily life is a theme that is taken up in an article by Hobart (1976) on the role

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of "orators" and "patrons" in political or economic action involving the *banjar*, the entity referred to by Bateson as the "village council":

> "The Balinese *banjar* is both a community and a council, with considerable sanctions and resources. The coercive authority vested in the community-in-council enables a wide range of decisions to be enforced, often with little compromise, so that influence over decision-making becomes a valuable prize... The *banjar* is a potential stage for intense conflict over access to power, while the suppression of open opposition by minorities tends to exacerbate latent tensions." (1976:92)

Hobart studied the roles of political oratory and patronage in the Balinese system, finding that these functions did not converge in single individuals (as is the case in many societies) but fell to different individuals, termed by Hobart "orators" and "patrons". Hobart concludes his description of the forces acting on the Balinese system thus:

> "While the rules of assembly procedure tend to lead to specialised roles in public speaking, constitutional, procedural and linguistic restrictions reduce the assembly's viability as an effective political arena. The formality of conciliar proceedings and the limited sphere of competence of public meetings leads to the use of alternative political relations, free of traditional restraints, based on partonage and factional ties." (1976:92)

Hobart's distinction between "orators" and "patrons"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

is a useful one, and brings out essential features of the distribution in Bali of formal, ritualized power exercised in public contexts with informal, factional power achieved through the intimacy possible in informal performative contexts.

That the factional pursuit of power and status in Bali is by no means simple in Bali has been brought out in work like that of H. and C. Geertz (1976) on the "lineage groups" *(dadia)* and other Balinese institutions involved in the pursuit of collective status and influence. Hobart has thus noted a wide sociological distribution of the types of individuals who become political patrons. He found that major players in patronage politics affecting the *krama banjar* ('membership of the village council') included two members of the traditional aristocracy, an irrigation offical *(klian)*, a village official (the *bendésa*, head of the village as a ritual unit), two 'ritual practicioners' *(mangku)*, and two government employees. As Hobart noted these patrons represent coalitions or factions, and are not simply individuals interested in accruing personal political power:

> "Patrons act as the leaders of factions which, as sets of households, are involved in intermittent competition for influence in the [banjar] assembly." (1976: 84)

Factions do not represent particular economic classes or interest groups, nor do they relate directly to national political parties. As Hobart notes, the idiom of kinship

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

enters into the formation of patronage groups, but is only one factor in the formation of these extensive corporate networks:

> "In Pisangkaja factions, known locally as *tèmpèk*, are recruited on diverse grounds and include tenant farmers, agnates, affines, distant kindred, neighbours and 'pure' clients. As affines and distant kin have potential links with several patrons, the idiom of kinship appears to be used to express reasons for political preference. Once established, however, patron-client relations are relatively stable, especially for core members." (1976:62)

Political patronage networks in Bali thus extend across lines of caste, status, and economic class, in part interacting with the 'kinship system', in part independent of it.

The anthropological record on Bali thus suggests a system in which there is complex interaction between all levels of society, quite different from the highly compartmentalized type of organization found in the Indian version of caste. There are no barriers to commensality in Bali, nor are temples, wells, or villages separated according to the 'caste' (or: status-title) constituency of temple congregations or village populations.

The inter-caste complexity of Balinese patronage networks suggests that different linguistic codes are unlikely to be associated exclusively with single status-title groups. A different interpretation is taken.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

however, by Bloch in his comments on Hobart's (1976) article. Bloch compares the Balinese situation to that of Tikopia, in which the formal linguistic code is retained exclusively by the chiefs, while the business of government is carried out by executive officers who conduct the business of governing in the informal code. Bloch suggests that in modern Tikopia the chiefs may be losing their own power due to the restrictions on personal contact imposed by the formal code, and he compares this to a (hypothetical) Balinese case in which a monopoly on the formal code has brought about a paralysis of ability to influence political processes:

> "The recent history of Tikopia suggests the possible reversal of the situation which would result in a state like that of Bali and many other parts of the world, where the carriers of the formal code because of the gradual impotence which it causes, are 'kicked upstairs' by the carriers of the informal code." (1976:28)

A statement like this is surprising from a scholar of Bloch's usual perspicacity, for if Bloch means by "carriers of the formal code" the traditional gentry and priestly elites, it is simply not true that they are in any difficulty in contemporary Bali, let alone in danger of being "kicked upstairs". In addition, as noted earlier, there is little basis for ascribing exclusive use of particular linguistic codes to certain 'caste groups' for Bali, and it is also doubtful that gentry and priestly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

classes have the only stake in maintainng the distinction of "high" and "low" registers.

An analysis that links the multiple linguistic codes of Bali to particular socially-defined groups runs the danger of obscuring the more fundamental principle of complementarity that links individuals of one status with those of another, facilitating patronage alliances across lines of 'caste' or economic class. While some commoners effect disinterest in knowledge of the system of *basa alus*, for anyone with even the slightest interest in being effective in the village council or patronage network some knowledge of *basa alus* is a prerequisite, and mastery is a considerable advantage. As one Balinese put it: "the language levels are like a ladder: the important thing is not who is on each step, but on being able to go up and down. This is what is meant by *mabasa sor-singgih* 'speaking up and down'."

1.1 Motivation of the thesis

I have suggested above that the Balinese speech levels are not to be exclusively associated with questions of economic class or relative rank in the status-title hierarchy. In my reading of Balinese society the speech levels play a more complex role, in part providing a cognitive map of Balinese social space, in part maintaining

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a balance of dynamic and static processes that can be understood in terms of what Bateson called a "cybernetic explanation".

In a simple form, a cybernetic system can be likened to a steam engine, an example used frequently by Bateson. The cycle created by the movement of a steam engine is "regenerative", that is the total energy within the system increases with every stroke. Without some way of slowing the forward motion of a system like this it will go into 'runaway' and self-destruct, which is just what steam engines did before James Watt invented the "governor" in the late eighteenth century. The governor employed by Watt was a rotating set of arms that can be set so that the more they diverge, the lower the fuel supply reaching the system. Thus the governor is a simple servo-mechanism that prevents exponential buildup of energy within a system, doing this by regulating the incoming flow of energy in proportion to the total build-up of energy.

Bateson's work on the Iatamul people of the Sepik River in New Guinea led him to recognize the existence of "escalating" or "vicious" cycles that can be compared to the steam engine that has no governor, while his work with Bali lead him to propose that Balinese society had evolved as a "steady state society" in which "cumulative interaction" and its often violent consequences had been controlled to a remarkable degree, despite inherent asymme-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tries in the social system.[4]

As noted earlier Bateson had observed that the constrained linguistic behavior of the meetings of the *krama banjar* acted to preserve a homeostatic state of the social system, "preventing the maximization of any simple variable"(1972: 125). In this context it is the *basa alus* forms that act as a "governor" in the Balinese social system, imposing a set of linguistic roles on participants in public discourse that gives no access to the expression of simple competitive interests.

The constraining influence of *basa alus* in public discourse is brought out not only in the lexical choices made by speakers in the *banjar* assembly (*pauman, sangkepan*), but in the traditional rhetorical forms that define the speech acts of this assembly. This is brought out in Hobart's description of the terms used in the village of Tengahpadang in describing the customary rhetorical form used by "orators" in the *banjar* assembly:

> "In Tengahpadang, public addresses contain four main sections: *mebetènin ngeraos*, 'to lower one's speaking', an accepted form of self-abasement indicating the speaker's lack of knowledge or fitness to speak; *nyelasang*, 'explaining', a restatement of common knowledge or a repetition of universally accepted values on the subject under debate; *ngedèngang pemineh pedidi*, 'presenting one's own thoughts', a brief statement of the current speaker's opinion; and finally *nyerahang tekèn banjar*, 'surrendering to the *banjar*', announcing that one will follow

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

whatever the assembly decides." (1976:75)

In addition to the *banjar*, the temple-community *(pemaksan)* and irrigation society *(subak)* lay claim to the Balinese individual and place both constraints and demands on their behavior. In addition to the laws recorded in the hereditary lawbooks of many villages *(awig-awig)*, there are laws and penalties administered by both the temple community and the irrigation society. Each of these institutions has coercive power over the individual, a fact that is brought out most clearly in the term *pemaksan* 'temple-community', whose derivation is from the verb *paksa* '(to) force'.

In both religious and secular aspects of Balinese public life it is the formalized discourse of *basa alus* that prevails as a communicational device. I will argue in this thesis that *basa alus*, in representing the inherited linguistic forms of the Balinese past, is adapted to the need for discourse that represents the fixed verities of Balinese culture, the objectification of ideals and beliefs rather than of instances, of "types" rather than "tokens".

In this *basa alus* can be compared with Balinese customs like teknonymy, birth-order names, and the status-title system that express the individual in terms of a series of cyclically-repeating "types". As C. Geertz pointed out in his seminal (1956) essay "Person, Time, and Conduct in Bali" these are among the institutions that have the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

effect of limiting what Bateson had termed "regenerative" patterns of interaction:

> "[In kinship organization] the immobilization of time through the iteration of form... defines individuals as occupants of regions in a social field, not partners in interaction." (1956: 18)

The present thesis is intended as an exploration of the relationship of "High" and "Low" Balinese (or: *basa alus* and *basa biasa/kasar*), looking at both historical and synchronic aspects of the problem of this relationship.

I will argue that in addition to being differentiated on lexical grounds, *basa alus* and *basa biasa* each have a characteristic discourse organization that can be spoken of in terms of "paticipant-salient" and "event-salient" types, using those terms as they are understood in recent work by Geoffrey Benjamin (1987). It is the "participant-salient" type of discourse, I will argue, that is most highly developed in *basa alus*, and it is for this reason that we find that *basa alus* preserves to a greater extent the participant-marking morphology of languages like Old Javanese. By contrast, the role of participant-marking morphology is reduced in *basa biasa*, and the system marking case-roles has evolved towards something resembling a split-ergative system of grammatical relations, the unmarked verb agreeing with the Object, and the marked verb an "antipassive" showing morphological agreement with Actor or *agent* arguments.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1.2 Rationale for a historical approach

Modern Balinese language, especially in *basa alus*, does not have a simple and direct relationship with the linguistic past. Instead of reflecting a steady and predictable progression of changes traceable to a single proto-form, Balinese gives evidence of input from at least two streams of language, one known to us from written records of the Old Javanese and Middle Javanese languages, the other through the Old Balinese inscriptions, first collected and edited by Rulof Goris (1954).

These were languages of authority and power, associated with the rise and flowering of the Sanskritized nation-states of insular Southeast Asia. This is a characteristic they shared with Old Malay, a language known from a small number of inscriptions, the largest dating from the middle of the the seventh century A.D., with other examples dated as late as 1356 A.D..

For all of these languages the first records known to us are from inscriptional evidence. For Java we know of inscriptions fixing the lineages of the kings of important dynasties, and of inscriptions setting up religious sanctuaries *(sīma)* exempt from certain taxes, or recording the number and type of gifts distributed in connection with the erection of a "border stone" *(teas)* defining a *sīma*. From Old Malay inscriptions we know of an oath of loyalty

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sworn to a feudal lord (Talang Tuwo, 686 A.D.), the commencement of a military expedition against Java (Kota Kapur, 684 A.D.), and the founding of a garden called *Śrīkṣetra* (Talang Tuwo, 684 A.D.).

From Bali we know of inscriptions establishing the borders of sacred enclosures called *partapanan*, dedicated to the use of religious mendicants of a number of types.[5] In addition we find detailed lists of offerings taken as 'religious tax' *(bakat)* in the service of the sanctuaries of deities like the "Lord of Lake Trunyan" *(Sang Ratu di Sanghyang di Turuñan)*, and we find an early mention of what were known later in their history as "reef rights" *(tawang karang)*, the traditional right of 'salvaging' materials from vessels wrecked on the dangerous reefs of Bali, a practice that nearly a millenium later was a factor in the Dutch decision to initiate the annexation of Bali.[6]

While Old Javanese developed into a language with an extensive and impressive literature preserved on palm-leaf manuscripts, Old Balinese had been on the historical stage for only a few hundred years when it was replaced in Balinese inscriptions by Old Javanese. This marked the beginning of a continuing influence of Old Javanese on the development of Balinese language, an influence that continues to make itself felt through recitation-and-translation genres like *mabasan*, and the language of dramatic forms like shadow theater and masked dance.[7]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

At the outset we should not fail to take into account the fact that in most cases written evidence in Old Javanese and Old Balinese cannot be taken as directly reflecting a contemporary spoken language. First of all, these were written, literary and/or inscriptional languages. Second, and perhaps even more important, these were all Sanskritized dialects, the linguistic coin of emergent nation-states, conceived of and organized in terms of the particular blend of ritual and secular power that characterized the Hinduized states of Southeast Asia. These were thus dialects of power and authority, and must have co-existed with other dialects unmodified (or little modified) by Sanskritization.

In a recent analysis of the cultural and political background of Modern Malay, Benjamin (1988) has suggested a parallelism of linguistic organization relying heavily on participant-marking morphology with the pragmatics of formal, authoritarian discourse in what he terms a "transcendental cultural regime". In such a regime, says Benjamin, an external entity (like the nation-state) becomes the model by which the individual measures himself, and there is thus a correspondingly greater emphasis on the orientation of the self in terms of 'place' or rank in a socially-defined hierarchy.

Benjamin holds that the Malay nation-state (in both pre-colonial and modern forms) is classically "tran-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

scendental", and that this cultural orientation is reflected in the discourse-syntactic organization of Formal Malay, in both its classical and modern expressions.

Conversely, Benjamin holds that colloquial or "Low" Malay depends far less on use of explicit verbal markers, and is oriented largely towards the event itself. For Benjamin this is a characteristic of an "immanist" cultural orientation that is found in Malaysia among more traditional villages, or among autonomous tribal groups like the Temiar who exist at the edges of the influence of the modern Malay nation-state.

The present thesis represents in part an attempt to apply these notions to the study of Balinese language. In this case, however, I will argue that the "participant-salient" type of discourse associated with use of *basa alus* can be linked not to 'external' sources of political power, but to the coercive character of 'internal' Balinese institutions (like the *banjar* and *désa adat*) that derive their authority from ancestral and extra-individual sources.

Old Javanese, which I have noted had a profound influence on the development of modern Balinese, is a language that employs an extensive set of verbal "Focus markers" to establish the status of various participant roles in a clause. Thus changes of valence in Old Javanese are nearly always registered by the addition or subtraction of affixes marking (among other things) the case-role

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

status of implicated arguments. Old Javanese is thus in this respect classically "participant-salient" in its mode of syntactic arrangement. This is a characteristic that appears to be shared as well by Old Malay and Old Balinese, both of which possessed similar (though not identical) sets of verbal "Focus markers". Old Javanese and Old Malay also possessed "topical" and "non-topical" pronouns keyed to the verbal Focus markers that resemble similar pronominal paradigms found in Philippine languages, (Tagalog, Cebuano Visayan, etc.). In Old Balinese this contrast of "topical" and "non-topical" pronouns exists only as an opposition of full and enclitic pronouns. (The same tendency can be seen at work in parts of the Old Javanese and Old Malay verbal paradigms.)

Modern Balinese appears in many respects to have evolved into a "split-ergative" system, or an ergative system with a strongly developed anti-passive. This is not true across the board, however, and there is a tendency to avoid or suppress ergative constructions in *basa alus*. A detailed reading of historical and contemporary evidence suggests that the participant-marking machinery inherited from languages like Old Javanese and Old Balinese is called into play in *basa alus* at just those points where there is the greatest possibility of dissonance between grammatical and sociolinguistic marking. This is especially relevant in connection with verbal marking that has both grammatical

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and person-marking features, a subject to which we will return in Chapter Six.

Much of this thesis is concerned with the question of Balinese "bilingualism" or "diglossia" suggested by the analysis of Balinese linguistic behavior sketched above. I will argue in Part II of this thesis that Balinese "diglossia" does not represent so much a set of simple oppositions contrasting "in-group" and "out-group" linguistic styles as a system of complementary "language games". Some of these "language games" are appropriate in the contexts of "dynamic" aspects of Balinese society, some in the context of the institutions that define its "steady state" aspects.

1.3 Arrangement of the thesis

The remainder of Chapter One is devoted to a review of prior literature on Balinese language, beginning with a discussion of several views of the "speech levels" as they are found in Modern Javanese and Balinese. This is followed by a brief review of studies of Balinese literature, and by reviews of grammatical and lexicographical materials.

Following the present introductory chapter the thesis is divided into two parts. Part I is devoted to Old Javanese (OJ), Old Malay (OM), and Old Balinese (OB), three inscriptional languages that can be seen as representing

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the historical background of Modern Balinese, not in a genetic sense alone, but as Sanskritized dialects of political entities that were crucial in historical processes effecting the evolution of Balinese culture and society. All of these languages reflect the "elaborated codes" used at the centers of ritual and political power during the period of the Hinduized states.

Chapter Two reviews the Focus morphology of Old Javanese and its connections with pronominal, deictic, and topic-marking systems that track referential and discourse properties of participant NPs.

Chapter Three introduces materials from Old Malay and Old Balinese, looking especially at Focus morphology in these two languages, and at the evidence for a "possessive syntax" in Old Malay, using that term as understood in the work of Alieve (1980).

Part II of the thesis is devoted to the synchronic state of Modern Balinese. Chapter Four is a review of basic structures and paradigms of Balinese, including the structure of noun phrases and equational sentences, the deictic, pronominal, and prepositional paradigms, and paradigms for other "function words" including modals, adverbs, conjunctions, interrogatives, and negatives. These systems all show lexical variation based on status that allows the elaboration of sociolinguistic features of Balinese life at the deepest levels of grammatical function.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter Five is a study of Balinese derivational morphology as this is exemplified in the 'active voice' or Actor Focus forms, whose morphology is consistent across speech levels.

Chapter Six is a study of 'passive' morphology and syntax of Balinese. In this chapter I link what Kersten terms "First Passives" to features of the "possessive syntax" proposed by Alieva (1980) for Old Malay, and to the "Foregrounding Passives" of Hopper (1979), or "syntactic ergativity" of Verhaar (1988). These features, I will argue, make the Balinese "First Passive" quintessentially "event-salient", hence ideally suited for the pragmatics of informal discourse. By contrast the passive forms taking *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology are "participant-marking", in form, hence, I will argue, particularly suited for use in *basa alus*.

Chapter Seven moves away from the "laws and instances" approach taken in earlier chapters and attempts to study the evolution of Balinese *basa alus* discourse in a "cases and interpretation" approach. In this chapter I look at the recitation-and-translation genre called *mabasan*. The claim made in this chapter is that for Balinese the various types of oral-literary encounter with the past (*mabasan*, shadow plays, masked drama, etc.) help to maintain contact with the historical sources that feed into *basa alus* lexicon and discourse structure.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter Eight continues in the vein of Chapter Seven but looks at the organization of *biasa/kasar* discourse as this is found in the context of 'folk tales' of the *satua* type. The thesis concludes with examples that illustrate shifting between *alus* and *biasa* discourse styles to bring out ironic meanings or to give esthetic form to the ideal of social complementarity maintained linguistically by the speech levels.

1.4 The problem of *speech levels*

While it is well known that both Modern Javanese and Modern Balinese share the trait of distinctive vocabulary marked for status, the Javanese system has been more thoroughly studied. Perhaps because of this the Javanese system has sometimes been taken as a model for the Balinese, and some scholars suggest that the Balinese case may represent a "lagging emulation" of the Javanese "prototype". On closer inspection the Balinese system turns out not to be related in a direct way to the Javanese system, but to be a product of a differing historical and socio-cultural development, originating perhaps from the interaction of a Javanized nobility with a commoner 'substrata' maintaining indigenous dialects, but after this going its own way independent of later developments in Java.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

No study of Balinese language can be complete without some reference to the problem of *speech levels*, since this has effects on choice of both lexicon and morphological form. Since the Javanese system undoubtedly has had a historical effect on the development of the Balinese, we will begin with a review on the more extensive literature on the Javanese system.

The basis of the Javanese system has been briefly summarized as follows by Errington:

> "The founding opposition in the system of Javanese linguistic etiquette is between 'low' *ngoko* and 'high' *krama* styles of *address*, that is, ways of speaking *to* persons. *Ngoko* and *krama* are also names of members of the hundreds of pairs of synonymous lexemes that distinguish the styles between which one chooses to speak." (1986: 333)

Note here that the terms *ngoko* and *krama* are applied to two distinct linguistic categories. On the one hand they represent two opposed (but complementary) speech registers; on the other, the paired sets of synonymous lexemes that are used in distinguishing these speech registers.

In addition to the paired sets of *ngoko* and *krama* lexemes, there is a third type of special status vocabulary, called *krama inggil*:

> "Another special set of words called *krama inggil* (literally 'high *krama*') is used to *refer to* (speak *of*) persons, speech partners or others, so as to mark status differences between them and someone else." (1986: 334)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Of special note here is that *krama inggil* terms are mainly terms of second or third person reference, whose function is to "enable a speaker to refer in a respectful way to third persons considered by him to occupy a higher social position than himself (1978:308)." As Uhlenbeck points out in a longer treatment of the *krama inggil* lexemes, there are *krama inggil* terms for virtually everything that is connected with the individual person. This includes body parts and functions, things which affect the body, clothing and kin terms. There are also *krama* terms "for the most common and general human activities such as bathing, sleeping sitting, standing, eating, drinking, walking thinking, speaking, requesting, giving, receiving, and the like." (1978:308)

Errington (1985 a & b) and Uhlenbeck (1978) base their discussions of "language levels" or "speech levels" on the degree (and form) of usage of members of the *krama/ngoko* doublets or of *krama inggil* terms. While both of them also recognize a third, basic register *madya* (literally, 'middle') which is intermediate between *krama* and *ngoko*, they have not followed Geertz in proposing a rigid, three-tiered "low-middle-high" system corresponding to *ngoko*, *madya*, and *krama*.[8]

Geertz (1960) based his description of the Javanese speech levels on the *alus-kasar* (roughly "refined" vs. "rough, unrefined") opposition that he saw as underlying

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

much of Javanese social behavior:

> "Basically...the Javanese pattern their speech behavior in terms of the same *alus* to *kasar* axis around which they organize their social behavior generally." (1960:248)

Thus for Geertz the basic linguistic opposition was of *krama* to *ngoko*, as in the social realm *alus* contrasted with *kasar*. Geertz went on to treat the speech register *madya* as a subset of either *krama* or of *ngoko*. From this he derived the notion of three "stylemes" - low, middle, and high (or *ngoko*, *madya*, and *krama*). These he said interacted with certain "honorifics" to produce from three to five subsets of the three stylemes. Geertz linked these stylemes and their substylemes to three sociologically determined 'dialects'.

The perils of such a rigid definition of the Javanese speech levels were brought out by Uhlenbeck (1978: 300 -320). Geertz's 'dialects' predicted, for example, that 'urban *prijajis*', or 'white collar elite', would have no knowledge of, or at least never use, the *madya* register.[9] Conversely, rural peasants would have no knowledge of *krama* forms. Uhlenbeck gave many examples to the contrary, and it is no longer controversial to characterize Geertz's 'dialects' as untenable. Uhlenbeck saw as Geertz's error a failure to distinguish between the two senses of the terms *ngoko*, *madya*, and *krama*, that is, as terms referring to speech levels on one hand, and status-marked doublets (or

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

triplets) on the other.

For Uhlenbeck and Errington the inter-relationships of speech registers and status-marked lexemes produce a dynamic situation in which linguistic status markers and speech codes can be manipulated according to situational concerns. Thus, "speech level" and use of honorific vocabulary in the Javanese case respond to the relative status of interlocutors, sometimes defined partly in terms of hereditary status, but more often in terms of age, kinship relation, or perceived status in an occupational or other social hierarchy. In the Balinese case, as we shall see, some status-marked forms are tied to questions of absolute social status, while in other cases they respond to ritual, public or status-asymmetrical features of the speech act.

1.5 Speech levels in Modern Balinese

As Zurbuchen (1987) points out, almost all Balinese are aware of semantic sets like *jaja* and *sanganan*, both meaning 'small rice-cake', that "conform...to the High/Low or *alus/ kasar* paradigm" (1987:67). But this paradigm is to some extent a fiction. Zurbuchen's objections to these categories are especially telling:

> "(The terms *alus* and *kasar*) which can respectively be translated as 'refined' or 'high' and 'coarse', 'common' or 'low,' have been the basis for concep-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tualization of spoken Balinese in terms of High versus Low levels, and have given rise to the fallacy that a binary opposition is the foundation of level variation. This binary opposition of *alus/kasar* is partially correct in reflecting a dualistic hierarchy of caste status (*Triwangsa* versus *Jaba*) intimately tied to formal variation in speech; yet level choices are made even between *jaba* speakers, and the lexical choices are not always so binary, nor the status issues so bilateral, as the *kasar/alus* terminology suggests." (1987:93)[10]

As Zurbuchen says, Balinese speakers will also be aware of larger sets of words like *ngamah*, *neda*, *madaar*, *nunas*, *ngajeng* and *marayunan*, that all mean 'eat', but which "have specific and and limited uses, and crosscut the *alus/kasar* categorization in various ways" (1987:67). In considering the source of such fine-grained distinctions of lexicon we will thus have to take into account a complex system of constraints on appropriateness, rather than a simple system of bilateral oppositions.

Kersten (1984) separates the terms *kasar* and *biasa*, reserving the term *kasar* for words that are "somewhat offensive" (*tidak sedap didengar*), and using the term *biasa* 'ordinary, usual' for what has more generally been termed *kasar* or *kapara* language in the past.

For Kersten *basa biasa*, "ordinary language" contrasts with three types of *bahasa hormat*, "polite, respectful language". The first of these polite or honorific types of language, called *basa alus*, is used he says, "whenever a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Balinese speaks to someone to whom he wishes to show respect, or to whom respect is due, as far as this is possible".[11] Thus for Kersten use of *Basa Alus* pertains mainly to adjustments of *speech level* made between interlocutors with asymmetrical status relationship.

Secondly, says Kersten, there is a contrast between *basa biasa* and *basa singgih* ("respect language"):

> "If someone speaks about the person of someone to whom respect is due, s/he uses special words *when mentioning that person, the parts of his or her body, his or her kinship relations, thoughts, sayings and actions*. These special words are called 'basa singgih'."[12]

Kersten differs with other experts on Balinese language in referring to the *singgih* level as *basa singgih* rather than as *basa alus singgih*. This is because the presence of *singgih* terms is in itself independent of questions of basic language level. As Kersten points out:

> "Basa Singgih is used not only when face to face with someone who should be shown respect, but, properly, also if one is speaking of this person to a friend, and using Basa Biasa for this exchange, not Basa Alus."[13]

Basa alus might then be said to be "polite" language, while *basa singgih* might be termed "deferential" or "honorific", with the caveat that *singgih* terms are not in general negotiable, but are tied to considerations of rank and status that are fixed features of the Balinese social

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

landscape.

While Javanese use of *krama inggil* might also be termed "deferential" in that it serves to establish the higher status of particular interlocutors or referents in a speech act, assignments of *inggil* terms in Javanese reacts more to situational than absolute aspects of status. Uhlenbeck (1978), for example, stresses the dynamic nature of the Javanese system in his statements on the *krama - ngoko* opposition:

> "In the area between *ngoko* and *krama* the speaker of Javanese has a set of possibilities by which he can regulate the measure of respect which he needs when criteria for the use of respect forms such as age and social position are in conflict. (1978: 318)

In contrast the use of *alus* or *singgih* terms of reference in Balinese is a much less fluid matter, and the expectation of being referred to in particular forms of *singgih* vocabulary is virtually an inalienable right for some speakers, a matter tied up with questions of status, title and lineage.

The thorough-going nature of the application of *singgih* terms in Balinese is brought out by Kersten in several notes on the use of *basa singgih*:

> "1. In intimate speech the use of *Basa Alus* is often dispensed with, but not so with *basa singgih*. Balinese never use words regarded as showing too little respect in mentioning the person or actions of people whom they are unsure about, especially when face to face

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with those people.

2. If in talking about two people and one of those people should be shown respect, the other one not, then with great care one chooses terms that are appropriate to the station (*kedudukan*) of each, even if the arrangement of the sentence thereby becomes clumsy."[14]

One of the most noticeable consequences of this tracking of the status coordinates of referents is a kind of sociolinguistically controlled ergativity, in which verbs agree (in status terms) with their Objects. This is brought out in examples given by Kersten:

(5) I Kelor **nyeda**-yang Anaké Agung.

'I Kelor killed (*seda*) the Anak Agung (a high nobleman, or *satriya*).'[15]

(6) Anaké Agung nga-**mati**-yang I Kelor.

'The Anak Agung killed (*mati*) I Kelor (a commoner).'[16]

(7) Lantas **ida** ka-**seda**-yang tur parekanidané ka-**mati**-ang.

'Then he (resp) was killed (*seda*) and his servant was killed (*mati*).'[17]

In examples (5) to (7) the verb agrees with its Object (whether or not this is the grammatical subject as indicated by the Focus marker of the verb). It thus shows an absolutive pattern of agreement based not on person, number, or gender but on status coordinates of verbal and nominal lexemes involved in the construction.

A third type of "polite language" identified by Kersten is what he terms *basa alus sor*, or "Low Refined"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

language. Words of this type are used largely to lower own's own speech level in deference to an interlocutor or referent for whom *singgih* terms are appropriate:

> "There are a small number of Balinese words which possess two polite forms beside the *biasa* form, that is (both) an *Alus* and a *Singgih* form. In this case, perhaps we might say that the *Alus* form represents a kind of 'Low *Alus*' form, meaning that it is to be used when facing someone to whom one should (or wants to) show respect, *but with respect to one's own affairs, condition, actions, or family members, or of someone of own's own social status.*[18]

Use of *basa alus sor* is thus tied to the use of *basa singgih*: if one addresses someone in *basa singgih* terms, then *alus sor* terms should be used in self-reference, as far as this is possible.[19] Use of *basa alus sor* is not, however, a function of low status in the way that *basa singgih* is of high status, and I have observed use of *basa alus sor* terms used on numerous occasions by speakers of high social status. What is maintained in the matching of *alus sor* to *alus singgih* terms is the principle of asymmetry. This is appropriate in the context of formal public behaviour, where lowering one's self is expected behaviour, and in formal contexts involving contact of persons of differing social status. The *alus sor* and *alus singgih* terms in this case preserve the fixed form of asymmetrical contacts, imposing roles on participants in the speech act that conform to traditional "steady-state"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

models of behaviour. It is this intimate connection of *alus singgih* and *alus sor* speech levels in maintaining public modes of address that leads to expressions like *mabasa sor-singgih* 'to speak up and down' and the attendant value placed on mastery of multiple linguistic codes.

There is also an intermediate range of status-marked vocabulary termed variously *alus mider, alus menengah* or *alus madia,* all of these terms implying an intermediate *alus* speech level.

> "If one avoids language that is very low, as well as that which is very honorific, then the speech act is said to have the 'menengah' or 'madia' form, not too refined and not too coarse.[20]

Zurbuchen (1981) follows Bagus (1979:197) in differentiating *alus mider* and *alus madia* terms, the former standing for "basic alus vocabulary", the latter for a system of limited scope, providing "neutral" vocabulary useful in a number of socially-defined contexts:

> "There are relatively few morphemes regularly labeled as alus madia forms: Bagus (1979:200) counts only 28 items out of his total of 755 forms which show variation. The traditional motivation for using alus madia forms involved two criteria: first, they could be used by a high-caste individual for speaking to a Sudra [commoner] of special status, such as a village headman or lay priest; second, and more generally, they were and ae used between interlocutors who do not know each other. The 'neutrality' of the alus madia vocabulary ensures that two individuals meeting in a marketplace or on the road will largely avoid any

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

major register errors. Until the identities of the individuals are better known, alus madia speech facilitates feedback and self-correction as speakers adjust their language to the social situation at hand." (1987: 81)

Bali shares with Java a similar preoccupation with assymetrical relationships, and Errington's (1986) summary of the Javanese system might be said to be equally true of the Balinese:

"The very existence of this elaborate system of markers of respect and deference bespeaks a particularly Javanese conception of the relation between servant (or client) and master (or patron), or personal worth and social behavior, and or self and self-conduct (Geertz: 1960; Errington: 1984). In traditional Javanese society, proper use of the system presupposed knowledge of relative status of interactants defined through kin relation, relative noble and/or official status, patron/client ties, relative age, and so on." (1986: 332)

The Javanese system is, however, more open to adaptation to psychological and intentional features of the speech act than is the Balinese. Thus Uhlenbeck has shown that Javanese novels can be emotively enriched by varying the mixture of *krama*, *inggil*, *ngoko* and *madya* elements in dialogue.[21] In the novel *Serat Rijatna*, for example, this comes out especially in dialogues between two characters who have the relationship of older and younger sibling. This is an important relationship in Javanese society, in its cross-gender form often serving as the prototype for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the ideal marriage relationship (thus the use of terms like *ingkang rayi* 'younger sibling' for 'wife'). In dialogues between these two characters shifts of mood on the part of the two characters are reflected in choice of "speech level". In works like *Sori Rijatna* changes of "speech level" are thus to linked largely to the psychological aspects of communication.

In Balinese, freedom to shift registers in this way is severely constrained, since use of *alus singgih* terms is not open to arbitration, and the use of *alus singgih* that prompts the use of *basa alus sor*. In the Balinese system it is largely the general framing of the discourse that is open to quesion - whether the basic register of the speech act is to be *alus*, *alus madia/mider* or *biasa*. The use of *singgih* and *alus sor* language is constrained by the more immutable "laws" and linguistic forms of the status-title hierarchy.

1.6 Background of Balinese language studies

Von Humboldt's *Über die Kawisprache* (1836-39), an investigation of the *Kawi* (or Old Javanese) language, and van der Tuuk's *Tobasche Spraachkunst* (1864), were among the first serious studies of Austronesian languages of the Malay-Indonesian area, although Raffles had reported on Javanese and Old Javanese in his *History of Java* (1817).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dutch scholars following van der Tuuk made great advances in the study of Indonesian languages, but there was an almost disproportionate attention paid to text-philology of Old Javanese, and relative inattention to local languages, especially those lacking a written literature. Thus more intensive study of many of Indonesia's local languages had to await the era of the anthropologist and the development of national language efforts by the post-colonial government.[22]

Some fifty years separated Kern's edition of the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* and the publication of the first major grammar of Old Javanese, Zoetmulder's *De Taal van het Adiparwa* (1950).[23] During the same period there were more than a score of translations of Old Javanese texts produced, often of very difficult materials.

The present state of our knowledge of the early history of Balinese language and culture is due largely to the efforts of Rulof Goris, who collected and edited many of the Old Balinese and Old Javanese inscriptions found on Bali, publishing these in his *Prasasti Bali* (1954).

The contribution of Hooykaas to the study of Balinese literature is nearly inestimable. In addition to his works on the elements of Balinese ritual language preserved by Balinese *brahmana* sources (Hooykaas: 1964, 1966, 1971) Hooykaas produced translations of poetic works in the Balinese *geguritan* genre. His edition of *Geguritan*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Jayaprana was published under the title *The Lay of Jayaprana, the Balinese Uriah* (1958). This was followed by a translation of the Balinese poem *Bagus Umbara* (1968), and a decade later his edition of *Geguritan Basur*, which received the title *The Balinese Poem Basur, an Introduction to Magic* (1978). In addition to numerous articles on Balinese literature and culture Hooykaas also produced the single existing general introduction to Balinese literature, his *Introduction a la Litterature Balinaise* (1979), and *Kāma and Kāla*, a major work on the instructional literature on the art of the shadow puppeteer *(dharma pewayangan)*.

Worsley's *Babad Buleleng - A Balinese Dynastic Geneology* (1972) represents the work of a second generation of scholars working on Balinese materials. This was followed by contributions like Hinzler's (1981) transcription and discussion of a *wayang* version of the *Bima Swarga* story. A significant contribution has also been made by Wallis in his (1982) dissertation on the musical components of Balinese literary and ritual speech acts.

Zurbuchen's (1987) work on the language of Balinese shadow theater concentrates on what she terms the *noetic context* of Balinese literary and dramatic life, the cultural and social modes in which acts of language (written or spoken) are created, packaged, and consumed. As Zurbuchen shows, in important Balinese dramatic forms like

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the shadow theater there is a characteristic mixing of "ancestral" and "contemporary" tongues that is especially linked to the role of the everpresent *panasar*, or clowns, who accompany their royal masters everywhere in the shadow plays, interpreting their actions and "ancestral speech" into contemporary idioms:

> "By recasting the names, actions, and emotions of the epic characters into contemporary idiom, the panasars convince Balinese audiences that a temporally and linguistically distant epic is nonetheless relevant to the present... The panasars are able to speak the past in the present in a broader fashion than any other symbolic figures; their words show the ways both old and new stores of knowledge presuppose and necessitate each other. Their message concerns the value of moving among and surviving within the many perceptible times, places, orders, and languages commonly juxtaposed in the Balinese life-world." (1987:204-205)

Balinese have not abandoned orality in spite of abundant access to chirographic media; hence, says Zurbuchen, the very definition of 'text' must be reconsidered when we look at Balinese literary life. In this view literary texts, whether oral or written are not separable from the social and cultural conditions in which they are produced. Far from being the relics of isolated individual experiences, they reflect the larger design of the culture, the concerns that are thematic and recurrent. They are thus cut from the same cloth as ritual and performance: they in part represent, in part reveal, the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

shared symbolic networks that shape and give expression to Balinese society.

1.7 Works on Balinese grammar

While van Eck had produced a grammatical description of Balinese as early as 1874, until the work of Kersten (1948, 1970, 1984) there has been little further work done on the grammar of Modern Balinese.[24] Kersten refined his *Balische Grammatica* (1948) in two Indonesian language versions, the second of which (1984) represents his most concise statement to date.

Kersten begins his study of Balinese grammar by differentiating base words (*kata dasar*) and words characterized by addition of affixes (*imbuhan*) or change through other morphological processes. His introduction to the Balinese morphological system is useful and well-organized However, in following the usual practice of describing the affixes of the Balinese system piecemeal, that is in terms of the various functions that can be performed by each affix, Kersten to some extent obscures the larger fact that the affixual system is in general unitary, but interacts with both the semantic content of word bases and the clause-level constraints of syntax to produce the appearance of multiple functions for single affixes.

In dealing with the highly developed 'passive' syntax

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of Balinese, Kersten refers to three distinct types, which he terms the "First", "Second", and "Third Passive" respectively.[25]

Kersten's "Second" and "Third Passives" are sub-types of what Zoetmulder termed the "*ka*-passive" for Old Javanese, and the Balinese forms appear to preserve both the morphology and the function of the *ka*-R-(suffix) constructions that were of great importance in both the Old Balinese and Old Javanese.

The issues raised by Kersten in his discussion of Balinese 'passives' are a major concern of this thesis, especially in Chapter Six. here I argue that the Balinese "First Passive" is a quintessentially "event-salient" construction, most appropriate in the context of *basa biasa*, while the "Second" and "Third Passives" retain the participant-marking morphology that is more appropriate in contexts requiring use of *basa alus*.

There are a number of other sources of information on Modern Balinese language. These include English language works like the interesting collection of sentences compiled by Shadeg (197[illegible]) to accompany his "thousand-word glossary", and brief comments on grammar given in the (1984) reprint of his glossary (published without the earlier sentences).

There are also interesting grammatical materials to be found in a two part manuscript by B. Joseph (ca. 1984) originating from University of Sydney. This work is a draft

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

for an English language grammar of what Joseph calls "High" and "Common" Balinese. We can hopefully look forward to further development of this promising document in future publications.

An important contribution has also been made in a thesis by Ward (1975) devoted to phonology, morphophonemics and lexical variation in Modern Balinese. Ward concentrates on basic phonology of Balinese, the structure of syllables and words, and the effects of socio-linguistic constraints on the lexicon. As Zurbuchen points out, he was the first to "formalize the notion of semantic set as comprising all the level variants of one concept, and [to make] the distinction between 'structural' variation (involving primarily function words, or 'functors') and 'lexical' variation (involving content words)."[26]

In the recent past there have appeared a number of Indonesian language studies describing various aspects of Modern Balinese. A discussion of the basic elements of Balinese morphology and syntax is to be found, for example, in I Wayan Warna et al (1983). This book takes a structuralist view, concentrating on phrase level organization and the differences between 'endocentric' and 'exocentric' constructions. This study is strong on theoretical orientation; however, we might wish for more details of usage than are provided within this framework. A major problem in this work is that it virtually equates the Balinese "First

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Passive" with the Indonesian forms taking *di-*. There is indeed some similarity between these forms; however, they are not identical in function, and to claim that they are obscures very real differences.

Another useful Indonesian language publication is *Kata Tugas Bahasa Bali* ("Function Words of Balinese") of Ketut Ginarsa et al (1983). This is also a study in the structuralist tradition, but is more successful than Warna et al (1984) in that it concentrates on a single sub-system of Balinese, the area of the function words described by Ward as "functors". There is very useful information to be found in this book, and sufficient examples of usage are given. Important groups of Balinese function words *(kata tugas)* are also outlined in Chapter Five of the present thesis.

A third work on Balinese language published in recent years in Indonesia is *Geografi Dialek Bahasa Bali*, by I Madé Denes et al (1985). This is a very useful publication, containing a good deal of information on dialect variation, as well as maps showing major Balinese isoglosses. A work such as this could well serve as the basis for a more exhaustive linguistic survey of Bali.

1.8 Works on Balinese lexicon

The study of Balinese lexicon Western students rests on the firm foundation of van der Tuuk's monumental *Kawi* -

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Balineesch - Nederlands Woordenboek (1897 - 1912). Van der Tuuk's dictionary is a standard tool for those with specialist interests in Java or Bali. Materials collected by van der Tuuk include information on regional and social variation that is still of great interest to researchers carrying out dialectical studies, while students of 'translation' genres like *mabasan* will find invaluable his materials linking Balinese and *Kawi* (Old Javanese) words.

Van der Tuuk's work, however, is unusual in that he based its arrangement on the Javano-Balinese *hanacaraka* syllabary, instead of the roman alphabet. In addition most page headings and entries are given in the Balinese version of *Kawi* script. Thus, van der Tuuk's dictionary demands that the user be in a fairly advanced stage of study, having mastered (in addition to Dutch) the complexities of the *hanacaraka* syllabary, a syllabary derived from Indic sources, but following an arrangement unknown in India.[27]

While a number of shorter Balinese-Indonesian or Balinese-English glossaries have been published in recent decades, there are basically three dictionaries in common use, though one of these is now difficult to obtain. The first of these to be published was the *Kamus Bali-Indonesia* (1979).

The *Kamus Bali-Indonesia (KBI)* ranks high in terms of number of enteries and follows the sensible arrangement plan of listing words by their *root* or *base* form, following

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

these by the derived forms that can be formed with the addition of affixes. For Indonesian languages, where a limited set of affixes carrying morphosyntactic information can be combined on a systematic basis with *base* forms carrying basic semantic information, this is an eminently reasonable use of space, and makes for a dictionary that is at once compact and logical.

There are, however, several drawbacks to the *KBI*. First of all it is difficult to obtain, at least to my present knowledtge. Published under the auspices of the Dept. of Education (*Dinas Pengajaran*) at the level of the Balinese Provincial Government, it did not have a wide initial distribution and apparently did not see a second printing. In addition, the translations for entries are sparse, usually consisting of a single Indonesian synonym. Since the Indonesian and Balinese systems of form and meaning are related, but do not exactly overlap, this tends at some points to obscure the Balinese system. This problem can be overcome by citing clause length examples of usage, a course that is taken in recent works like that of Kersten (1984), to be reviewed below.

The second dictionary to be published in more recent times is the *Balinese-English Dictionary* of Barber (1979). Barber states in his preface to this work that it is a rearrangement and translation of van Eck's *Erste Proeve van een Balineesch-Hollandsch Woordenboek* (1876). This is a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

large and useful dictionary, but using it requires some practice, for its arrangement follows an unusual principle. This is that the character for *h*, which is used in Balinese writing solely as the 'carrier' of a vowel sign, is treated by Barber as phonemic, hence as a letter that should be counted in alphabetizing. A consequence of this conception of the use (rather: non-use) of the *ha*-syllable in Bali is that the reader must search for familiar Balinese words like *adol* 'sell' and *aba* 'carry' under *h-adol* and *h-aba*. In addition, words with geminate vowels that are normally written as two consecutive vowels of the same type (e.g. *jaan* 'delicious', *tiing* 'bamboo') are to be found in Barber spelled with an epenthetic 'h' (thus *jahan* and *bahan*).[28]

The *KBI* makes occasional note of the social status of words, while information of this kind is not generally included in Barber (1979). A principled approach to grouping the status variants of important Balinese words is taken in Kersten's (1984) dictionary, *Bahasa Bali: Kamus Bahasa Lumrah* ("Balinese Language: A Dictionary of the Common Language"). This work is less comprehensive in terms of number of entries than either *KBI* or Barber's dictionary (1979). On the other hand it makes improvements in organization over these dictionaries in a number of respects.

First of all, while following the *KBI* and other

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

contemporary Indonesian dictionaries in listing entries using a *baseword - derived word* system, Kersten improves upon works like the *KBI* by giving examples of Balinese usage, both for basic and derived forms, and by elaborating on the meanings of words with important grammatical or socio-cultural 'meanings'. Kersten's considerable knowledge of Balinese (especially that of the north coast) comes out not only in his choices of examples for this dictionary, but in his careful selection words, which he limits to the most wide-spread *(lumrah)* elements of the lexicon.

Another significant advance made by Kersten is that he includes symbols marking the sociolinguistic status of lexemes in his glosses of Balinese words (whenever this is relevant), and groups together vocabulary items that are identical in meaning but differ in terms of status marking. This is an important innovation in that it lists in one place words that are grouped together by native speakers of Balinese on the basis of their perceived place in a sociolinguistic "cline of person" keyed to considerations of status and social rank.[29]

Kersten's detailed explanations of words with significant socio-cultural content and words with a high functional load in the syntactic system makes his a dictionary that should be welcome to all students of Balinese with access to Indonesian language. His (1984) work on the grammar and lexicon of Modern Balinese are very

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

useful in gaining a basic understanding of this language. For more detailed work on lexicography the *KBI* (1979) and the dictionaries of van der Tuuk (1897- 1912) and Barber (1979) all have much to offer the ambitious student.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Footnotes to Chapter One

[1] The term *nawasanga* combines Sanskritic and indigenous Javano-Balinese words for nine (*nawa* and *sanga*).

[2] The situation is complicated since from the pespective of North Bali *Gunung Agung* is to the south, while in South Bali it is to the north. This means that 'east' *(kangin)* and 'west' *(kauh)* are reversed in North Bali, hence that right and left also have differing values. (cf. Swellengrebel 1960: 38)

The basis of the geographical directions in the opposition of 'seaward' and 'inland' is not unique to Bali, as is brought out in Swellengrebel's comments on etymological relation-ship of the Balinese *nawasanga* words with similar words in other Indonesian languages. Thus *ka-aja* can be related to Bugis *aja*, 'west', *ka-lod* to Malayu *laut* 'sea'. In *kangin* 'east' we can also recognize Malay *angin* 'wind', the *ka-* element being a deictic and nominalizing formative. The etymology of *kauh* is less certain. Old Balinese has *ka-ruh* 'west' which suggest a relationship to words like Old Javanese *ruhur/luhur* meaning 'high', 'ancestral', 'dignified', especially since west has been the direction of death and the ancestors in Bali since the ancient period.

[3] Bateson uses the word "players" here in reference to the "games" described in Van Neumann's theory of games. Van Neumann's analysis concentrated on study of the kinds of coalitions that are likely to occur in games maximizing simple variables, and constrained by differing set of rules, most of these conceived of in terms of simple, competitive sequences. Bateson's aim in his (1949) article was to study what kinds of changes in the rules of Van

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Neumannian games would be necessary to produce a "steady-state" system like that exemplifed in his analysis by Balinese society.

[4] cf. Bateson: 1979, p. 105:

> "As a matter of history, systems with positive gain, variously called *escalating* or *vicious* circles, were anciently familiar. In my own work with the Iatmul tribe on the Sepik River in New Guinea, I had found that various relations among groups and among verious types of kin were characterized by interchanges of behavior such that the more A exhibited a given behavior, the more B was likely to exhibit the same behaviour. These I called *symmetrical* interchanges. Conversely, there were also stylized interchanges in which B's behavior was different from, but *complementary* to, that of A. In either case, the relations were potentially subject to progressive escalation, which I called *schismogenesis*."

[5] See *Prasasti Bali* (PB) 001.Ib.2 - 3 for a *partapanan* dedicated to mendicants *(bhikṣu)* of the Śaiva type termed *śiwakangśi*, *śiwanirmmala*, and *śiwaprajñā*; PB 002.I.b.2 - 3 for an enclosure dedicated to the *bikṣu widya* in charge of the worship of the Fire God *(Hyang Api)*; PB 102.I.b.1 - 2 for a *partapanan* dedicated to two religious personages with Buddhist titles: *Ida bhikṣu Dharmmaśwara* and *Da pitāmaha... bhikśu Dharmmachāya*.

In Old Balinese *sīma* is found as a verb *sima-yang* 'to mark out as a hermitage' (PB 001.Ib.3, etc.)

[6] See Hanna: 1976, pps. 28 - 32 for a summary of the role of Balinese "reef rights" *(tawang karang)* in the *Overjissel* incident and the subsequent Dutch decision to bring the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

north coast kingdom of Buléléng under its direct control.

[7] See Zurbuchen (1987) for a study of the language of the Balinese shadow theater (*wayang*), Young (1981) for a study of the *topèng* form of masked dance.

[8] Uhlenbeck has shown that aside from certain pronominal forms distinctive to *madya*, the *madya* lexical items are in general derived either by shortening of *krama* forms or by augmentation of *ngoko* forms. In addition, the *madya* register is defined by the absence of certain *ngoko* terms. The net effect of these variations is to produce a less formal register appropriate to informal contexts that yet retains some of the elements of respect characteristic of *krama*.

[9] *Prijaji* = *priyayi* in reformed spelling. As Errington has noted, the *priyayi* are the descendants of the "traditional litarati elite: courtiers, servants, and descendants of kings" (1986:332). In contemporary Indonesia there are significant numbers of *priyayi* in the government bureaucracy, but they do not constitute a separate class that can be termed the 'white collar elite'. To some extent *priyayi* is a statement of cultural loyalty, of affiliation with *priyayi* values and principles, although this is usually supported by a claim of historical kinship or 'retainer' relationship with one of the *kraton*, the traditional centers of Javanese political and spiritual power.

[10] The terms *triwangsa* and *jaba* refer to the Balinese division of the Hindu *catur-varṇa* system into two more general classes, members of the upper-three castes, or *triwangsa*, being described as *anak jero*, those 'inside' (*jero*) the court circles that once held a near monopoly on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ritual and political power, the commoners being described as *anak jaba*, those who are on the 'outside' (*jaba*) of the system.

[11] TBB, p. 17:

"Jikalau seorang Bali berbicara kepada orang yang hendak dimuliakan, ia mempergunakan kata-kata halus, sejauh ada."

[12] TBB, p. 20:

"Jika seorang membicarakan orang yang patut dimuliakan, ia mempergunakan kata-kata khusus **bila menyingung diri orang itu, bagian tubuhnya, hubungan keluargaannya, pikiran, ucapan dan perbuatanya.** Kata-kata yang khusus itu dinamakan 'basa singgih'."

[13] TBB, p. 20:

"Basa singgih itu tidak hanya dipergunakan bila berhadapan dengan orang yang dimuliakan itu, tetapi - sewajarnya - juga jika beliau dibicarakan kepada kawan, dengan memakai Basa Biasa, bukan Basa Alus."

[14] TBB, p. 22:

"1) Dalam pembicaraan ramah Basa Alus sering dilalaikan akan tetapi Basa Singgih tidak demikian. Orang Bali tidak mempergunakan kata-kata yang kurang hormat bila menyebut diri, keadaan atau perbuatan orang yang disegani, apa lagi jika berhadap dengan orang itu.
2) Jika sekaligus berbicara mengenai dua orang, satu harus dimuliakan, yang satu lagi tidak, maka dengan teliti dipilih sebutan yang tepat, sesuai dengan kedudukannya masing-masing, sekalipun susunan kalimat menjadi canggung karenanya."

[15] TBB, p. 22

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[16] ibid

[17] ibid

[18] TBB, p. 23:

"Ada sejumlah kecil kata Bali yang mempunyai dua bentuk hormat di samping bentuk biasa, yaitu bentuk Basu Alus maupun bentuk Basa Singgih. Jika demikian, bentuk halus itu mungkin merupakan 'Basa Alus Sor': artinya dipakai dalam menghadapi orang yang hendak dimuliakan, **tetapi menyebut hal dirinya, keaadaan, perbuatan, keluarga dirinya, atau orang yang sederajat dengannya**."

[19] *Biasa* terms of self-reference can be used in such situations if no *Alus Sor* equivalent exists for a *Singgih* term; cf. TBB, p. 23:

"If it happens that there is no special (*Alus Sor* word) for an expression, then *Basa Biasa* is used, which within an *Alus* sentence will certainly sound 'coarse' (*kasar*) and therefore (sufficiently) self-deprecating."

[20] TBB, p. 28:

"Jika menghindari baik bahasa yang amat rendah, maupun yang amat mulia, maka **pembicaraan** bersifat 'menengah', 'madia', tidak terlalu halus dan tidak terlalu kasar."

[21] cf. Uhlenbeck: 1978; pps. 312-313

[22] Many of the languages of Indonesia, for example, are currently being studied under the joint directorship of the *Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa* (Center for the Preservation and Development of Language) and the *Departmen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* (Department of Education and Culture).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[23] Zoetmulder composed this grammar based on a palm-leaf manuscript of the Old Javanese *Ādiparwa* that he had smuggled into a Japanese internment following the fall of the Netherlands-Indies to the Japanese in 1943 (personal communication). Zoetmulder and Poedjawijatna translated his (1950) grammar into Indonesian as *Bahasa Parwa: Tata Bahasa Djawa Kuno* (1954, 1961/1967), but we are still without an English translation of this foundational work.

[24] Van Eck's *Beknopte Handleiding bij de Beoefening van de Balineesche Taal* was published in Utrecht in 1874. Comments on the Balinese language were made during the same period by Kern (1871), Friedrich (1876 - 78), and de Vroom (1872).

[25] It appears likely that Kersten was aware of the system of nomenclature used by van der Tuuk for Toba Batak in choosing these names, for the forms described as "First Passives" by van der Tuuk for Batak resemble Balinese constructions so-named by Kersten. While the Toba Batak "First Passive" usually takes the marker *di-*, it can optionally be expressed with the unmarked base form in imperatives or in 3rd person forms, <u>if</u> the agentive NP or pronoun is used with the prepositional form *di-baen*.

There are remarkable similarities here with the Balinese "First Passive form": it too is often found in third person with an agentive preposition *baan* that is clearly related to Batak *di-baen*. Like the Batak "First Passive" it is the most strongly agentive of the passive forms; and, it appears (but always) in the morphologically unmarked form.

[26] As summarized in Zurbuchen 1987, p. 66

[27] The source of the *hanacaraka* ordering appears to lie in the systems of linguistic mysticism that played a large

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

role in Javano-Balinese religious practice and philosophy. Syllables of the Indic Devanāgarī syllabary are described in the Buddhist manual *Sang Hyang Kamahāyanikan* as 'giving birth to' the various elements of the physical body, while a Balinese text *(Tutur Anacaraka)* described by Zurbuchen (1987: 56) ascribes the letters of the *hanacaraka* syllabary to locations in the physical body.

28 The vowel-clusters of words like *jaan* and *baan* are pronounced as either geminate vowels or dipthongs, depending on dialect. The use of dipthongs appears to predominate overall, but there are areas where geminate vowels are the norm. Pronunciation of these words is also to some extent effected by speed of utterance, so that is common for a single speaker to use [ba:n] and [baən] as well as the contracted form [bən] for the common word *baan*.

29 An example of a typical dictionary entry in Kersten (1984) is given following (with English glosses for the Indonesian of the original):

-awan. awanan (B) **awinan** (A): 'reason, because'

ento awanan (B) **punika awinan** (A): 'that's the reason; for for that reason'
mawanan (B) **mawinan** (A): 'thus; thus it was that...'
maka-awanan, maka-awinan: 'that was the reason that...'
tan pawanan, tan pawinan: 'with no reason at all'
Tan pawanan jejeh kenehné. 'There was no reason for the fear in his heart.'
ngawanang (B) **ngawinang** (A): 'to cause'

(TBB, p. 168)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PART I:

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF BALINESE LANGUAGE (OLD JAVANESE, OLD MALAY AND OLD BALINESE)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER TWO

PARTICIPANT MARKING IN OLD JAVANESE

2.0 Introduction

Old Javanese possesses a system of verbal markers whose morphology closely resembles the "Focus" morphology of Philippine languages like Tagalog.[1] However, the Old Javanese system differs from the Philippine type in a number of significant ways. The most important of these for the present work is that Old Javanese verbal predicates can take more than a single Focus morpheme, and are thus often involved in tracking multiple NP adjuncts. As a consequence verbal predicates cannot be described in terms of single Focus types, the course taken for Tagalog by Schachter & Otanes (1972), but must be seen in terms of Focus (or: case-marking) features of individual affixes.

Complex Focus predicates are a major source of cohesion in Old Javanese, both in the clause-level binding of syntax and in the systems maintaining discourse coherence. Deictic and pronominal systems are also both important in the tracking of participant NPs, and the dimension of "Person" is in general a central organizing principle, standing in importance alongside the Focus

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

system binding participant NPs to the verbal predicate, and a system of overt topic markers binding sentential elements to the macro-levels of discourse and referentiality.

These are all characteristics of what Benjamin (1987) has called an articulated mode of expression, a notion he has explored in recent work on the differences between modern Colloquial and formal Malay. Benjamin links formal Malay to an articulated pattern of affixation that characterizes that language, while he speaks of Colloquial Malay as representing a condensed mode of expression characterized by reduction of morphology and preference for 'bare root' verbs.

As the most casual student of historical Indonesian literature is aware, Old Javanese possesses a considerable morphological machinery involved in marking participant structure. And Old Javanese is well known to have been a language of authority manifested from sources 'outside' the world of individuals uninitiated into the inner circles of an emergent (Sanskritized) nation-state. These features of Old Javanese are suggestive of Benjamin's analysis of formal Malay, a language with a relationship to Colloquial Malay comparable to that Old Javanese must have had with non-Sanskritized dialects of its era:

> "The modern 'High' varieties of Malay are characterised... by: the explicit and obligatory marking of participant structure, agency and transitivity;... a preference for hypotactic, participant-dominated

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

subject-predicate sentence organisation; and by sociocentric modes of expression. These features betoken a there-and-then-oriented, other-cathected mode of conciousness associated with the authority-based, mediated social relations typical of the pre-modern trading states and the modern nation-states in which the 'High' varieties of Malay have been developed." (1987: 13)

An important feature of Benjamin's understanding of condensed and articulated modes is his recognition that condensed should not be understood as 'restrictive'. As he points out:

"...the more condensed ways of speaking allow the hearer to construct a more elaborate range of possible meanings, while the more articulated ways tend to restrict the hearer to a single understanding." (ibid)

For Benjamin the use of "articulated" speech codes is critical in sociolinguistic contexts that reflect what he terms a "transcendental" orientation of self and other. In transcendental cultural regimes, says Benjamin, the 'other' is taken as given; hence in political life the self is modeled in terms of the values presented by an exterior authority. Benjamin says of the linguistic consequences of an articulated form of discourse:

"Making our meanings explicit, as we do when speaking in a more articulated mode, places our addressee in the as-if position of having little or no prior knowledge of whatever it is we are talking about. It implies that we are privy to some special knowledge about the world and that we are in a sufficiently

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

differentiated social position to control its dissemination: speaker and addressee are to be thought of as outsiders with respect to each other." (ibid)

For Benjamin, Malay colloquial-formal diglossia or bilingualism can be specifically associated with the communicative situation imposed by an indigenous elite with political aspirations:

"Such a mode is especially appropriate to languages standardized for public use in modern nation-states, just as it was to the highly transcendental frame of reference coerced in earlier centuries by those individuals -- themselves often outsiders -- who wished to entrench themselves at the top of the Malay status-hierarchy." (ibid)

I will argue in this thesis that Old Javanese represents an elaborated linguistic linguistic code bearing a relation to the everyday speech of its era similar to that described by Benjamin for the relationship of formal to Colloquial Malay. However, Old Javanese has had a different cultural history from that of Malay, and cannot be described in exactly the same terms. By the time of the East Javanese period (ca. 1000 -1500 A.D.) Old Javanese had become a sacral language with an indirect relationship to everyday speech, a language already betokening the religious authority of the (Sanskritized) past. Old Javanese retained this relationship to everyday language in Bali long after the disappearance of the last Hindu-Javanese kingdoms, and has come to be a source of lexical

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and morphological input into the *Alus* speech levels of Modern Balinese.

We will return to a more complete discussion of the sociolinguistic issues involved with use of Old Javanese in Bali in Chapters Seven and Eight. The current chapter concentrates on morphosyntactic and discourse-syntactic issues related to the Old Javanese system of particiapnt marking, especially the verbal system of Focus morphology and the topic-marking, pronominal, and spatio-temporal deictic systems involved in discourse and referential coherence. We begin with a summary of Old Javanese Focus morphology, looking first at Actor Focus, then Goal Focus and "mediate action" constructions.

2.1 Actor Focus affixes in Old Javanese

Old Javanese possesses Actor Focus (AF) affixes *ma-*, *-um-* and *mang-*, but shows no sign of an affix comparable to Tagalog *mag-*. Instead *mang-* of Old Javanese appears to cover functions sub-categorized in Tagalog by *mag-* and *mang-*. (We will see below, however, that there is evidence in inscriptional Old Javanese that *mang-* at one time had the more restricted "occupational" or "habitual" meanings that are found with Tagalog *mang-*.)

The semantic distinctions between Actor Focus types described for Tagalog by Schachter and Otanes (1972) are in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

general applicable to the Old Javanese case, if we read Old Javanese *mang-* for both Tagalog *mag-* and *mang-*:

> "...*-um-* verbs [denote] causal action and/or action not involving movement of an object external to the actor." (1972:292)

> "...*mag-* verbs [connote] deliberate action and/or action involving movement of an object external to the actor." (p.289)

If there are both *-um-* and *mag-* variants of a verb, say Schachter and Otanes:

> "...the *-um-* verb generally designates a movement from one place to another on the part of the performer, the *mag-* verb a movement from one place to another of some object external to the performer." (p.292)

Bloomfield's (1917) comments on the *mang-* affix are echoed in later descriptions like that of Ramos (1971):

> "The active with *mang-*... expresses action more deliberate, selective, or in larger quantity (professional, habitual) than *mag-*." (Bloomfield 1917:395)

> "The actor focus verbal affix indicating the distributive is *mang-*. *Mang-* has special uses indicating plurality or distributive aspect of action, or habitual, repeated, or professional action (often) toward a multitude of objects." (Ramos 1971:58)

Schachter and Otanes treat *ma-* as an Actor Focus affix, while Foley and Van Valin (1984) describe it in terms of Dowty's (1979) system of lexical decomposition, calling it a stative marker with "the logical structure **predicate**' (x)" (1984:65).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

For Old Javanese affixes *ma-* and *mang-* there are variants *a-* and *ang-*. While Dutch analysts have largely maintained that these represent prosodic variations, Becker & Oka (1974) have proposed that the phonological contrast "presence vs. absence of *m-*" represents a contrast in "observer distance" from the speech act, basing this analysis on person-marking features of the formant *m-*.[2] In Becker & Oka's analysis this contrast of "observer distance" in AF morphology is one dimension of the "Cline of Person that orders linguistic forms according to their distance from the speaker". (1977:1)

Examples (1) and (2) illustrate intransitive predicates of Old Javanese taking *a-*, *ma-*, *um-*, and *ang-*, as well as transitive predicates taking *ang-* and *ami-* (aN-pi-). In these examples we can see at work both principles maintaining semantic contrasts (through choice of affix) and differences of observer (or participant) distance from the speech act. In (1) the perspective of the observor is detached and distant, while in (2) the subjects of the sentence (*petungnya* 'the bamboos') are seen at first from a distance, but there is a shift to a close perspective with the final verb *ma-camana* 'to cleanse the mouth with water':

(1)	jaladha	**a**-hireng	(**u**)**m**-ider	**a**-langlang
	rainclouds	AF1(sta)-*black*	AF2-*whirl*	AF1-*wander*

ang-uhuh	**ami**-rengw-*aken*	pater
AF3-wail	AF3+IFnom-*hear*-Ti	*thunder*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'Black rainclouds whirled about, wandering across the sky, wailing, sounding out (their) thunder.'

(2) petung-nya t-**um**-akul **um**-ara i-ng
bamboo-pro3 AF2-*bow* AF2-*approach* dat-det

lwah, añawuk banyu parèng **a**-tekes
stream AF3-*scoop* *water* *'going on to'* AF1-*sip*

ma-camana
AF1-*rinse mouth*

'The bamboo (seemed) to bow over, approaching the stream, scooping up water and going on to sip it and so (ritually) cleanse the mouth.'

In these examples verbs like *ider* 'whirl' and *tukul* 'bow' describing more self-contained actions take *-um-*, while *ang-* is found with verbs like *uhuh* 'wail' and *cawuk* 'scoop up' that have a dynamic, outer-directed quality.

Old Javanese *-um-* exhibits the tendency of Tagalog *-um-* to be associated with bases that have to do with inner-directed action, or action that does not normally extend beyond the boundaries of the initiating entity itself. Thus *-um-* is commonly found in Old Javanese with verbs of motion or perception and verbs referring to phsyiological symptoms, as well as 'meteorological verbs' and verbs describing natural phenomena with a dynamic character. As Zoetmulder has pointed out these include intransitive verbs having to do with sounds or visual manifestations produced in nature:

g-um-ereh 'to thunder'
k-um-isik 'to rustle, hiss' (make high pitched noise)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

k-um-eñar 'to gleam, shine, sparkle'
k-um-ilat 'to flash' (of lightning)

Verbs of motion taking *-um-* as their Actor Focus affix include:

umijil (um-wijil) 'come out, appear'
um-angkat 'set out'
(u)m-ulih 'return'
(u)milu 'join with, go with'
l-um-ampah 'go, set out'

Some verbs of perception have an option of taking *-um-* or *mang-*. In this case there is often implicit a distinction based on degree of volitionality and outer-directedness:

(3) (nāga) tibèng (tiba-i-ng) kuṇḍa kadi
(serpent) fall-dat-det *sacrificial fire like*

larwa-larwa-*n* t-**um**-on dilah ni-ng dīpa
redup-*moth*-LF AF2-*see* *flame* gen-det *lamp*

'The serpent fell into the sacrificial fire just as moths do <u>seeing</u> the light of a lamp.

(4) a-usik cāmara ri-ng geger...
AF1-*move restlessly casuarina pine* loc-det *ridge*

lwir-nya an **ma**non (**ma**N-ton) apsarī
form-pro3(-top) sub AF3-*see* *apsara(s)*

'The camara pines on the ridge swayed restlessly, as if they <u>gazed</u> <u>at</u> the *apsara-s*.'

The more centripetal features of *-um-* can be linked to lower valence of modified verbal bases (cf. Hunter: 1983), and the same features also contribute to the role of *-um-* in the system of interclausal prominence (cf. Becker &

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hunter: 1983). Verbs taking *-um-* are in the majority of cases backgrounded to other clauses organized around verbs with a higher discourse prominence (*mang-* verbs, unmarked intransitives, and Goal Focus constructions taking *-in-*).

Old Javanese *mang-* at the time of the first inscriptions was found very often with "occupational" reference, thus reflecting "habituai" and "occupational" uses of Tagalog *mang-*. In some of these cases *mang-* appears to have had nominal interpretation: thus *mangidung* has been defined by Sarkar as 'singers of *kidung* verse', and he notes also *ang-lakṣa* 'those who work with lac' and *a-paṇḍai* 'those who work as blacksmiths'.

By the time of the East Javanese period (ca. 10th to 15th centuries) *(m)ang-* had become the quintessential marker in Old Javanese of volitional, agentive, and outer-directed actions. Thus *(m)ang-* is found commonly in Old Javanese of the "Kekawin Age" with highly agentive verbs like *alap* 'sieze' or transitive verbs derived from nominals like *anugraha* (Skt) 'royal favor':

(5) ḍateng-èng (-a-i-ng) sabhā ... **mang**-alap
come to-irr+dat-det *court* AF3-*sieze*

i ratna-kanyā
dat *jewel-maidens(s)*

'...that (he) should go to the court (and) <u>sieze</u> the most beautiful maidens.'

(6) kadi bhaṭāra Brahmā yan **mang**-anugraha-*(a)ni*
like God Brahma coord AF3-*divine favor*-Tr2

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'(He) is like Lord Brahma when he grants royal favor.'

The stative affix *ma-* is used in Old Javanese very as is *ma-* in Tagalog. Thus it can be described as a stative prefix with the logical structure **predicate'** x (Foley & Van Valin) or as an attributive (Ramos: 1971; Hunter: 1983). Attribution can be said to signal the "least-marked" relationship of a subject and its predicate, whether the predicate is an adjective, verb, or predicate nominal. In Old Javanese (as in Tagalog) the subject is in almost all cases an Actor, and *ma-* can be included with a few exceptions in the category of Actor Focus affixes. The three most common types of attribution found with Old Javanese *ma-* are illustrated below:

(a) genitival or metonymous (NP + *ma*-NP)

ikang	ratha	**ma**-cakra
deic3-det	*chariot*	AF1(sta)-*wheel*

'...that chariot with wheels.'

(b) adjectival (NP + *ma*-adj)

ikang	tuñjung	**ma**-anéka-warna
deic3-det	*lotus*	AF1(sta)-*many-colored*

'...those many-colored lotuses.'

(c) verbal

sira	dyaksa	*um*-atur
pro3(top)	*magistrate*	AF2-*present oneself to king*

tan	*(m)a*-hiḍep	nṛpati
not	AF1(sta)-*think*	*king*

'The magistrate appeared in court but he paid no attention to the king.'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Like its Tagalog counterpart, Old Javanese *ma-* can be combined with the Goal suffix *-an* to produce predicates indicating the intensive or durative mode of an (intransitive) action:

(7) tekā ta-ng megha..... sahā kilat-nya
arrive top-det *rain-cloud(s)* *with* lightning-pro3

gereh-nya ghoratara **ma**-gentur-**an**
thunder-pro3 *most terrifying* AF1-*boom*-LF

'Then the rainclouds arrived with their lightning and their terrifying thunder <u>crashing</u> <u>and</u> <u>booming</u> (<u>without</u> <u>cease</u>).

Actor Focus morphology is a well-developed system in Old Javanese, differentiated internally along a number of axes. As Foley and Van Valin (1984) have concluded of the Actor Focus system of Tagalog:

> "The concept of actor is a vital one... and furthermore the distinction between a volitional actor, an agent, and a non-volitional one... is a basic division in the morphological categories of verbal affixation." (1984:82)

2.2 Goal Focus Affixes in Old Javanese

Old Javanese possessed two distinct markers of Goal Focus: *ka-* and *-in-*. Zoetmulder recognized the 'passive' character of these affixes, and thus described Old Javanese as possessing two passive types that he termed the "*ka*-passive" and "*in*- passive".

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The first of these markers can be identified on comparative grounds with PAN *-in-*. This affix has recently been described by Starosta, Pawley and Reid (1982) as originally a morpheme deriving nouns with the general meaning "the N affected by V-ing":

> "The affix **ni-/-in-* functioned in Proto- Austronesian to derive nouns from other nouns, although it may also have begun to have the function of marking perfective aspect in verbs, a function which is now its primary one in Philippine languages." (1982: 163)

Van der Tuuk described *-in-* of Toba Batak as a 'passive marker' as early as 1867 (cf. van der Tuuk 1971: 166-72), while for Tagalog *-in-* is generally understood as a marker of perfective aspect. Van der Tuuk (1864-67) and Bloomfield (1917) also noted nominalizing functions for *-in-* forms in Toba Batak and Tagalog:

> "...there are a great number of substantives which show this passive form, e.g. *p-in-ahan* - 'cattle' (the things which have been fed), *s-in-onduk* - 'husband' (the one for whom food is served), etc." (van der Tuuk [1864-67] 1971: 167)

> "The infix *-in-* produces static words denoting *things which are produced by such and such a process or treated so and so: ang p-in-atak* 'each of the small sections into which a rice-field is divided by the irrigation trenches' (< *pitak* 'divide')." (Bloomfiled 1917: 403)

We will return in section 2.5 following to the cross-linguistic coincidence of passive, static and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

perfective features of *-in-* in discussing the consequences of irrealis marking in Old Javanese.

The second Goal Focus affix of Old Javanese (*ka-*) can be related to the Tagalog marker *-ka-* described by Foley and Van Valin (1984) as marking the perceiver in non-volitional verbs of perception:

a. **Na-ka**-rinig ng ingay
(perf)-Perceiver-*hear* det(-top) *noise*

ang lalake
det(top) *man*

'<u>The</u> <u>man</u> heard a noise.'

b. **Na**-rinig ng lalake ang ingay
(perf)-Perceived det(-top) *man* det(top) *noise*

'The man heard <u>the</u> <u>noise</u>.' (1984:69)

Zoetmulder (1952, 1961) first distinguished the two types of passive morphology in Old Javanese and recognized what we would now term the degree of agency as a critical factor in choice of passive form:

> "In the *-in-* passive the *action* and its *performer* are treated as more important than in the *ka-* passive. In the *ka-* passive what is treated as central is the *state brought about by the action*. In this sense it can be compared to the Indonesian *ter-* prefix."

This difference of *agent* involvement in the two Goal Focus types is brought out, says Zoetmulder, in differing constraints on the use of pronominal clitics marking third person agents of *-in-*and *ka-* constructions:

"If the performer of the action [of an-*in-* verb] is a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pronoun, it is placed (directly) following the passive (verb) form."

"If a pronominal form is used to represent the performer of action of a *ka-* passive, then the pronoun cannot be placed directly following the passive (verb) form, but must instead be given with the 'function word' *dé*. Thus we find *t-in-on-(n)ira*, but *ka-ton dé nira*."

Verbs with an inherently agentive and volitional character favor the *-in-* marker in Goal Focus. A typical examples is *gawé* 'do, accomplish':

(8) **g-in**-awé-nira kevalya tan pa-hiḍep
GF1-*do*-pro3(-top) *isolation* [Skt] *not* AF1-*think*

sarwa wiṣaya
all *objects* [Skt]

'The state of spiritual isolation is realized by him, without any thought of the objects of sense.

For some Old Javanese verbal bases both *ka-* and *-in-* derivations exist. In this case there are differences of volitionality and agency associated with the performance of the actions involved. Thus in (9) below the verbal base *tūt* 'follow' takes *ka-* in the case of a description of a fragrance carried along by the wind, while in (10) the use of *-in-* brings out the volitionality in the agency of a hunter as he intently stalks his quarry:

(9) **ka**-tūt mara (N-para) wangi-nya
GF2-*follow* AF2-*come,approach* *sweet smell*-pro3

de ni-ng māruta
'by' gen-det *wind*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'The sweet fragrance was carried along by the wind."

(10) t-**in**-ūt-nya sa-para-n ikang manuk
GF1-*follow*-pro3 '*everywhere*' deic-det *bird*

an *pang*-layang
subord AF3nom-*fly*

'Everywhere that the bird flew he followed along.'

Many verbal bases exhibit a preference for either *-in-* or *ka-*, while some are found only with one of these affixes. Verbs with a strong preference for *ka-* are typically verbs of perception, or mental or psychological states in which the subject is a *perceiver*. Thus *wruh* 'know, be aware of' is never agentive and thus cannot take an *-in-* derivation, occuring only with *ka-* or *ka-R-an*. For verbs like *iḍep* 'think of' and *wenang* 'be able to' GF forms in *-in-* are attested but uncommon, while *ka-* forms are found in large numbers. For verbs of perception (like *ton* 'see') both *ka-* and *-in-* forms are found, with differences of volitionality arising from choice of Goal Focus affix:

(11) tan **ka**-hiḍep tangguh ni-ng
not GF2-*pay heed* *admonition* gen-det

watek dewatā
group/class *gods*

'The admonition of the gods was not heeded.'

(12) **ka**-ton pwa *ma*-hurip Sang Kaca
GF2-*see* top AF1-*live* hon *Kaca*

dé nikang daitya
'by' gen-deic3-det *demon*

'(Then) (the fact) that Sang Kaca still lived was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

noticed by that demon.'

If *ka-* is used in conjunction with *-an*, an affix referring to locative-like Goal arguments, there is a corresponding semantic shift towards the end-point of the action or its locus. Thus in (13) the unmarked subject of the *ka*-R-*an* construction is 'those ten villages' *(ikā daśa-deśa)*, a *locus* is treated as *patient* of the action, in what might be described as a "deinstrumental" or "de-locative" construction:

(13)	tātan	*ka*-ton	ikā	daśa-deśa	kadi
	neg	GF2-*see*	deic3/+3	*ten villages*	*like*
	ka-saput-**an**			hima	
	GF2-*breast-cloth*-LF			*snow*	

'The ten villages could not be seen, as if they were jacketed with a breast-cloth (by the) snow."

The Focus predicate *ka-saput-an* 'covered with a breast-cloth' in (13) is distinguishable only on syntactic grounds from substantive uses of *ka*-R-*an*. The presence of an agentive NP (*hima* 'snow') suggests that this is a verbal construction, but even in this there is a suggestion of substantive formation, for its (incorporated) post-verbal position is comparable to that taken by modifiers or possessors in noun phrase structure (Head-mod-poss).

Substantives formed from *ka*-R-*an* are common in Old Javanese. Many of these are abstract nouns representing qualities or states (14) while others are locative nominals representing, for example, places of residence (15).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(14) wruh nghulun **k**ottaman-ta (**ka**-uttama-**an**-nta)
know pro1 GF2-*foremost*-LF-pro2

'I know of your fine qualities.'

(15) lunghā ta sira (*u*)m-ulih
set out top pro3(top) AF2-*return*

*m*arèng (*N*-para-i-ng) **ka**-hyang-**an**
AF3-*come*-dat-det GF2-*god/ancestor*-LF

'He set out, returning to Heaven (the place of the gods).'

In the case of other *ka*-R-(suffix) constructions regarded by Zoetmulder as substantives, it is clear that they represent not so much fixed features of the lexicon as *nominalizations* triggered by grammatical contexts in which sentential elements are used as arguments of a clause. *Pejah* ('dead, slain') in (16) below, for example, is a base that takes only *-in-* in Goal Focus, and we would thuss expect to find *p-in-ejah kawitan-(n)ira* 'his ancestor was slain' in an independent clause. In (16), however, this clause is the grammatical subject to the Focus predicate (*in-angèn-angèn*), so must take substantive form. In this form the genitival preposition *ning* characteristic of NP construction is used to link the former subject (*kawitan-nira*) to the Head of the nominalized construction:

(16) *in*-angèn-angèn ta **ka**-pejah ni-ng
GF1-R2-*ponder* top GF2-*dead* gen-det

kawitan-(n)ira
ancestor-pro3

'The death of his father was what he always thought

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

about.'

In some cases the nominalized form is based on a strongly *agentive* and *volitional* verb (like *alap* 'seize') and hence retains the agentive *dé*-phrase in the substantive construction. This is brought out in example (17):

(17) *mang*-rengö pwa sang watek Yadu ri
AF3-*hear* top hon *group* *Yadaava(s)* loc

k-alap-**an** Sang Subhadrā
GF2-*seize*-LF hon *Subhadra*

dé Sang Arjuna
'by' hon *Arjuna*

'The Yadava clansmen heard of <u>the</u> <u>seizure</u> of Sang Subhadra <u>by</u> Arjuna.'

Derivation of *ka*-R-*an* substantives in Old Javanese thus represents both lexical processes (exs. 14 - 15) and nominalization tiggered in response to grammatical context (exs. 16 - 17). Substantive *ka*-R-*an* constructions stand alongside verbal constructions of analogous form, with independent adjuncts of verbal constructions coded as pronominal *possessors* (occasionally agentive phrases) in the nominalized forms.

2.3 Transitivizing Suffixes in Old Javanese

Old Javanese verbs taking *-um-* or *mang-* in Actor Focus can also be combined with transitivizing suffixes *-aken* or *-i/-ani*. Their Goal Focus counterparts can combine with *-aken* or with *-an*. Note that in this configuration *-aken*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

remains constant for Actor and Goal Focus, while *-i/-ani* and *-an* are specialized for Actor and Goal Focus respectively.

In AF transitive constructions the prefix (*-um-* or *mang-*) marks the primary reference as Actor, while suffixes -0, *-aken* or *-i/-ani* clarify the relation of the predicate to its objects. In the GF forms the primary relation is marked by one of the two Goal Focus prefixes (*-in-* or *ka-*) and the exact sub-type of Goal relation is signalled by -0, *-aken* or *-an*.

In the case of the *-aken* suffix the orientation of the verbal base is towards Goal arguments that are moved, affected, or transferred in the process of an event or action (much like Foley & Van Valin's *theme* arguments). Like Malay *-kan*, Old Javanese *-aken* can thus be said to refer to the "affected complement". By contrast verbs taking suffixes *-i/-ani* or *-an* most often refer to what Benjamin (1988:16) terms a "domain complement" with locative-like characteristics.

For adjectival bases the *-aken* form often signals the transfer of the state or quality of the base to an object. This is illustrated by the derived transitive in *(m)ang*-R-*aken* based on (Skt) *līlā* in the example below:

(18) ikang *pa*-carita **ang**-lila-**(a)ken**
deic3-det AF1nom-*story* AF3-*play, delight*-Tr1

manah ni-ng *mang*-rengö
heart(s) gen-det AF3-*hear*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'That narration brought delight to the hearts of those who listened.'

For intransitive bases like *adig/adeg* 'stand up' *-aken* forms a derived transitive 'set up, make stand up':

(19) *mang*-adeg ta sira t-**um**-inggal-**aken**
AF3-*stand* top pro3(top) AF2-*leave behind*-Tr1

pa-turw-*an*-(n)ira
AF1nom-*sleep*-LF-pro3(-top)

'He stood up, leaving behind his sleeping place.'

(20) **in**-adeg-**aken** ta Sang Hyang Teas
GF1-*stand*-Tr1 top hon hon *border stone*

'...the sacred border stone was set up.'

The transitivizing suffix *-aken* is also frequently found with *mang-* verbs in constructions functioning as adverbials:

(21) *um*-ulat **mang**-ingöt-ingöt-**aken**....
AF2-*look,glance* AF3-R2-*be aware*-Tr1

kala-murkha ike ta rākṣasī
dangerous & violent deic3/+1 top *demoness*

'He looked (at her) very thoughtfully - this was a demoness, violent and threatening destruction.'

For transactional verbs like *tarima* 'receive', *-aken* promotes the thing given in the transaction, not the *recipient*. If the *recipient* is to be brought into focus the suffix *-an* is chosen instead. This contrast is brought out in (22) and (23) below:

(22) Sang Ambikā t-**in**-arima-**(a)ken** i
hon *Ambika* GF1-*receive*-Tr1 dat

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sang Citrānggada
hon *Citranggada*

'Sang Ambika <u>was</u> <u>given</u> (in marriage) to Sang Citranggada.'

(23) ri kāla ni-ng wiwāha
loc *time* gen-det *marriage*

seḍeng rahadyan sanghulun t-**in**-arima-**n**
+prog *'my noble lord'* GF1-*receive*-LF

Sang Dewayāni
hon *(name)*

'...at the time of the wedding, when you, My Lord, <u>were given</u> Dewayani.'

Added in isolation to bases *-an* has the function of forming substantives that refer to the simple goal of the action of the base (*dum-an* 'share' < *dum* 'divide').

For transitive constructions in Goal Focus taking *-in-* the suffix *-an* extends the domain of the verb to include a *recipient* argument, as is clear from (23) above.

For other bases *-in*-R-*an* has an iterative or intensive aspect that contrasts with a simple, telic aspect for the un-suffixed form:

(24) *an*ikep daṇḍa t-**in**-ikel
AF3-*grasp with hand* *'staff of govt.'* GF1-*broken*

'...(he) grasps a <u>broken</u> staff of state.'

(25) *in*-ulir r-*in*-empu t-**in**-ikel-**an**
GF1-*whirl* GF1-*crushed* GF1-*broken*-LF

pāṇipāda-nira
hands & feet-pro3(-top/resp)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'His hands and feet were whirled about, crushed, broken over and over again.'

A good case can be made that the affixes *-i/-ani* were not fully developed as AF counterparts of GF *-an* in Old Javanese until late in the history of that language, developing out of an earlier form in which *i* retained its status as a preposition marking "directional" or "dative" relations. As Zoetmulder has shown, the *i* morpheme following *mang-* predicates can often be interpreted as retaining its status as an independent preposition:

> "The *-i* form can be regarded as arising from the (combination) of a base which takes a nasalized (affix) and the addition of the particle *i* which can point to 'location'.
>
> In Old Javanese...it is often very difficult to distinguish a nasalized verb (occurring) along with the (independent) particle *i* from the *-i* (verb) form."

It appears likely that *-i/-ani* evolved by analogy to *-aken*, allowing transitivization along an axis similar to that of *-aken*, but differentiated to specify the 'locative' type of Goal arguments that are coded with *-an* in Goal Focus.

Uses of *-i/-ani* are not nearly as common in Old Javanese as are uses of *-an*. Exceptions include stereotypical uses of *-i/-ani* with derived transitives in *mang-* formed on bases like *wighna* (Skt) 'obstacle' and *anugraha* (Skt) 'divine or royal favor'. In such cases the *-ani* form

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

has the effect of cancelling the prepositional goal marker (*ri* or *i*) that is found with the unmarked form and indicating a more direct relationship of the predicate to its Goal argument(s):

(26) asing **mam**ighna (**mang**-wighna) **ri**-(i)kang yajña
each AF3-*obstacle* loc-deic3-det *sacrifice*

'...everything that <u>obstructs</u> sacrificial ritual.'

(27) sandeha ta sang hyang Indra$_i$
worried top hon1 hon2 *Indra*

k-*in*-on-(n)ira ta Sang Jānapadī
GF1-*order*-pro3(resp) top hon1 *Janapadi*

mighn**ani** (**N**-wighna-**ani**) tapa-**nira**$_j$
AF3-*obstacle*-Tr2 *austerities*-pro3(resp)

'Lord Indra was worried (about Sang Śaradwan$_j$). He ordered Sang Janapadi <u>to</u> <u>obstruct</u> his$_j$ austerities.'

2.4 Role of *pa-* element affixes in Old Javanese

We have seen in 3.2 that the affix *ka-* is active in forming substantives of a generally 'non-volitional' character. *Pa-* element prefixes are also active in forming substantives, but in this case features of *agency* and *volitionality* are often involved in the case frame.

The most basic of these prefixes is *pa-*. As Zoetmulder points out this affix can be considered analagous to *ma-*:

> "The prefix *pa-* is used to form a noun (*kata sebut*) alongside the verbal form (*kata tambah*) formed with *a-/ma-*."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

If we look at examples of *pa-* forms found in clausal contexts it is clear that these constructions answer to syntactic demands. They have this in common with *ka*-R-*(an)* nominalizations discussed above, except that in this case it is a clause containing a *ma-* stative or other Actor Focus verb that is nominalized. This 'shift' from verbal to nominal form occurs commonly where (underlying) Actor Focus constructions are called upon to serve as the objects of prepositions. In this case the Actor NP picked out by the Focus affix of the underlying verbal form takes the *possessive* relation to the derived substantive, either through the Head-Modifier type of organization found with Old Javanese NPs (28), or use of the genitival preposition *ning* (29):

(28) Mahārāja Śāntanu prihati ri
Maharaja Shantanu worried loc

pa-tinggal Dewī Ganggā
AF1nom-*left behind* *Dewi Gangga*

'Maharaja Shantanu was worried at Dewi Gangga's <u>leaving</u>.'

(29) kadi h-*in*-atep ikang Khāṇḍawa-wana
like GF1-*cover* deic3-det *Khandava forest*

dé ni-ng **pa**-susun-(n)ing panah
'by' gen-det AF1nom-*pile*-gen-det *arrow(s)*

'It was as if the (whole) Khandava forest had been covered by <u>a</u> <u>piling</u> <u>up</u> of arrows.'

As in the case of the *ka*-R-*an* substantives, when underlying clauses are nominalized they bring with them any

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

core adjuncts of the underlying clause. In the case of *pa*-R substantives the first modifier often represents the Actor of the underlying clause and takes the *possessive* relation to the derived substantive construction. This is illustrated in (30) following:

(30) k-*in*-on -(n)ira *(u)m*-ajar-*aken*-*a* ri
GF1-*order*-pro3(-top) AF2-*tell of*-Tr1-irr loc
pamangguh (paN-pangguh) -nira duḥkha
AF3nom-*meet with* -pro3(-top) *pain*
ri sang Dhṛtarāṣṭra
loc hon *Dhrtarashtra*

'He$_i$ was ordered by him$_j$ to speak of <u>how</u> <u>he</u>$_i$ <u>had</u> <u>met</u> <u>with</u> <u>misfortune</u> to Lord Dhṛtarashtra.'[3]

The function of *pa(ng)*- in embedding sentential arguments also appears to be related to use in *benefactive* constructions.

Benefactives in Old Javanese take the causative stem form **pa(ng)*-R-*aken* and can occur in both Actor and Goal Focus. However, Old Javanese benefactives appear most commonly in the Goal Focus form *pinang*-R-*aken*, a fact that may respond to increased "features of transitivity" that promote an ergative realization of complex constructions in languages like Old Javanese (see 2.5 below).

Old Javanese benefactive constructions can be based on underlying transitive bases, as well as on intransitive or nominal bases. Thus in (31) below three benefactive predicates are formed on nominal bases representing

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

entertainments performed for the benefit of an audience of demons:

(31) ikang daitya seḍeng *ma*-gawé pānotsawa
deic3-det *demon* +prog AF1-*make* *festival*

p-in-ang-(k)idung-**aken**
AF3nom-GF1-*kidung verse*-Tr1

p-in-ang-igel-**aken** **p-in-ang**-raket-**aken**
AF3nom-GF1-*dance*-Tr1 AF3nom-GF1-*play*-Tr1

dé ni-ng watek Nātha
'by' gen-det *group,class* *Lord(s)*

'Those demons were in the midst of having a celebration, (being entertained) by the followers of the demon-king <u>with</u> <u>readings</u> <u>of</u> <u>kidung</u> <u>verse</u>, <u>dances</u>, <u>and</u> <u>performances</u> <u>of</u> <u>plays</u>.'

Note that in the benefactive constructions illustrated in (31) the agency of the dancers, singers and actors is mediated through the dances, songs, or plays performed for the audience. There is thus a multi-step, or mediate, relation of the primary Actors to their ultimate Objects. It is this mediate relation that triggers *pa(ng)-*, the nominalized analog of the underlying AF affix *ma(ng)-*. This suggests that embedding of Actor arguments in benefactives (ex. 31) and other "mediate action" constructions motivates nominalization at the level of the verbal predicate, just as does embedding of sentential complements (as evidenced in exs. 28 - 30 above). This supports the claim of Foley and Van Valin (1984) that nominalization is likely to be involved where there is a 'tight linkage' of two (or more)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

clauses:

> "One of the most significant consequences of a strong syntactic bond between two clauses is the increased likeliehood of the dependent clause occurring in a nominalized form." (1984:275)

2.5 Interaction of Goal Focus and Irrealis marking in Old Javanese

It is very common for benefactive constructions taking *-in-* to lose this primary Focus marker in the presence of irrealis marking. This is illustrated in (32) following where the benefactive form in Goal Focus *(p-in-agawé-aken)* has lost its Goal Focus marker in the presence of irrealis marking *(-a)*:

(32) k-*in*-on-*aken* ta Sang Pāṇḍawa
GF1-*order*-Tr1 top hon *Pandawa*

pa-gaway-**aken-a** (< **pina**-gawé-**aken-a**)
AF1nom-*perform*-Tr1-irr (minus *-in-*)

tilem
dark of moon, cremation ceremony

'It was ordered that the ceremonies of cremation <u>be carried out for</u> the Pandawa brothers.'

Thus far we have looked at the Old Javanese Focus morphology in terms of its role in coding participant relations, that is in terms of grammatical agreement. At the same time there appears to be an *aspectual* dimension implicit in choice of Focus marker. This is brought out

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

most clearly for Old Javanese by the incompatability of the *-in-* marker of Goal Focus with irrealis marking (*-a*, *-en* for irrealis forms of non-volitional verbs). In example (32) above we have seen a case where the irrealis marker has triggered loss of *-in-* in a benefactive construction. The same phenomenon is also found in the irrealis forms of simple Goal Focus predicates normally taking *-in-*:

(33) ika-ng wānara weh-**an-a** (< w-**in**-eh-**an-a**)
deic3-det *monkey* *give*-LF-irr (minus GF1)

ratna bhūṣaṇa tan tuṣṭa buddhi-nya
jewelry & fine clothes *not* *pleased* *mind*-pro3(-resp)

'If a monkey <u>were</u> <u>to</u> <u>be</u> <u>given</u> fine jewels and ornaments his heart would not be happy.'

Note that in (33) that loss of *-in-* has the consequence that the verb appears in an morphologically unmarked form. This is unusual in Old Javanese, for under normal circumstances it is only intransitives in topic position that appear in *base* form. Thus a surface form like *wéh-an-a* must be interpreted as arising through a derivational pathway, e.g. loss of *-in-* in the presence of irrealis.

Presence of irrealis does not trigger loss of Actor Focus affixes, nor of the non-volitional Goal affix *ka-*. This is illustrated in examples following:

(34) gañjar-*an* ... **anūt**-a (**aN**-tūt-a) guṇa-nira
reward-LF AF3-*follow*-irr *quality*-pro3

'The reward <u>should</u> <u>be</u> <u>in</u> <u>accord</u> <u>with</u> his skill.'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(35) dūr-*an* hana daśa-śīla **ka**-wruh-**a**-mw-**a**
distant-LF exist *10 virtues* GF2-*know*-irr-pro2-irr

'It's hard to believe <u>that</u> <u>you</u> <u>would</u> <u>know</u> <u>of</u> the ten virtuous practices !'

From these examples it is clear that it is only the -*in*- affix that is cancelled by presence of irrealis. This suggests special features of the Goal Focus forms taking -*in*- that may have to do with aspectual, rather than grammatical properties of this affix.

I have noted above (section 2.2) that -*in*- may have evolved from a nominalizing morpheme signalling "the N affected by V-ing" (cf. Starosta, Pawley, and Reid: 1982) and that it retains this feature of forming "static words" (Bloomfield) or "passive substantives" (van der Tuuk) in Tagalog and Toba Batak. A similar useage of -*in*- is found in Old Javanese, except that here the predicate taking -*in*- is adjectival in nature and modifies a nominal Head, with which it forms phrases like those defined as "static" and "passive" by Bloomfield and van der Tuuk:

a. tapih t-**in**-ulis i-ng mās
skirt GF1-*draw* dat-det *gold*

'...a skirt <u>drawn</u> <u>upon</u> <u>with</u> <u>gold</u>'

b. gubah g-**in**-andha-pattra ri-ng kānaka drawa
drapes GF1-'*fragrant-leaf*' loc-det *gold* *liquid*

'...drapery <u>decorated</u> with gold-leaf <u>in</u> <u>the</u> '<u>fragrant</u>-<u>leaf</u>' <u>pattern</u>.'[4]

Note that these lexicalizations of Goal Focus

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

predicates invariably refer to accomplished or 'perfected' actions, in this reflecting the function of markingperfective aspect that Starosta, Pawley, and Reid (1981: 163) point out is now the "primary one in Philippine languages".

Aspectual consequences of Austronesian 'voice' systems have been described in the past for Tagalog (Bloomfield: 1917), Samoan (Milner: 1973), and Bahasa Indonesia (Kana: 1983). Thus Bloomfield describes Tagalog as having two modes, the "actual" and the "contingent", and two aspects, the "punctual" and "durative". He defines the "punctual mode" in terms that suggest that features of telicity are components of the "punctual" category:

> "...in the punctual aspect the occurrence is viewed in its entirey, without regard to duration." (1917:217)

Milner bases his analysis of Samoan on Bloomfield's aspectual model, using the similar terms "actual" and "virtual" for the modes of his system, "perfective" and "imperfective" for its aspects. Milner cites Forsyth's (1970) definition of perfective aspect in support of his system, thus highlighting what might be termed "telic" features of the perfective form:

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

In their (1980) discussion of "transitivity" Hopper and Thompson note the "telic" features of perfective or

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

punctual action in their definition the transitivity feature ASPECT, and the frequent associations of telic features with arguments taking patient roles:

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

Kana (1983) discusses the question of aspectual features of the the *meN-* and *di-* prefixes of Bahasa Indonesia, citing first a manuscript by Steve Wallace (n.d.) describing aspectual distinctions for the 'voice' affixes of Jakarta Malay:

> "The basic formal dichotomy in Jakarta Malay is between verbs prenasalised with *ng-* and those without the nasal (either no prefix of *di-*, depending on the person of the agent)... The nasal forms carry meanings of actor-focus, generic activity, imperfective aspect and non-indicative mode. The non-nasal forms, in contrast, indicate notions of goal-focus, specific act, perfective aspect, and indicative mode." (1983:22)

Kana agrees with Hopper (1977) in seeing a contrast of discourse "foregrounding" and "backgrounding" functions for the *di-* and *meng-* forms of Classical Malay, but also proposes aspectual features for these affixes as found in Bahasa Indonesia and a larger role for the *di-* form in "temporal sequencing".[5]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Kana used the rates of co-occurrence of *meng-* and *di-* forms with modal verbs to test for the presence of implicit aspectual contrasts, finding that an aspectual contrast is most clear in the case of *sedang*, a modal with the meaning 'in the process of':

> "... in the 30 examples of the progressive marker sedang *in the process of* which occur in the two novels [studied], it occurs with *di-* only four times, and three of those are in relative clauses, where the grammar constrains the selection of *di-* over *meN-*. The only odd one... has an indefinite subject." (1983:26)

Kana also notes differing responses for *meng-* and *di-* to the process of reduplication. Thus both *meng-* and *di-* verbs can have imperfective meaning in reduplicated form, but the "*di-* verbs in this case 'need' the reduplication to make them imperfective... [while] the *meN-* verbs... do not require a reduplicated verb stem for an imperfective interpretation." (1983:27)

For Old Javanese the system of modal verbs is less pervasive than for Bahasa Indonesia, and it is difficult to be sure of aspectual differences between reduplicated and non-reduplicated forms without being able to elicit native-speaker information. Thus it is primarily in the mutual incompatibility of irrealis mode and the Goal Focus forms taking *-in-* that there is a suggestion of the association of perfective or punctual aspect with a particular morphosyntactic form.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Comrie (1976, 1981) has noted that Indo-European scholars have long recognized certain "correlations between aspect and voice, in particular between perfect (resultative) aspect and passive voice" (1981:65) and he has looked in detail at such linkages in Modern Eastern Armenian and Nivkh. Comrie claims that while languages in general have a marked bias towards "A-orientation" ('active voice', Actor Focus) under certain conditions this bias can be weakened in favor of "P-orientation" ('passive', Goal Focus). He argues that "with the perfect one is interested in a state resulting from an earlier situation" and that in such cases "the resultant change of state is attributed primarily to P rather than A". Thus "the perfect would be more likely than other aspects to correlate quite highly with the passive-ergative" (1981:70).

The behavior of Old Javanese *-in-* in the presence of irrealis appears to support Comrie's claim that there is a relationship of perfective aspect and passive-ergative formation, for the *-in-* form has indeed been variously described as passive (Zoetmulder: 1961) and ergative (Herrfurth: 1982).

In addition the Old Javanese *-in-* form can be shown to relate to referential features like "definiteness" that correlate with greater individuation of Object arguments and by extension a greater likliehood of expression inperfective aspect.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Zoetmulder may have been the first to note a correlation of the "*in*-passive" with definiteness of Object arguments:

> "...if the Object is already known, and is thus definite, it is usual to use the passive form; if the Object is not definite, the Active form is used:
>
> *anon ta sira patapan* 'He saw a hermitage.'
>
> *t-in-on [n]ira tékang patapan* 'He saw the hermitage.'"[6]

Definiteness of Object arguments can also be related to the feature termed "individuation of O" in Hopper and Thompson's (1980) study of "features of transitivity". Hopper and Thompson note that Objects that are specially marked as definite ofen "co-vary with other features indicating a higher degree of TRANSITIVITY in their clause" (1981:257). These include features like "volitionality" that have to do with agents, as well as with "affectedness" and "individuation" of Object arguments, all features that can be correlated with Old Javanese constructions taking *-in-*. Hopper and Thompson also bring out the relationship of the "totality" and "telicity" of events to differentiation of Object argements. They cite work by Catford (1976) and Anderson (1976) on Caucasian languages linking "totality" of events to ergative constructions, and point out that there is well known to be a "diachronic relationship between ergativity and perfectivity" among the Polynesian languages (cf. Chung:1977, Anderson:1977).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A comparison of Actor Focus and Goal Focus forms for the Old Javanese verb *tūt* 'follow' shows that increases in a number of Hopper and Thompson's "features of transitivity" can indeed be linked to choice of the ergative form with a punctual aspect that contrasts with a non-specific action neutral with regard to aspect:

(36) sang watek ṛṣi siddha t-**um**-ūt
hon1 *group* *sage* *'effective'* AF2-*follow*

hana ri-ng ākāśa
exist. loc-det *sky, space*

'Those who are sages are able to follow after anything (that moves) in the sky.'[7]

A. participants: 2
B. Kinesis: + action
C. Aspect: atelic
D. Volitionality: +/-
E. Affirmation: +
F. Mode: realis
G. Agency: low
I. Affectedness of Object: 0 (not affected)
J. Individuation of Object: low

(37) t-**in**-ūt-nya sa-para-n ika-ng manuk
GF1-*follow*-pro3 *'everywhere'* deic3-det *bird*

an *pang*-layang (< *mang*-layang + sandhi rule)
sub AF3-*fly*

'He followed after that bird everywhere as it flew (from him)'.[8]

A. participants: 2
B. Kinesis: action
C. Aspect: telic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

D. Volitionality: +
E. Affirmation: +
F. Mode: realis
G. Agency: high
I. Affectedness of O: + (affected)
J. Individuation of O: high

Summary: (37) shows greater "transitivity" than (36) in a number of features, including Aspect, Volitionality, Degree of Agency, Affectedness of Object and Individuation of Object.

The comparison of (36) and (37) above suggests that the Old Javanese *-in-* forms of Goal Focus correlate with increased features of transitivity that can be linked in many instances to perfective and ergative features. These ergative/perfective constructions contrast with less "transitive" constructions taking Actor Focus affixes or *ka-* morphology. The latter constructions tolerate the irrealis mode, thus corroborating the observation made by Hopper and Thompson that in general negative or irrealis modes "show a preference for less Transitive constructions" (1981:273).

While Modern Balinese lacks a marked category of *irrealis* there appear to be aspectual contrasts between Actor Focus verbs taking a nasal prefix and Goal Focus verbs in morphologically unmarked form, with the latter representing the perfective form, or playing a role in temporal sequencing. These contrasts appear to correlate consistently with contrasts maintained in Old Javanese in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the opposition of the agentive and punctual "*in*-passives" with both Actor Focus and "*ka*-passive" forms. We will thus return to the problem of the relationship of verbal Focus and aspect in Chapter Six.

2.6 Topical and non-topical pronouns of Old Javanese

The Old Javanese system of verbal Focus markers has been described above as a system representing role-relations of paricipant NPs within the verbal prediacte itself. In this the Old Javanese system can be termed a "head-marking" system of grammatical agreement. According to Nichols (1986) in a "head-marking" system the relation of NP arguments to the verb is registered on the predicator rather than on the NP arguments themselves, as is the case in "dependent-marking" systems of grammatical agreement.

A number of contemporary typologists have concluded that systems of grammatical agreement have their source in the morphological incorporation of pronouns into verbs or nominal heads (Greenberg: 1978, Givon: 1976, Bresnan and Mchombo: 1987). Starosta, Pawley, and Reid (1982: 148) contend that the AN Focus markers were probably not originally verbal at all, but developed out of earlier nominalizing morphology. But, as analysts as far separated in time as van der Tuuk (1864-67) and Becker & Oka (1987) have pointed out, this nominalizing morphology can itself

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

be shown to have person-marking features at the most basic level.

Bresnan and Mchombo (1987) have suggested that the similarity of grammatical and anaphoric agreement is not accidental, but reflects a complex relationship of grammatical and discourse marking, with differing languages manifesting different degrees to which the anaphoric relationship has been grammaticalized in terms of agreement markers. I have said that in Old Javanese grammatical agreement is a matter of the Focus morphology of the verbal predicate. To the extent this may have once been a pronominal or anaphoric feature of Old Javanese, it had been fully grammaticalized by the time Old Javanese emerged as a written language. However, the Focus system of Old Javanese does interact crucially with the arrangement of the pronominal system as well as with a system of overt "topic markers" involved with marking referential or discourse prominence.

The Old Javanese pronominal system shows interesting similarities with the system of Philippine languages like Tagalog in that a distinction is made between pronouns that are "topical" vs. "non-topical" viz a viz the Focus marking system. Note that "topical" here refers to the system of grammatical agreement, hence to the notion of grammatical 'subjecthood', so long as we understand 'subject' here as neutral in terms of semantic role. The Tagalog pronominal

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

systems is illustrated Figure 1 following.[9]

Figure 1: The Tagalog Pronominal System (*Ang* and *Ng* forms)

	Singular	Plural
1. *Ang* pronouns ('topical'):		
1st person:	ako	kami/(tayo)
2nd person:	ikaw/ka	(kayo)
3rd person:	siya	sila
2. *Ng* pronouns ('non-topical'):		
1st person:	ko	(namin/natin)
2nd person:	mo	ninyo
3rd person:	niya	nila

The resemblance of the Tagalog and Old Javanese pronominal systems is most evident in the third person forms. In Tagalog "topical" forms *siya* and *sila* contrast with "non-topical" forms *niya* and *nila*. In Old Javanese the equivalent forms are *ya/sira* and (enclitic) *-nya/-nira*.

The Old Javanese pronominal system shows clear contrasts of respectful and intimate/non-respectful forms. Note the use of the word *hulun* 'head' in the "humble" forms of 1st and 2nd person pronouns. Placing one's head at the feet of a ruler, religious figure, or deity has long been a primary gesture of devotion and loyalty in Southeast Asia.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This is brought out in Modern Balinese by polite address forms like *cokor I Déwa* 'the foot of my Lord' (used with a high status *satriya*) and *palungguh Ida Peranda* 'the foot of the reverend High Priest' used in addressing a High Priest *(pedanda, peranda)* of *brahmana* status. Major pronouns of Old Javanese are illustrated in Figure 2 following:

Figure 2: The Old Javanese Pronominal Sytem

	Full	Enclitic
1st person:		
(-resp)	aku	-ku
(neutral)	kami, mami	-mami
(humble)	ng-hulun, pinaka-nghulun	
2nd person:		
(-resp)	kanyu, kamu	-nyu/-mu
(neutral/resp)	kita	-ta/-nta
(resp)	rahadyan sang-hulun	
3rd person:		
(-resp/neutral)	ya	-nya
(resp)	sira	-nira

In the Old Javanese system full pronouns represent NP arguments that have the relation of grammatical subject (or 'Focus topic') to the verb, the verb itself specifying the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

semantic role that is played by this NP. Enclitic pronouns, on the other hand, code either Actors that are 'non-subjects' or possessors (in noun phrases) .

If we compare the behaviour of the 3rd person pronouns of Old Javanese under conditions of Actor Focus and Goal Focus, it becomes clear that the contrast of pronouns like *sira* and *-nira* is not one of grammatical case. Thus compare examples (38) and (39) below:

a. *sira* with Actor Focus clause:

(38) **ang**-anugraha ta **sira**
AF3-*royal favor* top pro3(top)

s-um-angga pṛthwItala
'holding up the earth'
'He (Brahma) granted the divine favor (called) Supporting the Earth.'[10]

b. *sira* with Goal Focus clause:

(39) am-wit Sang Kṛṣṇa mulih-a
AF3-*ask leave* hon *Krishna* *go home*-irr

in-anumata **sira** dé Sang Pāṇḍawa
GF1-*agreement* pro3(top) 'by' hon *(name)*

'Krishna asked leave to go home. It was granted him by the Pandavas.'[11]

It is clear from these examples that *sira* represents third person arguments in a "Focus topical" or "subject" relation to the verb, regardless of associated case role. It thus translates alternatively as nominative 'he' or objective 'him' of English. Since *sira* is unmarked for case role it is used as the 'pivotal' argument in a control-verb

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

construction. As in an English passive control-verb constructions 'he' thus stands for both the Object of the matrix clause and the Actor of the embedded clause:

(40) k-**in**-on ta **sira** t-**um**-amèng (tumama + i-ng)
GF1-order top pro3(top) AF2-*enter*-dat-det

ka-bini-hajy-*an*
GF2-*wife of king*-LF

'He was ordered to enter the harem-quarters.'[12]

Because of the constraints limiting the saliency of Object arguments in Actor Focus clause, it is most normal for control-verb constructions to take the *-in-* form for the verb of the matrix clause, as illustrated in (40) above. In this case the *agent* of the control verb can have zero-representation (as in ex.40) or take the indirect pronominal form *-nira* as in example (27), reproduced below as (41):

(41) sandeha ta sang hyang Indra$_i$
worried top hon1 hon2 *Indra*

k-**in**-on-(**n**)**ira** ta Sang Jānapadī
GF1-order-pro3(-top) top hon1 *Janapadi*

mighnani (N-wighna-*ani*) tapa-**nira**$_j$
AF3-*obstacle*-Tr2 *austerities*-pro3(-top)

'Lord Indra$_i$ was worried (about Sang Śaradwan$_j$). It was ordered (by) him$_i$ that Sang Janapadi obstruct his$_j$ austerities.'

Example (41) illustrates the two major functions of *-nira*: (1) coding non-subject *agents* of Goal Focus verbs taking *-in-* and (2) coding *possessors* in *possessive* NPs.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Thus the contrast of *sira* and *nira* does not represent a contrast based on relations like 'subject of' and 'object of', but rather a contrast of pronouns coding the relation of grammatical subject or 'Focus topic' with pronouns that serve agentive and possessive functions, but are not the grammatical subjects of verbs marked for Focus.

2.7 Topic markers in Old Javanese

I have claimed in 2.6 that the Old Javanese pronominal system is internally differentiated in terms of grammatical agreement, that is in terms of whether or not pronominalized forms show agreement with the Focus marker of the verb. The pronominal system also interacts with the morphemes *ta* and *pwa* that have been described variously as 'emphatic particles' or 'topic markers'.

The general function of these particles is to mark discourse prominence. This need not necessarily be of a continued discourse topic, but can be connected with the (momentary) foregrounding of rhematic material, or of 'setting' adjuncts including temporal or locative phrases. Thus in (42) following it is a predicate adjective *(krodha)* that takes is given contrastive prominence with the topic marker, in (43) the preposition introducing a metaphor, and in (44) a phrase establishing the temporal setting of the event. In these cases it appears that *ta* has the function

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of marking intra-clausal prominence:

(42) Krodha **ta** Sang Dewayani ri dé-nira (a)n
angry top hon *(name)* loc *cause*-pro3 subord

p-in-i-singgih buddhi-nira
IFnom-GF1-*respect* *idea*-pro3(-top)

'Sang Dewayani <u>was</u> <u>angry</u> (!) because her idea hadn't been treated with respect.'

(43) Kadi **ta** sira wukir agöng p-*in*-angan
like top pro3(top) *mountain* *great* GF1-*eat*

i-ng gelap
dat-det *darkness*

'<u>As</u> <u>if</u> he were a mountain eaten up by the darkness of night.'[13]

(44) Ri wengi-nya **pwa ya ta** irika
loc *night*-pro3(-top) (top phrase) dat-loc-deic3

Sang Aśwatthāmā amūk ri kulem
hon *(name)* *run amuk* loc *darkness*

'<u>In</u> <u>the</u> <u>dead</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>night</u> there Aśwatthama attacked madly, running amuk in the darkness.'[14]

It is clear in larger stretches of narrative that topic markers *ta* and *pwa* are implicated both in the introduction of new discourse topics and in maintaining reference to topics continued in the discourse. Thus the narrative existential verb *hana* regularly takes *ta* in introducing new discourse topical NPs, as do the unmarked intransitive verbs often associated with the beginnings of narrative sequences. In this case it appears likely that it is cross-clausal prominence that is registered with the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

topic marker, and that it is the nucleus of the clause, both the verb and its major argument, that are brought into discourse prominence:

(45) hana **ta** thāni ma-(a)nak lima-ng siki
exist top *farmer* AF1-*child* *five*-det counter
'There was a farmer (who) had five children.'[15]

(46) tekā **pwa** dewadūta s-*um*-āntwa Sang Ruru
arrive top *god-messenger* AF1-*greet* hon *(name)*
'The messenger of the gods arrived (and) greeted Sang Ruru.'[16]

Topicalized clause nuclei like *hana ta thāni* (45) and *tekā pwa dewadūta* (46) are often found where reference to a continued discourse topic is carried pronominally over a sequence of clauses. In this case, however, the events referred to often have a discrete, sequential, and cause and effect relation that is lacking in topic-chains composed of sequences of Focus predicates referring to a single NP head. Thus compare (47) below with (1), reproduced below as (48):

a. sequence of topicalized clauses

(47) hana **ta** thāni ma-(a)nak lima-ng siki
exist top *farmer* AF1-*child* *five*-det counter
(u)m-ilu *manaḍah* (*maN*-taḍah) bhojana
AF2-*join* AF3-*eat* *food*
ma-werö **ta** ya dé ni-ng pana-madya
AF1-*drunk* top pro3(top) 'by' gen-det *liquor*
mang-inep **ta** ya tan wenang *(u)m*-ulih
AF3-*sleep over* top pro3(top) *not* *able* AF2-*go home*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ri-ng desa-nya
loc-det *village*-pro3

'There was a farmer with five sons. (They all) went out togehter to feast. They got drunk from hard liquor. They (had to) spend the night, (for) they were not able to return home to their village.'[17]

b. topic-chain

(48) jaladha **a**-hireng **(u)m**-ider **a**-langlang
raincloud(s) AF1(sta)-*black* AF2-*whirl* AF1-*wander*

ang-uhuh **ami**-rengw-*aken* pater
AF3-wail AF3-IFnom-*hear*-Tr1 *thunder*

'Thick rainclouds whirled about, wandering across the sky, wailing, and sounding out (their) thunder.'

In constructions where one agentive action is seen as background to another the 'more transitive' form typically takes the 'topicalized' form of the clause. This is true of example (19) above, reproduced below as (49):

(49) **mang**-adeg **ta** **sira** t-**um**-inggal-**aken**
AF3-*stand up* top proe(top) AF2-*left behind*-Tr1

pa-turw-*an*-(n)ira
AF1/nom-*sleep*-LF-pro3(-top)

'He stood up, leaving behind his sleeping place.'

The functions of marking intra-clausal and cross-clausal prominence appear to coincide in the use of the topic marker *ta* with benefactive, control-verb and other complex constructions. In this case the type of Focus predicate chosen is nearly always the 'more ergative' *-in-* form of Goal Focus, and the clause appears in the form:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

VP - topic marker - subject/Focus topical NP (A or O)

Since Old Javanese is a "head-marking" language this type of arrangement has the advantage of placing maximum intra-clausal attention on the initial verbal constituent, the constituent containing the major grammatical information in the clause. This is an especially important factor where the Focus predicate is morphologically complex, as in the case of benefactives, control-verb constructions, and other constructions involving multiple participants or mediated action.

The topicalized form of the clause allows the verbal head of complex constructions to be brought into discourse prominence, along with its major argument (as marked by the Focus morphology) which appears invariably following the topic marker. If this argument is pronominal it takes the form *ya* or *sira*, regardless of its case-role relation to the verb. Other arguments of the verb typically appear in prepositional phrases (although some ditransitive verbs allow two arguments to be in an absolutive relation to the verb).

A typical example of the kind of complex construction triggering the topicalized form of the clause is illustrated by the benefactive illustrated in (49). This is a semantically and morphologically complex form based ultimately on *pulih* 'healed'. The form *pina-pulih-aken* found in (49) shows the Goal Focus form *(pina-)* of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

morpheme *pa-* used to derive the causative stem **pa-pulih* 'bring back to health'. Surface forms derived from this stem include Actor Focus forms like ***amapulihaken*** *(aN-pa-pulih-aken)* 'return to the fight on behalf of' and Goal Focus forms like *pina-pulihaken* of (49) below:

(49) **p-in-a**-pulih-**aken** **ta** **sira**
GF1-AF1/nom-*healed*-Tr1 top pro3(top)(resp)

dé ni-ng watek Korawa-bala
'by' gen-det *troop(s)* *Kaurava army*

'For his sake there was a (furious) rushing back to the attack by the Kaurava army.'[18]

The form of topicalized clausal arrangement can be used to demonstrate that pronominal agents of the "*in*-passive" are incorporated into the verbal predicate. Thus, while *sira* and *ya* are always found separated from the verb by the marker *ta*, this is never the case for *-nira* or *-nya*. These pronominal clitics remain in an inseparable relation to the verb in 'topicalized' constructions, as is illustrate in (50) below:

(50) p-**in**-anah-**nira** **ta** ika-ng uṇḍi
GF1-*bow/arrow*-pro3(-top) top deic3-det *ball*

ri-ng alalang
loc-det *lalang grass*

'Shot by him was that ball in the grass.'[19]

Like other 'true' pronouns *ya/sira* and *-nya/-nira* have anaphoric functions. Functions of Old Javanese *-nira/-nya* thus can be compared to anaphoric functions played by

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Malay-Indonesian *-nya*. As McCune and Simin (1983:77) point out this pronominal enclitic can refer to "(a) possession by, or (b) inference from some entity previously mentioned or present in the situation." This means that a discourse topical actant that is present in the case-frame as an agent, but is not the "Focus subject" of a clause, can be represented in the possessive/anaphoric form. This is illustrated in (51) following:

(51) *(u)m*-ālocita *ka*-cidra-*n* ika-ng daitya
AF2-*consider* GF2-*defect*-LF deic3-det *demon*

in-iring-**nira** **ta** kāla-deśa-nya
GF1-*incline*-pro3(-top) top *time and place*-pro3(-top)

'(He) considered the weaknesses of that demon. Followed (by) him was the rule of time and place.'[20]

The contrast of examples like (19) and (49), where the pronominal form is *sira*, and (50) and (51), where it is *-nira*, suggests the following generalizations:

> *sira* is chosen where the functions of grammatical agreement and discourse topicality overlap, that is where a continued discourse topic is also the entity picked out as 'grammatical subject' by the Focus affix(es) of the verb.
>
> *-nira* is chosen either for "possessive" or "inferential" functions of anaphora, or in cases where discourse topicality does not coincide with grammatical agreement, where anaphoric reference is to a continued discourse topic that has a crucial case-relation to the action (that of *agent*), but is not currently the subject (or Focus topic) of the clause.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Old Javanese thus appears to support the claims of linguists like Bresnan & Mchombo (1987) that "clear syntactic differences exist between grammatical and anaphoric agreement" (p. 768). In Old Javanese the 'topic marking' morphemes involved in establishing intra-clausal and cross-clausal prominence are crucially involved at just those points where there is maximum convergence of the systems of grammatical and anaphoric agreement.

2.8 Conclusions

Old Javanese is a "head-marking" system of grammatical marking with a highly developed "participant-marking" type of verbal morphology that codes grammatical agreement in terms of semantic roles indicated by Focus affixes. This system of verbal marking may have evolved from the incorporation of originally person-marking systems, a fact that may be reflected in the high capacity of Focus predicates to appear in topic-chains with zero-anaphora of 'subject' NPs. Both Actor Focus and Goal Focus are fully developed categories in Old Javanese, and are internally differentiated in terms of semantic features including volitionality and agency.

The pronominal system of Old Javanese interacts crucially with the system of grammatical marking, and pronouns take differing form depending on whether or not

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

anaphoric functions converge with functions related to discourse topicality. Old Javanese also possesses deictic articles that are important in establishing spatio-temporal elements of the text, in addition to playing important roles in discourse-anaphoric reference.

The Old Javanese systems of grammatical and anaphoric agreement also interact with a system of overt "topic markers" that are active in establishing both intra-clausal and cross-clausal prominence.

At the beginning of this chapter I made the claim that Old Javanese represents the elaborated linguistic code of a Sanskritized elite at the center of Javanese political and religious power, one in which participant-marking structures are brought to the foreground in the organization of discourse. If this is true, then we might suppose that there existed other 'dialects' or 'speech levels' alongside the "participant-salient" variety found in most Old Javanese texts.

There is, in fact, internal evidence suggesting that more "event-salient" forms of discourse did co-exist alongside the elaborated discourse typical of formal Old Javanese. This is especially evident in works like the *Tantri Kāmandaka (TK)* that combine a narrative framework in formal Old Javanese with animal tales from an essentially oral genre. These often contain quoted speech that appears very much to be of an informal or colloquial type.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Examples (52) and (53) following illustrate the contrast of formal and colloquial styles evident in quoted speech recorded in the 'Story of the Greedy Heron' from the *Tantri Kāmandaka*. In the first example (52) the greedy heron speaks in the guise of a religious mendicant, thus employing a formal, almost 'liturgical' style with full elaboration of Focus morphology and pronominal reference, and a Sanskritized vocabulary. In the second example (53) the heron and crab slip into an 'abbreviated' form of spoken discourse appropriate to the urgency of their confrontation. The dialogue quoted here is charac- terized by reduction of phonological material in pronominal forms, absence of Sanskritic lexical materials, reduction of dependence on verbal morphology, and predominance of unmarked topic-comment structures:

(52) Hooykaas 1929: 120.25-31

"Aum sang mīna kabéh,
dé-nta sama-**a**-takw-**an** ri buddhi ning-hulun,
réh-nya bheda buddhi ning-hulun tan kadi-ing uni,
wus **mang**-renge **ma**mi tutur sang paṇḍita.
Warahda **ma**-tutur,
yékā (ya-ikā) nimitta tan kadi-ing uni.
Tiba ning **mam**-(p)anggih pāpa-krama,
yékā wedi ning-ulun.
Ka-hyun mami mangké **mang**-ulah-**aken** tapa
um-ungsiréng śūnya,
ma-hayw-a ring ulah ayu, mwang śabda manohara."

The heron said:

"*Om, all of you fish.*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

You ask, all of you, about what I'm like,
the reason that I'm no longer as I used to be.
It's because I have heard the words of a holy man.
His teaching was of great benefit, that is the reason
that I'm no longer as I was.
To fall into evil ways, that is now my greatest fear.
I wish to practice austerities here and now,
Aimed at arriving at the blessed state of śūnya,
enjoying graceful movements, and sounds pleasant to
the ear."

(53) Hooykaas 1929: 124.28-35

"Iki kapo de-nya **a**-māngsa mīna kabéh."
Mojar ikang yuyu, lingnya:

"E Sang Baka,
aywa ta aku dé-nta 0-salah-**aken** iringké,
waluya-**aken** ng-wang ring talaga muwah.
Yan iki mangké kita tan **um**-(w)alyu-**aken** irikang
talaga muwah,
mati ko mene dé-ning-ulun."

Arep 0-supit tenggek-nya si baka dé-nikang yuyu,
lingnya:

"Mati kari ya ta aku !"
"Mati ngko yan tan kita-**am**-(w)awa muwah ring kami,
um-(p)aréng talaga Malini."

Mangkana ling-nya ikang yuyu.

English:

The crab saw a flat rock covered with the bones of
fish. He thought to himself:

"Hey, these must all be the fish eaten up by
him."
The crab spoke, saying:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Hey Mr. Heron, don't me wrong here,
Take me back again to the lake,
If you don't take me back to the lake this minute,
I'm gonna kill you right now."

The heron felt like his neck was about to be snapped by the crab, and he said:

"I'm gonna die for sure !"
"You'll die all right if ya don't take me right back to the Malini lake,"

that's what the heron said.

Examples (52) and (53) suggest that there were differences of disourse-syntactic organization for formal and informal styles of Old Javanese. While the materials cited here are not sufficient to give definitive proof of the existence of such differences, they certainly point in that direction, and suggest that further investigation might yield corroborating evidence.

In Chapters Seven and Eight we will compare passages from Balinese *mabasan* narratives and *satua* folk talesthat reflect similar contrasts of discourse-syntactic organization for formal vs. colloquial forms of discourse.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

[1] Schachter and Otanes (1972:6) give the following definition of Focus:

> "FOCUS is the feature of a verbal predicate that determines the semantic relationship between the predicate verb and its topic. This feature of verbal predicates is associated with the verbal affixes."

[2] I have excluded from this citation one element of Benjamin's description that is not relevant to the case of Old Javanese:

> "...a lexicon derived morphologically from a relatively small body of roots by reference to certain general and abstract semantic notions." (1987:13)

Old Javanese was very much like Sanskrit in the sense of being a reservoir of lexical forms with many sources of input. Because Old Javanese was a written, literary language whose preservation was supported by religious belief, its lexicon was like a pool that had no outlets. It was a closed system in which lexical items once accepted had a permanent place, and could not slip into forgetfulness in the transient and ever-innovating stream of everyday speech.

[3] The prefix *mar-* is found commonly in Old Malay and Old Balinese, but appears in Old Javanese only in a few words like *bangun* 'arise, wake up' that appear to be borrowings from Malay. Since AN *-r* and *-g* can be related through van der Tuuk's Second Law (RGH), it is possible that there is a relationship of Old Malay/Old Balinese *mar-* and Tagalog *mag-*. This is a subject that merits further attention.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[4] Van der Tuuk had noticed the person-marking characteristics of the formant *m-* in the verbal morphology of Toba Batak as early as 1867:

> "With regard to the prefix *ma:* what else can it be but a pronominal word and originally a pronoun of the 3rd person ?" ([1864-67] 1971: 122)

[5] HW 26.6

[6] AW 2.1

[7] The situation is complicated for Old Javanese in that bases taking *-um-* can also take the transitivizing suffix *-aken* that indicates a secondary orientation of the verb towards an "affected complement".

[8] Ad 92.18

[9] AW 1.12

[10] HW 4.1

[11] Kor 192.13

[12] There are some cases where a *ma-* verb appears to be transitive, a problem that is also found with Malay *ber-* with similar functions. Zoetmulder describes the Old Javanese 'transitive' uses of *ma-* as statives that have domain over the entire complement, e.g. the verb plus a qualifying NP:

> "Quite often words with the prefix *ma-* appear as if they take an object, for example:
>
> *ma-gawé yajña* - to carry out ritual
>
> But like Indonesian words that have the prefix *ber*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which also share the nature [of *ma-*], these are not transitive verbs, but rather compound words which have been given a prefix (*ma-* gawé yajña)." (BP I.57-8)

A similar approach is taken for Malay by Macdonald (1976:46), who describes Malay forms like *ber-isi* 'contain water' as Subject-Verb constructions where the affix has range over a compound NP. In commenting on his analysis Benjamin (1987:27) note that a construction like *dia ber-tanam padi* 'he plants rice' will not indicate an "acted-upon object", but rather that the subject is "characterised by the activity of planting", e.g. it is his occupation.

[13] BP I.89

[14] BP I.78

[15] BP I.79

[16] BP I.81

[17] JñS 108.11

[18] Utt 52.19, cited in OJE (II), p. 2081

[19] BP II.87

[20] Ud 11.8, cited in OJE (1), p.623

[21] Ad 42.31

[22] Ad 42.31. Note that the agentive NP *hima* 'snow' does not take the preposition *dé*, but is rather apposited directly to the verb phrase. While pronominal agents of Old Javanese *ka*-R-(suffix) forms require the agentive preposition *dé*,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

full NP agents do not.

[23] Ad 81.16

[24] Ad 78.3

[25] BP I.107

[26] BP I.113

[27] Ad 59.24

[28] RY 23.71

[29] OJO 26 (907) 20, cited in OJW (I), p. 13

[30] RY 4.54

[31] BP I.67

[32] BP I.67

[33] Sut 131.9

[34] BP I.66

[35] BP I.64

[36] For this reason I have retained in this thesis the notation LF (= "Locative Focus") used by Schachter & Otanes for the *-an* suffix of Tagalog.

[37] RY I.25

[38] Ad. 125.18

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[39] BP I.97

[40] BP I.97

[41] BP I.98

[42] BP I.98

[43] Ad 195.8 (in Kirtya typescript of Juynboll:1906 = 189.6)

[44] AD 140.8

[45] TK 38.17-19 (in Hooykaas:1929); 13a.2-4 in Kirtya Z 3479

[46] GK 43.11, cited in OJE (II), p. 2081

[47] Note that the irrealis marker *-a* appears twice in this example, once suffixed directly to the verb, once following the 2nd person pronominal enclitic *-mw/-mu*. Old Javanese may be unique in allowing multiple irrealis marking (as in example 35), as well as irrealis marking of lexemes other than verbs.

[48] AW 8.4

[49] TK 56.21 (in Hooykaas:1929)

[50] Kana cites Jespersen's observation that "the passive turn [voice] may facilitate the connection of one sentence with another" (1965:168) as one motivation for the choice of the *di-* form in Indonesian. She notes that there are very common "same subject sequences... in which all verbs after the first are in the passive" (1983:25).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[51] BP I.76

[52] Udy 49.10, cited in OJE 2081

[53] Udy 42.13

[54] I have not included the "*sa* pronouns" of Tagalog in Figure 1. These represent non-topical arguments of a locative or directional nature that do not have direct counterparts in Old Javanese.

[55] Ad 46.12

[56] Ad 192.7

[57] Udy 9.14

[58] BP I.85

[59] BP II.86

[60] BP II.91

[61] BP II.89

[62] BP II.88

[63] BP II.89

[64] Wir 71.34, cited in OJE 1437

[65] BP II.22

[66] Udy 9.14

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER THREE

EVIDENCE OF OLD MALAY AND OLD BALINESE

3.0 Introduction

After the year 1016 A.D. the written inscriptions of Bali ceased being written in the Old Balinese language and were written instead in Old Javanese.[1] This was no temporary aberration, for Javanese influence continued to wax on Bali, especially after 1343, the year that the East Javanese kingdom of Majapahit took political control of Bali.

The form that Javanese influence took on Bali during the pre-modern period was thus complicated both by historical events and by the complex relationship of the culture and language of the Javanized nobility to that of the general population, who experienced Javanese influence indirectly, through the medium of courtly behaviour, art, and ritual. As a result Modern Balinese reflects Javanese elements, especially in the lexicon of the *alus* registers that preserve the dialect of the Javanized noble classes of Bali, but the reflection is imperfect, and Javanese and Balinese do not 'line up' in the matter of *alus* lexicon.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Zurbuchen (1987) has suggested that this imperfect resemblance of Balinese and Javanese *alus* forms is a consequence of the historical setting in which the commoner population of Balinese encountered the Javanized nobility. The latter, says Zurbuchen, probably used an informal register of Javanese among themselves. Elements of this language were then incorporated into the speech of Balinese retainers wishing to address their patrons with Javanese terms. As Zurbuchen explains, this helps to account "for the noticeable presence in modern Balinese *alus* vocabulary of many Javanese terms classified as 'low' *(Ngoko)* in Javanese" (1981:22).

In this chapter we will will look at basic morphology and syntax of Old Balinese and Old Malay, two Sanskritized languages contemporaneous with Old Javanese and products of many of the same forces that shaped the evolution of Old Javanese.

Old Balinese is especially important for this thesis as it allows us to see, however imperectly, the linguistic base of Modern Balinese <u>before</u> the beginning of Javanese influence, at a period when Bali had already undergone afirst wave of Sanskritization (prior to the tenth century A.D.), but before the second wave of Indian influence mediated through the process of Javanization.

The striking divergences that Modern Balinese shows with Modern Javanese have led some analysts to place

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Balinese in a separate sub-group along with Sasak, spoken on the nearby island of Lombok, separated on the east from Bali by only about twenty miles. Teeuw (1965), however, notes the difficulties arising from the complicated historical developments in the entire area and suggests that we are not yet at the point that such sub-groupings can be made with confidence:

> "Present-day Bal.,Jav. and the Sas(ak) dialects, all in their own way, seem to be the result of a long and complicated local development - with more or less important outside borrowings - and before embarking upon the comparison of these languages with distantly related languages, one should try to trace back as carefully and as far as possible this local development, for which many data still await exploration. It is moreover far from certain that a uniform proto-Javanese, proto-Balinese, proto-Sasak should be postulated as the beginning of this development." (p.280)

We will look here at Old Malay and Old Balinese as further examples of historical languages of the Indonesian area representing the formal Sanskritized dialects of emergent political elites.

3.1 Evidence of the Old Malay inscriptions

Old Malay is known from only a few inscriptions, but these provide fairly comprehensive evidence of the major morphosyntactic forms of Old Malay.[2] The sketch of Old Malay that follows is based on three of these inscriptions:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1. Telaga Batu (ca. 686 A.D.) recorded on an 'oath-taking' stone and formulated as an oath of loyalty to the king (*datu*) of Śriwijaya

2. Kota Kapur (dated 606 Śaka, 684 A.D.) recording the commencement of a Śriwijayan punitary expedition against the island of Java (*bhumi Java*).

3. Talang Tuwo (dated 606 Śaka, 684 A.D.) recording the completion of the *Śrikṣetra* garden ordered built by one Śri Jayanāsa, presumed to have been the Śriwjayan overlord who ordered all three inscriptions.

Of these inscriptions the first, edited by de Casparis (1956), is the longest and the most useful, while the two shorter inscriptions (Kota Kapur and Talang Tuwo) can be used to provide corroboration of some details.

3.2 Old Malay Focus Morphology

Old Malay possesses a system of verbal "Focus" markers and its pronominal system has contrasts of 'topical' and 'non-topical' pronouns similar to those found in Old Javanese. While both Actor and Goal Focus affixes are found in the Old Malay system it was the Goal Focus forms taking *ni-* that appear to have predominated in terms of frequency.

The basic verbal morphology of Old Malay is illustrated in Figure 3. Also included in this chart are verbal substantives formed with *ka*-R, *par*-R, and *pang*-R. The status of *pang*-R forms is uncertain in Old Malay. Thus far I have found evidence for *pang-* only in the word

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pam-valya-ngku (PI II 36.25-6). It seems probable that *pam-* here represents *pang-*, but that (regressive) assimilation has triggered homorganic change of the nasal to a form consistent with the labio-dental initial of the base *(-valya)*.

Figure 3: The Old Malay verb

a. true verbs

	R-0	R -i	R-aken
0-R	vangun		
ni-R	ni-minum	ni-ujar-i	
ni-par-R			ni-par-sumpah-akan
mar-R	mar-coraka		
mang-R	mang-rakṣa	mang-ujar-i	
ma-R	ma-kāryya*		
ma-ka-R	maka-gila		
mi-R2	mi-ayu-ayu[3]		

b. verbal substantives

	R-0	R-an	R-an-a
ka-R	ka-mulang	ka-datw-an	ka-vuat-an-a
par-R		par-vuat-an	
pang-R	pam-valya-(ngku)		

**Ma-karyya* is unique among *ma*-R forms in Old Malay and may represent a borrowing from Old Javanese.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

3.3 Actor Focus affixes in Old Malay

From the inscriptions we know that Old Malay possessed Actor Focus markers *mar-*, *mang-*, *ma-*, and *mi-*. As noted in notes on Figure 4, *ma-* and *mi-* are of minor importance in the Old Malay system, *mar-* and *mang-* being much more commonly attested.

Mar- has both intransitive and transitive uses in Old Malay, and should perhaps be interpreted as a verb of the "Middle Voice", the course which is taken by Benjamin for Modern Malay *ber-* with similar properties.

Examples of Old Malay Actor Focus clauses taking *mar-* verbs are illustrated in examples following:

a. *mar-* as stative (taking nominal base)

(1) kadāci **kāmu**
whenever [<Skt *kadācit*] pro2(top)

mar-corakāra hīna-maddhyottama-jāti...
AF1-*thieving* [Skt] *low-medium-high-class* [Skt]

'(If ever <u>you</u>) <u>commit</u> <u>theft</u> of the low, middling, or highest types...'[4]

(2) athavā **kāmu**
or [Skt] pro2(top)

mar-vuddhi-śāraṇa ri lai...
AF1-'*take counsel*' [Skt] loc *others*

tīda **kāmu** **mar**-pādaḥ
not pro2(top) AF1-*foot* [Skt]

dari hulun-tuhā-**ṅku**...
source/accomp *heads-elders*-pro1

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'Or if ever you take counsel to conspire with others...(or) you are not submissive to my chiefs and elders...'[5]

b. *mar-* as transitive taking verbal base

(3) kadāci **kāmu** **mar**-vuat vini hāji
whenever pro2 AF1-*make* *women of king*

an tahu an t(e)ngah rumaḥ
subord *know* subord *middle* *house*

'If ever you make the women of the king find out about the inner (secrets) of the palace...'[6]

Old Malay *mang-* forms transitive Actor Focus verbs in most cases, although at least one *mang-* verb can be associated with an (outer-directed) intransitive form. For some bases the *mang-* derivation can form transitive verbs that take Object arguments without addition of a suffix, while for others we find affixation of the suffix *-i*, a transitivizing suffix oriented towards locative-like Goals. I have found the transitivizing suffix *-akan* so far only with Goal Focus forms in Old Malay, and have not found this affix associated in the inscriptional evidence with Actor Focus forms.

Old Malay *mang*-R forms are also found with the suffix -ā, a morpheme that appears to mark the same mode of *irrealis* that is marked with *-a* in Old Javanese. Examples of Old Malay clauses based on *mang*-R predicates are given in examples folllowing:

a. *mang*-R in unsuffixed and irrealis form

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(4) athavā **kāmu** **mang**-alit mas mani
or [Skt] pro2(top) AF2-*small* *gold* *jewel(s)*

malūn **mang**-ruru-**a** ka-dātu-an-ku
'before' ? AF2-*destroyed*-irr GF2-*king*-LF-pro1(-top)

'(Or if you) deplete (the treasury of) gold and jewels, with intent to destroy my kingdom...'[7]

b. *mang*-R forms taking the suffix *-i*

(5) tuvi mulam kadācI **kāmu**
moreover *whenever* [< Skt] pro2(top)

mang-ujar-**i** yang **mam**ava (**maN**-vava) dravya
AF2-*speak*-Tr2 rel AF2-*carry* *wealth* [Skt]

athavā **mang**-ujar-**i** diri-nya
or [Skt] AF2-*speak*-Tr2 *self*-pro3

urang an t(e)ṅaḥ rumaḥ
person(s) subord *middle* *house*

'(Moreover if ever you) speak to those who carry about (my) wealth , or speak to the persons of those who are within the middle of the palace (about my wealth)...'[8]

Note that *mang*-R forms allow for zero-anaphora of grammatical subjects with the relation of Actor/*agent* to the action (exs. 4 & 5). Note also that (except under unusual circumstances) *mang*-R forms take "topical" pronouns as subjects (*kāmu* in exs. 4 & 5). This suggests that pronouns like *kāmu* have the properties of marking grammatical subjects of verbs marked for Focus. However, we will find in looking at the Goal Focus constructions of Old Malay that full pronouns also appear in grammatical agreement with these verbs, hence that we must understand

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the notion of 'subject' here as applying to arguments showing grammatical agreement regardless of underlying semantic role. (For Old Malay as for Old Javnaese, this is represented in the Focus morphology of the verb.)

3.4 Goal Focus affixes of Old Malay

The primary marker of Goal Focus forms in Old Malay is *ni-*, an affix that can be understood as a reflex of PAN **ni-/-in-*, hence as cognate with *-in-/in-* of Old Javanese and Philippine languages, and *di-* of Malay. All of these affixes are Goal Focus markers, some of them retaining the nominalizing characteristics that Starosta, Pawley, and Reid (1982) suggest were original to the AN Focus affixes.[9]

Old Malay *ni*-R predicates appear both in simple unsuffixed form, and in derivations taking *-par-* and/or *-akan*. Old Malay Goal Focus clauses taking *ni-* are illustrated in examples following:

(6) kadāci kāmu tIda bhakti
whenever pro2(top) *not* *loyal/worship* [Skt]

dy aku **ni**-vunuh **kāmu** sumpah
loc pro1(top) GF-*kill* pro2(top) *curse*

'If ever you are disloyal to me <u>you</u> (will) <u>be</u> <u>killed</u> (by the) curse.'[10]

(7) yuvarāja rājakumāra... yaṅ **ni**-saṃvarddhi-**ku**
(types of prince) rel GF1-*raise in rank*-pro(-top)

akan datu-a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

goal/fut *king*-irr

'Princes of the rank of Yuvaraja, Rajakumara (etc.) who have been raised (by) me to the rank of Datu (district chief)...'[11]

It is also common for *ni*-R-(suffix) forms to be used in creating 'gap' relative clauses (e.g. relative clauses without a relative pronoun). Thus note the modifying role of the Goal Focus predicate *(ni-minum-māmu)* in (8) following:

(8) kadāci kāmu tīda bhakti...
whenever pro2(top) *not* *loyal/worship* [Skt]

dy-aku **ni**-vunuh **kāmu**
loc-pro1(top) GF1-*kill* pro2(top)

sumpah **ni**-minum-(**m**)**āmu**
curse GF1-*drink*-pro2(-top)

'If ever you are disloyal to me you (will be) killed (by) the oath (that is) drunk (by) you!'[12]

There are also Goal Focus constructions taking the form *ni-par*-R-*akan*. These resemble "mediate action" or causative constructions taking *pa(ng)*- in Tagalog and Old Javanese. The *-par-* of Old Malay thus appears to indicate the presence of 'Mediate Actor' NPs involved in the performance of the action of the underlying base. Illustrations of Old Malay *ni-par*-R-(suffix) forms are given following:

(9) yuvarāja rājakumāra...yaṅ *ni*-saṃvarddhi-ku
(types of prince) rel GF1-*raise in rank*-pro1(-top)

akan datu-a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

goal/fut *king*-irr

ni-par-sumpah-**akan** **kāmu**
GF1-A2F-*oath*-TR1 pro2(top)

'Princes of the rank of Yuvaraja, Rajakumara (etc.) who have been raised (by) me to the rank of Datu (district chief)- <u>you</u> have been <u>sworn</u> <u>to</u> the oath !'[13]

(10) tatkāla-nya parlak Śrīkṣetra **ni-par**-vuat
'that time'-pro3 *garden* *Śrīkṣetra* GF1-A2F-*make*

parwa-n Dapunta Hyang Śri Jayanaśa
order-lig hon hon (divine) hon *Jayanaśa*

'At that time the garden of Shriksetra (was) <u>caused</u> <u>to</u> <u>be</u> <u>built</u> (at) the order of His Highness, the most holy Lord, Śrī Jayanaśa.'[14]

Old Malay *ni*-R-(suffix) and *ni-par*-R-(suffix) forms thus encompass important functions of Goal Focus forms based on *-in*-R-(suffix) and *pina*-R-(suffix) morphology in Old Javanese. Thus we can see in examples like (8) above that full pronouns and enclitic pronouns (*kāmu* and *-māmu*) interact with these Goal Focus forms in ways similar to those found for Old Javanese pronominal forms like *sira* and *-nira*. In the following section we will look more closely at the implications in this split in pronominal useage in Old Malay, and at its relation to what Alieva (1980) has termed a "possessive typology" in syntax.

3.5 The Old Malay pronominal system

As in the case of Old Javanese or Tagalog, the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pronominal system of Old Malay shows evidence of a "topical" vs. "non-topical" distinction, that is of pronouns that show grammatical agreement with verbs marked for Focus, and those that do not. However, in the Old Malay system this contrast is maintained in morphology only in the 2nd person forms (*kāmu* vs. *-māmu*). Other pronouns contrast in being in full or enclitic form (e.g. 1st person *aku* vs. *-ku*, 3rd person *ya* vs. *-nya*). The enclitic forms show some phonological reduction compared to the full/unbound forms.

The Old Malay pronominal system is illustrated in Figure 4.[15]

Figure 4: The Old Malay Pronominal System

a. full pronouns	Singular/Plural
1st person:	aku
second person:	kāmu
third person:	ya/iya
b. dependent (enclitic) pronouns	
1st person:	-ku
second person:	-māmu
third person:	-ña (-nya)

Examples of the use of pronominal clitics to mark the agents of *ni*-R-(suffix) predicates can be found in examples

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(6) - (8) above. Enclitic pronouns can also be used in Old Malay to code *possessors* or *reference to prior text*, what McCune and Simin term "inference" (1983:77). *Possessive* and *discourse anaphoric* uses of enclitic pronouns in Old Malay are illustrated in examples following:[16]

a. enclitic pronoun used to code *possessor* in NP:

(11) *ni*-suruh tāpik kāmu dañan
GF1-*order* *punish* pro2(top) accomp

gotra-**māmu** santāna-**māmu**
lineage-pro2(-top) *descendants*-pro2(-top)

'(It) will be ordered that you are punished, along with <u>your</u> entire lineage and all <u>your</u> descendants.'[17]

b. (Third Person) enclitic pronoun used to establish *inference, reference to prior text:*

(12) *ni*-pahat di wela-**nya**
GF1-*sculpt, carve* loc *time*-pro3(-top)

ya-ng wala... *ka*-liwat...
pro3-det *army* GF-*go by*

'Engraved at <u>the</u> time the army passed by...'[18]

Thus, while enclitic pronouns of Old Malay on the one hand code *agents* of Goal Focus verbs taking *ni-*, on the other they are used to code *possessors* (or "inference") in NPs. This coincidence of the *agentive* pronominal function with that of the *possessive* appears to support the claim of Starosta, Pawley, and Reid (1982) that the AN Focus markers were originally involved in nominal derivation from unmarked verbal bases. It is also reminiscent of the behaviour of pronominal forms in what has been described as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a "possessive syntactic typology" by the Russian linguists Meschchaninov and Alieva.

3.6 Evidence for a *possessive* typology in Old Malay

The association of *agentive* and *possessive* functions of pronominal clitics is well illustrated in Western AN languages, but has received relatively little attention. In one of few such studies to date Alieve (1980) describes this association in terms of a "possessive syntactical type" represented in Modern Malay. Alieve bases her analysis on the work of the Soviet linguist Meschchaninov, a linguist of the generation just past who was a pioneer in typological studies in the Soviet Union.

Meschchaninov had worked extensively on studies of typology and as early as 1940, says Alieve, had formulated a system of typology based on "ways of expressing subject-object relations in a sentence, taking into account their nominal, verbal, and pronominal morphology, as well as their semantics and functioning". (1980:418) Meschchaninov proposed three basic types of syntactic structure: the nominative, the ergative, and the possessive. He had found evidence for the possessive type among the "Paleoasiatic" languages, says Alieve, while working on the typology of ergative systems:

"While studying the evolution of the ergative structure

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of a sentence in many languages Meshchaninov also discovered elements of the possessive system, which was revealed through the subject of the action being expressed by the genitive form of a noun or a pronoun." (1980:418)

Alieve says of this possessive syntactic type:

"In speaking of a language of the possessive syntactical type... the notion *possessive structure* acquires a new dimension. The expression of the fact that an object belongs to its owner, which is typical of nominative languages in which the possessive structure is taken as a nominal word group... is also given a new dimension, i.e. that of an action belonging to its doer (agent). The doer of the actions is expressed by a possessive attribute, in the same way as the subject of possession." (1980:419)

The *possessive syntactic* type is realized, says Alieve, in Modern Malay sentences like the following:

(13) Ini ¦ buku-buku-**nya**
This ¦ books-his

'These are his books.'

(14) Buku ini ¦ sudah dibaca-**nya**
Book this ¦ already read his

'This book has already been read by him.'

If we compare the possessive NP in (13) with forms like Old Malay *gotra-māmu* in (11) above we see a clear resemblance in the typology of Old and Modern Malay possessive forms. This is also true if we compare *agentive* forms like those found for Modern Malay in (14) and for Old Malay in the *ni*-R-(suffix) froms of examples (7) - (9). In

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

thus showing the regular correspondence of *possessive* and *agentive* forms Old Malay thus exemplifies what Alieve terms the "possessive syntactic type" found in parts of Modern Malay.[19]

If we schematize the constituents of Old Malay NPs taking pronominal expression of *possessors* and Goal Focus clauses taking *ni*-R verbs with pronominal clitics, a clear pattern of resemblance emerges:

(a) possessive noun phrase with pronominal possessor:

gotra-santāna-nya

'his lineage and descendants'

NP + clitic pronoun

(b) Goal Focus clause with pronominal agent:

sumpah ni-minum-(m)āmu

'the (water of the) oath drunk (by) you'

NP + *ni*-verb + clitic pronoun

Comparing the constituent order of types (a) and (b) we find that a formal resemblance emerges that supports the claim that the "possessive syntactic type" is represented in the Goal Focus forms of Old Malay. While Old Malay preserves this "possessive" form in all theree persons, in Modern Malay the correspondence of *agentive* and *possessive* functions of pronominal clitics is preserved only in 3rd person. In 1st and 2nd persons proclitic forms (*ku-*, *kau-*, etc.) have replaced the enclitic forms of languages like Old Malay.[20] Thus the "possessive typology" that Alieve has

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

proposed as characteristic of the 'passive' system of Modern Malay was, if anything, more highly developed in Old Malay.[21]

Old Malay appears to represent in some sense a "split-ergative" system, in which the *ni-* forms are formally differentiated from other constructions in taking "possessive structure". In this type of syntactic arrangement Goal/Undergoer arguments are in the absolutive relation to the verb, while the agent takes a special form, e.g. the anaphoric pronominal enclitic used otherwise to code *possessive* or *inferential* reference.

3.7 Old Malay: conclusions

Old Malay shows many typological similarities with Old Javanese, especially in terms of the functions of Focus morphology and the interaction of this system with anaphoric and grammatical functions of pronouns.

Writers like Teeuw (1965) have demonstrated the existence of dialectical differences between Old Javanese and Old Malay in regard to phonological features like R_2 (RLD: van der Tuuk's First Law). However, Old Malay also records forms like the locative preposition *ri* (cf. ex.2 above) that in Teeuw's analysis belongs to Old Javanese alongside the 'true' Malay form *di* (cf. exs.6, 8, 10 above). This suggests that the written language we know

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

through the Old Malay inscriptions may have represented a dialect that was *primus inter pares* among the dialects of emergent political forces, but which had not yet become powerful enough to exclude variants to be found in the dialects of other contenders for political influence.

We do not have any records of the ordinary speech that must have coexisted alongside the formal language found in inscriptional Old Malay. Thus we cannot draw any conclusions on the possibility that other types of discourse-syntactic organization existed alongside that of the formal speech acts represented in inscriptional evidence. From the inscriptional evidence, however, we can conclude that Old Malay possessed a "participant-salient" type of discourse-syntactic organization, one in which reference to participant NPs is overtly coded in the verb, and in which matters of grammatical and semantic role agreement are coded by Focus morphology. These are features that Old Malay shared with Old Javanese, and with Old Balinese, as we will see in sections following.

3.8 Evidence of the Old Balinese inscriptions

The sketch following of Old Balinese morphology is based on the inscriptions of the ninth to eleventh centuries edited by Goris (1954) and written in the inscriptional language of ancient Bali.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

These inscriptions were collected largely in the area around Lake Kintamani, the lake in the crater of Gunung Batur that feeds a large part of the irrigation networks of southern Bali. The evidence of the inscriptions reveals a society which strikingly resembles modern Balinese society in a number of important ways. The inscription found in the village of Trunyan, for example, reveals the importance of offerings made to the god *(bhāṭara)* of Lake Kintamani, a practice continued by villages of Lake Kintamani in contemporary Bali. In all these inscriptions there are long and detailed lists of offerings made to the *bhāṭara* resembling those found in modern Bali. In addition the inscriptions reveal the importance of chthonic offerings, and both the Sanskritic term *caru* and indigenous term *laspas* are used in references to these practices. The distribution of the inheritance of important religious officials is also described in detail in these inscriptions, reminding us similar instructions on inheritance recorded in the 'customary laws' *(awig-awig)* preserved on palm-leaf manuscripts in many contemporary Balinese villages.

3.9 Old Balinese lexical items found in Modern Balinese

A surprising number of Old Balinese verbal bases are found as well in the *biasa* ("Low") register of Modern

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Balinese, although there are differences of affixual morphology for the two languages. A number of the most common of these bases are listed below:

aba 'bring, carry'

ada 'be, exist'

alap 'take, get'

amah 'eat'

bakat 'get, obtain'

b(e)li 'buy'

idih 'ask for, beg'

juang 'take, grasp'

pesu 'come out, appear'

teka 'arrive, come to'

Common nouns of Old Balinese found in the "Low" register of Modern Balinese include food terms, kin terms, and words like *banjar* 'hamlet' referring to institutions still of central importance in Balinese social life:

bé 'meat/fish'

adan 'name'

banjar 'hamlet'

bapa 'father'

kurèn 'spouse'

poh 'mango fruit'

A number of important function words in Old Balinese are also found in the "Low" register of Modern Balinese. These include the locative preposition *di* and the locative

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

deictics *dini* 'here' and *ditu* 'there'.

The pronominal forms *iḍa* and *-ḍa* are a striking feature of Old Balinese, for these are found as 3rd person pronouns (*ida/-da*) in Modern Balinese. In Old Balinese these 3rd person forms referred exclusively to deities or individuals of high status (kings, heads of monastaries, etc.), the same types of referents represented in Old Javanese with the (cognate) pronominal formant *-ira*, found in *sira* and *-nira*. In Modern Balinese *ida* and *-da* are "High" pronouns appropriate in addressing or speaking of individuals of high *satriya* or *brahmana* rank. They also appear as elements in status-titles cum address forms like *Ida Dalem*, used for the *rāja* of Klungkung, and *Ida Bagus*, used for males of the *brahmana* caste.

3.10 The Old Balinese verbal system

There is evidence in Old Balinese for Actor Focus affixes *ma-*, *mar-*, *mang-*, and *-um-*. Goal Focus affixes include *-in-* for a few forms, but for the majority of bases the phonologically weaker reflex *-y-* is found instead. *Ka-* is also found in Goal Focus and substantive constructions in Old Balinese and is found more frequently in Old Balinese than either *-y-* or *-in-*.

The morphological system of the Old Balinese verb is illustrated in Figure 5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 5: The Old Balinese Verb

	R-0	R-yan/-in/-an	R-ang
0-R	bayar	teka-yan	buat-ang
		duduk-yan	
ma-R	ma-rumah	ma-taruh-in	ma-tekap-ang
mar-R	mar-odaya		mar-hantu-ang
-um-R	t-um-aku		m-usir-ang
mang-R	mang-idih	mang-juang-in	manyurat-ang*
-y-R	y-alap	d-y-uduk-in	s-y-urat-ang
	y-aba	y-anugrahen**	s-y-uhun-ang
verbal substantives			
0-R		amah-an	
pa-R	pa-tahil	pa-temu-yan	panèk-ang
			pa-pager-ang(-en)
par-R	par-bwayang[22]		
pang-R	pañuksma***	pang-juang-an	
ka-R	ka-t(e)ba	ka-bakat-an	
		ka-bakat-yan	
		ka-jady-an	

*mañurat-ang < maN + surat-ang

*y-anugrahen < y-anugraha + -in

***pañuksma < paN + suksma

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Old Balinese had Actor Focus markers *ma-*, *mar-*, *-um-*, and *mang-*, all of the Actor Focus forms that are known to Old Javanese and Old Malay combined. However, *ma-* and *-um-* have very restricted use in Old Balinese before the period of Javanization, and the Actor Focus affixes are in general far outnumbered by Goal Focus forms taking *-y-* and (especially) *ka-*.

3.11 Actor Focus affixes in Old Balinese

Ma- was used primarily to form statives in Old Balinese. A typical *ma-* stative of Old Balinese is illustrated in example (15) below.

(15) ana uparata ta anak **ma**-rumah ditu...
exist *consecrated* top *person* AF1-*house* deic2
'If there are consecrated person (who) have a house there...'[23]

Old Balinese *mar-* appears to have functioned much like *mar-* of Old Malay. Thus Old Balinese has cases of *mar-* with transitive verbs (*mar-buat* 'do, make' equivalent to Old Malay *mar-vuat*), but in other cases *mar-* is used intransitively. This suggests that Old Balinese *mar*-R represents a type of "Middle Voice" as suggested for related Malay *ber-* by Winstedt (1927) and Benjamin (1987). This supposition is strengthened by the use of *-ang* with intransitive *mar*-R predicates, indicating thus not an orientation towards explicit objects, but that the action

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

is conceived as directed outwards, towards contextually-implied objects. This is illustrated in (16) following:

(16) *ka*-siddha-*(a)n* da pitāmaha
GF2-*power*-LF pro3(resp) *grandfather*

mar-hantu-**ang** ya
AF-*soul*-Tr1 top

'The reverend head of the Freehold is empowered to carry out the division of inheritance.'[24]

Intransitive uses of *mar*-R verbs are also found taking the suffix *-ən* that can be compared to the "passive irrealis" suffix *-en* of Old Javanese:

(17) ana uparata ta anak **ma**-rumah ditu
exist *consecrated* top *person* AF1-*house* locdeic2

bhikṣu... angśa sadāyā(dya)na...
monk *(measures of gold and silver)*

mar-buruk-tanah-**en** ya
AF-*tax*-irr top

'If there are those (who) live there (who) are consecrated as monks, gold and silver in measures of *angśa* (etc.) <u>should be taxed</u>.'[25]

The Actor Focus affixes *mang-* and *-um-* are both found in Balinese with transitive meaning, but *mang-* is perhaps most common with the "occupational" meanings that are also found with *mang*-R in Old Javanese inscriptions. Transitive and "occupational" uses of Old Balinese *mang*-R forms are brought out in examples following:

(18) tani *ka*-bakat-*an* tikas-*an* **mang**-nila
neg GF2-*take as tax*- *plait* ? -LF AF3-*indigo*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mamangkudu (**maN**-bangkudu) **mang**-iket
AF3-*red natural dyestuff* AF3-*weave ikat*
'The products of dyeing with indigo, dyeing with red dyestuffs, and weaving in the *ikat* style (shall) not be taxed.'[26]

(19) a-teher to banua di Air Rawang
in addition deic2 *settlement* loc *(place name)*

mang-(k)uning-**in** di-(i)da Bhaṭara
AF-*yellow*-Tr2 loc-pro3(resp) *God*

Da Tonta di rāja-kāryya-n-da
pro3(resp) *(name)* loc *royal performance*-lig-pro3

mang-alap air daṇu dirus-en
AF-*take* up *water lake* *bathe*-irr

Da Bhaṭara **k-um-a**-muning-in ida
pro3 *God* GF2-AF-*yellow*-Tr2 pro3(resp)

'At the time of the ritual of his royal consecration the (people of the) settlement of 'Air Rawang' should perform the yellowing of the deity of the Lord Da Tonta. (They) should take water of the lake (and) bathe the deity. He (resp) should be made so he is a shining yellow.'[27]

In (19) the first *mang*-R predicate (*mang*-uning-*in*) takes the transitivizing suffix *-in* and picks out a *recipient* with locative-like characteristics. The second *mang*-R form (*mang-alap*) takes a simple *patient* adjunct.

The third Actor Focus predicate in (19) (*kuma*-muning-*in*) resembles Old Javanese *ka-ma*-R forms in that it combines both Goal Focus and Actor Focus morphology. The sense of this combination in the Old Balinese example is that the deity is 'made to shine all over'. Note that Focus

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

affixes in this construction each relate to a particular relationship of the act and its participants: the *ka-* shows that the deity is the Object/Undergoer of the bathing, the *-um-* that the deity is an Actor argument, the *source* of the 'shining with a yellow lustre'.

3.12 Goal Focus forms taking *-y-* in Old Balinese

Old Balinese possesses Goal Focus constructions based on *-y-*R-(suffix) and *ka-*R-(suffix). These appear to contrast in terms of degree of agency or volitionality. Thus note in the descriptions of kinds of 'accidental death' *(salah pati)* described in (20) following that forms of death involving agentive perpetrators take *-y-*R, while the unintentional death resulting from falling from a tree is described with a *ka-*R predicate:

(20) t-**y**-araḥ anak **ka**-tiḍa-nya labuh
GF1-*murder person* GF2-*stunned*-pro3 *fall*

manèk kayu k-**y**-aṛ(e)t kilap
climb wood/tree GF1-*strike lightning*

'...m"'dered by someone, stunned (from) falling (while) climbing a tree, struck by lightning.'[28]

In transitive constructions based on *-y-*R it is common for the predicate to take one of the transitivizing suffixes (*-ang* or *-yan/-in*). Like similar forms in Old Javanese and Modern Malay, these affixes can be said to differentiate for "affected" and "locative-like" Goal

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

complements respectively:

a. Transitive construction in *-y-R-ang*:

(21) ya ājñā s-**y**-uhun-**ang**
top *order* GF1-*carry on head*-Tr1

mañurat-ang (*maN*-surat-*ang*) ājñā sadyasiwa
AF3-*write*-Tr1 *order(s)* *eternal Śiva*

'That is what is <u>accepted</u> <u>as</u> <u>an</u> <u>order</u> (by those who) write the decrees of the eternal Śiva.'[29]

b. Transitive construction in *-y-R-in*:

(22) tatkala-n ŚrI Ugrasena tua l-*um*-aku
that time-lig *Lord Ugrasena* emph AF2-*go*

ka Buwunan saha twa
alla *(place name)* accomp [< Skt *sahā*] emph

y-anugrahen-da (**y**-anugraha-**in**-da) tua da
GF1-*royal favor*-Tr2-pro3(resp) emph pro3(resp)

pitāmaha... di Buwunan... *par*-tapa-n-*an*
'grandfather' loc *Buwunan* AFnom-*penance*-lig-LF

'At the time ŚrI Ugrasena went to Buwunan, the royal favor of an hermitage <u>was</u> <u>granted</u> by him <u>to</u> the reverend preceptor of the hermitage of Buwunan.'[30]

3.13 Goal Focus forms taking *ka*-R in Old Balinese

Old Balinese possessed the *ka*-R-*an* derivation known to Old Javanese and surviving in many modern languages of the Malay-Indonesian area. However, this derivation rarely (if ever) formed substantives in Old Balinese, but was heavily involved in Goal Focus verbal derivations. The base most

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

commonly involved in these derivations was *bakat* 'take as tax' There are both *ka*-R-*an* and *ka*-R-*yan* derivations formed on *bakat*, but it is unclear at this point whether *-an* and *-yan* are contrastive or represent dialectic or scribal variations. *Ka*-R-(suffix) predicates based on *bakat* are illustrated below:

(23) tani **ka**-bakat-**an** tikas-*an* *mang*-nila
neg GF2-*take as tax*-LF '*products*' AF3-*indigo*

*mam*angkudu (*maN*-bangkudu) *mang*-iket
AF3-*red natural dyestuff* AF3-*weave ikat*

'The products of dyeing with indigo and red dyestuffs and of weaving in the *ikat* style (shall) not be taxed.'[31]

(24) yan-ada pūjān sang ratu di sanghyang
if-exist *worship*-LF hon *King* loc *gods/ancestors*

di Turuñan **ka**-bakat-**an** *ma-ka*-ha-sér
loc Trunyan GF2-*take as tax-LF in quantitites of sers'*

'If there is a worship of the Lord God in the sactuary of the ancestors/gods at Lake Trunyan what is taken as tax (is to be) in quantities of *ser-s*.'[32]

(25) yan-ada pūjān Sang Ratu di guha...
if-exist *worship*-LF hon *Lord* loc *cave*

a-jalan-*an* **ka**-bakat-**yan-nya**
one-path-LF GF2-*take as tax*-Tr2-pro3

'If there is worship of the Lord God in the cave the taking as tax-offering (from them) (should be) in the same measure.'[33]

Other examples of *ka*-R-*yan* constructions appear to accentuate the dynamicity of *patient* arguments. Thus the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ka-R-*yan* derivation based on *jadi* 'happen, become' in (26) below refers to a process by which the Object is transformed into something else:

(26) ana cakcak lañcang-nya
exist broken pieces (ship's) timbers-pro3

ka-jadi-**yan** *pa*-pager-*ang*-*en* kuta
GF2-*become*-Tr2 AF1nom-*fence*-Tr1-irr *town*

'If there are pieces of (the ship's) timbers (washed up from a beaching), (they) should <u>be made into</u> what is to be used for the fencing of the city.'[34]

3.14 Old Balinese: conclusions

The frequency of *ka*-R-(suffix) forms in Old Balinese is a feature of some significance. In Chapter Six I will argue that similar forms play a large role in the *alus* register of Modern Balinese. The evidence of the Old Balinese inscriptions suggests that Old Balinese must be included alongside Old Javanese as a source of the *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology found in Modern Balinese.

The special association of *ka*-R-(suffix) forms with "refined" speech levels may even have been an incipient process in Old Balinese. For example, in Old Balinese highly agentive verbs like *alap* 'take, get' take -*y*-R-(suffix) form, while the very common verb *bakat* 'take as tax' is found only in *ka*-R-(suffix) form. Did the diminished *agency* associated with *ka*-R-(suffix) forms make it

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

more appropriate for use with the verb 'to tax' ? Van Naerssen (1976) has spoken of the *buat haji*, or "tribute" system revealed in the Old Javanese inscriptions as part of an ancestral and religious circuit into which certain Hinduized kings had mangaged to interpose themselves. The same system was practiced in Bali, also under the name *buat haji*; thus the concept of 'taxation' may have represented an absolute, but impersonal, form of authority in ancient Bali, with something of the authority that 'the village' *(désané)* or temple has in modern Bali. It may have been the impersonality of this coercive force that made the difference between choice of a *ka*-R-(suffix) and the more agentive -*y*-R-(suffix) form.

Old Balinese, like Old Javanese and Old Malay, was a Sanskritized dialect of an indigenous elite that had gained enough political prominence to be able to issue edicts and establish laws. Old Balinese evolved in response to political and economic forces similar to those that shaped Old Malay and Old Javanese; indeed it was to some extent a partner in the wider networks of economic, ritual, and political power that existed during the Hindu-Buddhist period in the archipelago. Thus it may be more than the influence of the "Common Indonesian" substrata that resulted in the commonality of "participant-salient" forms of morphosyntax for Old Balinese, Old Javanese, and Old Malay.

The productivity of *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology in both

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Old Javanese and Old Balinese points especially to the possibility of the elaboration of certain sub-systems over others in the formal context of the written, inscriptional language. In Part II I will suggest that this background of *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology in the historical languages "preadapted" it for use in the "High" forms of Modern Balinese, where it continues to be used as a 'passive' form appropriate to the requirements of formal, public and/or ritual discourse.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

[1] As noted by Zurbuchen (1981) the last purely Old Balinese inscription is Buwahan A. (303 in Goris: 1954) dated in the text Śaka 916 (994 A.D.), but Old Balinese continued to exist side by side in the inscriptions of the Warmadewa rulers Queen Guṇa-priya and King (Dharma)-Udayana as late as 1016 A.D.. This change of useage is linked by Goris (1969; p.95) to the higher rank of Queen Guṇa-priya (-dharmapatnI), a princess of the Uttungga-dewa dynasty of Java and direct descendant of Sindok, founder of the first East Javanese kingdom.

[2] The Old Malay inscriptions found in the vicinity of Palembang and dated between the years 683-86 A.D. were first edited by Coedès (1932: 271-326). The majority of these are also to be found in de Casparis (1956). (Three of the inscriptions edited by de Casparis are the basis of the study of Old Malay in this thesis.) Other sources of data include an inscription found on Java (dated 942 A.D.) discussed by Bosch (1941: 50-53), and the Pereng inscription (927 A.D.) edited by Krom (1931: 165). Later OM inscriptions of the Malay sovereign Ādityavarman were first editen by Kern (1913-29: VI.249, VII.163, 219), and have also been commented on by Chatterjee (1933: II.79- 84). Aichele (1942-43) has commented on the Old Malay "literary langauge" (*die altmalaiische Literatursprache*), while Teeuw (1959) has reviewed the history of western scholarly studies of the Old Malay inscriptions. A recent thesis by Adelaar (1985) on "Proto-Malaic" also makes use of the inscriptional sources.

[3] Old Malay *mi-* is probably to be related to the morpheme *pi-* found in Old Javanese in the formation of instrumental

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

nominals and in the derivation of derived transitives. This morpheme also survives (as an allomorph of *pa-*) with certain verbal bases in Modern Balinese. Old Javanese uses are illustrated below. Note that the nasalization *procédé* associated with the (OJ) affix *mang-* triggers the change of *pi-* to *-mi-* in the (OJ) derived transitive form:

(a) *pi-* forming *instrumental* substantive
*sandung** 'kick to side' > *pi-sandung* 'pedal of loom'

(b) *pi-* in derived transitive derivation
*rengö** >
ang-rengö (or) *r-um-engö* 'hear'
ang-rengw-aken (or) *r-um-engw-aken* 'listen to'
a-mi-rengw-aken 'cause to be heard, let hear'

The Old Malay form *mi-ayu-ayu* 'make beautiful, embellish' is formed on the adjectival base *ayu* 'good, beautiful'. It is found in the Telaga Batu inscription in the phrase *mi-ayu-ayu mangmang* 'embellish (i.e. change) the letters (of the inscription)'.

[4] PI II 33.7-8

[5] PI II 33.11

[6] PI II 33.9

[7] PI II 33.11

[8] PI II 33.9

[9] Van der Tuuk's work shows that Toba Batak uses *-in-*, *ni-*, and *di-* in 'passive' function, each one of these affixes representing a particular semantic area of the range of passive meanings. This suggests that languages in which only one of these affixes is represented may reflect the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

particularization in these languages of morphological features of a preferred dialect.

[10] PI II 33.5

[11] PI II 34.20

[12] PI II 34.20-21

[13] ibid

[14] Talang Tuwo inscription, line 2 (in Irfan:1983, p. 52)

[15] Old Malay follows the pattern of what Brandstetter (1916) termed "Common Indonesian" in not showing a contrast of singular and plural forms. Plural uses of 2nd person pronominal forms are common in the Telaga Batu inscription. Here they refer either to the subjects of the king in general, or to specific groups of princes like the *yuvarāja*, *kumārarāja* and *pratikumārarāja* mentioned, for example, in line II 34.20 of the Telaga Batu inscription.

[16] A general rule can be stated to describe the conditions under which *-nya* marks *anaphora* to *possessors* or to *prior reference* or *inference* respectively:

> If an argument that is eligible to be a possessor is recoverable from the immediate context, then *-nya* is interpreted as *possessive*.
>
> Otherwise *-nya* signals *inference*, or *reference to prior discourse* and thus helps to establish *discourse referentiality* and *definitiness* (features often influencing choice of syntactic form).

[17] PI II 34.21

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[18] Kota Kapur inscription, line 2 (in Irfan: 1983, p. 43)

[19] In fact it does so with more thoroughness than does Modern Malay, which Alieve points out has added prepositional expressions of *agent* based on words like *oleh* 'by' (derived from **oleh* 'get', 'obtain').

[20] The prefixed 'passives' of Modern Malay may have been influenced by the quasi-pronominal verbal prefixes described as "propositives" by Uhlenbeck for Modern Javanese (also found in Old Javanese, especially in instances of quoted speech).

[21] As Alieva notes, Modern Malay has been strongly influenced by the nominative-accusative patterns of Indo-European languages and has thus evolved in a nominative direction, obscuring some of the "possessive" features that are still found (says Alieva) in languages like Tagalog. The evidence of Old Malay supports Alieva's contention that Malay "has currently acquired the features of a nominative language" (1980: 421) and is thus losing its "possessive" characteristics.

[22] I believe this word should be taken as *par-wayang* 'performer of *wayang*'. According to modern Balinese experts on traditional literature, the scribal rule *pasang kakerèn* dictates that any consonant following *surung r* (*r* written as a half moon above a syllable ending with *r*) must be written double. Writing of doubled *w* is awkward in Modern Balinese script, and must have been so for scribes at the time of the inscriptions; hence the use of (phonologically similar) *b* in the form *par-bwayang*. This hypothesis on the origin of the form *par-bwayang* is lent credence by the existence in the Balinese inscriptions of the common word *sarbwa* 'all' deriving from (Skt) *sarwa*. Note that Old

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Javanese has *sarwa* as the usual form, but in a very few cases shows the variant *sarbwa*. (The modern Malay-Indonesian *serba* 'all kinds' is a descendant.)

Goris glosses *par-bwayang* as 'wandering players' in the glossary of his (1956) work on the Balinese inscriptions, but in another place (Goris: 1914: 23) he says that it means *Pak Dalang*, the performer of shadow plays. The term *par-bwayang* occurs in a list of musicians and performers found in the inscription of Bebetin (PB 002. II. b. 5) dated Śaka 818 (896 A. D.).

[23] PB 001. II. a. 5, b. 1

[24] PB 102. I. b. 5

[25] PB 001. II. a. 5, b. 1

[26] PB 002. II. a. 3

[27] PB 004. II. b. 1, 2

[28] PB 102. 1b. 5, 6

[29] PB 001. III. a. 1 *S-y-uhun-ang* is more literally 'be placed on the head'

[30] PB 002. II. a. 1, 2

[31] PB 002. II. a. 3

[32] PB 003. II. b. 4, 5

[33] PB 003. II. b. 4

[34] PB 001. II. b. 3

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PART II:

MODERN BALINESE: FROM SYNTAX TO DISCOURSE

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

INTRODUCTION

Part II begins with an introduction to basic structures of Modern Balinese (Chapter Four), and continues with discussions of major morphological and syntactic forms of the language (Chapters Five and Six). Chapters Seven and Eight look at the Balinese speech levels as "discourse strategies" in the context of 'classical' and 'folk' forms of narrative.

Chapter Seven focuses on translation of Old Javanese materials into *alus* Balinese in the 'recitation-and-translation' genre called *bebasan* or (as a verb) *mabasan*, *mabebasan*. These terms refer to the reading and translating of *Kawi* (Old Javanese) texts written on palm-leaf documents into an oral-literary form of *alus* register. The method of glossing used in *mabasan* relies heavy on stereotypical figures and narrative structure, and thus has a coherency of its own that helps to bridge gaps in interpretation that may arise for individual performers. *Mabasan* glosses thus take the form of secondary texts running parallel to the *Kawi* originals.

Chapter Eight looks at the use of the *basa biasa/kasar* form of organization in the language of 'folk tales' of the *Satua* genre. The *satua* genre includes tales of many kinds,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

including what we would call fairy tales and cautionary tales, but very often taking the form of animal fables.

While the 'texts' of the *mabasan* form represent the *alus* end of the sociolinguistic spectrum, the linguistic forms found in more tightly constrained modes of social interaction, the narratives of the *satua* genre are typically organized along *biasa/kasar* lines, although *alus* passages are acceptable, especially in dialogue. These two types of narrative text can thus be used as one means of insight into the discourse-syntactic organization of the Balinese "speech levels".

Examples of the two types of Balinese text used as the basis of Part II are given in Appendix A: *Mabasan Texts* and B: *Satua Texts*. Excerpts of *mabasan* texts given in Appendix A are part of a larger set of transcriptions of materials collected in Bali in 1984-85 and including materials from *mabasan* sessions in the village complexes of Sanur-Intaran and Ubud-Peliyatan.

Excerpts of *satua* texts cited in the thesis include: (1) a set of *satua* narratives graded for complexity and aimed at pupils in Balinese elementary schools; and (2) three versions of a modern *Satua* tale produced in 1985. A short discussion of the *Satua* genre, and excerpts from three forms of a single modern *Satua* fable, are to be found in Appendix B.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER FOUR

BASIC STRUCTURES OF MODERN BALINESE

4.0 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with basic sources of structure in Balinese language, here viewed largely in terms of phrase-level structures and lexical materials that can be related in terms of paradigms.

We will look first at the structure of Balinese noun phrases and equational sentences. Following this we will look at groups of lexemes that are responsible for organization at several levels of analysis. These are the words Ward (1973) describes as "functors", words providing referential and internal coherence whether serving the pragmatic needs of everyday communication, or the specialized needs of narrative text-building.

Among functional words we will look first at spatio-temporal and pronominal deictics, words that play a part in language in the organization of space, time, and person. Following this we will look at the system of prepositions important in marking participant status in clause-level constructions, the adverbs and modals

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

concerned with temporal and aspectual features of action, and conjunctions important in phrase and clause-level linkage. Important interrogative pronouns and negatives are also listed in this chapter.

4.1 Structure of the Balinese noun phrase

Balinese noun phrases have the Head noun initial, followed by its modifiers. If there are adjectival modifiers they follow the Head noun directly:

(1) alas wayah
forest old

'(an) old forest'

If a deictic article is added it follows the last adjectival modifier:

(2) alas wayah tur gedé ento
forest old and large deic2

'...that old and enormous forest'

A pronominal clitic coding anaphora to a *possessor* or *prior text* can be suffixed directly to the Head noun or to an adjectival modifier (but not to a deictic article):

(3) alas-é wayah
forest-pro3 *old*

'...the old forest'

(4) baas barak-é
uncooked rice red-pro3

'...the red rice'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to which the first nominal item is related as part to whole. This motivates use of the 'ligature' morpheme *-n-* signifying the bond of Head and (nominal or pronominal) modifier:

(5) di bata-n abing-é
loc *bottom*-lig *overhang of riverbank*-pro3
'...at the bottom of the overhang of the riverbank'[1]

(6) isi-n bubu-n kai-né
content(s)-lig *net(s)*-lig pro1-pro3
'...the contents of my nets''[2]

In noun phrases taking 1st or 2nd person possessive pronouns, the third person pronominal clitic *-é* can be added redundantly to emphasize the possessive sense:

(7) buku-n tityang-é
book-lig pro1-pro3
'...my book'

(8) beli-n I Madé-né
older sib-lig prop 2nd-born-pro3
'...I Madé's older sibling'

The use of 'ligature *n*' in building noun phrases is illustrated in (8). If the two terms of a possessive NP are completely merged as a semantic unit (as in the teknonym *Mé-n Cubling* 'Mother of Cubling') then use of the definitizing 'term of address marker' *I* is blocked (**Mè-n I Cubling*). However, if the Head noun of the phrase is made definite (or a possessor) through addition of the enclitic *-é/-né*, then the Head noun is given a contrastive sense and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the *I* morpheme can be restored:

(9) mémé-né I Cubling
mother-pro3 title *(name)*

'...the mother of I Cubling'

The basic structure of Balinese noun phrases can thus be generalized as follows:

Head - mod - pro (or) deictic article[3]

As I have claimed in Chapter Three for Old Malay, I will claim for Modern Balinese that the possesive form of this structure is shared with an important Goal Focus or 'passive' construction termed the "First Passive" by Kersten (1984). This "possessive" structure, I will argue, is most clear in the 1st and 2nd person forms where verbal Heads of constructions incorporate pronominal arguments post-verbally, e.g. in a possessive relation to the verb.

4.2 Structure of Balinese Equational sentences

There are three main types of Balinese equational sentence. One of these equates two NPs with a single referent, thus sentences with English translations like *John (is) a fisherman*. These might be termed 'equi-valent' equational sentences, since both members receive equal discourse prominence:

(a) equational type 1 (NP + NP):

(11) pianak-é ¦ *pang*-angon
child-pro3 ¦ instr/nom-*herd animals*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'His/her child is a shepherd.'

The other two types of equational sentence appear to be contrastive in terms of informational content, but on another level of analysis are both "topic-comment" structures. In the first type a discourse-topical NP is initial to the clause and has the relation of *theme* to the "new information" contained in the complement (or *rheme*). In the second type of equational sentence the *rheme* is topical, hence sentence initial, and the *theme* takes the complement position:

(b) equational type 2 (NP + adjective):

(12) pa-jalan-é [I Ubuh] ¦ enduk
sta/nom-*road*-pro3 prop *orphan* ¦ *slack*
'I Ubuh's walk had no spring.'[4]

(c) equational type two (adjective + NP):

(13) jèngah pesan ¦ keneh-né I Ubuh
angry *very* ¦ *heart/thoughts*-pro3 prop *Ubuh*
'Very angry at heart was I Ubuh.'[5]

(14) lega ¦ keneh-né Mè-n Cubling
relieved ¦ *heart/thoughts*-pro3 *mother*-lig *Cubling*
'Relieved were the thoughts of 'Mother of Cubling'.'[6]

The topic and comment type of structure exemplified in (11) and (12), mirrors the Head-modifier construction of the NP, and may be the basic form of Balinese equational sentences. The 'comment and topic' forms of (13) and (14) thus reflect the topicalization of the rhematic component. I will claim in Chapter Six that there is a relationship of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Head-mod form of NPs (and some equational sentences) to O-V-S clauses based on "First Passive" verbs.

4.3 Relativization in Modern Balinese

Relativization is a major strategy in Balinese, and there are both *Biasa* and *Alus* variants of the relative pronoun, e.g. *né* [K], *ané* [B/Ami] and *sané* [A]. The simplest relative clauses are those formed with a single adjective or adjectival phrase. These have the function of setting the subject apart as having some quality x in contrast to another group of subjects that does not have this quality (or qualities):

(15) di tongos-é ¦ ané gedé tur suung
loc *place*-pro3 ¦ rel *big* *and* *empty*

'...in the place that's big and deserted.'

(16) ring rahina ¦ sané becik
loc [A] *day* [A] ¦ rel [A] *good* [A]

'...on a good day'

Relativization of transitive clauses is a complex issue in Balinese, with fewer constraints on relativization of 'passives' than are found for languages like English. We will return to these issues in Chapter Six.

4.4 Deictic and Locative categories in Balinese

Deictic categories play a large role in many

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Indonesian languages, and are a primary part in those languages in the structuring of what Becker & Oka (1977) have termed the "Cline of Person":

> "A central thread - perhaps the central thread in the semantic structure of all languages - is the cline of person, an ordering of linguistic forms according to their distance from the speaker. Between the subjective... specific pronominal 'I' and the objective, generic common noun, between these poles the words of all languages--words for people, animals, food, time and space, indeed words for everything--are ordered and categorized according to their distance--spatial, temporal, social, biological, and metaphorical--from the first person, the speaker." (1977:229)

Becker & Oka have shown that for Old Javanese there is a complex series of deictic articles and pronouns differentiated by degree of distance from the speaker or hearer. These are important not only in establishing the spatial coordinates of the speech act, but also in the ordering of the temporal dimension.[7]

In Balinese (as in Old Javanese) the basic deictic contrasts are worked out in terms of vowel oppositions. These are merged in Balinese with elements indicating categories like 'locative' *(di-, ri-)* or 'manner' *(ké-)*. In Balinese high front vowels [i] and [é] code 'close to speaker or hearer', while the back vowels [o] and [u] and the low front vowel [a] code 'close to neither speaker or hearer'. Figure 6 illustrates important (non-pronominal) deictic forms found in Modern Balinese.[8]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 6: Major Deictic Forms of Balinese

A. *Biasa* ("Low") forms

	Close	Far
I. Deictic articles (or 3rd person impersonal pronouns):		
	éné/né *(this)*	ento/nto *(that)*
II. Deictic manner adverbs:		
	kéné *(like this)*	kéto *(like that)*
III. Locative 'pronouns':		
	dini *(here)*	ditu *(there)*
IV. Allative 'pronons'/verbs of motion:		
	mai *(to here)*	kema *(to there)*[9]

B. *Alus* ("High") forms:

I. Deictic articles/impersonal pronouns:		
	puniki *(this)*	punika *(that)* [10]
II. Deictic manner adverbs:		
	sapuniki *(like this)*	sapunika/kènten *(like that)* [11]
III. Locative 'pronouns':		
	driki *(here)*	drika *(there)*
IV. Allative 'pronouns'/verbs of motion:		
	mriki *(to here)*	mrika *(to there)*
V. Narrative deictic:		irika *(there/then)*

Balinese deictic paradigms suggest developments of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sociolinguistic interest. First of all, the locative forms *dini* and *ditu* found in *Biasa* register are identical with those of Old Balinese, while the *Alus* variants *driki* and *drika* can be shown to combine locative elements from both Old Balinese *(di-)* and Old Javanese *(ri-)*. In addition, all the *Alus* forms contain the deictic formatives *-iki* and *-ika* found in both Old and Modern Javanese.

Deictic articles are important in providing information on the spatial coordinates of Balinese speech acts, narrative or conversational. At the same time by signalling (narrative or actual) distance of the speaker (or hearer) from the speech act they often play a role in the temporal organization of the clause or discourse.

4.5 The Balinese pronominal system

The Balinese pronominal system is complicated by frequent use of the linguistic elements of the status-title and kinship systems as pronominal forms. Thus in *biasa* register *bapa* 'father' and *mémé* are frequently found replacing 1st and 2nd person pronouns, while the same terms plus a proper noun marker (*I Bapa* and *I Mémé*) commonly replace 3rd person *ia*.

Note that the category of number is not differentiated by Balinese pronominal system (nor is it in Old Javanese, Old Malay, or Old Balinese). Thus plural meanings, if they

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

must be made explicit, are given through suppletive phrases. The most common of these are *ajak ma-kejang* 'all together' for *biasa* register and *sareng sami* for *alus* register. Reduplicated numerals can also be used to indicate specific numbers of people involved in an activity. Hence we find forms like *ma-gaé ajak tet iga* [B] 'to work in threes', *lunga ajak da-dadua* 'to go somewhere together as two'.

The word *pada* can also be placed prior to the verb to indicate *plurality of performance of the action*. We thus commonly find examples like (a) *Anak banjaré pada magaé* 'all the people of the hamlet worked together', and (b) *anak luhé pada malaib* 'all the girls run/ran'.

Most pronouns can be used with plural reference in some contexts, although this is most common with 3rd person pronominal enclitics *-e/-né* [B], *-ipun* [Ami] and *-da/-nda* [Asi]. In the *alus midér* register *ida dané* is quite often used as a plural equivalent of singular *ipun*.

The Balinese pronominal system is illustrated in Figure 7. Note that the 1st and 2nd person forms given as *kasar* variants are most common in *satua* narratives, where they are used by animals. *Icang* and *cai* are the corresponding "Low" terms for humans. Note that *iba* literally means 'self' and that a reflexive pronoun can be formed by adding the pronominal enclitic *-né*, producing *ibané*. Other reflexive pronouns include *awak-é* [B] , *déwèk/*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

néwèk [Asor], *raga* [Ami] and *idané* [Asi].

Figure 7: The Balinese Pronominal System

	Singular	Plural
I. First person full pronouns:		
a. *Kasar*	kai	(kai ajak makejang)
b. *Biasa*	icang	(icang " ")
c. *Alus Menèngah*	iang	- - - -
	raga	(I raga ajak makejang)
	tiang	(tiang sareng sami)
d. *Alus Asor*[12]	titiang	(titiang " ")
II. Second person full pronouns:		
a. *Kasar*	iba	(iba ajak makejang)
b. *Biasa*	cai[13]	(cai ajak " ")
c. *Alus Menèngah*	raga-né	- - - -
	jero-né	Ida dané sareng sami
d. *Alus Singgih*	I Ratu	I Ratu sareng sami
III. Third person full pronouns:		
a. *Biasa*	ia	(ia ajak makejang)
b. *Alus Manèngah*	ipun[14]	(ipun sareng sami)
	dané	(dané sareng sami)
d. *Alus Singgih*	Ida[15]	(Ida sareng sami)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 7, cont.

B. Enclitic pronouns (third person only):

a. *Biasa* (with NP only)

-é/-né (-é/-né)

b. *Biasa* (with 'passive' VP in O-R-suffix form)*

-a (-a)

c. *Alus Singgih* (with NP or 'passive' VP)

-da/-nda (-da/-nda)

* There is some question as to whether this should be considered a fully pronominal form in Modern Balinese. This point is discussed further in Chapter Six following.

4.6 The Balinese prepositional system

Balinese uses a limited set of prepositions to mark both setting arguments (the *local* cases), and the *semantic* case-relation of certain participant NPs to the verb. The meaning of some prepositions is a function of the syntax of the larger containing clause, while for other prepositions there is a single associated case-role. Thus the [B] preposition *tekèn* varies considerably in meaning and function depending on its syntactic context, while the [B] preposition *aji* is used exclusively with *instrumental*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

meaning. The inventory of *alus* prepositions is smaller than that of *basa biasa*. Thus *ring*, *antuk*, and *sakèng* cover all the functions of the set of seven prepositions found in the *biasa* register. The Balinese prepositional system is illustrated in Figure 8.

Figure 8: The Balinese prepositional system

Register:	Biasa	Alus
1. locative	di	ring
2. allative	ka	ring
3. source	uli/uli(h)ing	sakèng
4. source/locative	sig/sid	ring/sakèng
5. recipient or source (in AF clause); agent or source (in GF clause); conjunction (in compound NP):	tekèn/-kèn	ring
6. agent (GF); manner or cause (AF or GF)	baan	antuk
7. instrument	aji	antuk/anggèn

4.7 Temporal Adverbs and Modals in Balinese

Tense and aspect are not marked categories of the Balinese verbal system, although syntactic arrangement may have aspectual consequences (see Section 6.8 following). Instead, Balinese makes heavy use of adverbs in establishing the temporal coordinates of the clause, while

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

aspectual dimensions can be specified with a set of modal verbs.

Balinese modals have a wide range of functions and are found modifying adjectives, statives, and adverbs as well as transitive and intransitive verbs. They can also be used independently or as the heads of constructions. The modals can be differentiated on a semantic basis according to degree or mode of accomplishment. The Balinese system of modal verbs is illustrated in Figure 9 below.

Figure 9: Balinese modal verbs

Register:	Biasa	Alus
1. accomplished	suba/(-ba)	sampun, (ampun)
2. not yet " "	tondèn	dèrèng, durung
3. process of being " "	(e)nu	kari, kantun
4. intention to accomplish	lakar*	jagi, jaga

*lakar is also used as a simple future marker (cf. bakal in Figure 11)

The temporal adverbs setting the time frame of an event are another important type of function word in Balinese. These adverbs are useful in indicating particular points in the progress of events or in establishing the relative order of sequences of events. While the Balinese modals are concerned mainly with modificiation of events

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

depicted in the core of the clause, temporal adverbs have to do with the temporal framing or setting of the event. Some of these adverbs have to do with locating an action or event in terrestrial "real time" relative to the present, while others have to do with the frequency of events, or with indicating the sequencing of events in narrative discourse. Some of the most important temporal adverbs of Balinese are illustrated in Figure 10.

Figure 10: Balinese temporal and sequential adverbs

Register:	Biasa	Alus
a. adverbs commenting on the aspect of an action , or used to indicate the shift to a subsequent event:		
1. inception of event *(just now, recently)*	mara	wau
2. end of event *(finished)*	suud	wusan, wuwusan
3. shift to next event *(then, and then...)*	laut, lantas	raris, durus
b. adverbs setting narrative time frame of event:		
1. past *(before, back when)*	malu	dumun, riin
2. point of narrative time (past)	dugas, laad-né	duk, daweg, ri kala punika
3. future *(will, intend to)*	bakal/(-kal)	pacang

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 10, cont.

d. adverbs relating to 'terrestrial' time frame of event:		
1. *now*	jani	mangkin
2. *yesterday*	ibi	di ibi
3. *earlier*	tuni	i tunian
4. *last evening*	ibi sanja	ibi sandé
5. *tomorrow*	mani, mani puan	bènjang, malih a-rahina
6. *the day after tomorrow*	mani puan, buin puan	bènjangan, malih kalih rahina

e. adverbs relating to duration, frequency of events:		
1. *for a long time*	makelo	suwé
2. *often*	pepes	sering
3. *rarely*	kapah	tumbèn, tèmbé
4. *ever*	laad, taen	naenin
5. *never*	tusing taen	nènten naenin

4.8 Interrogatives, conjunctions and negativizers

Balinese has an elaborated system of interrogative pronouns, with *biasa/kasar* and *alus* variants found for most forms. Some of these interrogatives can be converted into words with "universal" interpretation through addition of the particle *je*, an 'emphatic' particle used with in this

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

case with meanings like 'just' or 'even'. Thus from *nyèn* [B] 'who' we find *nyèn je* 'whoever, anyone', from *sapunapi* [A] 'who' we find *sapunapi je* with the same meanings as *nyèn je*. In a similar fashion the *alus* level interrogative pronoun *punapi* can be expanded through reduplication (and analogy with the contrastive deictic articles *puniki-punika* [A]) into *punapa-punapi* 'whatever'. Balinese interrogative pronouns are illustrated in Figure 11.

Figure 11: Balinese Interrogative Pronouns

Register:	Biasa	Alus
1. Personal *(who)*	nyèn	sira
2. Impersonal *(what)*	apa	napi, punapi
3. Locative *(where)*	di je	ring di je
4. Allative *(to where)*	ki je	ring di je, ring napi
5. Ablative *(from where)*	uli di je	sakèng di je, sakèng napi
6. Numerical *(how much)*	kuda	kuda
7. State *(how)*	kènkèn	sapunapi
8. Manner *(how)*	kènkèn baan	sapunapi antuk
9. Temporal *(when)*		
a. past	pidan, ané pidan	di pidan, sané pidan
b. future	buin pidan	malih pidan

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Balinese conjunctions include lexemes specialized for coordination or subordination and sensitive to semantic features of the units conjoined. Two of these conjunctions (*tekèn* and *ring*) function as prepositions in other contexts (cf. Figure 8 above), and some conjunctions figure in both clause level and phrase level operations. Important Balinese lexemes used in conjunction at the phrase and clause levels are illustrated in Figure 12. Note that the lexeme *tekèn* is used as a conjunction at phrase level, a preposition at clause level.

Figure 12: Major Balinese conjunctions

Register:	Biasa	Alus
a. phrase level coordination:		
1. conjunction of related NPs in compound NP *(and)*:		
	tekèn	kalih, malih
2. conjunction of related adjectives, adverbs, or verbs *(and)*:		
	tur	kalih, malih
3. conjuction of NPs and adjectives, not necessarily related *(and)*:		
	muah, lan	miwah
4. comparison of NPs (or clauses) - *(like)*:		
	buka	kadi, sekadi
5. disjunction of NPs (or clauses) - *(or)*:		
	yadin	wiadin, napi-ké

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 12, cont.

b. clause level coordination:		
1. sequence *(going on, in addition)*:		
	buin, buina	maliha, semalih
2. conditional *(if)*:	yèn	yèning
3. optative *(so that)*:	apang	mangde
4. cause *(because)*:	wiréh, sewiréh	ri antuk, ri antukan[16]
5. counter-factual *(even though)*:		
	jet	yadiastu(n)
6. qualification *(but)*:	kuala, kéwala	nanging, sakéwanten

Balinese has negativizing morphemes which (in *biasa* register) differentiate between NPs on the one hand, and VPs, adverbs, and adjectives on the other. Negativizing morphemes of Balinese are illustrated in Figure 13.

Figure 13: Negativizing morphemes in Balinese

Register:	Biasa	Alus
a. negative for NP *(not)*:	boya/tidong	ten/nènten
b. negative for verb, adverb, or adjective *(not)*:		
	tusing/sing tuara	ten/nènten
c. prohibitive	(e)da	sampun-ang

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

4.9 Summary

While there are a good many nominal and verbal bases that <u>are</u> <u>not</u> differentiated in status terms, there are at least two status variants in Balinese for all pronominal, deictic, and prepositional forms, as well as for most of the words described by Ward (1973) as "functors". As might be expected the greatest degree of status differentiation is found in the pronominal system (Figure 7), which is further complicated by the frequent replacement of pronominal terms with kinship terms appropriate to the relationship of interlocutors.

The *alus* form of the prepositional system is interesting in that it neutralizes several oppositions maintained in the *biasa* system. Thus *ring* is used in *alus* register both for "local case" prepositions with a locative or allative meaning *(di, ka)*, and for the "grammatical case" preposition *(tekèn)* that is used (at the clause level) with major NP arguments that are not in the 'unmarked' or absolutive relation with the verb.

As we will see in Chapters Seven and Eight the status differentiation of the important deictic and function words of Balinese allows the "framing" of discourse to be in either an *alus* or *biasa/kasar* mode. At the level of the clause *alus* and *biasa* forms of prepositions, modals, temporal adverbs, and deictics allow status differentia-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tion to be marked at the deepest levels of grammatical and referential function. At the discourse level status contrasts are maintained for sequential adverbs and conjunctions, as well as for deictics which (like those of Old Javanese) are important sources of coherence at both discourse and clausal levels of organization.

In *satua* tales it is possible to include language of the *alus* or *singgih* types, especially in dialogue, but the function words used in organizing narrative, grammatical, and anaphoric features of the text are ordinarily chosen from the *biasa/kasar* vocabulary.

The opposite is true of *mabasan* discourse: in *mabasan* the framing of the discourse must be in *alus* form, but the "principle of time, place, and person" *(desa-kala-patra)* can be used to justify the inclusion of whole passages in *biasa* or *kasar* form, as when the hero *Rāma* gives gives advice to his younger brother *Bharata* using the *beli-adi* style appropriate to the intimate discourse of older and younger siblings. Similarly, even the most *kasar* vocabulary can be justified by invoking the principle termed *pasang gedeg* ('exchange of anger') in translating descriptions of the imprecatory exchanges that were an expected part of battlefield behavior in the Hindu-Balinese epics.

The lexical contrasts maintained by the status variants of Balinese function words thus provide an important means for determining whether the framing of a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

discourse is to be in an *alus* or *biasa* mode. At the same time more subtle sociolinguistic contrasts are maintained in pronominal useage and in the sub-differentiation of verbal and nominal bases in status terms. This mixing of status variation at the level of the "function words" with that maintained through lexical or pronominal variation produces a linguistic dynamic that can respond to the many social and psychological forces that effect Balinese linguistic behavior. As Zurbuchen (1987:81) has pointed out, the contrasts maintained by the Balinese speech registers are complex, and the speech registers are more discourse strategies than fixed and separate variants of Balinese language:

> "The intentions and motivations of Balinese speakers, both as individuals and as members of society as a whole, are subject to fluctuation. So great is the determining force of context on speech register that lexical levels are difficult to test with the same reliability as syntactic intuitions. This is the case because registers are a discourse strategy in Balinese, used to show shifting emotions, relationships, and points of view." (1987:81)

The function words, deictics and pronouns of Balinese language are thus a major part of the linguistic system of coordinates that allows expression of what Zurbuchen has termed the "culture's particularly elaborated view of personhood defined in both social and metaphysical, political and metalinguistic terms" (1987:81).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Footnotes to Chapter Four

[1] Satua Bali I.B.(5) 46.2

[2] Satua Bali I.B.(5) 46.8

[3] I will leave aside here consideration of the semantic factors governing number and order of adjectival modifiers.

[4] Satua Bali I.B.(5) 45.2

[5] Satua Bali I.B.(5) 45.11

[6] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 11.7

[7] Balinese is very similar to Old Javanese in this respect, except that Balinese has a bi-valent system of contrasts for the basically tri-valent system of Old Javanese.

[8] There are also words with locative meanings based on derivations with the locative formative *d-* from words for the Balinese 'compass points', or *nawasanga*. Thus from *kelod* 'seaward, south' and *kangin* 'east' are found *delod* 'south of' and *dangin* 'east of'. There are further derivations of these words as well. These are formed by adding *ba-* [be] to words indicating spatial orientation, or to the locative derivation of *nawasanga* words mentioned above. Thus from *duur* 'above', 'on top', we find *ba-duur* 'at the top' and *ba-delod* 'located to the south'. The use of *be-* here suggests a borrowing of Malay *ber-*, which shows *be-* [be] in a number of dialects.

[9] Examples of deictic-allative/ablative pronouns used as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

verbs of motion are illustrated below:

a. Mè-n Sari **mai** ibi sanja
mother-lig *(name)* deic1/alla *last* *evening*

'Mèn Sari <u>came</u> <u>here</u> last evening'.

b. I Madé suba **kema**
prop 2nd-born +accomp deic2/abl

'I Madé has already <u>gone</u> <u>out</u>.

[10] There are also *alus mider* variants *niki* 'this' and *nika* 'that'.

[11] There are variants of this set with greater markedness in terms of 'refinement'. These include *asapuniki* and *asapunika*, as well as 'ultra-refined' *asampuniki/asampunika*.

[12] As noted in Chapter One *alus asor* terms are used in self-reference, lowering the position of the speaker in deference to a high status interlocutor.

[13] There is also a feminine form *nyai* (*nyi* in some dialects), related to *cai* through the nasalization morphophoneme, used as a marker of both (categorical) identity and difference (here, of gender).

[14] Use of *alus mider* forms like *ipun* is not tied so much to the status of particular referents, as to the overall framing of the event. Thus it is appropriate to use *ipun* when speaking to a high status person, or in a forum like the *banjar* meeting, about a commoner *(anak jaba)*.

[15] *Ida* is found as a 3rd person pronoun for higher *triwangsa* (gentry) referents, including high status *satriya* individuals and members of the *brahmana* lineages.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[16] Note also the *kasar* variant *-réh* from [B] *wiréh*, and *dé-ning kéto*, a *biasa* 'translation' of *alus* register *duaning asapunika*. Th use of such 'translations' of *alus* forms is especially common in performance genres, where the clowns *(panasar)* use the *alus* term when speaking to (or for) a high status character, but the *biasa* variant when speaking among themselves.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER FIVE

DERIVATIONAL MORPHOLOGY OF MODERN BALINESE

5.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the morphology involved in derivational processes that produce polymorphemic verbs and verbal substantives in Balinese. We will look first at stative and intransitive verbs that occur either in (phonologically) unmarked form or with the affix *ma-*.

5.1 Stative and intransitive verbs in Balinese

In Balinese statives and many intranstive verbs occur either in the form of the morphologically unmarked base or with *ma-*. These Balinese statives can be compared with Tagalog statives described by Foley & Van Valin (1984: 66, 70) as having the logical structure **predicate**' (x).[1]

However, there are differences between the two systems, for Balinese words like *melah* 'good' or *gedé* 'big' are equivalent to Tagalog words *ma-buti* and *ma-laki* that <u>must</u> take the *ma-* prefix, while Balinese *melah* and *gedé* <u>cannot</u>. Balinese *ma-* can also be compared with Old Javanese

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ma-, but in the latter system most bases can take either base (unmarked) form or the *ma*-R form, with differing semantic consequences. In Balinese (as in Taglog) stative and intransitive bases occur in either base form or with *ma-*, but not both.

There is sometimes a fine line between adjective and stative verb in Balinese, but in general a stative verb cannot occur as modifier to a nominal item while a true adjective can. Thus compare (1) and (2) below:

(1) anak gelem
person sick 'sick person'

(2) *anak tawang
person know *(knowledgable person)

In (1) the adjectival base is permitted to modify a nominal head, while in (2) semantic features of *tawang* prevent this from happening. *Tawang* can be said to be in a single meaning-class with bases like *inget* 'remember', *dingeh* 'hear' and *takut* 'afraid' that have a non-volitional meaning. This class includes words referring to mental or sense perceptions *(inget, dingeh)* and to emotions *(takut)*. These are bases that are used only as verbs (in underived form). The adjectival *gelem* 'sick', on the other hand, can be said to be in a single form-meaning class with other adjectival words (*luung* 'good', *seger* 'healthy', etc.); these words are never used as (underived) verbs.

Frequently used stative and intransitive verbs of Balinese are illustrated in Figure 14.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 14: Balinese stative and intransitive verbal bases

Register:	Biasa	Alus
I. non-volitional statives and intransitives:		
1. *be afraid*	takut, jejeh	a-jerih
2. *remember*	inget	éling
3. *laugh*	kedèk	ica
4. *know, be aware of*	tawang	uning
5. *sleep*	pules	sirep
6. *be dead*	mati	séda/padem
II. verbs of motion and related intransitives:		
1. *come, arrive*	teka	rauh
2. *go out*	luas	lunga
3. *arrive at*	tekèd	rauh (ring)
4. *return home*	mulih	mantuk/budal
5. *join, go along to*	milu	(ngiring)
6. *go down*	tuun	tedun
7. *appear, come out*	pesu	medal
III. specialized stative-intransitive verbs:		
a. existential *(there is/are)*:		
	ada	wènten
b. '*happen, become*' (by extension: *be permitted to*):		
	dadi	dados

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

When there is a volitional component involved in an activity, or it is a transitory state that is being described, the intransitive form taken is more likely to be *ma*-R. There are a great many *ma*-R intransitives in the language, as well as frequent cases of nominal attribution with *ma*-R.

Examples of Balinese *ma*-R statives and intransitives are given in Figure 15.

Figure 15: Balinese *ma*-R statives and intransitives

Register:	Biasa	Alus[2]
I. nominal attribution (stative formed from nominal base):		
1. *be named*	m-adan	ma-wastu, ma-parab, ma-pesèngan
2. *be of the age*	ma-tuuh	ma-yusa
3. *make profit*	ma-sari	
4. *contain*	m-isi	ma-daging
5. *have hair/feathers*	ma-bulu	
6. *have pained expression*	ma-sebeng	
7. *thieve, act as thief*	ma-maling	
8. *perform purificatory ritual aimed at chthonic spirits:*	ma-caru	ma-laspas
9. *hava a wound*	mat-tatu	(kanin)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 15, cont.

II. Intransitive verbs taking *ma-*:		
1. *take trip, jaunt*	ma-lali	(ma-lancar-an)
2. *fast (not eat)*	ma-kènta	
3. *enter, come into*	ma-celep	(nge-ranjing-an)
3. *become faint*	ma-kesiab	
4. *study*	ma-lajah	
5. *feel, experience*	ma-rasa	
6. *leap*	ma-kecog/kecos	
7. *lie down, sleep*	ma-sarè	merèm
8. *watch (play, spectacle, etc.)*	ma-balih	ma-cingak
9. *think about, desire*	ma-keneh	ma-manah/ma-kayun/ ma-pi-kayun
10. *eat*	ma-daar	(nge-rayunan)
11. *bathe*	(manjus)	ma-siram

Balinese sequences like *ma-kena bubu* 'cast nets' and *ma-karya lelombaan* 'put on contests' are suggestive of Old Javanese clauses like *ma-gawé yajña* 'perform sacrifice' that incorporate Object arguments. As several authors have suggested, the most elegant solution to the problems of analysis presented by these 'surface transitives' taking *ma-*, is to understand them not as transitive constructions, but rather as S-V constructions in which *ma-* modifies the entire complement (*gawé yajña, kena bubu,* etc.). This is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the course taken for Old Javanese by Zoetmulder (cf. 2.3 above). Benjamin (1987) takes the same approach for Malay, citing an earlier analysis by MacDonald (1976) supporting this view:

> "According to Macdonald's analysis, the conventional orthography can trap the unwary into assuming a Subject-Verb-Object construction instead of the Subject-Verb construction it really is. The *ber-* here governs a single compound nominal phrase, which would in a syntax-reflecting orthography be written hyphenated." (1987:27)

Thus seemingly transitive uses of *ma-* might better be thought of in terms of "object incorporation" or the governing of a compound nominal phrase by a single affix.

5.2 *ma-* statives with 'passive' interpretation

In the examples of *ma-* statives given so far it has always been an Actor participant that is associated with the *ma-* form. However, there are some Balinese bases that do <u>not</u> pick out an Actor argument when combined with *ma-*, but rather a *patient*.

This phenomena has been described in a number of different ways. Thus Kersten (1984) draws attention to the fact that the bases that have 'passive' interpretation with *ma-* are transitive:

> "If a base word is transitive the derived form often **has a passive meaning**". [3]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Joseph (ca. 1984) states that *ma-* used with some bases "indicates passive idea", and points out that *agents* play a reduced role in such constructions:

> "...this construction is used when the agent is not considered to be important." (ca. 1984: 70)

If we look at examples given by Joseph (ca. 1984) it is clear that there are two (semantically defined) conditions under which a *ma-* stative can have *patient* reference.

First, if the process described by a base is a physical change of state only peripherally effected by an animate agent, then the thing in which the change of state occurs is taken as the 'subject' of the *ma-* stative.

Second, a particular class of objects may be interpreted in terms of symbolic agency in certain contexts, and these become the 'subjects' of *ma*-statives. This is particularly clear in the case of "transactional" verbs like 'sell' (*adep* [B]/*adol* [A]). In Balinese market-place parlance the objects sold are often spoken of (metonymously) as the agents in transactions. (This is also true in English when, for example, we speak of items 'selling' for such and such a price). In this case a *ma*-R verb is chosen.

Agentive forms *ng-adep* and *ng-adol* exist for the verb 'sell', but are used largely in cases where a habitual or generic meaning is intended. The choice of the affix *ma-* in cases like these arises from the fact that is 'least marked' in terms of features of agency and volitionality,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

hence more appropriate in a semantic context where there is a conflation of agentive and patient-like features in a single argument.

The metonymous relationship of Objects and agents is also a factor in the choice of *ma-* by verbs like *kurung* 'to pen'. In this case the domestic cycle of 'penning chickens' is oriented more towards the chickens, than to the ephemaral human agents that pen them. As with the objects of selling, the chickens thus become (metonymously) Actors in the event.

The two general cases in which *ma*-statives refer to *patient* arguments rather than Actors are illustrated in the examples following:[4]

(a) process describes change of state of a physical substance; animate agent is peripheral:

(3) Jukut-é suba ma-lablab
greens-pro3 +accomp sta-*boil*

'The vegetables have come to a boil.'

(4) Yéh-é suba ma-seduh
water-pro3 +accomp sta-*pour*

'The water has already been poured.'

(b) Objects are treated metonymously as agentive:

(5) Umah-é suba m-adep
house-pro +accomp sta-*sell*

'The house is already sold.'

(6) siap-é jani ma-kurung
chicken(s)-pro3 *now* sta-*pen*

'The chickens are/have been penned up.'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Note that in transitive constructions *kurung* 'pen' has more commonly a 'passive' than an 'active' realization. Thus compare (7) and (8) below:

(7) siap-é ènto kurung-**a** (tekèn I Wayan)
rooster-pro3 deic2 *pen*-Ag3 ('by' prop 1st-born)
'That rooster <u>got</u> <u>penned</u> <u>up</u> (by I Wayan).'

(8) I Wayan **ng**urung siap *sa*-dina-dina
prop 1st-born AF-*pen* *chickens* *'every day'*
'I Wayan <u>pens</u> chickens every day.'

In the case of (7) the *definiteness* of the *patient* argument *(siap-é ento* 'that chicken'*)* and the passive form of the verb are linked to a 'perfective' interpretation, while in (8) the Actor Focus ('active voice') construction has a generic or habitual interpretation. We will return to this linkage of 'voice' and aspectual contrasts in section 6.8 following).

Balinese uses of *ma-* with *patient* reference are not infrequent, suggesting a stronger development of the "Middle Voice" aspects of *ma*-R in Balinese than is the case for languages like Old Javanese of Tagalog. Thus we can compare the Actor-orientation in examples like Old Javanese *ma-dwal* 'sell' with the Object-orientation of (cognate) Balinese *m-adol* [A] and *m-adep* [B] 'be sold':

a. Old Javanese

(9) Sang Ballawa sira ta **ma**-<u>dwal</u> matsya **māngsa**
hon *Ballava* pro3 top sta-*sell* *fish* **meat**
sarwa-bhakṣya

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

all (kinds of) things eaten

'Sang Ballawa sold fish, meat, and all kinds of foods.'[5]

b. Balinese

(10) tusing ada baas m-adep jani
not exist *uncooked rice* sta-*sell* *now*
'There's no rice for sale now.'

(11) akéh wènten sekar m-adol irika
many exist *flower(s)* sta-*sell* deic/loc
'There are many (kinds of) flowers sold there.'

While the Old Javanese *ma-* stative of (9) takes a 'subject' whose case-role is that of *agent*, the *ma-* stative forms for both *biasa* and *alus* Balinese in (10) and (11) take 'subjects' whose case-role is that of the *patient*.

As noted in section 5.1 above Foley and Van Valin (1984) have shown that *ma-* statives can be said to have "the logical structure **predicate**' (**x**)'". It is this neutral semantic structure of the *ma-* affix, its attributive characteristics, that makes its use prominent in the "Middle Voice" uses that are described for *ber-* of Malay by Benjamin (1987: 30 - 37).

5.3 Nominalizing morphology of Modern Balinese: *pa-* element affixes

Modern Balinese possesses two major prefixes forming substantives. The first of these *pa(ng)-* is involved in derivation of nouns that (in the majority of cases) are oriented towards Actor arguments, especially *agents* or

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

instruments.

Major uses of Balinese substantives based on *pa(ng)-* are summarized following:[6]

I. Forms taking *pa*-R or *pang*-R:

a. instrumental and agentive nouns

1. *pang-asih* 'potion for love magic' < *asih* 'love'
2. *pang-ijeng* 'watchman' < *(ng)-ijeng* 'keep watch'

b. habitual actor nominals:

1. *panakut (pang-takut)* 'coward' < *takut* 'afraid'
2. *pameler (pang-beler)* 'prankster' < *beler* 'naughty'

c. abstract nouns (the *pi-* allomorph is used mainly with vowel-initial bases other than /i/):

1. *pang-rauh* 'arrival' < *rauh* 'arrive'
2. *pi-uning* 'announcement, briefing' < *uning* 'know'

II. Forms taking *pa*-R-*an* or *pang*-R-*an*:

a. locative nouns (where action is performed, or physical feature of landscape resulting from action of the base):

i. underlying verb is intransitive:

1. *pa-saré-an* 'bed, bedchamber' < *saré* 'lie down, sleep'

ii. underlying verb from is transitive:

1. *pang-urit-an* 'place to germinate rice' < *-urit* 'plant rice seedlings'

b. Abstract nouns with temporal meaning (time when action performed):

1. *pa-bakti-an* 'day of worship' < *bakti* 'worship, devotion, loyalty'
2. *pa-nampah-an* 'day before ritual for slaughtering animals' < *tampah* 'slaughter'[7]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Balinese nominals taking *pa-* can also have reference to arguments with the semantic relation of *patient* to the action. Here it is clear that the same motivation is at work that gives rise to the 'passive' meanings of *ma-* for transactional verbs like 'sell'. In this case it is in regard to important transactional words like 'give' and 'borrow' that the *pa-* forms are motivated by a conflation of the characteristics of *patients* and (metonymous) *agents*.

Examples of *pa*-R substantives oriented toward *patient* arguments are given below:

1. *pa-baang* [B] 'thing given, gift' < *baang* 'give'[8]
2. *pa-silih* [B] 'thing borrowed' < *silih* 'borrow'

From a formal standpoint *pa-* can thus be considered a nominal analog of *ma-*, having the same stative or 'attributive' functions but signifying a single prominent participant in the event, where *ma-* relates directly to the event, secondarily to the primary participant in the event.

5.4 The affix *-an* in Balinese

The morpheme *-an* is in many respects the Focus marker with the most consistency of meaning across languages of the Western AN sub-grouping. However we should not assume from this that its exact functions and semantics are constant for every languages. In Old Javanese and Tagalog, for example, *-an* is used with Goal Focus predicates to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

markObject complements with a 'locative' meaning. In Balinese this is true only in the limited case of the Goal Focus 'locative substantives' formed with *ka-R-an*.

As in many other languages *-an* can be used in Balinese to form simple Goal nominals. A number of these are illustrated below. For some bases either partial or full reduplication is involved in this process, due partly to phonological, partly to semantic constraints:

(a) R-*an* forms:

1. *dum-an* 'portion, share' < *dum* 'divide'
2. *alap-an* 'thing plucked' < *alap* 'pick up, pluck'
3. *ajeng-an* 'food, rice' (ready for eating)

(b) partially reduplicated forms (R_2-R):

1. *de-daar-an* 'food, things eaten' < *(ma)-daar* [B] 'eat'
2. *te-unas-an* 'food, things eaten'[9] < *tunas* [Asi] 'request' (from higher status actant)
3. *ge-goda-n* 'things that tempt' < *goda* 'tempt'[10]

c. fully reduplicated forms (R2):

1. *aba-aba-an* 'what is carried (on a trip, home from a trip) < *aba* 'carry'
2. *amah-amah-an* 'food' 'things eaten (by animals)' < *amah* 'eat' (of animals)
3. *inum-inum-an* 'drinks' < *inum* 'drink'

Similar derived nouns indicating a Goal relationship at the most basic semantic level can be formed from underlying adjectival bases:

1. *se-seneng-an* 'things one is fond of' < *seneng*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'pleased, happy'[11]

The *-an* form is also used with some bases to form specialized non-volitional verbs that take *ke*-R-*an* in languages like Malay-Indonesian:

1. *ujan-an* 'caught out in the rain' < *ujan* [A] 'rain'
2. *peteng-an* 'caught out in the dark' < *peteng* 'night'

Reduplicated forms taking *-an* can also form derived nouns from nominal bases, in this case referring to the plural or distributive aspect of the nominal base:

1. *togog-togog-an* 'all kinds of statues' < *togog* 'statue'
2. *mas-mas-an* 'all kinds of jewelry and ornaments made from gold' < *mas* 'gold'

There are also *ma*-R-*an* verb forms in Balinese. While many *ma*-R intransitives have to do with transitory actions, the *ma*-R-*an* forms usually refer to (a) actions carried out reciprocally, or (b) the ongoing or continuous quality of the action or event:

(a) reciprocal action:

(12) anak cenik ènto **ma**-timpug-**an**
person little deicart2 sta-*throw stones*-LF

'Those little kids were throwing stones at each other.'

(b) ongoing or continuous quality of event:

(13) lantas **ma**-paitung-**an** ajak-a dadua
then sta-*counsel*-GF '*the two together*'

'Then the two of them took counsel together.'[12]

Balinese may be unique in using *-an* to form the comparative grade. It is commonly used in this function

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with adjectives and adverbs, and is also found with certain function words with a deictic or temporal charcter:

a. R-*an* added to adjectives or adverbs to form comparatives:

1. *luung-an* [B] 'better' < *luung* 'good'
2. *tegeh-an* 'higher' < *tegeh* 'high'
3. *gelis-an* [A] 'faster' < *gelis* 'fast'

b. R-*an* added to function words to form comparatives:

1. *dini-an* 'closer to here' < *dini* 'here'
2. *ditu-an* 'closer to there' < *ditu* 'there'
3. *be-duur-an* 'more to the top' < *ba-duur* 'at the top'
4. *tuni-an* 'still earlier (in the day)' < *tuni* 'earlier'

For some bases the reduplicated form with *-an* can be used to indicate the excessive or superlative degree of a quality:

1. *baat-an* 'too heavy' < *baat* 'heavy'
2. *gelis-gelis-an* 'as fast as possible' < *gelis* [A] 'fast'
3. *adèng-adèng-an* 'as slow as possible' < *adèng* [B] 'slow'

5.5 Balinese Actor Focus constructions

While stative *ma-* cannot be rigorously defined as an Actor Focus affix in Balinese it often serves that purpose, in many cases taking as its single argument the intransitive Subject. For other uses of Actor Focus, however, Balinese possesses only the morphophoneme N- covering the range of meanings that are differentiated in Old Javanese through the contrasts of Actor Focus affixes

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a-/ma, *-um-*, and *ang-/mang* and in Old Balinese with *ma-*, *mar-*, *-um-*, and *mang-*.

The nasalization morphophoneme can be described as triggering either one of two basic responses: (1) if the base is consonant-initial, homorganicnasalization of its initial segment; or (2) prefixing of [ṅ] or [ṅe]. In this case [ṅ] is chosen if the base is vowel-initial, [ṅ] or ṅe] if the initial segment is a semi-vowel. A technical set of rules for the changes triggered by N- can be written using the phonological features of Halle and Clements (1983):

(1) Rule I: N- / ___Vowel > [ṅ]
that is:
N- + [i], [e], [a], [u], [o], [ə] >
[ṅi], [ṅe], [ṅa], etc.

(2) Rule II: N- / ___Semi-vowel/nasal > [ṅ] or [ṅə][13]
that is:
N- + [r], [l], [y], [w] > [ṅ-r] or [ṅə-r], etc.
N- + [m], [n], [ñ], [ṅ]. > [ṅə-m], [ṅə-n], etc.

(3) Rule III: Consonant (-voice) / N-___ > +nasal (+voice +sonarant)
that is:
[t], [k], [p], and [c]) >
[n], [ṅ], [m], and [ñ])

(4) Rule IV: Consonant (+voice) / N-___ > + nasal (+sonorant)
that is:
[d], [g], [b], and [j]) >
[n], [ṅ], [m], and [ñ]) [14]

From a crudely descriptive point of view the most salient semantic feature associated with Balinese N-appears

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to be a very generalized notion of *agency*, covering a semantic area that is sub-divided by the contrastive Actor Focus affixes of languages like Old Javanese and Tagalog. Thus N- covers many types of actions, some volitional, others not, some transitive and directed towards Objects, some intransitive, and representing self-contained (but usually outer-directed) actions.

There are three main types of N-R derivation, depending on the semantic type of the modified base :

(1) those based on nominal bases: in this case there is usually a metaphorical or metonymous relationship between the nominal base and the activity specified by the verbal derivation formed with N-:

kubu 'shack in the ricefields' > *ngubu* 'live in a shack in the ricefields'

ngéka-daya 'to come up with a plan' < *éka-daya* 'strategy, trick'

(2) those based on intransitive verbal bases: some intransitive bases require N-R, while others have both unaffixed and N-R forms. In the latter type the unaffixed form appears to refer to more punctual or discrete events:

ngoyong 'to live, reside somewhere' < -*oyong
nyotot 'peck with beak' < *cotot* 'peck with beak'
ningeh 'listen, hear' < *dingeh* 'listen'

(3) those based on transitive verbal bases (or nominal bases that have a transitive element when transposed into the verbal system): N-R constructions formed on these bases can take simple *patient* arguments:

ngaé bangbang 'make/dig a hole' < *gaé* 'work'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ngelah pipis 'have money' < *gelah* 'possession'

While N-R-O derivations like those in (3) are undoubtedly transitive, there is little differentiation of Object arguments in these constructions. It is with the addition of the overt participant-marking morphemes *-ang* or *-in* that the Balinese clause becomes most fully involved in the processes of Transitivity, with the "carrying over" of actions to Object/Undergoer arguments.

5.6 Transitivizing suffixes in Modern Balinese

While Balinese *-ang* and *-in* can no doubt be compared to close cousins like Old Balinese *-ang* and *-yan/-in* in that they relate respectively to the "affected" and "domain" complements of the verb, the Balinese system has its own particular semantics. We will look here at major functions of *-ang* and *-in* in terms of their effect on Balinese Actor Focus predicates taking N-R-(suffix) form.

Since the functions of Focus affixes are in part determined by the semantic class of modified bases, there appear to be a multiplicity of functions for suffixes like *-ang* and *-in*. But we should not assume from this a number of homophonous morphemes: rather we are dealing with morphemes that operate at a meta-level, organizing semantic classes according to features that 'fit' with the general meaning of the affix.[15]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

5.7 *-ang* modifying nominal or adjectival bases

When *-ang* modifies a nominal bases the resulting derived transitive has the logical structure of an *accomplishment* verb (as defined by Foley & Van Valin), e.g. "CAUSE [BECOME] **predicate**'(x)", where x represents the underlying nominal base. This is illustrated in (14) following:

a. *-ang* with nominal base:

(14) Anak Agung ento lakar **ny**entana-n-ang
(satriya title) deic2 fut AF-*adopted heir*-Tr1

anak teruna ané bagus ento
person *young* rel *handsome* deic2

'That Anak Agung is going to <u>take</u> <u>as</u> <u>his</u> <u>heir</u> that handsome young person.'[16]

There are also *accomplishment* verbs taking *-in* in Balinese. However, there are differences between the *accomplishment* verbs taking *-ang* and *-in* in Balinese. Thus the derivation with *-in* is likely to refer to a transitory physiological symptom, while those represented by *-ang* are more often changes of state or transferable states. As a consequence *agents* of such *-ang* derivations are more likely to be animate and volitional, while derivations taking *-in* often have inanimate or abstract *agents*. In addition the *-in* forms are sematically-oriented towards a universal Object ("everyone") and there is thus no overt expression of an Object NP. This is not true for *accomplishment* verbs

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

taking *-ang*.[17]

(15) Anget-**ang** yéh a-dangdang gedè
hot-Tr1 *water* *one-kettle* *large*

'Heat up a big kettlefull of water !'[18]

(16) Dagang ento **nyugih-ang** pegawé ento
merchant deic2 AF-*rich*-Tr1 *public official* deic2

'That businessman made that official rich.'

c. *-in* with adjectival bases:

(17) Ida ngaé balih-balih-an
pro3 [Asi] AF-*carry out* [B] R2-*watch spectacle*-GF

ané **nakut-in**
rel AF-*be afraid*-Tr2

'He put on frightening public spectacles.'[19]

5.8 *-ang* and *-in* modifying intransitive bases

When *-ang* and *-in* are used to form derived transitives from intransitive bases they differ in terms of the dynamicity of the patient. This is brought out in two comments on the transitivizing suffixes made by B. Joseph: "The suffix *-ang* is used when the object is mobile... The suffix *-in* is used when the object is 'immobile' or locative in nature." (ca. 1984, p. 61)

Thus it is the object that is moved or transferred (Foley & Van Valin's *theme*) that is promoted with *-ang*, while *-in* refers to objects treated as static 'targets' of action. These contrasts are clear in the examples

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

following:

a. transitive formed from intransitive base + *-ang:*

(18) Pan Balang enu **nyujuk-ang** **umah**
(name) +incomp *AF-stand up*-Tr1 *house*

'Pan Balang is still building houses.'

(b) transitive formed from intransitive base + *-in:*

(19) I Yuyu **n**angsek-**in** I Cangak
prop *crab* AF-*close*-Tr2 prop *heron*

'B'er Crab came up close to B'er Heron.'[20]

For some intransitive verbs with a *temporal* or *directional* aspect the form N-R-*ang* is used to indicate *the* performance of an intransitive action related to the base. The most common of these are 'directional' verbs of motion based on the Balinese 'compass points' *(nawasanga)*. Thus from *kelod* 'south' we find the derived verb of motion **ng**elod-**ang** 'to go south, heading south'.

a. intransitive formed from 'directional' base:

(20) Lunga ki-ja Madé ? Tiang ? **Ng**elod-**ang**.
go *where* 2nd-born pro1 AF-*south*-Tr1

'Where'ye goin Madé ? Me ? (I'm) heading south.'

b. intransitive formed from 'temporal' base:

(21) Inggih baos-*an* mangkin sampun
yes [A] *speak*-LF [A] *now* +accomp [A]

nge-das-rahina-**ng**
AF-*time just before daybreak*-Tr1

'Yes, (we will) speak now of (the time when) day was about to break.'[21]

For stative/adjectival bases referring to emotions

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

-ang forms derived transitives showing the emotion as directed outwardly towards a target that is treated syntactically as an Object:

(22) Sing ja **ny**andang adi bakal
not indeed AF-*fitting* younger sib fut

sangat **ny**ebet-**ang** séda-n
very much AF-*grief*-Tr1 *death*-lig

raka-n adi-né
older sib-lig younger sib

'It's not fitting that you, young friend should grieve so much over the death of your older brother.[22]

In the case of a non-volitional state like *sakit* 'sick' the verb agrees with the 'experiencer' subject while the phrase describing the *locus* of the pain takes the post-verbal slot normally taken by the Object of a N-R-(suffix) verb:

(23) Ida **ny**akit-**ang** duur
pro3 [Asi] AF-*sick*-Tr1 *above*

'He (resp) has a headache.'[23]

The locative-like features of *-in* also come out in constructions like those described by Hook (1983) as representing the "abstrumental case":

(24) I Ketut lakar **m**asang-**in** célèng
prop 3rd-born future AF-*stomache*-Tr2 *pig*

'I Ketut is going to gut a pig.'

(25) Mémé **ng**ulit-**in** biu anggon-a panak-é
mother *AF-skin*-Tr1 *banana* *use*-Ag3 *child*-pro3

'Mother peeled/peels a banana for her child.'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

5.9 *-ang* and *-in* added to transitive bases

When *-ang* and *-in* are added to transitive bases there is often a rearrangement of the status of Object arguments. This is evident in the case of di-transitive verbs like *idih* 'beg for, request'. With *idih* the unsuffixed form takes the *patient* while the *recipient* is consigned to a prepositional phrase. If *-in* is suffixed the *recipient* argument is brought into the core of the clause and loses its prepositional phrase. However, this has the side-effect of motivating 'passive' form for the clause. (We will return to this fact in Chapter Six.):

(26) beli **ng**-idih pipis tekèn bapa
older sib AF-*request* *money* (source) *father*
'I asked/ask for money from dad.[24]

(27) bapa idih-**in** -beli pipis
father *request*-Tr2 -older sib (= pro1) *money*
'I asked dad for money.'[25]

A similar process drawing prepositional arguments into the core of the clause can be observed for *-ang*, but here the argument affected is usually an *instrument*:

(28) ia **ng**ebeg kayu aji batu
pro3 AF-*rub* *wood* instr *stone*
'He rubbed the wood with a stone.'[26]

(29) ia **ng**ebeg-**ang** batu di kayu-né
pro3 AF-*rub*-Tr1 *stone* loc *wood*-pro3
'He rubbed with a stone on the wood.'[27]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

5.10 *-ang* and *-in* in *benefactive* constructions

Like Malay *-kan* Balinese *-ang* very frequently forms *benefactives*. However, in Balinese *-in* is also associated with benefactives, a fact that is not true of analagous Malay-Indonesian *-i*.

The R-*ang* derivation based on *beli* 'buy' is a typical common example of the benefactive construction in Balinese:

(30) I Bapa bakal meli-ang
prop *father* fut Af-*buy*-Tr1

Ni Madé sepeda
prop(fem) 2nd-born *cycle*

'Father is going <u>to</u> <u>buy</u> a bicycle <u>for</u> Ni Madé.'

One of the special attributes of Balinese benefactives in R-*ang* derivations is brought out in a comment by Kersten:

> "The suffix -ang is retained, even if the party benefitted is not mentioned, but is only retained in the imagination of the speaker.
>
> Mémé jumah ja, pang ada **ny**akan-**ang**
> *mother* *at-home* '*just*' opt exist AF-*cook*-Tr1
>
> 'Mother is just staying at home so that there is (someone) <u>to</u> <u>cook</u> <u>for</u> (everyone).'"[28]

In this case the participant-marking capacity of *-ang* is used not to refer to specific entities benefitted by the action, but to the fact that entities exist who are the logical benefactees of the verb.

For intransitive bases forming derived transitives

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with *-ang* the benefactive construction is formed with *-in* rather than *-ang*. This is especially clear for the benefactive form of stative bases like *ampak* 'open'. In this case the *-ang* derivation points to the "affected complement, the 'thing opened'. Since affixes are not 'additive' in Balinese the derived base *-ampak-ang* cannot take *-ang* to form the benefactive, so by default it takes *-in*, the affix to which it is most related in type. This is illustrated in examples (31) and (32) following:

a. derived transitive in R-*ang*

(31) Ih Sari, ampak-**ang** ja jlanan...
'eh' (name) *be open*-Tr1 *'just'* *door*

ada tamiu teka
exist *guest(s)* *arrive, come*

'Eh Sari, <u>open</u> <u>up</u> the door, some guests have come.'

b. benefactive in R-*in*

(32) Cening, cening Ketimun Mas mémé teka
'little one' (2x) *(Golden Cucumber)* *mother* *come*

ampak-**in** mémé jlanan
be open-Tr2 *mother* *door*

'Hey little one, Ketimun Mas, I'm home, <u>open</u> <u>up</u> the door <u>for</u> <u>me</u>.[29]

5.11 Adverbial constructions in N-R-*ang*

There are also adverbial derivations in the form R-*ang* based on adjectival bases like *ènggal* 'fast'. When these take the form N-R-*ang* the modality of the action is seen

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'progressively', that is as simultaneous with the action of a main verb (usually taking N-R-(suffix) form):

(33) **ng**-ènggal-**ang** ia **ny**emak yéh **gemulak**
AF-*fast*-Tr1 pro3 AF-*get, fetch* *water roiling boil*
'Doing it quickly she fetched furiously boiling water.'[30]

'Passive' forms of these R-*ang* derivations have a different aspectual interpretation. We will return to this problem in Chapter Six (section 6.8).

5.12 Causative constructions in Balinese

In verbal constructions of Balinese the affix *pa-* is used to form 'causative' stems in which the *pa-* element can be said to make reference to "mediate Actor participants". These stems can be in unsuffixed or suffixed form, and can be used in both Actor Focus and 'passive' constructions.

The Balinese 'passive' system presents particular complications for Balinese causative forms to be reviewed in Chapter Six. I will therefore beg the question of 'surface forms' here and look instead at the causative stems as intermediate forms that can be realized in either Actor Focus or 'passive' constructions.

a. *pa*-R forming derived transitives from stative bases:

takut 'afraid' > **pa-takut* '(to) frighten'
éling 'remember' > **pa-k-éling* '(to) remind'

b. *pa*-R-*ang* forming derived transitives from intransitive

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

or nominal bases:

dingeh 'hear' > **pa-dingeh-ang* '(to) make, cause to hear'
laib 'run' > *pa*-laib-*ang* 'run off with, abduct'

c. *pa*-R-*ang* forming morphological causatives from transitive bases:

suun 'carry on the head' > **pa-suun-ang* 'have place on the head '

d. *pa-R-in* forming derived transitives from adjectival bases concerned with extension, speed, intensity, and the like:

lantang 'long' > *pa-lantang-in* 'lengthen'
becat 'swift, fast' > *pa-becat-in* 'increase in speed'[31]

5.13 *Ka*-R-(suffix) morphology of Balinese: nominal and verbal uses

An affix *ka-* like that found in Old Javanese and Old Balinese also figures in Modern Balinese in both verbal and substantive formations. Substantive derivations in *ka*-R-*an* can form both *locative* and *abstract nouns*. Some examples are given below:

a. abstract nouns in *ka*-R-*an*

1. *darma* (adj) 'well-behaved' > *ka-darma-n* 'virtue, dharma'
2. *luih* 'foremost' > *ka-luih-an* 'state of being foremost'

b. locative nouns in *ka*-R-*an*

1. *dini* 'here' > *ka-dini-an* 'hereabouts', e.g. 'this world'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2. *ditu* 'there' > *ka-ditu-an* 'thereabouts', e.g. 'the afterlife, the world of gods and ancestors'

We will look at verbal derivations taking *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology in the discussion of 'passive' morphology to follow in Chapter Six.

5.14 Conclusions

In this chapter we have looked at Balinese statives, as well as verbal and substantive derivations employing morphology that is familiar from other Western AN languages, including those surveyed in Part I of this thesis.

We have seen that the Balinese system has its own particular semantics, comparable in general ways to that of neighboring languages, but with differences significant enough to require a separate description.

We nave concentrated in this chapter on the morphology of Actor Focus constructions of Balinese. While this system remains constant in form across speech registers I will argue in Chapter Eight that there is some evidence of functional differences for these forms in *biasa* and *alus* levels that can be linked to the contrasting pragmatics of "event-salient" and "participant-salient" discourse.

Figure 16 illustrates major derivational morphology covered in this chapter, as well as morphology of 'passive' forms to be reviewed in Chapter Six.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 16: Verbal & Substantive Morphology of Balinese

(a) true verbs

	R-0	R-ang	R-in	R-an
1. root statives and imperatives:				
0-R	aba	beli-ang	jemak-in	
2. marked statives:				
ma-R	ma-balih			ma-timpug-an
3. 'Actor Focus' forms and 'active adverbials':				
N-R	ng-aba	ng-adeg-ang	ng-adep-in	
		ng-ènggal-ang		
4. "First passives" and 'passive adverbials':				
0-R	aba-n-a	beli-ang-a	tuut-in-a	
		ènggal-ang-a		

(b) verbs based on (historically) substantive formations

1. Non-volitional verbs (both registers):				
ka-R	ka-bilbil	ka-ampih-ang	ka-pacek-in	ka-pegat-an
2. *Alus* register "Second Passives"				
ka-R		ka-dados-ang	ka-atur-in	
3. *Alus* register "Third Passives"				ka-atur-an
4. 'Causative' constructions - 'passive' forms:				
pa-R	pa-takut	pa-laib-ang	pa-tuut-in*	
ka-pi-R	ka-pi-tuduh			
ma-pa-R	ma-pa-(a)jar			

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 16, cont.

3. 'Causative constructions' - 'active' forms (N- + pa-R; *ma-pa*-R):				
ma-R	ma-takut	ma-laib-ang	ma-lantang-in	
ma-pa-R				ma-pa-lawan-an
c. Derived substantives				
1. simple Goal nominals				
0-R				suun-an
0-R2				aba-aba-(a)n
$0\text{-}R_2R$				te-tunas-an
2. Locative or Abstract nouns				
ka-R				ka-dini-an
				ka-darma-(a)n
3. Instrumental, agentive or action nouns:				
pa-R	pa-derep			pa-bakti-an
pang-R	pang-asih			panampah-an
4. Goal nominals:				
pa-R	pa-baang			
pi-R	pi-kolih			

* *pa*-R-*ang*, *pa*-R-*in*, and *pa*-R are causative stems showing suffixation of pronominal forms or the 3rd person grammatical agreement marker -*a* in surface forms.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Footnotes to Chapter Five

[1] cf. Foley & Van Valin 1984, p. 70:

> "Tagalog is much like Lahkota... in that verbs involving a state or change of state are represented simply as states in the lexicon. Thus, verbs like *ma-buti* 'good', *ma-laki* 'big',... *basag* 'broken', and *puno* 'full', are all stative verbs and have the logical structure **predicate**' (x)..."

[2] I have not sub-differentiated *alus* forms here except by listing some items in (roughly) ascending order according to status. This is due simply to the needs of space and is not meant to imply that the Balinese status-marking system consists only of bipartite oppositions. (Cf. 1.4-5 above)

[3] TBB, p. 47:

> Jika kata dasar merupakan kata kerja transitif kata jadian sering **membawa arti pasif.**

[4] The examples are reproduced from Joseph (ca. 1984; p. 70). I have added constituent analyses and the example of a "First Passive" construction based on *kurung*.

[5] Wirāṭa-parwa 21.30, cited in OJE, p. 446

[6] Many of the examples in this list are drawn from Kersten: 1984 (TBB), pp. 37 - 42. The division into semantic types is the work of the author.

[7] In Formal Modern Indonesian there are *peng*-R-*an* derivations that are formally similar to Balinese *pang*-R-*an* forms. However, as is so often the case, the semantics of the two systems differ. Indonesian *peng*-R-*an* derivations

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

are mainly *abstract nouns* from transitive bases interpreted as being initiated and/or carried out by a *volitional agent*. These *peng*-R-*an* forms contrast with *per*-R-*an* forms in which the action is viewed as a natural development occurring without outside intervention. Thus compare *peng-(k)embang-an* 'conscious, externally-motivated development', with *per-kembang-an* 'spontaneous, natural development'.

I owe this insight into a broadcast on correct useage in Modern Formal Indonesian by the *Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembanan Bahasa*, the Center for Preservation and Developing of Language, an affiliate of the Indonesian Department of Education The program was broadcast on TVRI, Indonesia's state-operated television station in early 1984.

[8] The *alus* variants of *baang* also form Goal-oriented nominals taking *pa-*. Here the *alus mider* form is used when the giving is between equals, the *alus singgih* form when the gift is described as 'descending' from a higher ranking to a lower ranking individual:

pa-wéhwéh [Ami] 'gift' < *wéh* 'give' (to equal)
pa-ica/pa-icèn [Asi] 'gift' < *ica* 'give' ('downwards')

[9] Satua I Cangak I.10

[10] Satua I Cangak II.37 (b section)

[11] Mabasan Texts I.2(RY) III.21.1

[12] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 3.3

[13] [ňə] always preceeding a nasal-initial base.

[14] Note that (3) and (4) are identical in terms of output. Since all nasals are by definition +sonorant and because in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Balinese all nasals are +voice, Rules (3) and (4) can be collapsed into a more general rule of nasalization. In Rules (1) and (2) the affected phonemes are + sonorant (both vowels and semi-vowels are by definition +sonorant). This presence of sonorance in vowel or semi-vowel phonemes can then be described as inhibiting the nasalization of initial vowels or semivowels of the base and triggering instead prenasalization. Thus (1) - (4) can be collapsed into the two more general rules following:

(1) N- /___ [-consonant, +sonarant, +/- syllabic] > [ṅ]*

(2) N- /___ [+consonant, -sonorant] > 0, and [+consonant, -sonorant] > [-consonant, +sonorant, +nasal]

* with the additional constraint that [ṅ] must occur as [ṅə] when the phoneme affected is a nasal, and can optionally occur as [ṅə] before semi-vowels

15 For this reason I refer to *-ang* and *-in* with the neutral terms 'transitive one' (Tr1) and 'transitive two' (Tr2) in constituent analyses of Balinese examples, and of related suffixes in OJ, OM, and OB given in Part I of this volume.

16 B. Joseph: (ca) 1984:62

17 Adjectival bases combined with *-ang* can also have the meaning 'treat as x'. Thus *luih-ang* [B] and *utama-yang* [A] both mean 'treat as the highest, most important'.

18 Satua Bali I.A.(1) 6.9

19 Satua Bali I.B.(5) 49.3. The combination of the ultra-respectful pronoun *Ida* with the [B] verb *gaé* is unusual. In this case *ida* and *gaé* have been combined with the rhetorical intention of bringing out the base nature of the king's actions. (See Chapter Eight, section 8.3 for further elaboration.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[20] Satua I Cangak II.39

[21] Mabasan Texts III.1(RY) III.15.6

[22] Mabasan Texts I.5(RY) XXIV 45.2

[23] TBB, p.55

[24] B.Joseph: (ca) 1984:63

[25] ibid

[26] TBB, p.58

[27] ibid

[28] TBB, p.56. I have added the constituent analysis.

[29] Satua Bali I.B.(2) 2.12. Note the use of the kin term *mémé* 'mother', here as a First Person pronoun.

[30] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 11.2

[31] Examples are from TBB, pp.42-5

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER SIX

'PASSIVE' IN MODERN BALINESE

6.0 Introduction

If 'passives' of the Malay-Indonesian area are in general 'peculiar' those of Balinese may be the most peculiar of all. We will look in this chapter at two types of Balinese 'passive'. The first of these is based on the *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology familiar from Old Javanese and Old Balinese, while the other is based on verbal predicates in the form 0-R-(suffix)-(pro).

While these two forms of 'passive' (or "P-construction" to use Comrie's term) are not in complementary distribution in Balinese there are constraints on their use that suggest the presence of sociolinguistic factors in choice of passive form. I will argue in this chapter that the 0-R-(suffix) forms are quintessentially "event-salient" in form and meaning, and that as a consequence they have an extensive role in the organization of *biasa/kasar* discourse, entering into *alus* speech levels mainly in performative contexts, in exchanges between interlocutors on intimate terms.

The *ka*-R-(suffix) forms, I will argue, retain the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

older "participant-marking" morphology of languages like Old Javanese and Old Balinese, and thus have important functions in the organization of *alus* discourse, especially when used 'suppletively' to replace 3rd person forms of 0-R-(suffix) 'passives' whose grammatical marking retains person-marking features inappropriate to an *alus* context.

6.1 "Non-volitional passives" in *ka*-R-(suffix)

Ka-R-(suffix) derivations are used in all registers to indicate reference to Object/Undergoer arguments where action is seen as non-volitional, involuntary, or accidental, as 'happening to' an experiencer. The non-volitional mode indicated by *ka*-R-(suffix) forms makes them appropriate in contexts where the *patient* has reduced capacity or where the verb describes a mental or perceptual process. When a physical process is described solely in terms of inanimate objects *ka*-R- (suffix) morphology is also likely to be chosen.

These non-volitional passives can also be seen as 'cutting into the action' at its end-point, where attention has shifted away from the performance of an activity toward its results. This is brought out in recent description by Benjamin (1987) of the effects in Malay of *ter-*, a prefix with similar "non-volitional" and "accidental" interpretations:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> "While the three prefixes *me-*, *ber-*, and *di-* in the modern standard languages differ from each other in voice... they all share a common emphasis on the processual, intentional, transitive and in-progress character of the situations they refer to. It is precisely this meaning of 'source-to-goal progress' that is <u>negativized</u> by a fourth, and very, interesting, verbal prefix, *ter-*." (1987: 19)

Ka-R-(suffix) clauses are typically found in O-V-(S) and V-O-(S) form, but not S-V-O form, the essential relation being that of the verb and its Object complement, which stands in an unmarked "absolutive" relationship to the verb. A major exception to this general pattern are the V- (S)-O constructions, but these react to the particular conditions brought about by verbs taking sentential objects.

Ka-R-(suffix) clauses of *biasa* register can be subspecified for *degree of agency* through choice of agentive prepositions *baan* or *tekèn*, the first of these *(tekèn)* a preposition found marking what Foley & Van Valin term "core, but non-nuclear" constituents of the clause. In the context of 'passive' clauses this is the *agent* (cf. Figure 8, section 4.6 above). Note that *agents* taking *tekèn* are inherently less potent than those taking fully agentive *baan*, which can also double as an instrumental preposition (*tekèn* cannot). Examples below illustrate major *ka*-R-(suffix) constructions of Balinese, as well as differing conditions of *agency* in these constructions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(a) *ka*-R constructions

i. no expression of *agent* (V-O):

(1) Raris **ka**-kapit bungut I Cangak-é
then [A] GF(-vol)-*pinch* *beak* *B'er Heron*

'Then the beak of B'er Heron got pinched shut.'[1]

ii. *agent* takes preposition *tekèn* marking "core, but non-nuclear" grammatical terms (O-V-*tekèn*-S):

(2) raris bungut-ipun-é **ka**-kapit ring I Yuyu
then *beak*-pro3-pro3 GF-*pinch* 'by' *B'er Crab*

'Then his beak got pinched shut by B'er Crab.'[2]

iii. *agent* takes (strongly) agentive preposition *baan* (V-*baan*- S(pro)-O; O = S_2):

(3) Sa-wiréh **ka**-pineh baan kai (S_2)
because GF(-vol)-*think* 'by' pro1

'Because if it's thought about by me (if your intentions are evil, no matter how clever you are at hiding at, or how sweet your words, in the end it will come out).'[3]

b. *ka*-R-*in* constructions (*agent* NP incorporated post-verbally, or takes prepositional marking, if present: O-V-S):

(4) Ada bangbang linggah bek **ka**-pacek-**in** -tumbak
exist *hole* *wide* *full* **GF**-*stick* *in*-Tr2 *spear*

'There was a wide hole...full to the brim (with) spears stuck in the ground with their points upright.'[4]

c. *ka*-R-*ang* constructions (*agent* NP incorporated post-verbally, or takes prepostional marking, if present: V-O-*tekèn*-IO):

(5) Laut **ka**-tutur-**ang** unduk-né kéto
then GF-*tell*-Tr1 *matter*-pro3 *like that*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tekèn pekak-né
'to' *grandfather*-pro3

'Then the whole thing got told about (by him) to his grandfather.'[5]

d. *ka*-R-*an* constructions: *agent* completely suppressed (V-O or O-V):

i. 'accidental passive' constructions (*ka*-R-*an*):[6]

(6) Sukat ia **ng**-aba jimat tusing taen
since pro3 AF-*carry* *talisman* *never*

kelang-**an** (**ka**-ilang-**an**) isi-n bubu
GF-*lost*-LF *content(s)*-lig *net(s)*

'Ever since he carried (that) charm (he) never again suffered the loss of the things in (his) nets.'[7]

ii. abstrumental construction (U/source-Verb-S/abstrument):

(7) Carik-né **ka**-pegat-**an** yéh
rice paddy-pro3 GF-*cut off*-LF *water*

'The rice field got its water cut off.'[8]

"Non-volitional" uses of *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology are common in *biasa/kasar* register, although they are outnumbered as a passive form by the O-R-suffix forms. These constructions are also found in *alus* registers, but are less commonly a feature of *alus* discourse organization, for reasons to be discussed later in this chapter. *Alus* clauses based on "non-volitional" verbs are identical to *biasa* forms, except that verbal bases, pronouns, prepositions, etc. are drawn from the *alus* lexical base:

(8) Ri antuk **ka**-manah antuk
because GF-*think,desire* [Asor] instr/agent

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tityang	iwang	pisan	yan	anak	tulak
pro1 [Asor]	*wrong*	*very*	*if*	*person*	*refuse*

ring	**anak**	sampun	**ka**-baos	**wikan**
'to'	*person(s)*	+accomp	GF-*say* [A]	*wise*

'For if I <u>consider</u> <u>it</u> <u>in</u> <u>my</u> <u>heart</u>, it is very wrong to turn away from those who <u>are</u> <u>called</u> wise in this world.'[9]

While there are differing degrees to which *agency* is a feature of the clauses illustrated in examples (1) - (8), the absolutive relation of the verb and a single Object argument remains constant. This relation is marked in the verbal Head of the construction through the use of Focus markers, *ka-* showing the basic non-volitional Goal relation, *-ang/-in/-an* specifying sub-types of the Goal/Undergoer relation. In this the *ka*-R-(suffix) forms preserve the participant-marking characteristics of the Focus morphology that is central to languages like Old Javanese and Old Balinese.

6.2 *Alus* passives in *ka*-R-(suffix)

In the context of speech acts requiring some form of *alus* useage there are strong constraints of appropriateness on the use of pronouns. For reasons to be discussed in sections following, 3rd person 0-R-*a* forms of *biasa* register passives contain a person-marking element that is linked to lower status referents, hence potentially

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

inappropriate if used in reference to an actant requiring some form of *Alus* term.

For this reason in many examples of *alus* useage "P-constructions" involving person-marking elements are avoided, and are replaced with equivalent forms employing the *ka*-R-(suffix) Focus morphology that marks grammatical agreement alone, without reference to features of Person.

There are two main *ka*-R-(suffix) constructions involved here: the *ka*-R-*ang* and *ka*-R-*in* forms that Kersten terms "Second Passives", and the *ka*-R-*an* forms he terms "Third Passives" (1984:97-98). As Kersten notes, these forms are differentiated largely on the degree to which an Actor *(pelaku)* figures in the action, the "Third Passive" form representing the 'end-point' case, in which the Actor is completely absent. This complete suppression of the Actor argument in the Third Passive is described by some informants as making this 'the most *alus* form' *(bentuk yang paling halus)*.

Alus level passives can take one of two agentive prepositions. One of these is the specifically *agentive-instrumental* preposition *antuk* [A], the other the 'neutral' preposition *ring*, that (like *tekèn*) is used with weak agents in passive constructions.[10]

Examples following illustrate the contrasts that are maintained by the two types of *alus* register passive formed with *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a. Kersten's "Second Passives" (*ka*-R-*ang* and *ka*-R-*in*)

i. locative-Goal reference with -in:

(9) Akéh tukad-tukad sané ageng-ageng
many R2-*river* rel R2-*large*

ka-panggih-**in** antuk Ida
GF-*find, meet-with*-Tr2 instr/agent pro3 [Asi]

'Many great rivers <u>were</u> <u>met</u> <u>with</u> by him (resp).'[11]

ii. recipient reference with -in:

(10) Ida Pedanda **k**-atur-**in** rayun-an
pro3 [Asi] *high priest* GF-*offer*-Tr2 *eat*-LF

antuk krama désa
instr/agent *officials* *village*

'The reverend High Priest <u>was</u> <u>offered</u> food by the village officials.'[12]

iii. patient reference with -ang:

(11) Rayun-an punika **k**-atur-**ang** ring Ida
eat-LF deic2 GF-*offer*-Tr1 'to' pro3 [Asi]

Pedanda (antuk krama désa)
high priest (instr/agent *'original member'* *village*)

'That food <u>was</u> <u>offered</u> to the High Priest (by the members of the village council.'

(12) Satua **ka**-tutur-**ang** antuk I Guru
fable GF-*teach, tell*-Tr1 instr/agent prop *teacher*

'A *satua* tale <u>was</u> <u>told</u> (the class) by the teacher.'[13]

b. Kersten's "Third Passive" (*ka*-R-*an*); *agent suppressed:*

(13) Rauh irika Ida Pedanda **k**-atur-**an**
arrive *there* pro3 [Asi] *high priest* GF-*offer*-LF

rayun-an
eat-LF

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'(When) he arrived there, the reverend High Priest <u>was offered food</u>.'[14]

There are thus two main functions that converge on *ka*-R-(morphology) of Modern Balinese. The first is the function of providing a means of distinguishing non-volitional or "accidental" passives from agentive passives of the 0-R-(suffix) type. The Modern Balinese P-constructions thus preserve the semantic subdifferentiation of 'passive' types that we know existed for the Goal Focus forms of Old Javanese.

The second major function of *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology in Modern Balinese is its role in *alus* discourse strategy. Here *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology provides a "participant-marking" type of morphology that is neutral with respect to person, hence less likely than comparable 0-R-(suffix) morphology to create dissonance with status-marking aspects of the language. I will develop this point further in the discusssion of 0-R-(suffix) morphology and syntax to follow.

6.3 Organization of Balinese Actor Focus Clauses

Clauses based on 0-R-(suffix) and *ka*-R-(suffix) forms show consistent differences in constituent arrangement when compared to equivalent Actor Focus ('active') clauses. We will review the Actor Focus form of clausal arrangement

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

first.

Balinese N-R-(suffix) morphology is associated with S-V-O word order and appears generally to share characteristics of nom-acc organization. Thus writers like Kersten (1984) have regarded Balinese N-R-(suffix) clauses as representing the 'active' pole in a two-part voice system.

Nom-Acc characteristics of Balinese N-R-(suffix) clauses are brought out in examples following. Word-order is typically S-V-O and both 'subject' and 'object' NPs are in an unmarked relation to the verb:

(14) Ia **ng**aé pondok
pro3 AF-*make hut*
'He <u>built</u> a hut.'[15]

(15) I bojog **ng**auk-**in** timpal-né
Mr. Monkey AF-call-Tr2 *friend*-pro3
'B'er Monkey <u>called</u> his friends.[16]

(16) Liu ua désa-né **ng**ateh-**ang** ia
many elder(s) village-pro3 AF-*accompany*-Tr1 pro3
ka séma-né
to cemetery-pro3
'Many of the village elders <u>conducted</u> him to the burying ground.'[17]

A similar type of organization is found in S-V clauses based on *ma*-R stative predicates:

(17) I Ubuh **ma**-sastra
prop *orphan* sta-'*letters*'
'I Ubuh <u>studies</u>/<u>studied</u>.'[18]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Clauses based on (morphologically) unmarked intransitive bases, however, are found in either S-V or V-S form:

(18) Bojog-é ènto teka ka pondo-né
monkey-pro3 det *come* *to* *hut*-pro3
'Those monkeys came to the hut.'[19]

(19) Suba lantas kéto
+accomp *then* *like that*
teka Mèn Cubling (ng-aba bedeg kukuh)
come *Mother Cubling* (AF-*carry* *mat* *stout*)
'After that Mèn Cubling arrived (carrying a stout bamboo mat).'[20]

From these examples it appears that N-R-(suffix) and *ma*-R stative forms group together in showing a nom-acc arrangement of the clause, while the intransitives can 'go either way', sometimes taking the S-V order of nom-acc organization, sometimes the V-S order that we will find is characteristic of 0-R-(suffix) 'passives'.

Thus far we appear to be dealing with a system organized largely along accusative lines, with the Actor Focus clauses based on N-R-(suffix) and *ma*-R forms apparently little different from active voice clauses of nom-acc languages.

6.4 Balinese "First Passives" in 0-R-(suffix)

One of the most prominent features of the Balinese "First Passive" system is that it is internally split along

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the lines of "person", the 1st and 2nd person forms being treated differently than those of 3rd person.

In the 1st and 2nd persons the First Passive is formed by incorporation of the agentive pronoun following the morphologically unmarked verbal base (plus any suffixes). For vowel-final verbal bases the sign of this incorporation is the use of 'ligature *-n*' to bind the pronominal form to the verbal base, just as a pronimnal modifier is bound to a nominal Head in possessive noun phrases (*buku-n -tiang* 'my book'):

1st person: *beli-n -tiang* 'buy-I'
2nd person: *beli-n -cai* 'buy-you'

In 3rd person the marker *-a* is suffixed to the verb phrase. While some writers compare this marker to Indonesian *-nya*, a morpheme with both anaphoric and grammatical functions, I will argue in this chapter that anaphoric functions of *-a* have been largely grammaticalized in Balinese. An agentive NP cross-referenced by the marker *-a* may optionally be represented in a prepositional phrase taking *tekèn* or *baan*:

3rd person: *belin-a (tekèn I Madé)* 'bought (by I Madé)

This 'split' in pronominal useage recalls Silverstein's (1976) comments on the gulf separating 1st and 2nd person pronouns from those of the 3rd person:

> "...there are basically only two personal pronoun types, traditionally categories of 'first' and 'second' persons... the 'third person' is a 'non-person', and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the referent of the surface pronoun depends on the underlying nominal expression plus the pronominalisation rules of syntax." (1976: 117)[21]

Silverstein groups together 1st and 2nd person pronouns, characterizing them as [+ego] and [+tu] respectively. The 3rd person forms have a different referential function and can be characterized as [-ego,-tu]. The fundamental difference between [+ego/+tu] and [-ego/-tu] pronouns is thus between performative (I-thou) relations and referential, narrative (3rd person) relations.

Silverstein's "Hierarchy of Split Ergativity" (1976), links lexical splits of case-marking to inherent features of NPs (including person, +/-proper, +/-human, and +/-animacy). Silverstein's hierarchy predicts that lexical splits in case-marking can occur at each point along the hierarchy of such features, and that [+ego] and [+tu] pronouns are at the upper end of the scale in terms of positive values for features; hence they typically control the "marked" type of syntactic organization for a language (ergative for accusative languages, accusative for ergative languages).

The 'split' in the morphology of the Balinese First Passives appears to reflect the predictions made by Silverstein for lexical splits. The 1st and 2nd persons are at the upper end of the hierarchy of lexical features of animacy and 'control'; hence they are represented in "First

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Passive" syntax through incorporation into the VP itself.

Third person forms are 'reported on', hence (as Silverstein says) essentially nominal in form, and inherently weaker in features of control than 1st and 2nd person forms, Thus in "First Passive" syntax the 3rd person forms take a special marker, and NPs cross-referenced by this marker are optionally elaborated in prepositional phrases that can be sub-categorized for degree of agency.

a. 1st person [+ego]:

(20) byuh usak beli-n -tiang
banana *ruined* *buy*-lig pro1

'I <u>bought</u> a rotten banana !'

b. 2nd person [+tu]:

(21) Apa aba-n -cai uli pekèn
what *carry*-lig pro2 source *market*

'What <u>did</u> you <u>bring</u> from the market ?'

c. 3rd person [-ego,-tu]:

(22) Apa aba-n-a tekèn I Madé
what *carry*-lig-Ag3 'by' prop 2nd-born

'What <u>did</u> I Madé <u>bring</u> ?'

Note that the constituent order of the 1st and 2nd person forms can be compared to the form of the Balinese possessive noun phrase (cf. 4.1 above), if we assume (in b. that the Object NP in the unmarked, absolutive relation with the verb is the Head of its construction:

(a) noun phrase

byuh usak gedé icang-é

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

banana rotten big pro1-pro3(= +poss)

'my big rotten banana'

Head-mod-mod-pro

(b) "First Passive" verb phrase (1st/2nd person)

byuh usak beli-n -icang
banana rotten bought-lig pro1

'I bought a rotten banana.'

Head-mod-(VP)-pro

If we look at (b) in terms of more conventional typological terms it can be described as an O-V-S construction. Thus it shares with the unmarked intransitives the option of V-S word order, in this sense patterning with the intransitives and thus showing characteristics of an ergative, rather than passive, syntax.

The third person forms of the third passive also show "possessive" characteristics, but in this case the relationship is mediated through a grammaticalized person-marker and (optional) use of disambiguating prepositional phrases taking *tekèn* or *baan*, the former if agency is peripheral or weak, the later if there are strong features of agency and voltionality.

6.5 The 3rd person morpheme *-a:* a person-marker, a marker of grammatical agreement, or a passive morpheme ?

One of the most difficult problems for the student of Modern Balinese is analysis of the *-a* suffix, for this is a marker with widespread function, but one whose status in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

many instances appears mysterious, in one place seeming to have grammatical function, in another pronominal or even aspectual characteristics.

From a historical point of view it can be argued that the *-a* marker developed from the pronominal marker *-nya* found as an agentive marker with Old Balinese Goal Focus forms in *-y*-R-(suffix).

The Old Balinese infix *-i-/-y-* was phonologically weak (compared with OJ *-in-* or OM *ni-*) and presumably it was the loss of this phonologically unstable element that led to the modern 0-R-(suffix) forms. It is natural to suppose that in this process the familiar anaphoric pronoun *-nya* was grammaticalized, becoming in part a marker of the passive/ergative form itself.

Not a few analysts have held that the *-a* morpheme of Balinese can be likened to the pronominal *-nya* of languages like Indonesian. Thus Kersten points out:

> "This suffix [*-a*] is identical in function *(sejalan)* with the suffix **-nya** of Indonesian."[22]

This is true, however, only up to a point. First of all, Indonesian *-nya* is found suffixed to both nouns and verbs, while Balinese *-a* is specialized for use with the verbal system, the nominal system taking *-é*, the form found in Modern Javanese. Thus Indonesian *anak-nya Pak Menteri* 'the child of the cabinet member' does not translate into Balinese **pianak-a Pak Menteri*. This suggests that *-a* has

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

lost the possessive and "inferential" functions associated with pronouns like *-nya* and *-é*, while Balinese *-é* retains only those features and has lost the grammatical function of marking 'passive' agents that is retained by Malay-Indonesian *-nya* and Javanese *-é*.

Secondly, Indonesian *-nya* can refer to *patients* as well as *agents* of 'passive' verbs while Balinese *-a* can <u>only</u> represent *agents*. This is brought out in attempts to 'crosswire' Indonesian forms in *-nya* with Balinese forms taking *-a*, as illustrated in examples following:

a. Indonesian

(23)	Saya	mem-beri-nya	se-ekor	bébèk
	pro1	AF-*give*-pro3	*one-tail* (class)	*duck*

'I gave <u>him</u> a duck.'

d. Balinese

(24)	*tiang	maang-a	bébèk	a-ukud
	pro1	AF-*give*-pro3 ?	*duck*	*one-tail* (class)

'I gave-(by he ?) a duck.'

This suggests that Balinese *-a* has specifically agentive functions, making it fundamentally different from pronouns like Malay-Indonesian *-nya* that have generalized grammatical functions, as well as anaphoric functions.

It may be instructive to look at the behavior of the *-a* marker in discourse contexts. In the following example we follow the progress of a single discourse topic, a baby called "I Cubling" through a series of O-R-*a* predicates. In

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

this passage the discourse topic (I Cubling) is a helpless child, hence of reduced capacity and the party 'acted upon'. This stretch of narrative is accordingly organized in 'passive' terms. In this series of narrative clauses we find that use of the morpheme *-a* does not link up exclusively with anaphoric functions, but has other functions in the discourse. (Sentences forming the background of the example are given in italics before the constituent analyses of the current example.):

(25) *There is a teaching, the story of 'Mother of Cubling'.*
The male was called 'Father of Cubling'.
Their child was called I Cubling.[23]

Ento	kerana	mémé-né	kauk-**in-a**	Mèn Cubling
that	*reason*	*mother*-pro3	*call*-Tr2-(?)	*(name)*

'That was the reason that his mother <u>was</u> <u>called</u> Mèn Cubling, mother of Cubling.'

(26)

Bapa-né	kauk-**in-a**	Pa-n Cubling
father-pro3	*call*-Tr2-(?)	*(name)*

'His father <u>was</u> <u>called</u> Pan Cubling, father of Cubling'.

(27) *His mother and father were very happy, for they had just one child.*

I Cubling	sayang-**ang-a**	pesan
I Cubling	*affection*-Tr1-(?)	*very*

'I Cubling <u>was</u> <u>loved</u> very much.'

(28)

Sai-sai	ia	gandong-**a**
every day	pro3 [B]	*carry on hip*-(?)

tekèn	bapa-n-né
'by'	*father*-lig-pro3

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'Every day he was carried on the hip by his father.'[24]

In (25) and (26) *-a* is found with what we might term agentless passives in that there is no specific agent of 'calling' (**kauk-in*) recoverable from discourse, but the agent is rather the more general and universal 'everyone who knows *Pan* and *Mèn Cubling* '. In (27) there is a precedent to which *-a* might prefer (I Cubling's parents), and indeed most informants questiones asserted that it is I Cubling's parents who are the agents of *sayang-ang-a*, the matter of plural vs. singular reference not being of issue in Balinese.

In (28) one would expect *gandong-a* might also refer anaphorically to I Cubling's parents, but because the intention here is to focus specifically on the role of I Cubling's father in carrying him about, a prepositional phrase (*tekèn bapané*) is used to further specify the field of the anaphoric reference.

While (25) and (26) suggest that that *-a* may sometimes refer to general or universal agents, there are also true agentless passives in Balinese, and in fact it is not unusual for short narratives to be constructed entirely with O-R-*a* agentless passives. This is especially true in recipes or other descriptions of physical processes effecting largely inanimate objects. This is illustrated in the short narrative from a children's book on Balinese writing reproduced below:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(29) *Making Kolek*

a. Kaséla-né[25] tuni kolek-**a**
keséla-pro3 *earlier* *kolek*-Ag3

'Earlier today the *keséla* got made into kolek.'

b. Kolek-é isi-n-**in-a** gula liyu
kolek-pro3 *contents*-lig-Tr2-Ag3 *sugar much*

'The *kolek* has a lot of sugar put into it.'

c. Gula-né ulet-**a** malu
sugar-pro3 *knead*-Ag3 *first*

'The sugar is kneaded first.'

d. Suba kéto pulang-**a** di kolek-é
+accomp deic/manner *put into*-Ag3 loc *kolek*-pro3

'After that (it) is mixed into the *kolek*.'

e. Di lebeng-é mara kisid-**ang-a**
in mortar-pro3 *'just happen'* *change place*-Tr1-Ag3

'Then (the mixture) is scraped and pounded together in the mortar.'

f. Payuk-é ditu aled-**in-a**
cookpot-pro3 deic/loc2 *base*-Tr2-Ag3

'At that point a cookpot is used as a cooking container.'

g. Kolek-é sidu-n-**a** aji sidu
kolek-pro3 *spoon*-lig-Ag3 prep/instr *spoon*

'The *kolek* is (then) stirred with a spoon.'[26]

While (29) suggests that *-a* is simply a passive marker, examples like (27) and (28) suggest that *-a* may also have anaphoric functions.

There are several arguments against *-a* as simply a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

passive morpheme. First of all we observe that no such morpheme is necessary with 1st and 2nd person forms. Second, it is possible to form third person 0-R-(suffix) forms that do not take the *-a* marker under certain (semantically-defined) conditions.

There are two main contexts in which the *-a* marker is lost in 3rd person First Passives. The first is in the case of verbs found commonly in phrases in which agents are of high potency. Thus from *amah* and *sarap* [K] 'eat (of animals)' clauses in 0-R-(suffix) form with meanings like 'be eaten up, be devoured' are very common.

Here the NP adjunct is incorporated directly into the VP, just as are pronominal forms in 1st and 2nd person forms. Extrapolating from the predictions of Silverstein's Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity (1976) this change in form should be linked to positive features of animacy and control on the part of the 3rd person agent. This is indeed the case in (30) and (31) following:

(30) *If the monkeys didn't die, Pan Cubling was going to have to fast every day.*

Nasi-né	pragat	telah	amah-bojog
rice	*finished*	*used up*	*eat-monkey(s)*

'His rice was finished, gone, eaten up (by) the monkeys.'[27]

(31) Ni Wingsali... ènggal ma-laib
prop(fem) *Wingsali* *fast* sta-*run*

apang tusing sarap-macan

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

so that not eat-tiger

'Ni Wingsali ran fast, so that (she) wouldn't <u>be eaten up</u> (by) the tiger'.[28]

Thus in conditions where 3rd person agents show strong features of control or potency, the *-a* is lost and the predicate takes the "possessive-ergative" form found in 1st and 2nd person forms.

As Kersten points out, if the Actor is of the most general or universal kind, the O-R-(suffix) form can appear without the *-a* suffix. This gives rise to a second type of 3rd person "First Passive" form that does not require the *-a* marker, as illustrated in (32) following:

(32) Ganti-né sing dadi kelid-**in**
change, return-pro3 *not happen avoid*-Tr2

'Fate can't <u>be avoided</u>.'[29]

In (32) the complete universality of the agent ('everyone without exception') allows the 3rd person form fo the First Passive to be presented without any 'passive marker' at all. Thus the combination of O-V-S word order and use of the morphologically unmarked verbal base (plus optional suffix) is enough in some contexts to establish the presence of the P-construction. Thus if we propose that *-a* is purely and simply a 'passive marker' we will have to explain its 'deletion' under certain semantic conditions, but not others.

I have suggested above that *-a* has its origin in a person-marking morpheme (*-nya*), and that it retains

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

anaphoric features in some contexts. This comes out clearly in connection with a few words like *baan* that have multiple uses and can take either the -é pronominal marker of the nominal system, or the -*a* of 'verbal anaphora'.

In addition to its function as an agentive (sometimes instrumental) preposition in P-constructions of an "ergative-like" nature *baan* has verbal, nominal, and conjunctive functions. Some of these are illustrated below:

a. *Baan* as verb meaning 'get, obtain':

(33) I Mémé maan baas di pekèn
prop *mother* AF-*get, obtain* *rice* *in market*
'Mother got (uncooked) rice in the market.'

(34) Kambèn ento baan-tiang meli di pekèn
sarong *that* *get*-pro1 AF-*buy* *in* *market*
'That sarong, I got (by) buying in the market.'[30]

b. *Baan* as auxillary verb:

(35) Ibi sanja tiang tusing maan ma-balih
last evening pro1 *not* AF-*obtain* AF-*watch*
'Last evening I didn't get to watch (the play).'[31]

c. *Baan* as conjunction meaning 'because of':

(36) I Ubuh ngejer baan pedih-né
prop *orphan* AF-*tremble* *because of* *anger*-pro
'I Ubuh trembled from anger.'[32]

There are two further uses of *baan* that show an especially interesting contrast in choice of pronominal enclitic. The first of these is found where *baan* is used as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a noun meaning 'way or means of doing something'. In this case *baan* takes the pronominal enclitic *-é* that I have noted above is found only in the nominal systems:

d. *Baan* as noun meaning 'reason':

(37) I Madé tusing dadi teka,
prop 2nd-born *not* *happen* *come*

baan-é luh-né gelem
reason-pro3 *female*-pro3 *sick*

'I Madé couldn't make it because his wife is sick.'

In another use of *baan* with similar meanings an adjective or adverb takes the (preferred) sentence-initial position and is followed by *baan-a*, a phrase that appears to mix the use of *baan* as an agentive preposition with the nominal use found in (37). This is illustrated in (38) below:

d. *Baan* as noun meaning reason (?)/agentive preposition (?)

(38) Pelih baan-a ng-anggo baju-né ento
wrong *way*-pro3 ? AF-*use/wear* *shirt*-pro3 deicart2

'The way she wears her blouse is wrong.'[33]

Balinese consistently translate *baan-a* in examples like (38) with Indonesian *cara-nya* 'her/his way of doing something', thus pointing to a nominal interpretation of the construction that is reflected in the English translation. This suggests that in this context *-a* has possessive function like that of *-é*. However, the issue is more complicated that this, since *baan-a* is also found in cases where it clearly must be interpreted as an agentive

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

preposition taking a pronominal clitic (like Old Javanese *dé-nya*). This is illustrated in (39) following:

(39) Sing dadi baan-**a** **nge**-liwat
not *happen* 'by'-Ag3 AF-*cross over*

'It didn't happen (that) he could cross over.'

Examples like (38) and (39) give clear evidence of anaphoric features of *-a*; for it is this anaphora to a 3rd person Actor argument provided by *baan-a* that allows it to 'feed' the following Actor Focus forms in these examples, allowing for zero-representation of their 'subject' (Actor) NPs. This zero-representation of overt Actor NPs that are 'subjects' to the N-R-(suffix) forms following *baan-a* constructions are only possible because of the anaphoric features of the *-a* morpheme.

Generalizing from the examples given in this section we can conclude that the *-a* of Balinese First Passives is an originally pronominal marker on its way to becoming fully grammaticalized as an ergative/passive marker, but retaining anaphoric functions in some contexts. In sections following we will see that 0-R-(suffix)-*a* constructions play important roles in governing key grammatical operations, in providing a means for discourse foregrounding, and in temporal sequencing and marking of aspectual contrasts. There are also 'passive adverbials' in 0-R-*ang-a* form that have functions similar to adverbials formed with *baan-a*. Because of the many functions played by verbal (and other) bases

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

taking *-a*, this marker has an important place in the organization of *biasa/kasar* speech levels. We will look at verbal, adverbial, and aspectual functions of *-a* in sections following.

6.6 Role of "First Passives" in discourse foregrounding

It is especially in 1st and 2nd person forms that Balinese First Passives can be said to reflect the "possessive typology" that I have argued in Part I is characteristic of OM, OJ, and OB Goal Focus forms taking *ni*-R-(suffix), *in*-R-(suffix), and *-y*-R-(suffix).

Alieva (1980) has noted that the "possessive" typology as found in parts of Malay can be linked to features of ergativity, while Verhaar (1988) has expanded upon this for Indonesian, claiming that Indonesian is "morphemically ergative" despite the profound influence of nom-acc syntax promoted both by a long historical contact with Western European languages and by the proponents of normative models of the national language stressing nom-acc syntactic organization:

> "This language lacks nominal case, so verbal markings are the only ones we can go by; or the lack thereof. With 0-form constructions [1st & 2nd persons], the Agent is almost without exception 'bound', at least syntactically (i.e. inseparable from the verb). In contrast, Patient NP's are invariably 'free', both morphemically and syntactically. So are all

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

intransitive Subjects in this language. In other words, Agent and intransitive Subject are distinguished in the way they are treated morphemically, while Patients are, again morphemically, treated the same way as intransitive Subjects." (1988: 356)

Hopper (1979) links the 'passive' verbs taking *di-* in Classical Malay narrative to the need for a discourse device "foregrounding" certain events in relation to others:

> "In actual fact... the Malay 'passive' as it is used in the classical narrative rarely corresponds to the English passive. Rather, the Malay 'passive' form is used for events that are perfective, active, foregrounded, and realis..." (1979: 228)

Hopper notes that 'passives' in the form *di*-R-(suffix) are crucially involved where actions advance the narrative. He contrasts these with 'active' forms taking *meng-* which he says are important in providing the background details of narrative. He suggests that because these two systems are "coequal" in terms of discourse function (and equally "marked" in their morphology) that we should regard the "so-called passive as the Ergative System" (1979: 231). An important point brought out by Hopper is that there are aspectual consequences of 'voice' contrasts in Classical Maly that have links to discourse organization:

> "In Malay, where tense is not overtly marked, the 'voice' system serves the same function in narrative--to assert the respective anteriority of events and to indicate which events actually advance the narrative and which events are ancillary." (1979: 232)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Balinese "First Passive" forms in 0-R-(suffix) form can be said to play a similar role in discourse foregrounding. This is true in both performative and narrative contexts. An example of the discourse foregrounding function of 0-R-(suffix) syntactic organiza- in a performative contexts is given in (40) following:

(40) Buin ada tuh balé *pa*-darma-*n*
in addition exist emph *'hall'* sta/nom-*religion*-LF

balé *pa*-parum-*an*, tuh nyandang
'hall' sta/nom-*take council*-LF emph AF-*clear*

0-beneh-**in** -adi
GF-*good*-Tr2 -younger sib (= pro2)

'In addition there are also <u>the places of religion</u>, <u>the places of meeting</u> - those (too) clearly should be put in order (by) you, little brother.'[34]

An example of narrative functions of the First Passive is illustrated in (41) - (43) following. Here a shift from N-R morphology to that of the First Passive form shifts the perspective from the performers of a series of actions to a new discourse topic, the focus of new events foregrounded in the discourse (in 42 - 43):

(41) Liu ua désa-né **ng**ateh-**ang**
many *elder(s)* *village*-pro3 AF-*accompany*-Tr1

ia ka séma-né
pro3 *to* *burial ground*-pro3

Ada ané **n**egen
exist rel AF-*carry on shoulder*

ada ané **ng**éling sigsig-an

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

exist rel AF-*cry* *sob*-LF

'Many of the village elders accompanied the body of I Cubling to the burial grounds. There were those who carried (the bier) on their shoulders and those who cried, sobbing piteously.'

(42a) **N**ekèd di séma-né
AF-*arrive* *in burial ground*-pro3

'Arriving in the cemetery...

(42b) laut gaé-n-**ang**-a bangbang.
then *make*-lig-Tr1-Ag3 *hole*

'...a hole got dug.'

(43) Ditu I Cubling tanem-a
there prop *(name)* *bury*-Ag3

'There I Cubling was buried.'[35]

In these examples we can see clearly a shift from "backgrounded" events appearing in a series of Actor Focus clauses in (41) and (42a) to "foregrounded events" in (42b) and (43). Here it is the telic, punctual events of the burial that take the "First Passive" form that I have claimed has ergative characteristics. The events leading up to this point are "progressive" and "back- grounded" in meaning, and are correspondingly associated with the Actor Focus, or 'active' forms. This example supports the view that Balinese "First Passive" and "Actor Focus" forms have contrastive discourse functions similar to those described for 'passive' and 'active' forms cf Classical Malay by Hopper (1979).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

6.7 First Passives in "Pivotal" grammatical constructions

Example (42) above also points to the importance of Balinese First Passives in "pivotal" grammatical constructions of Balinese. Thus note that in (42) there is zero-anaphora of the Actor argument in both of the conjoined clauses, and that there has been an unusual kind of ellipses across these coordinate structures.

The first clause is intransitive, the verb *(nekèd* 'arrive') taking the Actor Focus marker N-. However, as Pike has remarked of such verbs of motion, they can often be considered or "bi-intransitive", in that they often refer to a *locus* or *domain* argument in addition to the intransitive Subject. The second clause shifts to verb-initial ergative (First Passive) form, introducing a new discourse topic (*bangbang* 'hole') that is related not to the Actor of the first clause, but to the *locus* of the bi-intransitive verb of the first clause. This relationship of the two clauses resembles the O > S pattern of cross-clausal agreement pattern that is said to be characteristic of languages showing "syntactic ergativity". (cf. Verhaar 1987: 355-56)

The effect of the Balinese example can be imitated somewhat in English by contrasting coordinate structures containing a participial component. Example a. below represents the normal pattern in English, while b. trans-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

lates the Balinese pattern.

a. Arriving in the cemetery, they dug a hole.

b. *Arriving in the cemetery, a hole got dug.

This suggests that Balinese First Passives can control ellipses across coordinate structures in ways that English cannot. This happens to be one of the grammatical structures that Foley and Van Valin (1984) claim are involved in the action of "Pivots", macro-arguments of either Actor or Undergoer type that in given languages are found in control of key syntactic operations, especially those involving deletion under co-referentiality.

In Foley & Van Valin's view it is the Subject that is pivotal in English, and this macro-argument thus controls important grammatical constructions including relativization, raising, and ellipsis in coordinate structures.

For Balinese we find that both Actors in AF constructions and Undergoers in First Passive verbs can control some grammatical operations, but that in many cases the First Passive (or: ergative) form is the required, or preferred construction. Examples following illustrate behaviour of Balinese Actor Focus and First Passive forms in the context of grammatical operations linked by Foley and Van Valin (1984) to the notion of Pivot:

a. relativization

i. Actor "pivot"

(44) Liu masih ané **ng**-ajang

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

many *also* rel AF-*lift up*

'There were also many who lifted up (dirt from the hole).'[36]

ii. Undergoer "pivot" (more prominent statistically)

(45) piring sané selag-tiang belah
plate rel [A] *borrow*-pro1 *broken*

'The plate that I borrrowed (literally: borrowed-I) broke.'[37]

(46) tuara ada buin ané takut-**in-a**
not exist *'more'* rel *afraid*-Tr2-Ag3

'There wasn't (anyone) left to be afraid of.'[38]

b. 'Raising to Subject'

i. Undergoer "pivot" (always)

(47) Nyèn jeneng-**a** **ny**emak
who *seem/shape*-Ag3 AF-*take*

buku-n tiang-é di méja-né
book-lig pro1-pro3 loc *table*-pro3

'Who does it seem (might have) taken my book from the table ?'[39]

(48) Apa, kendel I Ketimun Mas
what *happy* prop *Golden Cucumber*

kadèn-**a** saja mémé-né teka
suspect-Ag3 *indeed, in truth* *mother*-pro3 *come*

'Boy, was I Ketimun Mas happy. (It) seemed (to her) that her mother had really come home.'[40]

c. Ellipsis in coordinate structures

i. Actor "pivot"

(49) sayan gangsar ia **n**umbeg **ng**aé bangbang
the more *forceful* pro3 AF-*dig* AF-*make* *hole*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'All the more energetically they <u>worked</u>, <u>digging</u> the hole.'[41]

ii. Undergoer "pivot"

(50) Buah-é alap-**a** tekèn I Marakarma
areca nuts pick-Ag3 *'by'* prop *(name)*

aba-n-**a** mulih baang-**a** mémé-né
carry-lig-Ag3 *go home* *give*-Ag3 *mother*-pro3

'The fruits <u>were</u> <u>picked</u> by Marakarma, <u>carried</u> home, <u>given</u> <u>to</u> her mother.'[42]

From the examples above, as well as consideration of larger streches of text represented in the Appendix II or this thesis, it is clear that Balinese Actor Focus forms play a more restricted role in controlling pivotal grammatical operations than do the First Passive/ergative forms. This comes out most clearly in the case of "Raising to Subject". In the case of Balinese verbs with meanings like English 'seems', only a "First Passive" realization is possible.

There are a number of other important grammatical operations that preferentially take First Passive form. These include *benefactive*, *causative*, and *control-verb* constructions, as well as constructions based on verbs controlling embedded speech or other sentential components.

For control-verb and other constructions controlling embedded clauses there is a preferred form like that found with Balinese verbs like *jeneng-a* 'seems': 0-R-(suffix) verb in matrix clause, N-R-(suffix) or stative/intransitive

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in embedded clause. This suggests that (ergative) First Passive forms take precedence in terms of syntactic control in these constructions. Similarly, *benefactive* and *causative* constructions involving mediate participants are also found preferentially in First Passive form. This is illustrated in examples following:

a. control-verb constructions

(51) Mani-né I Tiwas tundèn-**a** nebuk
next day-pro3 prop *poor* *order*-Ag3 AF-*pound*

padi *baan* I Sugih
unhulled rice 'by' prop *rich*

'The next day Ms. Poor <u>was</u> <u>ordered</u> <u>to</u> <u>thresh</u> paddy rice by Ms. Rich.'[43]

(52) sedek dina anu ia tudèn-**a** **m**eli bébèk
'*one day*' pro3 *order*-pro3 AF-*buy* *duck*

ka pekèn
alla *market*

'One day he <u>was</u> <u>ordered</u> <u>to</u> <u>buy</u> duck at the market.'[44]

b. verbs contolling embedded speech:

(53) Saut-**in-a** baan I Siap Selem... (S_2)
answer-Tr2-Ag3 'by' prop (*name: 'ready-black'*)

'I Siap Selem <u>answered</u>...'[45]

c. other verbs taking sentential complements

(54) *Be'r Monkey was sitting around in the shade of a tree.*

Dingeh-**a** I Kekua **ny**elsel iba,
hear-Ag3 prop *turtle* AF-*complain* *self*

kéné munyi-né
mannerdeic1 *word*-pro3

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'(He) overheard B'er Turtle complaining to himself, like this were (B'er Turtle's) words...'[46]

d. causatives

(55) Cening lakar **pa**-temu-**ang** -bapa
little one fut AF2-*meet*-Tr1 -*father* (= pro1)

tekèn Radèn Galuh
'to' *(name of a Princess)*

'(You) little one, I will introduce to Radèn Galuh.'[47]

e. benefactive constructions

(56) I Raksasa tusing ampak-**in-a** jlanan
prop *demon* *not* *open*-Tr2-Ag3 *door*

'The demon didn't get the door opened (for him).'[48]

Examples (44) - (50) illustrate the prominence of the Balinese First Passive constructions in "pivotal" grammatical operations and suggest that Balinese may (in Foley and Van Valin's terms) be a language with an Undergoer Pivot, the Actor Focus forms developing from anti-passives in what was once essentially an ergative system. As I have attempted to show in Part I, Modern Balinese evolved against the background of languages in which multi-valent systems of verbal Focus were a prominent feature. Hence it may be more accurate from a historical point of view to say that languages like Balinese have evolved from languages with "polyvalent" case-marking into languages showing "split case-marking", possibly elaborating 'splits' incipient in the "polyvalent" Focus systems.

I will suggest in the section following that the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

contrast in Balinese of ergative-like First Passive forms and Actor Focus clauses organized along nom-acc lines is also connected with *aspectual contrasts* like those described in Part I (section 2.5) for Old Javanese. I will argue that choice of grammatical form often has to do with determining the mode of actions (realis or irrealis, punctual or progressive), or with the organization of events in time, establishing what Hopper has termed "the relative anteriority of events" (1979:232).

6.8 Aspectual consequences of 'voice' oppositions

During the period that I was first learning Balinese there were certain sentences that seemed to me to exemplify all that seemed most 'irregular' and unexpected about Balinese. One of these is reproduced in example (57):

(57) *One day they say I Cubling fell sick.*
Night and day he was watched over by his mother and father.

Suba	masih	idih-**ang-a**	ubad
+accomp	*also*	*request*-Tr1-Ag3	*medicine*
tekèn	kaki	balian[49]	
'from'	*grandfather*	*healer*	

If we translate example (57) word for word into English we come up with the strange sounding form following, which among other things gives no hint of who it is that is to benefit from the medicine sought:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

*Already also be asked medicine for from the village healer.

In more acceptable English, but retaining the 'passive' form, this becomes:

'(He) had also already been asked (for) medicine for from the village healer.'

More natural still in English is to translate the whole construction into the active voice:

'(They'd) also already asked the village healer for medicine for (him).'

Thus the Balinese and English versions seem almost diametrically opposed in discourse-syntactic organization, the Balinese taking the 'passive' form for complex constructions that are most natural in English in 'active' voice constructions.

I have argued above that Balinese First Passives play important roles in pivotal grammatical operations, and in constructions involving control of embedded arguments. Hence choice of First Passive form in (57) comes as no surprise, since this is the preferred construction for benefactives. However, there is a second factor at work in choice of First Passive form in example (57) , one that is brought out by native speaker comments on this example.

When asked to come up with Actor Focus equivalents of (57) most informants were able to do so, but said of the sentences they produced that they were 'too detailed' *(terlalu bertélé-télé)*. Two of the 'active' forms proposed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

by Balinese speakers interviewed are given in the examples following:

(58) Suba masih mémé bapan-né **ng**-idih-**ang**
+accomp *also* *mother* *father*-pro3 AF-*beg*-Tr1

ubad sig I Kaki Balian
medicine source prop *(name)*

'I Cubling's mother and father requested medicine for him from the village healer.'

(59) Suba masih mémé bapan-né I Cubling
+accomp *also* *mother* *father*-pro3 prop *(name)*

ng-idih ubad anggon-**a** **ng**-ubad-**in**
AF-beg *medicine* *use*-Af3 AF-*medicine*-Tr2

I Cubling sig kaki balian
(name) *source* *grandfather* *healer*

'I Cubling's parents had also already requested medicine to be used to treat I Cubling from the village healer.'

Note that both (58) and (59) require overt NPs where these are not required in the ergative-like construction of example (57). Thus for example (58) is ungrammatical if is is formulated without overt NP reference to the *benefactee* and *agent(s)* of the clause:

(a) *Suba masih **ng**-idih-**ang** ubad
+accomp *also* AF-*beg*-Tr1 *medicine*

sig I Kaki Balian
source *(name)*

*Already also ask (*ben.*) for medicine from the healer.'

The ergative form is thus the most 'economical' in terms of elaboration of overt NPs, since the -*a* morpheme

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

can be used anaphorically, and the absolutive argument of the ergative-like First Passive verb is easily made the target of deletion under terms of coreference.

In addition to differences in grammatical form for examples like (57) and (58), there are also *aspectual contrasts* associated with use of First Passive (ergative) or Actor Focus forms. Balinese speak of a greater degree of 'definiteness' for events described with First Passive form. One informant asked to comment on the differences between the First Passive form of (57) and its Actor Focus equivalent in (58) thus had this to say:

> "This example (57) is correct, but even after all that you still don't know if they ever got the medicine. In the first sentence (57) we know that the medicine has already been searched for and brought home, and that I Cubling has already been treated. In the second sentence (58) they could still be looking for the medicine, or maybe they have just begun to look for it."[50]

We might say that event described in (57) is viewed in its *perfective* or *punctual* aspect. The event is also *telic* in that what is referred to is the finite 'end-point' of the event, not its processual features, the features that are linked to N-R-(suffix) morphology by the Balinese informant quoted above.

The First Passive (ergative) form represents a discrete event that takes place within the frame of the event, and does not extend in time outside the current

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

temporal frame. This *perfective* aspect of the ergative form of syntactic organization is in part corroborated in (57) by the presence of *suba*, the [B] modal of positive accomplishment. Kana (1983) has shown that the equivalent Indonesian modal *(sudah)* is used with high frequency with Indonesian *di-* forms that have aspectual functions similar to Balinese 0-R-(suffix) forms. There is likewise a high association in Balinese of the modal *suba/-ba* with 0-R-(suffix) forms, a fact that offers support to the hypothesis that Balinese ergative forms have a *perfective* interpretation.

Note, however, that this *perfective* or *telic* aspect of Balinese ergative syntax is not tied to questions of tense, and First Passives can occur with reference to future events:

(60) Apa ané bakal tuju-n-a kema
quest rel fut *aim*-lig-Ag3 deicverb2
'What's (he) planning <u>to do</u>, going out.'[51]

(61) Mai ja malu ada lakar
deicverb1 emph *just now* exist fut
orah-ang -tiang a-bedik
inform-Tr1 -pro1 *'a little bit'*
'Come over here a minute, there's something just now (that) <u>I want to tell</u> (you).'[52]

For certain verbs the *perfective* and *telic* features of a 0-R-(suffix)-*a* form are so pronounced that the verb can be used idiomatically in 1st person forms to refer to the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

definiteness of an intended act. Thus compare 3rd person and 1st person uses of **orah-in* 'inform' in (62) and (63):

(62) (Apa) Pan Pugeg -ba orah-**in-a**
quest *(name)* +accomp [K] *inform*-Tr2-Ag3

'Has Pan Pugeg <u>been</u> <u>informed</u> ?'

(63) tiang lakar orah-**in-a**
pro1 fut *inform*-Tr2-Ag3(= def)

'I'll (definitely) <u>let</u> (him) <u>know</u>.'

In (63) the aspectual features associated with the verb *orah-in-a* are the sole reason for use of that verb, for there is no question of grammatical agreement between 1st person *tiang* and *orah-in-a*, technically a 3rd person form.

The aspectual features of the First Passive forms taking *-a* also come out in the contrast of Balinese adverbial predicates in N-R-*ang* and 0-R-*ang*-a form. We will look at these in 6.9 following.

6.9 'Voice' oppositions in Balinese adverbial constructions

There are both N-R-(suffix) and 0-R-(suffix) adverbial derivations in Balinese, usually formed with the suffix *-ang* in its function of marking 'processual' and 'outward-directed' features of action. In the case of N-R-*ang* derivations the adverbial modification of the action is seen as occurring simultaneously with its performance. These Actor Focus, or 'active' adverbials can modify either

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Actor Focus or 'passive' verbs, as in examples following:

a. N-R-*ang* adverbial with 'active' main verb:

(64) Tiang **nuyuh-ang** **ma**-mula
pro1 AF-*toil,sweat*-Tr1 sta-*farm*

tusing *maan* *ng*-alap
not AF-*obtain* AF-*pick, harvest*

'I <u>sweat</u> <u>and</u> <u>toil</u> <u>farming</u>, but dont' get to harvest anything.'[53]

(65) **Ng**-ènggal-**ang** ia **ny**emak yéh gemulak
AF-*fast*-Tr1 pro3 AF-*fetch* *water* *boiling*

'<u>Quickly</u> she <u>fetched</u> furiously boiling water.'[54]

b. N-R-*ang* adverbial with "First Passive" verb:

(66) **Ng**-ènggal-**ang** jangkut-**in-a** adi-né
AF-*fast*-Tr1 *hug*-Tr2-Ag3 *younger sib*-pro3

'<u>Quickly</u> her little sister <u>got</u> <u>hugged</u> (by her).'[55]

As Kersten (1984:107) notes there is a relationship between the adverbs formed with *baan/baan-a* and those taking the form 0-R-*ang*-pro (1st and 2nd person) or 0-R-*ang-a* (3rd person). Both the *baan* and First Passive adverbials *(kata keterangan)*, he notes, are more about the action itself than the state of the Actor (p.108). It is also the case that (like *baan-a*) the First Passive adverbials 'feed' Actor Focus verbs following in sequence. Here again the (limited) anaphora provided by a 3rd person First Passive form taking *-a* makes it useful in constructions involving grammatical subordination or sequencing of events. In (67) the effect of the 0-R-*ang-a*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

form of the adverbial *(tekek-ang-a)* is to imply that the tightening of the subject's grip begins at a point posterior to the act of grabbing:

(67) Jeg lidu-n-**a** koné jènggot-né
lickety-split *yank-lig-* *they say* *beard*-pro3(poss)
tekek-**ang-a**
tight-Tr1-Ag3
'Lickety-split (he$_i$) <u>grabbed</u> his$_j$ beard, you know, (and) <u>tightened</u> <u>up</u>.'[56]

Similar functions of *-a* morphology in temporal sequencing are found in 'modal conjunctions' indicating that events happen in a simultaneous or overlapping manner, thus translating English phrases like 'while busy doing x'.

If Actor Focus clauses are used in topic chains, or in conjunction with unmarked intransitives, the juxtaposition of the two predicates is often sufficient to imply simultaneity of the events:

(68) Teka Mèn Cubling **ng**-aba bedeg gedé
come *(name)* AF-*carry* *bamboo mat* *big*
'Mèn Cubling <u>arrived</u>, <u>carrying</u> a stout bamboo mat.'[57]

However, when there is a similar simultaneity of events, but one clause is set up as background to another clause (that often has a counter-to-fact or counter-to-expectation interpretation) the ergative system makes its appearance. This is the case with with the constructions based on *sedeng iteh-a* illustrated in (69) and (70) below:

(69) <u>Sedeng</u> <u>iteh</u>-**a** I Lutung **ng**-amah biu

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

current-busy-Ag3 prop *monkey* AF-*eat* *banana(s)*

ditu lantas *ka*-tumbak baan I Kaki Perodong
there going on GF(-vol)-*spear by* prop *(name)*

'While Be'r Monkey was busy eating bananas, there and then he was speared by I Kaki Perodong.'[58]

(70) sedeng iteh-**a** ia **ng**-amah udang matah
current-busy-Ag3 pro3 AF-*eat* *shrimp raw*

jeg lidu-n-**a** jènggot-né
lickety-split *yank*-lig-Ag3 *beard*-pro3

'While he was busy eating raw shrimp (from I Ubuh's nets), lickety-split, his beard got grabbed (by I Ubuh).'[59]

Constructions like those of (69) - (70) thus depend on the *-a* morpheme in establishing what are in part sequential features, in part subordinating features of clausal arrangement. At the same time *-a* retains its person-marking features, and thus is able to establish anaphora that in turn 'feeds' sequentially posterior Actor Focus constructions.

This ability to anaphorically 'feed' subsequent Actor Focus constructions found with *baan-a*, 0-R-*ang-a*, and *sedeng iteh-a* constructions is also found in First Passive uses of verbs like the 'optative conjunction' *apang/-pang* and the 'instrumental verb' *anggon* 'use'.

When used with *apang* the marker *-a* establishing anaphora is used in its 'sequencing' function. Here as a consequence of the combination of the optative meaning of *apang* with the 'aspectual' feature of the ergative marker

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

-a the clause taking *apang-a* is interpreted as being in a different time frame from that of the main verb. Thus the clause introduced with *apang-a* is interpreted as happening in a time frame disjunct from the current time frame of the discourse. Note that *apang-a* can 'feed' anaphora to a following Actor Focus forms (71), but can also be used in its 'sequencing' function alone, as in (72) where *apang-a* does not agree with the grammatical subject of *beneh-ang-a*:

(71) Mani désa-né *ma*-boros
tomorrow *village*-pro3 sta-*hunt*

apang-**a** **ng**-aba cicing galak
so that-Ag3 AF3-*carry* *dog* *fierce*

'Tommorrow the village is going to hung. It should be that (one/you) bring a fierce dog.'[60]

(72) Éné sanggah uug, apang-**a** beneh-**ang-a**
this/here *shrine* *broken* *so that*-Ag3 *right*-Tr1-Ag3

baan désa-né
by *village*-pro3(def)

'Here's an old broken-down shrine. Let it be fixed up by the village.'[61]

6.10 Sociolinguistic constraints on use of the *-a* marker

We have seen in sections 6.5 to 6.9 that Balinese First Passives are a pervasive part of the organization of *basa biasa*, or "Low Balinese", with important roles not only at grammatical and discourse levels, but also in aspectual and sequential features of organization.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

I have argued above that *-a* is not fully pronominal, but that it retains person-marking characteristics from a pronominal past, and hence has limited anaphoric potential. For Balinese there is no question that *-a* responds in some way to the full pronoun *ia* (although they are not always able to explain how this is so for forms like *apang-a*).

Indeed it is possible to replace *-a* with the full pronouns *ipun* [Ami] or *ida/-da* [Asi], but this is only the case where the *-a* that is replaced with these pronouns has anaphoric reference. What is <u>not</u> possible is to cross-reference a 0-R-*a* form of any kind with an [Asi] pronoun or full NP. Thus (73) and (74) below are grammatical, while (75) is identical in form to (74) but 'ungrammatical' on sociolinguistic grounds:

a. *-a* replaced with [Ami] *ipun:*

(73) nénten wènten ulam panggih-**in** -ipun
not [A] exist [A] *flesh/fish* [A] *catch*-Tr2-pro3 [Ami]
'He <u>didn't</u> <u>catch</u> any fish.'[62]

b. *-a* cross-referenced with [B] or [Asi] pronoun:

(74) Tiang tutur-**in-a** tekèn I Bapa
pro1 [<u>Ami</u>] *advise*-Tr2-Ag3 'by [B] prop *father*
'I <u>was</u> <u>given</u> <u>advice</u> by my father (a commoner).'[63]

(75) *Tiang tutur-**in-a** antuk Ida
pro1 *advise*-Tr2-Ag3 'by'[A] pro3 [Asi]
*I <u>was</u> <u>given</u> <u>advice</u> by <u>him</u> (a high status member of the *triwangsa*).[64]

While it is possible in some contexts for 3rd person

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

First Passives to take an [Asi] pronominal enclitic (yielding forms like *tutur-in-da*) this is not an especially widespread feature of Modern Balinese, and informants consistently refer instead to *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology in correcting socially ungrammatical forms like (75). As explained by the late I Dewa Putu Dani of Peliyatan, example (75) should correctly take the "Second Passive" *ka*-R-*in* form:

(75) Tiang **ka**-tutur-**in** antuk ida
pro1 [Ami] GF2-*advise*-Tr2 'by' [A] [Asi]
'I <u>was</u> <u>given</u> <u>advice</u> by him (resp).'[65]

As I Dewa Putu Dani also pointed out the verb form is likely to be further elaborated if the NP picked out as grammatical subject by the *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology takes *alus mider* or *alus singgih* reference:

(76) Ipun/ida **ka-pi**-tutur-**in**
pro3 [Ami]/[Asi] GF2-A2F-*advise*-Tr2
antuk ida pedanda
agent/instr pro3 [Asi] *high priest*
'He [Asi]/[Ami] <u>was</u> <u>given</u> <u>advice</u> by the High Priest.'[66]

While 0-R-pro forms taking [Asi] enclitic pronouns are found in *alus* register discourse, they are much less common than equivalent "Second Passive" or "Third Passive" forms taking *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology. There are clearly prescriptive constraints at work here, for in the *mabasan* texts collected during research for this thesis it is clear that across the board replacement of 0-R-(suffix) with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ka-R-(suffix) forms is the norm for *mabasan* groups with a high percentage of upper caste members, while for groups with a more mixed representation the tendency is toward greater tolerance for 0-R-(suffix)-pro forms.

There are several other affixes with a historical background in Goal Focus marking that can be used in Balinese "Second" and "Third Passives". These include the compound Goal Focus morphemes *ka-pi-* and *ka-pa-* common in formal discourse. For some bases it is also common to use a dervation taking *pa*-R (or *pi*-R) in place of more elaborated *ka-pa-* or *ka-pi-* forms found in *alus* discourse. These do not differ in meaning from the more elaborated forms, but are also used with 'passive' or Goal Focus meaning:

(77) Nènten sios sané **pa**-kayun-**in** antuk **ida**
not *other* rel A2F-*think*-Tr2 'by' pro3 [Asi]

se-antuk-an pepatok-an sang ma-raga
'*because*' R_2-*standard*-LF prop(resp) sta-*body*

putra sané **pa**-kayun-**in-da**
son rel A2F-*think*-Tr2-pro3 [Asi]

'There was nothing else that <u>he</u> (resp) <u>thought</u> <u>about</u>; it only the standard of good behavior by a son that <u>he</u> <u>considered</u> <u>in</u> <u>his</u> <u>thoughts</u>.[67]

As (77) illustrates the fact that choice of (historical) Focus morphology in *alus* registers allows speakers to eliminate use of the potentially dissonant 'ergative marker' *-a*.

The morpheme *-a* is thus like the grain of sand that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

raises the pearl: its potential to offend against socio-linguistic norms helps to motivate and keep in place the alternative Focus morpholgy of the "Second" and "Third Passives". These Focus constructions are derived from a widespread system of participant-marking forms based on grammatical agreement rather than person-marking, and so avoid the troublesome sociolinguistic issues raised by the grammatical/anaphoric marker -*a*.

Loss of access to the First Passive constructions taking -*a* has profound consequences for the organization of *alus* discourse and syntax. It means, for example, that greater elaboration of prepositional phrases and other explanatory aduncts is required in *alus* discourse in cases involving grammatical subordination or aspectual contrasts. In the discourse-syntactic organization of *biasa/kasar* register these same functions are typically handled by the interaction of ergative (First Passive) and nom-acc (Actor Focus) forms.

In Chapters Seven and Eight we will look at differences of discourse-syntactic organization as these are exemplified in narrative texts produced in the context of *mabasan* 'glossing' and the folk tales of the *Satua* genre.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Footnotes to Chapter Six

1 Satua I Cangak I.80

2 Satua I Cangak II.101-102. The *alus* preposition *ring* replaces *tekèn* here in response to the setting of the speech act. The physical location of the narrator (Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa) is a *geriya*, a priestly residence, and the narrator a *brahmana* who customarily uses *alus* forms of important function words in the framing of *biasa* level narratives like those of the *satua* stories. Apart from this the narrator's *satua* stories were organized using lexicon and morphology of *biasa* and *kasar* levels (the latter especially in dialogues between animals).

3 Satua I Cangak I.90 - 91

4 Satua Bali I.B.(5) 49.10

5 Satua Bali I.B.(5) 48.5

6 As noted in Chapter Five (section 5.4) there are also "accidental passives" taking R-*an* in Balinese. This is a feature of the Balinese system that is not shared with Old Javanese or Malay-Indonesian, which have *ka*-R-*an*, but not R-*an* forms of the "accidental passive".

7 Satua Bali I.B.(5) 48.10. Another example of the accidental passive formed with *ka*-R-an is found in Satua I Cangak II.28:

sa-antukan	ipun	**ka**-dingin-**an**
because [A]	pro3 [Ami]	GF2(-vol)-*cold*-LF

'...for he was <u>overcome</u> <u>with</u> <u>cold</u>.'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[8] TBB, p. 99

[9] Mabasan Texts I. 5. (RY) XXIV. 42. 2

[10] This contrast of *antuk* and *ring* is similar to that maintained by the contrast of agentive prepositions *baan* and *tekèn* in *biasa* register. However, the *alus* preposition *ring* also covers "local" functions (*locative*, *ablative*, etc.); hence *ring* is a more generalized preposition than *tekèn*, which can cover case-role relationships of several types (*agent* of First Passive, *source* or *recipient* in Actor Focus).

[11] Mabasan Texts I. 1. (RY) II. 1. 5

[12] TBB, p. 98

[13] informant: I Déwa Putu Dani (almarhum)

[14] TBB, p. 98

[15] Satua Bali I. A. (1) 3. 6

[16] informant: Pak Gandra of Pejèng village, based on Satua Bali I. A. (1) 8. 11

[17] Satua Bali I. A. (1) 2. 8

[18] Satua Bali I. B. (5) 43. 10

[19] Satua Bali I. A. (1) 5. 5

[20] Satua Bali I. A. (1) 9. 1-2

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[21] Silverstein summarizes in this passage Benveniste's views on the "non-person" status of 3rd person pronouns.

[22] TBB. p. 73

[23] Commoner Balinese practice teknonymy, the practice of renaming parents in terms of their children. Hence the parents of I Cubling both take his name in their teknonymous epithets *Mèn Cubling* and *Pan Cubling*. H. and C. Geertz (1976: 85-94) have discussed the important consequences of this practice, concluding that it is part of a broader pattern of "naming [through] repeating, generalized, and impersonal role designations... which enforce a systematic genealogical amnesia" (p. 162). The purpose of these impersonalized and repetitive forms of naming, say these authors, is to focus "on the perpetual recreation of an established pattern, the maintainance - to use againg Bateson's luminous phrase - of a steady state" (1976: 162).

[24] Satua Bali I. A. (1) 1. 1-9

[25] *Keséla* is a white, starchy root vegetable, given the generic name *ubi* 'starchy root vegetable ' in Indonesian. It is not exactly *taro*, not exactly *cassava*, closer to a potato, but more grainy in texture.

[26] Purwa Akṣara I. 32

[27] Satua Bali I. A. (1) 5. 11

[28] Satua Bali III. A. (1) 7. 19-10

[29] TBB, p. 96

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[30] TBB, p. 170

[31] TBB, p. 170

[32] Satua Bali I.B.(5) 46.13

[33] TBB, p. 108

[34] Mabasan Texts I.3.(RY) III.54.3

[35] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 2.8-11

[36] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 8.3

[37] TBB, p. 523

[38] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 7.6

[39] Shadeg: 1977, no. 724. Note that there is no Actor Focus equivalent of "First Passive" *jeneng-a*. The N-R-(suffix) derivation of the base *jeneng* 'shape, form' simply means (in *alus singgih* reference) 'reside in, live at'. Thus in Balinese 'seems' takes 'passive' or erg-abs form form where English takes a 'dummy subject' construction. Whether this can be taken as evidence that the 'passive agent' marked with *-a* should be taken as the 'dummy subject' in Balinese is a matter of no little interest, but cannot be further discussed within the limits of this dissertation.

[40] Satua Bali I.B.(2) 17.8-9. The derived transitive form **kadèn- ang* 'cause to suspect' also typically takes "First Passive" form and controls an Actor Focus, stative, or intransitive verb in the embedded clause:

Buin mani-né semeng-an kadèn-**ang-a**

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

next *day*-pro3 *morning*-LF *regard as*-Tr1-Ag3
Pan Cubling **luas**
(name) *go out*

'The next day (it) was made to appear (that) Father of Cubling had gone out.' (Satua Bali I.A.(1) 7.1 - 2)

41 Satua Bali I.B.(1) 9.2

42 TBB, p.113

43 Satua Bali I.B.(2) 4.1

44 Satua Bali I.A.(3) 23.1-3

45 Satua Bali I.B.(3) 5-9. Verbs taking embedded speech are also commonly found in 'Actor Foucs' form. Example (53) is in fact part of a longer narrative unit that uses a shift from 'active' to 'passive' form to establish a sequence of events:

(a) Mèn Kuuk lantas **ng**-omong
(name) *then* AF-*said*
"Siap Selem apa to ulung"
(name) *what* deicart2 *fell*

'Mèn Kuuk then said: "Siap Selem, what was that that fell" ?'

(b) saut-**in-a** baan I Siap Selem
answer-Tr2-Ag3 'by' prop *(name)*
don timbul jeneng-**a** ulung
leaf *(name)* *seems*-Ag3 *fall*

'Replied I Siap Selem: "It seems that a *timbul* leaf fell down".'

46 Satua Bali I.A.(2) 13.3

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[47] TBB, p. 94

[48] Satua Bali I.B.(2) 12.2. Note that benefactive constructions in Actor Focus ('active') form are more likely to refer to undifferentiated or general *benefactees:*

Tusing	bani	tiang	**ng**-ampak-**in**	jlanan
not	*brabe*	pro1	AF-*open*-Tr2	*door*

'I wasn't brave enough <u>to</u> <u>open</u> the door at all.' (Satua Bali I.B.(2) 13.7)

[49] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 2.3

[50] *Kalimat pertama memang benar, tapi belum tentu mereka dapat obatnya. Dalam kalimat pertama obat sudah dicari, sudah dibawakan, dan I Cubling sudah diobati. Dalam kalimat kedua mereka sedang mencari, atau baru mencari.* (informant: Pak Gandra)

[51] Shadeg: 1977, no. 443

[52] Shadeg: 1977, no. 169

[53] TBB, p. 105

[54] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 11.2

[55] TBB, p. 105. Note that the English translation is ungrammatical, since in English adverbs ordinarily cannot modify passive verbs.

[56] Satua Bali I.B.(5) 46.11

[57] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 10.2

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[58] Satua Bali I.A.(2) 22.5-6

[59] Satua Bali I.B.(5) 46.10

[60] Satua Bali III.A.(2) 10.31-32

[61] Satua Bali III.A.(2) 10.27-28

[62] Satua I Cangak I.6

[63] informant: I Déwa Putu Dani

[64] Mabasan Texts I.4.(RY) XIII.4.1

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER SEVEN

BALINESE LOOK AT OLD JAVANESE: *KAWI* IN THE CONTEXT OF *MABASAN*

7.0 The terms Old Javanese and Kawi

While earlier in this thesis I have treated Old Javanese as a single entity representing a particular stage in the evolution of Western AN languages, at another level of analysis this cannot be taken as a given. First of all, Old Javanese is a language that is known only from written texts and inscriptions left to us by authors not so much concerned with the representation of contemporary language as with the creation of a special form of language approximating Sanskrit in being a *saṃskṛta-bhāṣā*, a 'perfected' language embodying eternal truths. In inscriptional Old Javanese Sanskritic elements are associated with elements of the cult of royalty, and play a secondary role in the language. Later Old Javanese reveals a more thorough blending of Sanskritic vocabulary with Austronesian lexicon and morphology. It thus resembles the hybrid of Sanskrit and Telugu language called *maṇi-pravālam* in representing a concious attempt to bring about an esthetic fusion of San-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

skrit and elements of local or 'natural' language *(prākṛt)*.

The corpus of Old Javanese written works appears to cover a number of stages of linguistic evolution, but conservative forces operating on this language of elite discourse make it difficult (if not impossible) to deliminate stages of historical development. The inscriptional materials and literary texts preserved on palm-leaf documents *(lontar, rontal)* cover a period of over seven hundred years in duration, and are the products of a culture that at one time was spread over most of Java and Bali, and at the height of its power had influence over a much wider area. If we are to judge from the contemporary state of affairs there must have been dialect variation in areas where Old Javanese was used, and it is likely that such local dialect variations influenced the form of the formal written language

Not surprisingly there is a great deal of variation in language among Old Javanese texts. The language of the inscriptions, for example, differs significantly from that of the metrical texts of the classical *kekawin* genre, while the language of late texts like the *Pararaton* is again very different from that of the *kekawin*. Thus the term Old Javanese represents not a single unitary language, but the written evidences for a series of related linguistic forms.

Old Javanese was synthetic by nature, combining typical Austronesian morphology and inflection with a lexi-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

cal base nearly evenly divided between Sanskritic and indigenous words. Indic concepts of (ritual) kingship played a large role in the burgeoning states of the Hindu-Javanese era, and in this context knowledge of Sanskrit was a means of access to political power.

The Sanskritic elements of Old Javanese acted as a kind of sociolinguistic filter, allowing some speakers access to the codes of authority and power and denying it to others. In this context the bilingual speaker was by definition privy to the inner circle of political power dominated by a Sanskritized elite, while monolingual speakers were on the 'outside' of this system.

Thus 'Old Javanese' represents but one pole of expression in what must have been a linguistically plural society, in which dialects integrated with the vocabulary of the emergent Hindu-Javanese state had gained political ascendency over dialects untransformed by Sanskritization.

The classical era of Hindu-Javanese culture (ca. 10th - 15th centuries) has sometimes been termed the "Kekawin Age" after the name of Old Javanese literary form that in many ways epitomized the art of that era. Javanese played a role in Javanese society much like that of Sanskrit within classical Hindu society. It was a specialized language of learned exchange, especially cultivated within the monastic religious orders, but also important in the organization of a state-system that must have resembled the *negara* or

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"theater state" described for nineteenth century Bali by C. Geertz (1980).

In this system the role of Old Javanese in ritual and the arts had a political and social aspect, for the arts were the medium of the public displays that characterize the "theater state", and as such were at the very heart of the state. In this context 'performance' is not 'entertainment' but the enactment of socio-cultural and political reality:

> "The expressive nature of the Balinese state was apparent through the whole of its known history, for it was always pointed not toward tyranny, whose systematic concentration of power it was incompetent to effect... but rather toward spectacle, toward cermony, toward the public dramatization of the ruling obsessions of Balinese culture: social inequality and status pride." (1980: 13)

The composition of texts in the *kekawin* genre, modeled after the Indian *kāvya* and incorporating metrical forms and rhetorical figures from that tradition (cf. Hooykaas: 1958), was an important focus of esthetic production in the East Javanese period. By the thirteenth century in addition to the *kekawin* texts being produced in Old Javanese, there began to appear texts in the indigenous Javanese *kidung* meters, composed in a language that has come to be known as Middle Javanese. This language is unique in being a Javanese product whose later development almost certainly took place in Bali. Robson (1971) has noted the complex

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

relationship between the literary traditions of Old and Middle Javanese with those of modern Java and Bali:

> "Old and Middle Javanese literary traditions can be treated as a whole, both forming the heritage of the Balinese, and thus marked off from the Modern Javanese tradition. The idiom of the Middle Javanese *kidung*, however, is perhaps closer to Modern Javanese than to Old." (1971:7)

Robson suggests that the Middle Javanese language preserved on Bali in the *kidung* literature has a common ancestry with Modern Javanese in the East Javanese dialect of the fourteenth century. This was the idiom of the Majapahit dynasty whose culture is still the inspiration for the classical Javano-Balinese arts.

Middle Javanese may have been used on Bali as early as 1343 A.D., the year that Gajah Mada extended Majapahit suzerainity over Bali. But the heyday of *kidung* composition on Bali came during the Gelgel period (ca. 1550-1600), the period that also saw the collapse the Majapahit power in the Brantas valley of East Java, and the retreat of the last Hindu kings of Java to the Belambangan area at the eastern end of Java.

Middle Javanese must have lived on for a time in Balinese literary circles for there are a few Middle Javanese forms preserved in *alus* levels of Balinese (the deictic article *punika*, verbal deictics *marika/mariki*, etc.). However, Middle Javanese was never integrated into

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Balinese linguistic context to the same extent as Old Javanese. Thus it is that speakers of Modern Javanese have easier access to the language of the Middle Javanese *kidung* narratives, but do not have a supporting tradition of recitation, nor have the texts themselves been preserved in Java. Modern Balinese, on the other hand, admit to the difficulty of the *kidung* language, but preserve melodic principles supporting *kidung* recitation. [1]

As Robson points out, for Balinese the language of both *kekawin* and *kidung* is *Kawi*, the 'poetic language' that is used by the heroes and gods of the *wayang* plays, or by by high priests during the rituals associated with the 'birthdays' of temples *(odalan)* or the 'life rituals' *(manusa yadnya)* that mark the progress of individual lives.

As other authors have pointed out, the term *Kawi* is used for a number of distinct linguistic forms. For the traditional literati of the Central Javanese courts *(kraton)*, *Kawi* can mean the literary language more correctly termed *kawi miring* 'slanted Kawi', a Javanese literary idiom conciously developed in the seventeenth century by court poets like Yasadipura I who were then endeavoring to recover the poetic idiom of the Majapahit culture that had disappeared during the political and social upheaval of the period of Sultan Agung. This is the *Kawi* that is used to add elegance to the composition of traditional Javanese poetry in the *macapatan* form (cf.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Errington 1982:44 - 45).

For Balinese the word *Kawi* can also mean 'poet' or 'creator'. Hence we find *Sang Kawi*, 'the realized poet', and *Sang Hyang Kawi*, 'the Creator, the Supreme Poet'.[2] These terms captures resonances of what Zoetmulder has termed "a cult of beauty" that saw its greatest flowering in the the period of the East Javanese kingdoms (10th - 15th centuries), but which has left its imprint on both Javanese and Balinese conceptions of art and the sacred. In this "cult of beauty" the creator of texts in *Kawi* was initiated through "aesthetic rapture" *(kelangwan)* into the creative aspect of the divinity, thus gaining special powers that set him apart from other mortals.

Thus for Balinese *Kawi* is not simply Old Javanese or Middle Javanese: it represents instead the voices of Balinese ancestors, those who gave shape to the present form of (traditional) society, and continue to stand outside it as sources of authority and power. *Kawi* stands at the top of a hierarchy of linguistic forms, higher than contemporary linguistic forms because it is closer to the authenticating voices of the ancestors. *Kawi* thus plays a large role in Balinese cultural life, providing a language that recreates the aura of ancestral figures, a language incomprehensible to average Balinese that both separates them them from, and can provide access to, the "unseen side of existence" *(niskala)* that confers power on those who can

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

master its secrets.

7.1 *Kawi* in the context of *mabasan*

As Zurbuchen (1987) has demonstrated, two of the most important arenas for performance of *Kawi* are the shadow theater (*wayang*) and the *bebasan*, a term described by Zurbuchen as referring to "the group study and performance of literature". The nominal form *bebasan* is derived from *basa* 'language' (< Skt. *bhāṣā*), while the verbal froms *ma-basa-n* and *ma-bebasa-n* refer to a 'doing' of language, an activity that brings language into being. The complete *mabasan* activity is generally thought of as consisting of two parts: (1) *ma-kekawin*, in which *Kawi* texts in the Indic meters of the *kekawin* genre are recited, and (2) *mabasan* proper (also: *negesin*, *masanin*) in which a Balinese gloss of the *Kawi* original is given, couched in the special oral-literary regiser of *mabasan*, and framed in an *alus* idiom appropriate to the ritual elements of the form (even when performed only 'for practice').

There is a thus a parallelism between the *mabasan* and the discourse of Balinese shadow theater *(wayang)* or classical dance *(arja, topeng)*. In the former *Kawi* texts are translated into a special oral-literay language that is framed largely in *alus* terms, but can include *biasa* elements of dialogue where appropriate. In the latter the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ubiquitous clowns of Javano-Balinese theater translate the *Kawi* utterances of heroes, gods, and demons into contemporary *biasa* and *kasar* idioms, bringing them into the present through the medium of contemporary spoken language.

Mabasan activities are usually organized according to the *sekaha* principle, a principle described by H. & C. Geertz (1975) as resting on the premise "an independent group for every purpose, and only one purpose per group" (1975: 30).

While *mabasan* can be performed in both formal and informal contexts, the elements of performance are essentially the same, though there is likely to be a good deal more discussion of fine points of recitation and meaning in informal 'practice' sessions. Participants ordinarily sit in a semi-circle or circle around the *kropak*, the box containing the palm-leaf text, or *lontar*. Zurbuchen (1987) gives a succinct description of the general form of a *mabasan* session:

> "Generally, participants are seated cross-legged in roughly circular fashion on an open pavilion or *balé*. The persons who will begin the reading and translatin may be somewhat nearer the center of the group; the translator is often turned slightly so as to face the reader. In front of the reader is a round raised tray *(dulang)* such as is used for arrangements of offerings; on this tray are the lontars to be performed. There are often small offerings and burning incense next ot the lontars; reading-group participants are provided at intervals with betel, cigarettes, coffee and snacks." (1987: 90)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sometimes a brief blessing of the *kropak* or *lontar* is offered. Some advanced practicioners have learned specific *mantra* to be recited during the opening of the *kropak* and the *lontar*, but ordinarily the blessing consists simply of an offering of a few drops of holy water, sprinkled with a flower blossom *(sekar)* using the gesture called *ñekar*, and accompanied by *mantra-s*.

In a formal setting the first reader may preface the reading with an "apologia" or *Pangaksama* (< Skt. *ā-kṣama* 'forgive'). This can be compared to the rhetorical form termed *mebetènin ngeraos* 'lowering one's speaking' that is customary as the first section of speeches delivered in the context of meetings of the "town council" (cf. Hobart 1975: 75). Interpersonal linguistic behaviour in the context of the *sekaha bebasan* is in general less formal than in public forums like that of the "town council" *(banjar)* meeting, if only because there is much less at stake in terms of political influence. However, the principle that the corporate entity itself has the final say in all matters remains in force; hence to claim insufficient knowledge is to state one's qualifications, to speak of ones lack of knowledge is to demonstrate one's fitness. (A typical *Pangaksama* is illustrated in Appendix A.1 of this thesis.)

After taking the *lontar* out of its box, opening it, and placing it on the *dulang*, the reader scans the first line, recites is once as a warm up, then repeats it to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

signal the beginning of the exchange of *Kawi* and Balinese lines.

There are two main styles used in the recitation of *Kawi*. In the first, termed *ma-kakawin*, the quantitative verse patterns of the Indian- influenced *kakawin* literature are 'translated' into melodic patterns (called *reng*) based on organizational principles derived from the art of Balinese *gamelan* music (cf. Wallis 1980:149 - 155). The second main type of recitation is the *palawakya* style, a prose style used for the recitation of the *Parwa* literature devoted to *Mahābharata* materials.

After each line (or part of a line) is 'sung' by the *Kawi* reader, an extemporized Balinese translation is given by a second participant, usually termed the *pangartos*, or *peneges* (< *artos*, *teges* [A] 'meaning'). The language used in this glossing of the *Kawi* text is framed largely in *alus* terms, and relys heavily on stereotypical devices like those described by Albert Lord (1976) in his well-known work on the oral tradition of Yugoslavian epic singers.

There are characteristic phrasing and intonation patterns found in *mabasan* 'translation', but the length of lines can vary considerably. Differences of dialect or linguistic loyalty also frequently show up in *mabasan* translation. There are thus distinct local styles in *mabasan* language: the Northern style of Buléléng, for example, differs considerably from the both the styles of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

South Bali and of conservative Karang Asem at the eastern extremity of the island.

As is the case for other Balinese speech acts, the language of *mabasan* is sensitive to the dictates of context and circumstance, what the Balinese term *désa-kala-patra* 'place, time, and name'. While we speak of appropriatenes in terms of 'time' and 'place' the Balinese add 'name' to this list, thus illustrating the importance of the sociolinguistic coordinates of participants in Balinese speech acts.

In the *bebasan* performance the ritual nature of the setting, the connection with ancestral voices, means that the framing of texts must be in *alus* register. In translation of dialogue, however, the demands of *désa-kala-patra* can be interpreted with much greater flexibility. Hence an exchange between the virtuous *Wibhisana* and his mother is likely to be translated with a mixture of *alus* and *biasa* forms, *Wibhisana* using respectful *alus* terms when addressing his mother, she replying with the more intimate terms typical of the *bapa-cening* ('father-child') style most appropriate to the parent-child relationship.

Again, the description of an exhortation by *Rāma* to his younger brother *Bharata* will probably take the intimate tone of the *beli-adi* 'younger brother-older brother' style that is appropriate when a *satriya* of higher rank speaks to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a subordinate (cf. Zurbuchen 1987:77). Descriptions of confrontations on the field of battle often call for a descent to the most *kasar* forms of language, for skill in language intended to incite is a hallmark of the ideal Balinese hero. Hence translation of dialogue at the points termed *pasang gedeg* ('angry exchange') demands *kasar* language, just as other contexts demand *alus* or mixed registers.

7.2 *Mabasan* in the work of I Gusti Panji Tisna

While I have claimed above that competition for political advantage is rarely a part of *mabasan* activities, competition for more ephemeral types of status is not unknown in the *mabasan* context. *Mabasan* is a performance art, one that can be judged by a generally accepted set of public standards, and in which there are good performances and bad, skilled performers and novices. As such the *mabasan* form can allow the expression of individual differences that tend to be suppressed in the fixed order of hierarchical relationships and general pattern of anonymity that is supported by Balinese "kinship" and "status-title" institutions.

One of the most revealing portraits of this aspect of *mabasan* to be produced in modern times is a fictional account to be found in the (1935) novel *Ni Rawit, Seller of Souls*, written in Indonesian language by the Balinese

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

writer I Gusti Nyoman Pandji Tisna. In a critical section of this fictional work Panji Tisna uses an account of a *mabasan* session to reveal the psychological aspects of the two main characters of the novel.

In the chapter of *Ni Rawit* titled "A Duel of Wits" *(Beradu Kepandaian)* the hero, Ida Nyoman, and his antagonist, Ida Wayan, are first introduced through the eyes of Dayu Kènderan, a cousin to the hero and daughter of Ida Bagus, the *brahmana* in whose priestly residence a *mabasan* session is to be held. Ida Nyoman has just returned from a three-year stay in the traditionally conservative area of Karang Asem, and Dayu Kènderan remarks on the effect this has had on Ida Nyoman's development:

> "Certainly Ida Nyoman had changed a lot, and was no longer like he had been three years ago. His language was refined and his gestures and actions were like those of the majority of the people of Karang Asem, because he had lived for years among them. His way of showing respect also revealed that he had associated for a long time with those who are learned and wise. A lot of what he said you couldn't figure out, for here and there it was mixed with *Kawi*." (1935:73)

For Dayu Kenderan Ida Nyoman's good qualities are revealed in his gestures and language, which reflect the traditional norms said to this day to be best preserved in the region of Karang Asem. Of special interest is Dayu Kenderan's use of the word *Kawi*, for it brings out at once the ideas of refinement and incomprehensibility: *Kawi* is a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

language that must be commonly incomprehensible, for in this it preserves the feature of distanciation that marks it as sacred; at the same time knowledge of *Kawi* implies refinement, for as the expression of what is most "inner" *(jero)* in cultural terms it also partakes of the most *alus* forms of language, those most appropriate at the heart of religious (and social) organization.

It is in Panji Tisna's exploration of the characters of the Ida Nyoman and his opponent Ida Wayan in a *mabasan* 'duel' that his skill as an observer really comes out. This is a small masterpiece of literary invention, for Tisna succeeds in illustrating the meaning of *mabasan* in Balinese eyes at the same time that he develops psychological dimensions of the two main characters. The *Kawi* text chosen for translation in this passage is from the *Arjuna Wiwāha*, the best known of the works of the *kekawin* literature in *mabasan* circles, but noted for its difficult language. As Ida Nyoman and Ida Wayan pit their skills against each other in glossing this text, there is a gradual unfolding of subtle differences of personality and motivation.

Panji Tisna's account of *mabasan* in *Ni Rawit* provides a rare window into the traditional Balinese view of *mabasan*. It is an account that is also strikingly contemporary, and we might well hear comments similar to those recorded by Panji Tisna at a meeting of a modern *sekaha bebasan*. A translation of the *mabasan* section of Panji

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Tisna's *Ni Rawit* is offered in 7.3 following as an introduction to the 'emic' aspects of *mabasan*, its meaning in the eyes of those who are its practicioners.

7.3 "A Duel of Wits" - excerpts from *Ni Rawit, Tjeti Pendual Orang* (I Gusti Panji Tisna: 1935)

At that moment Ida Bagus requested that they begin to *mabasan*.

The manuscript was read by I Kerta with a voice that was high and sweet, while I Wayan Puguh gave a humorous interpretation.[3] In the meantime Ida Bagus had ordered I Cengok to keep watch behind the rice granary.

They had been going along avidly for some time, reciting various meters *(wirama)*, but there replacements had still not yet arrived. When Balian Sandi wanted to take a turn, they saw that a guest had come in carrying in his hands a small lamp.

"Please come up, older brother", said Ida Bagus sweetly, "have you just arrived ?"

"Yes, has it been going on for long already ?"

"No, we've just begun, because we were waiting for you, older brother", replied Ida Bagus politely. "Please sit down. We just got to the part where Arjuna comes to pay his respects to Lord Shiva. Now, because you're here, we'd like to ask that you take a turn at giving the meaning !"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"How can it be that you think I'm smarter than Jero Balian !" said Ida Wayan, seeming to lower himself just a bit, but it was evident from his face that he was raising himself up as well. "Hey, I didn't notice at first - a guest from Karang Asem. When did you get here, Nyoman ?" he said to the young man before him, pretending to be happy to see him.

"Not a guest, brother !" said Ida Bagus. "He's the one who really owns this house and grounds."

"Guest or not, it's all the same" said Ida Nyoman gently. "I got here a little earlier, older brother, when the sun went down. Is everything well with your family at *Geriya Kesiman* ?"

"Hopefully so," (replied Ida Wayan).

After that I Kerta began to read:

Aum sembahning anatha tinghalana de trilokasarana

"Why don't you take a turn, Wayan ?" said Ida Bagus.

Ida Wayan Ompog sat in the proper manner reading and of course didn't forget to cast his gaze in the direction of the spot where the women and girls had gathered to watch. He smiled sweetly, then began to translate with a rather high-pitched voice and an attitude that bordered on vanity:

"The kind of understanding that is based on ignorance is given aid by three things."

Wahyadyatmika sembahing hulun i jengta tan hana waneh,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

continued I Kerta.

With a brave air, and not forgetting to gaze at the doorway (where the women sat), Ida Wayan translated as follows:

"It is the basis of that knowledge that I beg at the feet of the Lord, nothing other."

Sang lwir agni saking taken kadi minyak saking dadhi kita

"It is courage that comes from truth," said Ida Wayan, while looking around as if to find out what people thought of his interpetation.

Most of the people there didn't understand the section of the *Wiwāha* that was being read, and for that reason they were amazed by Ida Wayan's skill. Ida Nyoman sat silently, whle Balian Sandi sat with his head bowed; the women were all as if struck dumb. There was no one who objected to Ida Wayan's language or explanation. Arrogantly he challanged them with his gaze. And there was no telling the joy of his heart when he realized that I Dayu and Ni Anis were, every once in a while, and very cautionsly, casting glances at him from the corners of their eyes.

"I've got you now," he said in his heart. "Now you understand who I am."

Just then I Kerta continued his reading:

Sang saksat mtu yan hana wang amuter tutur pinahayu

"As if making your heart hard in order to pierce through to a good end."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Thus ran Ida Wayan's interpretation.

Not a word was spoken by anyone. It was as if their throats had been stopped up in amazement, for (Ida Wayan) had translated such difficult language with such ease and speed. Jero Balian continued to sit quietly, bowed over and moving his big toe as if writing something on the mat.

Wiapiwiapaka sarining paramatatwa durlaba kita, said I kerta, after taking a gulp of water.

"The meaning of purity is that it strenghtens the will."

Icantang hana tan hana ganal-alit lawan hala-hayu

"The grace of God is seen in the large and the small, in both good and ill."

Utpati sitti linaning dadi kitata karananika

"They pray with great energy, so that God will bless them."

I Kerta stopped for a moment, because the reading was going to shift to the meter *Totaka*.

Ida Wayan meanwhile asked for the ingredients for chewing betel, then ate a quid while slapping his thighs. Then he said in a high-pitched voice:

"What's your opinion, all of you, was my translation correct or not ?"

"We were amazed at your skill, my lord ! You could translate such difficult lines just like that," said one person, showing great respect.

Ida Wayan felt like he was in seventh heaven.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"It's only on account of effort that it's like that," he said proudly. "You sit *Kawi*, you stand *Kawi*. You wake up to *Kawi* and go to bed with *Kawi* - even when you're eating you read *Kawi*. And the *Wiwaha* isn't even that hard."

"Hey, if you don't call the language of the *Wiwaha* difficult, then the others must seem really easy !" said I Gusti Ngurah in amazement. "If I could be as clever as you in the blink of an eye, I'd give a thousand pieces of silver ! How happy I'd feel in my heart."

Ida Wayang laughed from the joy in his own heart.

"And now I think it would be best if we had I Nyoman repeat what I just translated earlier, because its clear that there are still a lot of people who don't yet understand. Don't you think so, Jero Balian ?"

The *dukun* raised his head slowly. He was about to answer but I Puguh cut in first:

"Hey, <u>this</u> fool was far from understanding. And because I'm stupid and slow, I couldn't even understand the Balinese that you used."

Everyone laughed. But in truth they didn't understand the true import of what Ida Wayan Ompog had said.

Ida Bagus looked at Ida Nyoman while saying:

"It's true, Nyoman. Why don't you repeat what Wayan did before. It would be good for all of us - who knows, maybe we'll get asked to do *mabasan* at someone's house, then fine words like those Ida Wayan has given us would come in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

handy."

"Older brother," said Ida Nyoman to Ida Wayan, "because you've given an order, of course younger brother will obey. Whatever is true and fitting must be studied by those who are still stupid."

"You don't have to go on," (said Ida Wayan). "Everyone knows that its only natural for you to be less skilled than I am, because you're still young and haven't studied *Kawi* for that long. Please go ahead."

He looked over his shoulder toward I Dayu, as if to say to her that he was more clever, more valuable, and of higher status than the other young man. By coincidence at that moment I Dayu was just looking at Ida Nyoman as he approached the *lontar* manuscript with great care and affection. Ida Wayan scowled with anger.

At that moment I Kerta began to read again, after trading gazes for a moment with his beloved (Ni Anis):

Aum sembahning anatha tinghalana de trilokasarana

Ida Nyoman didn't translate the line immediately. He first took leave of Ida Wayan, saying:

"Because I've just begun to study, if I make a mistake, I ask your pardon very much. It's very difficult to imitate words like yours, older brother."

"Of course, of course" said I Wayan Puguh, "and it's fitting that you make mistakes here and there, because *Kawi* is really difficult. And the meaning, as Ida Wayan said

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

earlier, in my opinion is even more difficult to understand. I myself have only just begun to study *Kawi* a little bit."

"As long as the intention of what you say is as I put it before," said Ida Wayan arrogantly, "it doesn't matter is the words are different. Where is there someone who can exactly copy the words of a guru, or the teachings of someone more wise than himself. Impossible ! It's perfectly normal for students to make mistakes. So go ahead, Nyoman. Don't be shy. Read Kerta, from the beginning of where Arjuna worships Lord Shiva !"

Kerta began to sound out the meter with a sweet voice, saying:

Aum sembahning anatha tinghalana de trilokasaran

"This lowly person offers (you) the gesture of *sembah*, for he wishes the protection of the Lord of the Three Worlds."

So ran Ida Nyoman's translation. While he spoke he looked up at Ida Wayan, as if to ask if the meaning was correct.

Ida Wayan said nothing, pretending to take no notice. But there was a great tumult in his heart, for the translation was very clear and in accord with its source.

Wahyadyatmika sembahing hulun i jengta tan hana waneh, I Kerta rather quickly added.

"My interior and exterior selves worship at the feet of My Lord, none other."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sang lwir agni saking tahen kadi minyak saking dadhi kita

"Like fire (appearing) from wood, like oil (appearing) from churned milk, thus are you my Lord."

Sang Saksat m(e)tu yan hana wang amutur tutur pinahayu

"Who appears, as it were, whenever anyone speaks of what is true and beautiful."

After that Ida Nyoman leaned over towards Ida Wayan, and said, "I've finished taking a try at translating, older brother. It's certain that there were a lot of mistakes, and that my translation was far from the real meaning."

Ida Wayan's face was flushed red with shame. He hadn't suspected that Ida Nyoman really understood *Kawi*.

Jero Balian lifted his head and gazed at the young man with real pleasure. In his opinion Ida Nyoman's translation had been correct and clear.

I Wayan Puguh explained happily that the translation and been very easy to understand. And Ida Bagus as well did not forget to praise the skill of his future son-in-law. He said:

"Now I really understand those words for the first time. The meaning is really deep, and it's not easy to understand what is intended. Even though the words are simple, the ture essence is very difficult to discern. Don't you think so Jero Balian ?"

"I also feel that was a truly precise transaltion," said the *dukun* politely. "I'm convinced that Ida Nyoman

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

already understands the meaning of the *Wiwaha*."

Indeed everyone present was amazed. No one had suspected Ida Nyoman was that clever. His language was refined, and his translation and explanation were true in every detail. His words had not matched exactly those of Ida Wayan, but they were rather more clear and precise, and better understood by those who had gathered to listen.

They knew now that Ida Nyoman was no stranger to the *kropak*, the box that holds the *lontar* texts.

The reading continued. Praise for Ida Nyoman now began to pour out, for his translating became all the more fluent and clear. All the time the pain in Ida Wayan's heart was also mounting, for he felt that he had been defeated by Ida Nyoman. Finally he spoke out in a teasing tone:

"Hmm, I'm the one that showed him the way to translate like that. If not, it's sure he'd still be feeling around in the dark. 'Totaka' let him translate that all by himself. Read 'Totaka' meter, Kerta, so we can see if clever Mr. Nyoman here can translate it."

He looked over to where the women sat. And what he saw was I Kerta trading glances with Ni Anis, and I Dayu half watching Ida Nyoman, half eating betel with an expression of desire on her face. "Kerta, read ! Quickly !" he said in a sharp tone.

"What ?"

"Totaka meter."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sasiwimba haneng gatha mesi banyu, sang Kerta in a fluid and sweet voice.

Ida Nyoman translated quickly and seemingly without forethought:

"Like the orb of the moon reflected in an urn of water."

Ndan asing suci nirmmala mesi wulan.

"Musn't all that is clean and pure have within in it objects that are also without stain ?"

I Kerta stopped for a moment, because Balian Sandi asked, "What was the meaning of the second sentence, Lord Nyoman ? Try to explain it to us."

"It's very clear," said the young man slowly and sweetly. "If water is calm, it must be that the reflections within it will resemble the actual objects that are reflected there. But if the water is disturbed and turbulent, how can it be that we would see true reflections on its surface ?"

"Of course they would appear defective," said I Wayan Puguh brightly. "So it's true (what's written in the *lontar*), your explanation makes clear the true meaning."

Praise now fell on Ida Nyoman in earnest, and the eyes of the girls were glued to him. Now too Ida Wayan's heart was really hot, and he quickly ordered I Kerta to continue reading. If he caught Ida Nyoman making a mistake in translation, he was going to put him to the test.

But he was far from attaining his purpose. On the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

contrary, the longer the reading went on the more intently everyone listened. Not a single soul moved from their seat, for it seemed as if they were face to face with Arjuna himself, or with Lord Shiva flying along over their heads. Even Ida Wayan could not resist. Without intending it, without even being aware of it, he too began to listen intently and with amazement to the words of the young man whom a moment before he had regarded his enemy. As time went on the night began to wane and a chill entered the air. When a cool, damp wind started up, Ida Wayan looked towards the courtyard. Darkness.

He remembered I Sompelogan: had he already done his work ?

7.4 *Mabasan* from *Ni Rawit* to contemporary Bali

Panji Tisna's account of *mabasan* reveals several important aspects of *mabasan*. First of all, as in other public, corporate contexts, language and behaviour are highly constrained, and polite language is the rule. Formalized expressions of apology and other self-lowering devices are used by speakers to establish credibility before the group, and to defer to other participants in the speech act. Some of these facets of public language and behaviour are captured in Panji Tisna's account, even though the Malay idiom employed by Panji Tisna in his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

novels presents some obstacles to portraying the extreme politeness of Balinese public discourse.

Second, *Kawi* is characterized in *Ni Rawit* as implying a state of self-mastery like that attained by the gods and heroes of the Hindu-Balinese past. Indeed at the peak of Ida Nyoman's victory in *mabasan* he becomes one with Arjuna, and generates an aura of spiritual unity that draws in even the envious Ida Wayan. Thus *mabasan* is an important arena for the preservation of the ideals of yoga and self-mastery that permeate the classical Old Javanese literature.

Panji Tisna's account of *mabasan* allows us a glimpse into *sekaha bebasan* activities that have changed little between the writing of *Ni Rawit* (1935) and the present. Note that while the *mabasan* of *Ni Rawit* is carried out within a priestly household *(geriya)* the group attending the *mabasan* also includes a member of the gentry *(satriya)* title-group and a number of commoners *(anak jaba)*. As his name implies one of the commoners, *Balian Sandi*, is a healer, or *balian*. Because of their vocation *balian* naturally have an interest in the ritual texts couched in *Kawi*, an interest they share as well with commoner priests *(mangku)*, and the high priests *(pedanda)* of the *brahmana* lineages.

Knowledge of texts written in some form of *Kawi* is by no means confined to particular caste-title groups. Certain

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

brahmana houses do still specialize in literary pursuits, and the *pedanda* are often recognized experts on *Kawi*, but there are also numerous commoner individuals with an interest in *Kawi*. Zurbuchen (1981: 29) lists 'healers' *(balian usada)*, 'diviners' *(balian wariga, balian teneng)*, 'blacksmiths' *(pandé)*, and 'experts in offerings' *(tukang banten)* among commoners who are likely to have some knowledge of *Kawi* texts.

The practice of *mabasan* suffered a decline in the years after the composition of Panji Tisna's *Ni Rawit*. The Japanese occupation and the post-war struggle for independence acted to disrupt Indonesian life in general, and *mabasan* became politically unpopular during the latter part of Sukarno's regime, when *mabasan* had for some Balinese come to represent the 'feudal society' *(kebudayaan feodalis)* rejected by many Indonesian nationalists, and especially condemed by the *Partai Komunis Indonesia (PKI)*.

Mabasan activities were undergoing an unprecedented expansion in the village of Sanur when I visited there in 1984 - 85. The pressures of tourism and development have for many Balinese stimulated a new-found interest in traditional art forms, styles of dress, etc. that express tangible aspects of Balinese identity. These essentially revivalist motivations have recently come to bear on less visible displays of 'Balinese culture' like the performance of *kekawin* and *kidung*, and there appears to be a growing

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

trend towards revival of interest in *sekaha bebasan* specializing in these traditional oral-literary forms.

The Balinese provincial government has also had a hand in the revival of *mabasan* activities. For members of the educational and cultural bureaucracy of the Indonesian nation-state visible manifestations of Balinese culture like the *mabasan* can be integrated into the pluralistic national culture, becoming a particularly Balinese expression that manifests a desired blend of cultural identity and national solidarity summed up in the national slogan *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* "Unity in Diversity". Thus the government has begun to sponser annual 'Kakawin Contests' *(Lomba Makakawin)* beginning with competitions organized at lower administrative levels *(kecamatan, kebupaten)* and culminating in an all-Bali 'Kakawin playoff'.[4]

There is also a growing trend in the local recording industry towards recording and distribution of *kekawin*, *kidung*, and *geguritan* materials in cassette form. These cassette recordings often include a *mabasan* gloss of the text recited, and for *kidung* recitation there is often musical accompaniment.

In sections following we will look at 'texts' produced in the *mabasan* context by contemporary Balinese. I will argue that we can see evidence in these documents for a rhetorical form based on translation and paraphrase that has roots stretching far back into the Hindu-Javanese past.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

I will argue that *mabasan* in partaking of this traditional rhetorical form also partakes of an orientation towards the linguistic forms of the past. Because of this fact *mabasan* plays a role in supporting and maintaining the *alus* linguistic forms of Modern Balinese, in some cases providing materials for the *alus* lexicon, in others providing a model of the "participant-salient" type of discourse-syntactic organization that I have argued is maintained in *alus* discourse strategies of Modern Balinese.

7.5 The persistence of rhetoric: a sequel to "Binding Wild Words"

During the writing of "Binding Wild Words" (Becker and Hunter [1983], 1987) I had the good fortune of working with A.L. Becker during the evolution of his theories on the role of "binding" or "cohesion" in language. In that work we set out to do a cross-linguistic comparison of a single passage of the Old Javanese literary work *Tantri Kāmandaka*, a passage that not incidentally contains an elaborate simile comparing mastery of grammar and rhetoric with the physical task of binding an elephant.

For Becker, the metaphor of "binding" does not have a narrow meaning, but is something that can be applied at a number of levels of analysis. The passage studied in "Binding Wild Words", for example, is a Sanskritic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

subhāṣitā, 'wise saying' cited along with its Old Javanese gloss. The passage forms one of the first 'paragraphs' of the *Tantri Kāmandaka*, a work whose organization depends on the juxtaposition of *subhāṣitā* and narrative or didactic elements. These gnomic verses of Indian origin are used to provide what Labov (1967) and Polanyi (1978) have termed evaluations. In doing so they provide cohesion and binding at the level of the text:

> "As evaluations the *subhāṣitās* give meaning to -- and thus 'bind' -- the events of the story." (1987:479)

At a closer level of analysis comparison of the *subhāṣitā* and its Old Javanese paraphrase reveals major differences in the linguistic devices involved in phrase and clause level "binding" for the two languages. In Old Javanese, for example, grammatical cohesion at both phrase and clause levels is maintained largely through an extensive set of deictic prepositions, while in Sanskrit similar roles are played by inflectional systems based on gender and number (or person and number). These differences of organization present to the translator a set of cross-language 'gaps', for each language elaborates certain sub-systems at the expense of others in the organization of meaning. Becker has spoken of the these cross-linguistic gaps in terms "exuberance" and "deficiency", taking those terms from the work of the philosopher Ortega y Gasset.[5]

It is the "exuberances: and "deficiencies" found in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

comparing languages that make the work of translation so difficult. Yet at the same time these are potentially the areas of maximum insight, for they force us to reexamine the structure of our own descriptions, hopefully leading us to a view of distant texts, languages, and societies that reaches beyond the limits of our most dearly held theoretical biases.

In sections following of this chapter I will compare *Kawi* originals with Balinese *mabasan* glosses. By looking at what is 'exuberant' and 'deficient' in the Balinese translation of Old Javanese/*Kawi*) texts I hope to establish some sense of what is shared, and what is different, between these two languages that have interacted for so long on the historical stage.

7.6 Excursus: The role of *subhāṣitā* in the *Tantri Kāmandaka*

The *subhāṣitā-paraphrase* style of organization that is found in the *Tantri Kāmandaka (TK)* is not unique in the history of Old Javanese literature, and indeed is a central principle of organization in a large number of works. Didactic works on spiritual belief and practice ranging from the Mahāyanist *Sang Hyang Kamahāyanikan* to Śaiva woks like *Jñāna-siddhantā*, for example, are arranged along a central 'thread' of Sanskritic text, which in some instances we know had an independent existence. [6]

Similarly works on polity like *Ślokāntara* (ed.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Rani: 1957) use *subhāṣitā* as a major structural device in organizing didactic materials. Again, in the *Parwa* literature that translates sections of the *Mahābharata* into Old Javanese, short quotations from the Sanskrit original are used as 'prompts', moving along the narrative by introducing the name of a new character or highlighting a particular aspect of a situation.

The organization of the *Tantri Kāmandaka* may be unique in that it is a work that on the one hand resembles didactic texts, and on the other can be classsified as a work of belles-lettres, a course chosen by Pigeaud in his classification of Old Javanese written materials (Pigeaud: 1976).

The *Tantri Kāmandaka* in fact combines three genres, "*subhāṣitas*, animal tales (from the *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa*), and a frame tale which sets up the moral dilemma which the animal tales explore from different sides" (Becker & Hunter 1987: 480). The larger framing tale of this work features a story with a Scheherezade-like heroine named *Tantri*, while a second framing tale introducing the animal stories tells the story called "The Friendship of Bull and Lion" that is well-known in both the *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa*. These tales place the *Tantri* well within the belles-lettristic tradition, yet *subhāṣitā* are used as a major structure-giving device throughout this work, sometimes introducing didactic or "evaluatory" ma-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

terials, but at other points used solely to motivate development of the narrative.

It is clear that the *TK* is conceived within a tradition in which units of *subhāṣitā* played an important functional role. This is exactly the kind of text-organization that we associate with the priestly authors who compiled didactic texts like the *Ślokāntara* and *Nītiśāstra*, or religious documents like *jñānasiddhānta*. Indeed the sympathetic portrayal of the first minister and state-priest *(empurohita)* in Canto I of the *TK* suggests a priestly author for this work.[7] Such a priestly author (or authors) may have conceived of text-building largely in terms of narrative units 'punctuated' with *subhāṣitā*, a form likely transferred to written literature from the oral-literary forms of didactic instructions based on "translation and paraphrase".

The results of such an attempt to apply an essentially didactic technique to the organization of fictional narrative comes out most clearly in Canto I of the *Tantri Kāmandaka*.. The basic outline of the story at this point is as follows:

The chief minister of King Eśwaryyapala recommends the rite of 'royal marriage' to his king as a means to bringing prosperity to the realm. But the king takes a more 'tantric' than ritual interpretation and proposes to take a new wife every day, who is to be "ushered into his presence each day by the chief minister". When the kingdom runs out of eligible brides the *purohita* realizes that he must offer

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his daugher *Tantri*. Fortunately *Tantri* is an expert in the "secret lore of animal fables" (*tantri- vākya*) and assures her father she can charm the king and so bring about the desired ritual wedding. *Tantri* is successful in this enterprise, and the desired wedding-ritual takes place.

Through use of *subhāṣitā* this literary plot is enlarged to draw in reference to the larger system of belief and practice that lies behind the text. The audiences of the first minister *Bandheśwaryya* with the king, for example, are expanded into dialogues on the nature of religion and duty, while a quotation from the *Bharata-Nāṭya-śāstra* is used to illuminate the special ability of *Banddheśwaryya's* wife to interpret inner moods through involuntary signs and gestures (*iṅgita, ceṣṭa*).

Beginning in Canto II the *TK* is devoted to expostion of a long chain of animal tales, embedded one within the other. In these tales a new narrator is introduced. This is *Bhagawan Basubaga*, a wandering mendicant-saint who provides a *subhāṣitā* commentary on each tale, thus imitating the form of Indian *Pañcatantra* materials.

Hooykaas (1931) has shown that the *Pañcatantra* materials of the *TK* can be related to the *Pañcatantra of Durga-siṃha* written in the Kaṇṇaḍa language, and he notes that *Basubhaga* is mentioned in the latter work (under the name *Vasubhāga*) as a *brāhmaṇa* who choses five 'gems' of Śiva's *Bṛhatkathā* ("Great Collection of Tales") for inclusion in the "terrestrial *Pañcatantra*".[8]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The sage *Basubhaga* in the *TK* is the source of *subhāṣitā* evaluations, as well as the presumptive narrator of the animal stories. In this role he may resemble the Buddhist "masters of *Jātaka*" known from Old Javanese inscriptional evidence. We know that *Pañcatantra* and *Jātaka* stories are mixed in Central and East Javanese temples like Caṇḍi Sojiwan and Caṇḍi Prambanan, and the two *kidung* reworkings of the *TK* both contain a different order and number of stories from that of their model. All of this points to an oral mode of transmission, like that preserved in the tradition of the Balinese *satua* tales or the Javanese *Anung Suroto* tales, both modern descendants of the *Jātaka* or *Tantri* type of tale.

7.7 *Subhāṣitā* elements in the discourse of *wayang* and *mabasan*

Becker (1979) has shown that juxtapositions of translation and invention like those found in the *TK* are still common in the discourse of the Javanese shadow puppeteer. For the Javanese *dalang* Old Javanese thus stands to Modern Javanese as Sanskrit stood to Old Javanese, and it is equally available as a source of *subhāṣitā-like* organization, in this case used in the structuring of a contemporary oral narrative.

In the *kidung* literature of the sixteenth century we find a description of similar processes of 'translation'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in the performance of *wayang*, in this case associated with a verb meaning "to Prakritize, to translate into colloquial speech". This is brought out in comments by Robson on a description a *kekawin* passage sung during a *wayang* portrayed in the *kidung* work *Bangbang Wideya* (Robson: 1971):

> "To the accompaniment of... music the performer sang *kekawin*. After this he gave an interpretation (*amrakreta*...), that is to say, he was making a *prakreta* (interpretation in ordinary language) of the *kakawin*, which employs archaic, poetical language."[9]

As Prākṛt stood linguistically to Saṃskṛt in classical India, so stood the language of *kidung* to the language of the *kekawin*. Old Javanese may thus have already been 'Kawi' to the writers of *kidung*; for to translate from this language into a spoken idiom was to perform *prakreta*, an act of colloquialization comparable in form to the acts referred to in contemporary Bali with words like *mabasan* and *masanin*.

For Balinese knowledgable in traditional literature the rhetoric of translation and invention is a familiar form, and examples of *Kawi* text, *mabasan*, and the language of the *dalang* all are alike in being instances of 'translation' across linguistic forms separating the authoritative past from the ever-changing present. In these translation processes the *subhāṣitā-paraphrase* pattern persists, shaping *mabasan* narrative as surely as it does the *wayang* plays.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The *subhāṣitā-paraphrase* rhetorical pattern grew out of the encounter of Javanese and Balinese with the linguistic expressions of an imported and 'external' philosophy that had come to dominate the centers of religious and political authority. In the context of modern Bali there is a similar dichotomy, but in this case the 'external' power is 'ancestral' rather than actual: from the emic point of view *Kawi* is the voice of the ancestors, and as such is a principle source of corroboration for the legitimacy, or lack of legitimacy, of current religious and social practices. From an etic point of view 'the ancestors' can be said to represent the reified coercive power of a number of corporate groups that organize the life of the individual in Balinese society. We know from the work of several remarkable generations of anthropologists working on Bali that these institutions have remarkable coercive force, resting not on a monopoly on physical force but simply on the power to disenfranchise offenders against the system. This is the 'other' in the dialogue of present tense Balinese with ancestral *Kawi*.

7.8 Balinese texts: cases and interpretations

This section of the thesis represents an attempt to move from what C. Geertz (1980) has termed a "laws and instances" type of explanation to one of "cases and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

interpretation". As in "Binding Wild Words" a comparative approach is taken. Here I will be comparing passages from the classical literature in *Kawi* with Balinese glosses given during *mabasan* sessions.

Of the *mabasan* episodes cited in this chapter two are provided in Appendix A of this thesis, while the remainder are to be found in the author's *Mabasan Texts* (in preparation).

7.9 Passage 1: Phrase level cohesion and lexical variation

The first passage to be looked at here is a statement of the name of the main character found at the beginning of the episode of Jaratkāru from the Old Javanese *Ādiparwa* (Juynboll 1906:24.3 - 26.7). This short passage takes a stereotypical form that can tell us a number of things about the phrase level sturucture of Kawi and Balinese, and about the relationship of Old Javanese sources of lexical input to the speech levels of Balinese:

(1) Passage 1 (from the Old Javanese *Ādiparwa*; in Juynboll 1905:24.3)

(1a) *Kawi:*

Hana ta sira brāhmaṇa Sang Jaratkāru ngaran-(n)ira /1/ matangnyan Jaratkāru ling ning haji /2/

(1b) *Balinese:*

Inggih, wènten Ida Sang me-raga brahmana Sang

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Jagatkaru parab ida /1/
Inggih, mahawinan Jaratkaru punika ke-baos ring kecap Sastra-né /2/

(1c) *English:*
Yes then, there was one who had taken the form of a brahmana, Sang Jagatkaru by name. /1/

For that reason he is called Jaratkaru in the words of sacred texts. /2/

First let us look at phrase level cohesion in these examples. The Old Javanese has two NPs:

(a) ng-aran -(n)ira
def-*name* -gen-pro3 [resp]

(b) ling -ni-ng haji
word/say -gen-def *holy scripture*

These Old Javanese phrase are translated into Balinese by the following phrases:

(a) parab ida
name [Asi] pro3 [Asi]

(b) ka-baos ring kekecap sastra
GF-*say* loc *words/books* *scripture(s)*

We notice first of all that both *Kawi* and Balinese NPs are similar in that they take Head-Mod-Poss form. At a closer level of analysis, however, there are differences of organization. Both of the *Kawi* NPs are formed with the genitival element *ni-* that plays a central role in providing cohesion in Old Javanese possessive and agentive phrase construction. Thus in (a) *ng-aran-nira*, *ni-* 'binds' the 3rd person (resp) pronoun *-ira* to the Head of the NP it modifies; in *ling ning haji* it joins a non-animate NP

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(taking the 'definite marker' *ng*) to the Head of the construction.

In the Balinese gloss for (a) *parab ida* it appears that the post-Head position of the pronoun is sufficient to mark the possessive relation. However, we know that in other phonological environments (e.g. where the Head noun is vowel-final) a 'ligature' morpheme *n* is required in the formation of the NP (hence: *bubu-n I Madé-né* 'I Madé's nets'). This is not a matter of an epenthetic phoneme used at points of potential vowel-hiatus (as *bubu-n i madéné* might suggest), for we also find the 'ligature *n*' used following vowel-final bases where the following word begins with a consonant (e.g. *puri-n dané gusti* 'the temple of my lord/lords'). 'Ligature *n*' thus appears to be a grammatical particle whose presence is cancelled in certain phonological environments.

Thus the need for an overt genitival marker is weaker in Balinese than it is in Old Javanese. However, the presence in Balinese of 'ligature *n*' suggests that overt markers of grammatical "binding" (what Foley:1976 has termed "ligatures") are a feature of Modern Balinese, but have in part been replaced by constraints of word-order.

We now turn to a comparison of certain lexical items found in the *Kawi* and Balinese versions of passage (1). A comparison of these words reveals that the cross-linguistic relations between *Kawi* and Balinese cannot be explained by

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a simple creolization model. Instead we must take into account socio-cultural issues and a complex historical relationship that saw Javanese influence on Bali mediated through a series of historical encounters. In the course of these encounters Old Javanese and Middle Javanese forms were absorbed into the Balinese linguistic system, and came more and more to be associated with the Balinese past (cf. Zurbuchen 1987: 17 - 19 for a discussion of the general form taken by this historical relationship).

We will look here at the relationship of Kawi and Balinese forms of words for 'name' and 'he/she' (resp):

Kawi	Balinese
aran 'name'	*parab* [Asi] 'name'
-ira 3rd pro (resp)	*ida* [ASi] 3rd pro (resp)

While some words have clearly come into *alus* Balinese directly from *Kawi* [OJ], for lexical sets like *aran* - *parab* 'name' and *ira* - *ida* 'he/she' the relationship of the *Kawi* and Balinese forms is not simple. Thus [OJ] *aran* 'name' should probably be connected with *adan* of "Low" Balinese from a comparative point of view, while the [OJ] pronominal stem *-ira* compares with *ida* of modern "High" Balinese.

Teeuw (1965) has shown that Old Balinese groups with Old and Modern Malay in showing the /d/ reflex of PAN r_2 (RLD: van der Tuuk's Second Law), while Old Javanese represents a dialect (or dialects) showing /r/ where Old Balinse has /d/. On the evidence of Balinese semantic sets

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

like the locative prepositions *ring* [A] vs. *di* [B] we might hypothesize that Modern Balinese preserves the indigenous '*d*-dialect' in *basa biasa*, the imported forms of the Javanese '*r*-dialect' in *basa alus*. There may be some truth to this assertion in the case of *di* vs. *ring*, but *ida* offers a counter-example: in this case *basa alus* has retained a pronoun of the indigenous '*d*-dialect' rather than that or the Javanese '*r*-dialect'.

I have noted in Chapter Three that the pronominal form *ida/iḍa* was a lexeme of marked high status in Old Balinese, and that was used only in reference to deities (like *Ida Bhaṭāra Tonta* of a sanctuary at Lake Trunyan) or to heads of religious institutions (usually termed *pitāmaha*). This suggests that the 'retention' of indigenous *ida* in Modern Balinese may represent an exception to a more general rule separating lexical materials of a '*d*- dialect' from those of an (imported) '*r*-dialect'.

In the case of Old Javanese *aran* 'name', Old Balinese had *adan*, a lexeme also found in Modern Balinese in *basa biasa*. Here the '*d*-dialect' form has been preserved, as predicted, in the modern "Low" register. However, this does not mean that *aran* has been adopted in *alus* register. Instead we find other forms (like *parab* or *wasta*) that have their origins in Old or Middle Javanese. Balinese *mabasan* practicioners will often recognize that "Low Balinese" *adan* 'translates' Old Javanese *aran*, and this itself may be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a powerful factor preventing inclusion of *aran* among the *alus* variants of the semantic set for 'name'.

Instead of *aran* a number of more specialized *Kawi* words for 'name' have been chosen for inclusion in *basa alus*. The most respectful of these is [Asi] *parab*, a word for 'name' well known in *Kawi*, but with special connotations. Zoetmulder & Robson (1982) note that the word *parab* was associated in the *kekawin* with descriptions of poets writing the name of their beloved (or a beloved deity) on the thick petals of the *puḍak* blossom, or on the walls or columns of shrines or pavillions in beautiful natural settings.

Poetic, romantic, and religious overtones of *parab* have ensured it a place at the top of the scale in terms of 'refinement', hence it is *parab* that has entered Balinese as an *alus singgih* lexeme. The *alus sor* equivalent, appropriate in self-reference, is *ma-wasta*, derived from the less common Old Javanese term *wasiha* 'title, name' (< Skt. *avasthā* 'condition, state').

Thus the processes of selection through which words have come into *alus* or *biasa* registers of Balinese is a complex one, and cannot be explained by a model that implies the imposition of one linguistic norm upon another, as if by political conquest. Rather we see evidence of a a long and complex relationship in which both Balinese and Javanese (or Javanized) sides of the linguistic interaction

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

had areas of greater or smaller influence in shaping the evolution of Balinese language.

7.10 Passage 2: Goal Focus predicates - *Kawi* and *basa alus* examples

In "Binding Wild Words" and in Part I of this thesis a central concern has been the "binding" power of Focus predicates. I have argued in Part I that the Focus system of grammatical agreement found in Old Javanese is 'participant-marking' in character. Thus verbal Heads of constructions are marked with Focus morphology showing agreement for semantic role with major NP constituents of clauses. This system of grammatical agreement is linked to the pronominal system, which I have claimed distinguishes purely anaphoric pronouns from those that mix anaphoric/discourse topical functions with the function of grammatical agreement. In addition a series of overt 'topic markers' involved in both clausal and discourse prominence interacts with these systems in providing referential and discourse cohesion.

I have also argued that the "Low" *(basa biasa)* register of Modern Balinese shows evidence of being organized in terms of what Benjamin has termed "event-salient" discourse. I have argued that this kind of organization is most prominent in ergative (or "First

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Passive") constructions of *basa biasa*. On the other hand, I have claimed that participant-marking morphology of the "Focus" type is preferred in *alus* discourse strategies of Modern Balinese due to its compatability with a "participant-salient" orientation appropriate in formal sociolinguistic contexts.

We will look in this section at a number of examples of what I have termed the "participant-marking" type of discourse-syntactic organization 'chosen' by *basa alus*. The parameters of this type of arrangement differ for [+ego/+tu] vs. [-ego/-tu] pronominal forms, a fact that appears to be related to differing constraints on performative and narrative speech acts. The first passage we will look at continues the story of Jaratkāru as found in the Old Javanese *Ādiparwa*. This passage describes Jaratkāru's ascetic food-gathering practices:[10]

(2) Passage Two: *Ādiparwa*, Juynboll 1906: 24.11 - 14

(2a) *Kawi*

mālap wīja **ka**-sawur /15/[11]
Mwang ikang (h)uwus **ka**-singsal ing (h)awan /16/
yatikā p-**in**-et **in**-aseh-**an**-(n)ira /17/
akwéh pwa ya wekas-**an** /18/
irika ta ya-n l-**in**-iwet-nira /19/
tatkāla **pinaka**-caru ri bhāṭara /20/
mwang pa-wéh-nirèng tamuy /21/

(2b) *Balinese*

Ri setata wyakti Ida **nge**-rereh beras sané sampun

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sambrag /15/
Inggih, semalih punika sané kecag-kecag-kecag ring margi- né /16/
Punika wyakti **ka**-ruruh, raris **ka**-bersihin /17/
Inggih, pemuput-né punika dados katah /18/
Kala punika raris, raris punika sané **ka**-tulek antuk Ida /19/
Inggih, ri kanjekan taler punika, **ka**-, **ka**-anggèn aturan ring Ida Batara /20/
Sapunika taler **ka**-atur, miwah **ka**-icèn, punika tamyu-tamyu- né /21/

(2c) *English:*

Yes, always he searched for rice that was already broken /15/

Yes, and what was strewn about this way and that in the road /16/

It was that (kind of rice) he searched for, and then cleaned. /17/

And then he would..., take that (rice) and cook it up into porridge /18/

And the result would be a lot of food in fact /19/

And, in connection with that, it would be, ah, used as an offering to the Gods and Ancestors /20/

And it would also be used for offering to guests, both to those higher in status (ke-atur) and to those lower (ka-icèn) /21/

This passage begins in both *Kawi* and Balinese with an Actor Focus predicate, after which there is a switch to Goal Focus forms that coincides with the promotion of an Object argument to discourse topic, e.g. the rice *(wīja, beras)* that is collected by Jaratkāru. The remaining predi-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

cates describing the discourse topic are in Goal Focus form for both languages. This allows us to compare the treatment of a single event with Goal Focus forms of Old Javanese and Balinese.

First of all we note that there is some morphology that is shared across the two systems, but some that is not. *Kawi* and Balinese share *ka*-R morphology, but *-in*-R forms and *pa-* morphology are found only in the *Kawi* text, and are replaced with *ka*-R morphology in the Balinese glosses.

Thus, if we list the verbal and substantive constructions found for *Kawi* and Balinese versions of passage (2), it appears that the Old Javanese system is "exuberant" in use of Goal Focus morphology, while the Balinese system is "deficient" (using these terms in the non-evaluatory sense intended by Becker and Ortega y Gasset):

Kawi

(ma-alap	'take, sieze, gather')
ka-sawur	'scattered'
ka-singsal	'loosed, detached'
p-in-et	'gotten (by)'
in-aseh-an-(nira)	'cleaned (by)'
l-in-iwet	'cooked with rice and coconut milk (by)'
pinaka-caru	'used as *caru* offering (by)'
pa-wéh	'given as gift'

Balinese

(nge-rereh	'search for, gather' [A])
ka-ruruh	'searched for, gathered'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ka-bersih-in	'cleaned'
ka-tulek	'made into rice gruel' *(tulek)*
ka-anggèn	'used as (x)' [A]
ka-atur	'offered' (to s.o. of higher status) [A]
ka-icèn	'offered' (to s.o. of lower status) [Asi]

Here we can see that the Balinese translator in effect reduces several morphological (and semantic) contrasts found in the *Kawi* system to a single set of *ka*-R-(suffix) forms.

If we look closely at the *Kawi* examples it is clear that there are differences of degree of *agency* and *volitionality* connected with the contrast of *ka*-R and *-in*-R forms. The clauses referring only to the state of the rice *(wīja)* take *ka*-R, while those in which the *agency* of Jaratkaru is involved take *-in*-R-(suffix) forms.[12]

These examples illustrate a typical "exuberance" of *Kawi:* the elaboration of a system of verbal Focus markers signalling the participant-role status of adjunct NPs, as well as related features of *agency*, *volitionality*, *aspect*, *discourse prominence* and the like.

In the Balinese gloss of passage (2) <u>all</u> the Goal Focus, or 'passive' predicates take *ka*-R-(suffix) form, regardless of issues of volitionality and agency. Thus, as I have suggested in Chapter Six, the distinction maintained between "agentive" (0-R-suffix) and "non-volitional" (*ka*-R-suffix) forms in Balinese *basa biasa* is neutralized in *basa alus*. This leaves the *ka*-R-(suffix) forms as the sole

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

remaining 'passive' form for *basa alus* (in a majority of contexts). As I have suggested in Chapter Six this switch to the Focus-marked form of 'passive' in *basa alus* reponds in large part to the need to filter out the potentially dissonant person-marking features of the marker *-a* used in 3rd person forms of the 0-R-(suffix) constructions.

7.11 Further passages: Goal Focus forms of *basa alus* - motivations for the "First Passive" type of organization

The switch to *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology in *basa alus* is, however, not as complete as the analysis given in 7.10 suggests, and there are a number contexts in which 0-R-(suffix)-pro morphology appears instead of *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology.

First of all, it is common to find "First Passive" morphology in *basa alus* in performative contexts (e.g. where the speech act itself can be characterized as [+ego/+tu]).

The switch from use of *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology in an *alus* narrative context to 0-R-(suffix) form in a performative context is illustrated in passage (4) below:

(3) Passage Three: *Ādiparwa*, Juynboll 1906: 25.20-22)

(3a) *Kawi*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

s-**um**-ahur ta sira /88/
mahatīs kadi s-**in**-irām ning amreta manaḥ nira /89/
tapa-wrata karma wayam: sang(h)ulun t-**in**-anan-ta /90/

(3b) *Balinese*

Sakèng punika duanin raris **ma**-waca-n-an makadi ida /88/

Inggih, kalangkung kayu-n ida-né dayuh, ical raris anggan ida-né, kadi **ka**-sirat-**in** antuk mreta /89/

Inggih, inggih jero-né ! Makadi tiang 0-takèn-**in** I Déwa /90/

(3c) *English*

It was for that reason that the honored one spoke.

Yes, his heart had been exceedingly refreshed; it seemed as if He had forgetten (the pain) in his limbs, as if He had been bathed in the waters of immortality (amreta, mreta).

"Yes then, my good sir," (He said), one such as myself have been asked a question by my lord..."

In passage (3) the form of the Balinese 'passive' switches from *ka*-R-(suffix) form to 0-R-(suffix)-pro form in the change from a narrative context (lines 88-89) to a performative context (line 90). In the narrative context the potential for "dissonance" brought up by the *-a* marker of the 3rd person "First Passive" forms motivates use of *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology; in performative contexts there is no question of such sociolinguistic "dissonance" and as a result, no suppression of "First Passive" morphosyntax.

There are some grammatical contexts that also appear

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to trigger use of "First Passive" morpholgy in *basa alus*, even in 3rd person. On of the most outstanding of these contexts is that of relativization, a grammatical operation that is most often controlled by a "First Passive" (ergative) construction in *basa biasa*. In *basa alus* this "First Passive" morphology sometimes replaces *ka*-R morphology in cases of relativization. This is illustrated in (4) below:

(4) Passage Four: *Ādiparwa* 2.30 (after a description of the suffering of Jaratkāru's ancestor given in lines 2.23-29):

(4a) *Kawi*

Ya ta **ka**-ton dé Sang Jaratkāru /50/

(4b) *Balinese*

Punika sané 0-panggih-**in** ida /46/[13]

(4c) *English*

That was (what) was seen (by) Him.

Thus it appears that both performative and grammatical contexts (of certain types) can motivate use of "First Passive" morphology in *basa alus* contexts.

7.12 Influence of "linguistic loyalty" on choice of morpho-syntactic form

In the *mabasan* texts used as the basis for this thesis it is clear that there are varying degrees to which "First Passive" (ergative) form is replaced by *ka*-R-(suffix)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

morphology in *basa alus*. While texts in which dialogue plays a large role in general show a higher frequency of "First Passive" arrangement that can be tied to the performative aspects of dialogue, another important contraining factor on the distribution of 'passive' forms within texts is not text-internal, but rather related to the question of linguistic loyalty, of linguistic choices made in response to socio-cultural identity.

This comes out clearly in comparing the Balinese interpretation of *Ādiparwa* 24.11-14 given in passage (2) above with a second Balinese version reproduced in passage (5) below. The first version of this passage was produced by a *brahmana* 'translator' in the context of a *sekaha bebasan* with a high percentage of *brahmana* members and an inclination towards 'ultra-*alus*' lexicon, grammar, and diction. The second version (5) was produced by a well-known *dalang* from the Ubud area, Jero Dalang I Ēwer. His *basa alus* is clearly of a more mixed kind than that of the *brahmana* speaker in version (2). The *brahmana* version is more formal in structure, using participant-marking forms almost exclusively in Goal Focus constructions. I Ēwer's version is more dynamic, more what we would expect of the puppet-master, a person who is a master at bridging the worlds of *alus* and *biasa/kasar* discourse in the context of the shadow theater:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(5) Passage Five: *Ādiparwa*, Juynboll 1906: 24.11 - 14

(5a) *Kawi*

mālap wīja **ka**-sawur /15/
Mwang ikang (h)uwus **ka**-singsal ing (h)awan /16/
yatikā p-**in**-et **in**-aseh-**an**-(n)ira /17/
akwéh pwa ya wekas-**an** /18/
irika ta ya-n l-**in**-iwet-nira /19/
tatkāla **pinaka**-caru ri bhāṭara /20/
mwang pa-wéh-nirèng tamuy /21/

(5b) *Balinese*

Ida *ma*-raga wiku sakèng teleb, kayun-ida; **ng**-ambil pantun sané kecag-kecag /15/

Sané sampun ewek-ewek **k**-utang ring margi-né /16/

Punika raris **n**uduk-ida /17/

Ma-wastu akéh raris *pam*uput-nya-né /16/

Punika raris **ka**-rateng antuk ida /17/

Punika 0-anggèn-ida 0-atur-**ang** ring ida batara, malih **ka**-atur-**in** ring sang *ma*-raga tamu /18/[14]

If we list the Balinese Focus predicates for passage (5) a striking contrast comes out with those found for the version given in passage (2):

<u>Balinese</u>

(*ng-ambil*	'get, gather' [A/Asi])
ka-utang	'thrown out'
0-*duduk*-(*ida*)	'picked up'
ka-rateng	'cooked' [A]
0-*anggèn*-(*ida*)	'used as' [A]
0-*atur-ang*	'offered to' (s.o. of higher status) [A]
ka-atur-ang	" " " "

Comparing the frequency of *ka*-R-(suffix) and "First

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Passive" (ergative) morphology for the two Balinese glosses of *Ādiparwa* 24.11-14 we find clear differences in the distribution of morphosyntactic types for the two speakers represented:

(a) version (2): 4 *ka*-R, 2 *ka*-R-*in*

(b) version (5): 2 *ka*-R, 1 *ka*-R-*ang*, 2 0-R-pro, 1 0-R-*ang*

In 'passive' constructions the *brahmana* 'translator' of the Sanur version sticks to the participant-marking morphology of the *ka*-R-(suffix) forms, while the master of shadow plays mixes participant-marking 'passive' morphology with the ergative-like morphology of the "First Passive".

I have argued in Chapter Six that the "First Passive" morphosyntactic form is one of the most prominent features of an "event-salient" form of discourse organization. In Chapter Eight I will give examples from *satua* narratives supporting the assertion that the morphosyntactic forms of *basa biasa* are more adaptable to the dynamic needs of 'natural narrative' than the more static forms of *basa alus*.

This adaptation of the "First Passive" type of organization to the dynamic needs of oral-narrative I would argue, is also a prime factor in the language Dalang Ēwer's gloss of *Ādiparwa* 24.11-14: for this master of *wayang* the "event-salient" type of organization that is a crucial element in the shaping of the discourse of shadow theater 'bleeds through' into the more constrained interpretive

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

style of *mabasan*.

7.13 Sociolinguistic constraints on *mabasan* glossing

Returning again to passage (2) above, we find in this passage a good example of the influence of the Balinese socio-cultural system on interpretation of a *Kawi* orginal. *Kawi* in general does not appear to be organized in terms status-distinctions. However, there were constraints of appropriateness in some areas, especially among the pronouns. Thus in reference to the heroes, sages, and gods who populate the *Kekawin* literature, only the 3rd person pronouns *sira* and *nira* that are found, while *ya* and *-nya* are used to refer to demons or animals, to inanimate objects, or to human beings of low status.

Kawi verbal bases, however, were not status-marked ,yet in Balinese glosses there are certain contexts where a single *Kawi* verbal lexeme will 'demand' two words in Balinese. The word 'die' is a typical case: for commoners *mati* is acceptable (according to most sources), while for individuals of medium status [Asor] *padem* is appropriate. The [Asi] term *séda* is then reserved for high status *satriya* and *brahmana* referents.

Another example of the replacement of one *Kawi* word with two Balinese words is found in passage (2) above (section 7.10), where the *Kawi* word *pa-wéh* 'instrument of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

giving' is translated with two Balinese words, *ka-atur* and *ka-icèn*. Both of these words mean 'give' but have differing sociolinguistic 'meanings', reflecting asymmetrical relationships in the context of exchange. Let us look again at line (17) of passage (2):

(6) Line 17, Passage Two:

Kawi:

mwang pa-wéh-nirèng tamuy

Balinese:

Sapunika taler ka-atur miwah ka-icèn punika tamyu-tamyu-né

English:

And it was also offered up like that to those higher in status and to those lower.

In Clause (7) Jaratkāru, the giver, is a *brahmana* and yogi, hence of high religious status. For this reason exchange transactions involving him are, in the Balinese view, asymetrical; for in daily life he comes inevitably into contact with lower status clients, while in ritual he himself takes a lower status role with respect to the Godhead. For this reason the translator of this passage glosses the single *Kawi* construction based on *pa-wéh* with two Balinese *ka*-R-(suffix) predicates, each signifying a different 'direction' of exchange (*ka-atur* 'upwards' and *ka-icen* 'downwards').

Atur and *ica* are both *Alus Singgih* terms meaning

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'give, offer', but they signal exactly opposing directions of exchange. *Atur* is used only when the direction ofexchange is from a lower-status referent to a higher. *Ica* is used in the reverse situation, e.g. when the 'giver' is of higher status than the recipient.[15]

Status directionality in exchanges of food has been shown by Cole (1983) to be an expression of principles of asymmetry in Balinese patron-client relations. Words for 'giving', 'requesting', and 'eating' are especially important in this regard.

Patronage networks are an important part of Balinese social organization extending across lines of caste, status, and title. As I have argued in Chapter One there are still important patronage networks connecting gentry or priestly houses with commoner *(anak jaba)* houses in contemporary Bali. Wherever there is asymetry of status-relation- ships a specialized vocabulary applying to food exchange is involved. Thus words like *carikan* 'leftovers' and *lelungsuran* 'beggings' have very positive connotations if they stand for food or remains of food-offerings that are passed 'downwards' within a "lineage" or patronage group.[16]

However where food is shared (ritually) <u>across</u> lines of "lineage" or patronage *carikan* and *lelungsuran* are very loaded terms, and potentially insulting. For to eat after someone is to verify one's lower status in an asymetrical

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

relationship, and this is something that is done only within the context of the "in-group". Hence there are strict rules of etiquette governing division of food, table-language, and even the timing of eating that are designed to prevent anyone at a public function be perceived as 'eating *carikan*' of another.

Differences between verbs like *atur* and *ica* reflect similar asymetries. *Atur-an*, for example, can mean an offering to a deity, something said to a person of higher caste-status, or some material item given to someone of higher status. *Ica* as a base can mean 'smile, laugh', when referring to someone of high status. This meaning of 'smiling upon with favor' remains as a metaphor in the background of words like *pa-ica* 'gift' that refer to the favor of a god, feudal lord, or high priest *(pedanda)*. With *ica* the status-directionality is 'downward', and the gift is characterized as a favor or act of grace descending from a higher to a lower status individual.

Balinese glosses of *Kawi* verbs thus 'fill in' important details of Balinese socio-cultural organization that are reflected in language by lexical variations. The *mabasan* text is thus at once a translation and a 'localization' of the Old Javanese text, a record of the past, but also a re-interpretation in terms of contemporary institutions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

7.14 Conclusions

In this chapter I have argued that Balinese speech acts like the *mabasan* (along with shadow theater and dance-drama) have acted to preserve a relationship with 'ancestral' language that has kept alive older rhetorical models and systems of morphosyntactic organization. This has meant that Modern Balinese, particularly the *alus* levels, have had a constant wellspring of linguistic and rhetorical forms from which to draw materials for the shaping of contemporary language.

I have argued that there is a range of variation in what constitutes *basa alus* for individuals from differing status and occupational backgrounds, and have cited supporting cases showing variation in the degree to which individuals replace "First Passive" with *ka*-R-(suffix) form in the shaping of *alus* discourse. I have also argued that performative contexts are associated with a greater degree of freedom in choosing "First Passive" form, even where the context of the speech act is formal and the framing of the discourse is in *basa alus*.

In Chapter Eight we will look at the role of "event-salient" features of *basa biasa* organization in the context of *satua* narrative, concluding the thesis with a number of examples illustrating complementary roles played by *alus* and *biasa*. *kasar* discourse strategies.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Footnotes to Chapter Seven

[1] Wallis (1980) has shown that the melodic patterns underlying *kidung* recitation can be linked to principles of phrasing found in the instrumental traditions of Balinese *gamelan* ensembles:

> "From these data, one may conclude that the basic melodic materials for *kidung* singing... are associated with an instrumental tradition. [There are] recurring melodic units [that] may be found in many instrumental music contexts in Bali and Java. The combining of these short melodic cells or 'sentences' into larger sections is the basic compositional device in much of the island's gamelan music." (1980:220)

[2] Compare the Javanese *Sang paramèng kawi* "he who is foremost in literature" (Errington 1982:11).

[3] Tisna uses the word *keropak* here (metonymously) for manuscript. In its more usual meaning *keropak* signifies the wooden box in which the manuscripts are stored.

[4] The active role of the provincial bureaucracy in this revival must be a fairly recent phenomena. Thus the proceedings of an academic conference on *mabasan* conducted in 1979 by Udayana University show that the provincial government had not begun to take an active interest in *sekaha bebasan* at that time:

> "The efforts of the government to date are felt to be too few by *sekaha* [interviewed in the study]. Their reasoning isn't just that they receive far less attention and care than the other art forms, but also that their art is one whose very existence depends on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the interest and attention paid to this cultural inheritance that rarely finds dedicated proponents."
(I Wayan Jendra et al: 1979, p. 22; my translation)

5 cf. Becker: 1988, p. 1:

"As the great Spanish philologist, Jose Ortega y Gasset put it, a translation--like any 'reading'--is always both exuberant and deficient... That is, there are always things in the translation which have no counterpart in the original; they are there because of the demands of the language of translation. These are the exuberances. For one working with Southeast Asian languages, these include things like number and tense and copula, which rarely have any counterpart in the original. And there are also things in the original which have no counterpart in the translation, the deficiencies--things like classifiers and focus markers which are hard even to fake in English."

6 K. Wulff (1935) and J. W. De Jong (1974) have demonstrated the internal constistency of the Sanskrit subtext of the *Sang Hyang Kamahāyānan*, in fact treating the Old Javanese paraphrases simply as a commentary.

7 The word *empurohita* is probably composed of *purohita* 'royal chaplain, state priest' [Skt], and the indigenous term *empu*, a title used during the East Javanese period both with religious figures of the Śaiva and Sogata (Buddhist) denominations, and with artisans practicing crafts of a sacred nature, especially blacksmiths and composers of *kekawin*.

8 Venkatasubbiah: 1928a, p. 260; Venkatasubbiah (1928a & 1928b) has commented on this work and provided translations of some sections. In one of these we learn that it was a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

brāhmaṇa called *Vasubhāga* (= OJ *Basubhāga*) who originally chose the five gems of the *Pañcatantra* from a group of tales related to him by a 'fallen angel' *(gaṇa)*:

> "*Puṣpadanta, chief of the gaṇas... was for some reason born in the world of men as the excellent poet Guṇāḍhya. Becoming the court-poet of the emperor Śālivāhana, he 'told' in the Paiśācī language the stories that Śiva related to Pārvatī in the form of 'Great Stories' (Bṛhatkathā). From this ocean of stories, the Brāhmaṇa Vasubhāga selected five gems... under the name of Pañcatantra.*"

9 Robson: 1971, p. 35. He continues:

> "The verb *mrakreta* aslso occurs twice in the *kakawin* Wṛttasañcaya (2a and 14a), and *pinakreta* in the *kakawin* Smaradahana (1, 23d); in these cases, however, it means translating or interpreting a Sanskrit source into Javanese. While Pañji Wireswara was singing the passage from the *kakawin* the servants were busy squabbling, but when he started interpreting again their attention was rivetted. Most probably they did not understand the literary language." (pp. 35 - 36)

10 I give this example in the form of a paragraph rather than in the line-by-line form of the actual *mabasan* rendering. *Mabasan* glosses often form narrative wholes, and experienced 'translators' often have internalized a *mabasan* subtext running parallel to the *Kawi* orginal. This is the rationale for giving passage (2) and subsequent *mabasan* passages in paragraph form. The original line-by-line presentation is preserved in the numbers at the end of each line keying *Kawi*, Balinese, and English renderings of the text.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[11] Juuynboll: *kasawus*

[12] When the rice is used as an offering, hence enters into the action as an Actor-like participant, we find that the *pa-* morphology makes its appearance.

[13] This example is from a second *mabasan* version of *Ādiparwa* 24.3 - 26.7 recorded in Ubud. This text is to be found in the author's *Mabasan Texts* (in preparation). See passage (5) below for further examples drawn from this version.

[14] For the English translation see passage (2) above, section 7.10.

[15] Balinese does possess a form descended from [OJ] *pa-wéh* in *pa-wéhwéh* 'gift, thing given'. This, however, is a term that belongs to the *alus sor* register alone, and is used specifically where the 'giving' is between equals. (cf. TBB, p. 640.)

[16] Good examples of the positive meanings of *carikan* are to be found in Hooykaas' (1958) translation of *Geguritan Jayaprana*. These include examples found in lines (48) e-f, (59) a-b, and several times in verse (71). Examples found in verse (71) are reproduced below:

"Anak-é Agung ma-picha,
kawula-né pada ñarik...
para mantri,
sami ka-icèn <u>charikan</u>"

"The Anak Agung granted gifts,
his subjects all <u>ate</u> <u>after</u> <u>him</u>...
all the ministers,
were given <u>leavings</u> <u>from</u> <u>his</u> <u>feast</u>."
(Hooykaas 1958:61, my translation)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CODA

LANGUAGE VALUES IN A STEADY STATE

8.0 Introduction

I have argued in this thesis that the *kasar*, *biasa*, and *alus* registers of Modern Balinese are not dialects, nor are they entirely separable into discrete "speech levels". Rather they are discourse strategies, dynamic entities that can be manipulated by individual speakers (and groups of speakers) to give voice to a wide range of social meanings. Every Balinese speech act is to some extent constrained by caste-status principles, but in actual practice the situation is more dynamic than these terms imply, due to the operation of the principle of *désa- kala-pattra* 'place-time-and-person'. As Zurbuchen has pointed out of this defining feature of the Balinese socio- linguistic system:

> "The linguistic operation of the principle provides that speech behavior is subject to constant fluctuation, as participants find themselves in a variety of contexts and speech events and engaged with a range of different interlocutors." (1987:79)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

I have also argued that there are two basic types of discourse-syntactic organization to be found in Balinese, one "participant-salient" and linked to *basa alus* (and the historical written languages Old Javanse, Old Malay, and Old Balinese), one "event-salient" and linked to modern *basa biasa*.

In this thesis I have concentrated on the ways in which these two types of discourse-syntactic organization are manifested in the Balinse 'passive' system. I have claimed that the First Passives of *basa biasa/kasar* can be understood as ergative-absolutive in form, and that their orientation is thus towards the event itself (a fact that appears to be a consequence of O-orientation in many AN languages).

I have also claimed in Chapter Six that person-marking features of the marker of 3rd person agents in First Passive (erg-abs) constructions link these forms to the [B/K] pronoun *ia*, thus rendering them ineligible in *alus* discourse. I have claimed in Chapters Six and Seven that as a consequence *ka*-R-(suffix) forms are chosen for realizing 'passive' (or Goal Focus) meanings. I have argued that this is because the morphology of these suffixes is based on the inherited Focus morphology, hence agrees in grammatical and semantic terms, but not in terms of person-marking. The *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology, I have argued, is participant-marking in form, hence ideally suited for use in the formal

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

contexts requiring *alus* behavior, where marking of role-relations takes precedence over individuation of particular features of the event or its participants.

I should make it clear at this point that the effect of the participant-marking constructions is not to differentiate or individuate their referents, but on the contrary to portray them as (semantically-defined) "types". Participant-marking morphosyntax depersonalizes discourse by recasting features of Person (maintained largely by anaphoric marking in *basa biasa*) in terms of features of grammatical/semantic agreement.

There are a number of important corollaries of this depersonalization of events and actions in *basa alus*. One of these is the reduction in complexity of prepositional marking for the *ka*-R-(suffix) forms used in *alus* discourse. Another is the significant loss in the power of the verb to convey information on aspect or temporal sequencing, and the consequent dependence in *basa alus* on elaborated prepostional phrases or adverbials overtly referring to temporal and aspectual dimensions of the clause.

In this chapter we will take a final look at the contrasts in discourse-syntactic organization that I have maintained are found for *basa alus* and *basa biasa/kasar*. Section 8.1 reviews in more detail the greater degree to which the *biasa/kasar* prepositional system differentiates semantic features of of the relation of agents to events or

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

actions. Following this we will look at examples of the organization of event-salient narrative and dialogue in folk tales of the *satua* genre. Finally we will look at a number of examples illustrating the ways in which shifts in speech level can be used ironically, or to bring out the ideal complementarity of individuals defined as "occupants of regions in a social field, not partners in interaction" (C. Geertz 1956: 18).

8.1 Semantic sub-categorization of agents in Balinese First Passive constructions

In Chapter Six (section 6.1) I have given evidence that NP agents of "non-volitional" passives in *biasa* register can be differentiated (when present) according to whether they are (post-verbally) incorporated or take prepositions *tekèn* or *baan*. This system is duplicated for *basa alus* forms with the prepositions *ring* and *antuk*, except that *ring* of *basa alus* is also used with locative arguments, while *tekèn* is not. The *alus* prepositional system is, in effect, more generalized than that of *basa biasa/kasar*. This comes out most clearly in the case of the *biasa* prepositions used with the First Passive constructions that I have claimed represent an erg-abs type of morphosyntax.

For First Passives there is a choice of agentive

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

prepositions NPs that can be linked to degrees of potency or involvement. There are three prepositions involved in this process: *tekèn*, *baan*, and *aji*.

At the phrase level *tekèn* is used to conjoin similar NPs (*I Bapa tekèn I Mémé* 'mother <u>and</u> father'), while in 'active' clauses *tekèn* is associated primarily with *recipient* complements of unsuffixed ditransitive verbs, that is with the adjunct that is peripheral to the clause nucleus, but still within the core of the clause (cf. Foley & Van Valin:1984 for the distinction here of "core" and "nuclear" arguments): [1]

(1)	I	bapa	**m**aang	pipis	**tekèn**	I	Madé
	prop	*father*	AF-*give*	*money*	prep	prop	2nd-born

'Father gave money <u>to</u> Madé.'

When a *ma-* intransitive forms is 'converted' to a transtive First Passive construction *tekèn* is typically chosen to represent the (ergative) Actor. of This comes out in examples given by Joseph (ca 1984) on the conversion of stative *ma-kenyum* 'smile' into a transitive construction taking O-R-*in-a*. In these examples *tekèn* marks the 'scope' complement of the di-intransitive verb *ma-kenyum* 'smile' in (2), while in (3) it is used to mark the *agent* of the derived transitive in First Passive form:

a. Actor Focus clause taking stative *ma*-R verb:

(2)	Anak	teruna	ento	**m**a-kenyum
	person	*young*	*that*	sta-*smile*
	tekèn	anak	bajang	ento

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

prep *person* *unmarried* *that*

'That young girl smiled at that bachelor.'

b. First Passive clause in R-*in*-*a*:

(3) Anak bajang ento kenyum-**in-a**
person *young* *that* *smile*-Tr2-Ag3

tekèn anak teruna ento
prep *person* *young* *that*

'That bachelor got smiled at by that young girl.'

The prepostion *baan* is chosen when *volitionality* or *potency* of the *agent* is stressed. It is thus possible to use *baan* with *instrumental* arguments, while this is not possible for *tekèn*:

(4) I Madé jagur-**a** **baan** I Nyoman
prop 2nd-born *punch*-Ag3 Ag/instr prop 3rd-born

'I Madé got punched by I Nyoman.'[2]

If both an *agent* and *instrument* are present in the case-frame, *baan* is chosen for the *instrument*, the *agentive* argument with the most immediate 'control' or 'potency' in the situation, while *tekèn* is chosen for the animate *agent*:

(5) Buah pohé ugug-**a** **baan** juan **tekèn**
fruit *mango*-pro3 *shake*-Ag3 Ag/instr *pole* prep

I Guru
prop *teacher*

'The mango fruit was shaken with a pole by the teacher.'[3]

Choice of *tekèn* or *buan* can sometimes be linked to semantic features of verbal bases. Thus *baan* is always found with non-volitional *ka*-R verbs from bases having to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

do with mental or psychological states or perceptions (cf. Section 6.1 above). Most bases can take either *baan* or *tekèn*, however, the choice made depending on the degree of *agency* intended by the speaker. Thus compare use of *tekèn* and *baan* with the verb **tongos-in* 'watch over' in (6) and (7) following:

(6) *One day I Cubling fell sick.*

Peteng lemah tongos-**in-a** **tekèn**
night (&) day place-Tr2-Ag3 prep

mémé bapa-n-né
mother (&) father-lig-pro3

'Night and day <u>he</u> <u>was</u> <u>watched</u> <u>over</u> <u>by</u> his parents.'[4]

(7) *Be'r Cat and Be'r Mouse went to the house of the monster.*
When they got there they saw that I Ketimun Mas was trapped under a wicker cover,

tongos-**in-a** **baan** I Buta tekèn I Bongol
place-Tr2-**a** Ag/instr prop *blind* prep prop *deaf*

'...<u>watched</u> <u>over</u> <u>closely</u> <u>by</u> B'er Blind and B'er Deaf.'[5]

In (6) I Cubling is the discourse topic, while the agency of his parents is more peripheral, more a given of the context than an issue. By contrast in (7) the fact that B'er Blind and B'er Deaf are guarding I Ketimun Mas is central to the event, part of the problem that must be overcome by B'er Cat and B'er Mouse.

The third preposition involved in explicating *agentive* NPs in First Passives is *aji*, which is specialized as an *instrumental* preposition. In many contexts *aji* is inter-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

changeable with *baan*:

(8) I Wayan sudut-**a** **aji/baan** kadutan
prop 1st-born *stab*-Ag3 instr/Ag-instr *keris*

'I Wayan got stabbed (by someone) <u>with</u> a keris-knife.'

However, if the *agentive* and *instrumental* components of an action are both present, *aji* can only refer to the (inanimate) instrument. In this case the *agent* either takes *baan* or is inferred anaphorically from the *-a* marker:

(9) *To make a long story short, the monster came home.*

tekep-**in-a** I Ketimun Mas **aji** grobag
cover-Tr2-Ag3 prop *cucumber* *gold* instr *chest*

teteh-**in-a** **aji** lesung batu
weight-down-Tr2-Ag3 instr *mortar* *stone*

'...he covered up (the cage) I Ketimun (was in) <u>with</u> a wooden chest, weighted down <u>with</u> a stone mortar.'

The prepositions *tekèn*, *baan*, and *aji* of *basa biasa* thus sub-categorize *agentive* arguments in terms of degree of agency and/or instrumentality. This system is 'reduced' in *basa alus* to a two-part system contrasting *ring* and *antuk*, with *ring* moreover covering "directional" and "local" functions covered in *basa biasa* with *di*, *ka*, *uli*, etc. The prepositional system of *basa alus* may thus (like the *ka*-R-(suffix) morphology) be said to refer to participants as generalized "types", while the *basa biasa* system allows a fuller sub-categorization of instances, a portrayal of individual "tokens" of meaning.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

8.2 "Event-salient" organization in *satua* narratives

I have argued in Chapter Six that the aspectual features of the First Passive (ergative) constructions make them important in discourse-foregrounding and temporal sequencing, and I have illustrated cases where the *-a* marker of the 3rd person forms is used itself to convey aspectual or sequential meanings in non-verbal uses *(apang-a, baan-a, sedeng iteh-a)*. The degree to which these ergative- absolutive constructions are a determining features of *basa biasa* discourse comes out very clearly innatural narrative forms like the *satua* genre of folk tales (see Appendix B for a more complete description of the genre).

The following passage is the introduction to a *satua* story about *Pan Balang Tamak* ('Father Greedy Grasshopper'), an individual who in pitting himself against the *désa* embodies anti-social qualities that make him something of a Balinese anti-hero. In the citation of this passage given below, bold type and underlining are used to mark important verbal and modal features, while the sign (0) is used to signal cases of zero anaphora. This brings out consistently recurring features of *biasa* level discourse-syntactic organization that will be summarized following the example:

(10) *Balinese* (from *Satua Pan Balang Tamak*):

Ada reké anak **ma**dan Pan Balang Tamak, **ma**-umah di desa

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

anu. **Ka**-carita ia sugih pesan tur ririh **ma**-kruna, muah tuara nyak (0) kalah tekèn timpal-né di désa-né totonan; baan te saking kruna daya upaya 0-anggon-**a** (0) **nge**-musuh- **in** désa-né. Yèn 0-upama-**ang** daya-n Pan Balang Tamak-é, patuh buka bun slingkad lutung-é, baan te saking beneh. Ento kerana-né Pan Balang Tamak 0-sèngit-**ang**-**a** baan désa-né. Yèn tuah dadi baan-**a** (0) ngaé-n-**ang**, apang-**a** ia **ma**-kisid wiadin mati, sing ada enu (0) nongos di désa-né totonan.[6]

(10) *English:*

There is, they say, a man called "Father Greedy Grasshopper" who lives in some village or other. It's said that he's rich and clever with words; moreover he doesn't like to lose out to his friends in that village, so for that reason he uses tricks and schemes to make war on the village. To draw a comparison Pan Balang Tamak's tricks are as sure-fire in trickery as a monkey's climbing rope is for climbing - that's a good comparison. That's the reason that Pan Balang is hated by that village; if indeed they don't think of some way so that he'll take a slip or die, there won't be anyone left that will live in the village.

(10) Constituent Analysis:

Ada reké anak **ma**-(a)dan Pan Balang Tamak
exist *they say* *person* sta-*name* *(name)*

ma-umah di désa anu.
sta-*house* [B] loc *village* *something or other*

Ka-carita ia sugih pesan
GF*(-vol)-story* pro3 [B] *rich* *very*

tur ririh **ma**-kruna
and *facile* sta-*word(s)*

muah tuara nyak kalah

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

moreover not like defeated

tekèn timpal-né di désa-né totonan.
prep *friend(s)*-pro3 loc *village*-pro3 *aforementioned*

Baan te saking kruna daya **upaya**
'for that reason' source *words* *'tricks and schemes'*

0-anggon-**a** **nge**-musuh-**in** désa-né.
U-*use as*-Ag3 AF-*enemy*-Tr2 village-pro3

Yèn 0-upama-**ang** daya-n Pan Balang Tamak-é
cond U-*analogy*-Tr2 *trickery*-lig *(name)*-pro3

patuh buka bun slingkad lutung-é,
truly like twisted vines leg-rope monkey-pro3

baan te saking beneh.
'in that way' source *true*

Ento kerana-né Pan Balang Tamak
deicart2 *reason*-pro3 *(name)*

0-sèngit-**ang-a** baan désa-né.
U-*hate*-Tr1-Ag3 Ag/instr *village*-pro3

Yèn tuah/ [tuara ?] dadi
cond emph/neg happen

baan-**a** **ng**aé-n**ang** (N-gaé-n-ang),
Ag/instr-Ag3 AF-*work*, *do*-lig-Tr1

apang-**a** ia **ma**-kisid wiadin mati.
opt-Ag3 pro3 sta-*slip* *or else* *die*

sing ada enu **n**ongos
not exist +prog AF-*reside*

di désa-né totonan
loc *village*-pro3 *aforementioned*

Important features of the organization of *biasa/kasar* level discourse illustrated in (10) are summarized below:

a) stative *ma-* and Actor Focus N- are used in approxi-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mately equal proportion; unmarked intransitives and statives are common

(b) frequent use of 0-R-(suffix)-*a* morphology, while *ka*-R forms are exceptional

(c) *baan* appears in several forms: as a "causal conjunction" *(baan te)*, an agentive preposition *(baan)*, and an agentive preposition with incorporated (anaphoric) third person marker *(baan-a)*

(d) *apang-a* is used in sequencing of an optative/ irrealis clause

(e) zero-anaphora is high in both 'active' and 'passive' clauses, but is especially a feature of the constructions in which *baan-a* 'feeds' anaphora to a sequentially posterior Actor Focus verb

The organization of the *satua* narrative cited in (10) depends very heavily on the features I have described as ergative, and especially the use of the *-a* marker that I haves said is to a large extent stigmatized in *alus* discourse. Thus compare the structure of (10) to that of (11) where the main character of a *satua* story is introduced in the context of an *alus* discourse. In this case the framing of the text is largely within the range of *alus midér* useage that is characteristic of the metrical texts in the Balinese *geguritan* genre.

(11) *Balinese* (from: *Satua I Cangak*, "The Story of the Heron", in *Geguritan Pañca-sattwa*)

Tan **ka**-carita malih / Sang Pandawa /
Sami pada lédang / (0) **ny**ingak daging sagara-né /

Wènten paksi cangak **nge**-rentug /

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Duur batu-né (0) **ma-n**inggil /
Kadi (0) **ng**ineng yoga / (0)**ny**adang-**in** ulam-é rauh /
suwé ipun **ma-ny**antos-**ang** / sepi pisan /
ulam-é jejeh **ma**-marggi / I Cangak mangkin **sèngit-an** /

(11) *English:*

We will speak no more, of the Pandavas.
All were happy, looking at contents of the sea.

There was a Heron (who) perched there,
Standing alone atop a rock. As if practicing yoga,
(as he) waited there for fish to pass by.
A long time there he waited, very quietly.
The fish were afraid to pass.
the Heron now was angered.

(11) Constituent analysis:

Tan	**ka**-carita	malih	Sang	Pandawa
not [A]	GF(-vol)-*story*	*more, again* [A]	hon	*(name)*

Sami	pada	lédang
all [A]	plural	*pleased* [Asi]

nyingak	daging	sagara-né
AF-*see* [Asi]	*contents* [A]	*ocean*-pro3 [A]

Wènten	paksi	cangak	**nge**-rentug
exist [A]	*bird* [A]	*heron*	AF-*perch*

Duur	batu-né	**ma-n**inggil (**ma-N**-tinggil)
on top	*rock*-pro3	sta-AF-*stand alone*

Kadi	**ng**ineng (**N**-gineng)	yoga [7]
like [A]	AF-'*practice*' [A]	*yoga*

nyadang-**in** (**N**-cadang-**in**)	ulam-é	rauh
AF-*await*-Tr2	*flesh/fish* [A]-pro3	*come* [A]

suwé	ipun	**ma-ny**antos-**ang** (**ma-N**-jantos-**ang**)
long [A]	pro3 [Ami]	sta-AF-*await*-Tr1 [A]

sepi	pisan

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

quiet *very* [A]

ulam-é jejeh **ma**-marggi
flesh/fish-pro3 *afraid* [B] sta-*road/travel* [A]

I Cangak mangkin sèngit-**an**
prop *heron* *now* [A] *hate*-LF

It is clear that the structure of the *geguritan* passage in (11) differs very much from the organization of the *satua* text passage in (10). The entire *geguritan* passage is constructed around a series of Actor Focus predicates that carry the central information in their clauses. Benjamin (1987) has claimed that the *meng-* affix has different functions in participant-salient and event-salient discourse, and this appears also to be the case for Balinese. Thus compare the contexts in which N-R-(suffix) morphology occurs for passages (10) and (11):

a. passage (10), *satua* text:

1. daya upaya 0-anggon-**a** (0) **nge**-musuh-**in** désa-né
2. yan sing dadi <u>baan</u>-**a** (0) ngaé-n- **ang**,
3. Sing <u>ada</u> <u>enu</u> (0) **n**ongos di désa-né totonan.

b. passage (11), *geguritan* text:

1. Sami pada lédang **ny**ingak daging sagara-né
2. Paksi Cangak **nge**-rentug duur batu-ne,
   (0) **man**inggil (**ma**-Ninggil)
3. Kadi (0) **ng**ineng yoga, (0) **ny**adang-**in** ulam-é rauh
4. Suwé ipun **ma**-**ny**antos-**ang**

The *alus* discourse of (11) is composed entirely of AF clauses, so it is of little surprise that zero anaphora of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

overt Actor NPs is possible, and this in fact occurs several times. By contrast, Actor Focus forms in (10) occur in this passage only under conditions of zero-anaphora, twice in contexts where they are 'fed' anaphora by ergative forms taking the *-a* marker (the verb *anggon-a* in 1, the agentive preposition *baan* plus ergative marker *-a* in 2). Thus the N-R-(suffix) morphology interacts crucially in *biasa* discourse with the 0-R-(suffix) forms, in many cases performing subordinate grammatical functions or the role of "back-grounding" in discourse.

If we look at a passage from the same *geguritan* in which passive morphology predominates, we find that discourse-syntactic organization still does not resemble the *biasa/kasar* pattern found in the *satua* example (10), but rather is organized in terms of the *ka*-R-(suffix) forms representing what I have claimed is the more neutral participant-marking type of passive morphology:

(12) *Balinese:*

Ring toya-ne ipun **ng**-umbang / **ka**-hanyut-**an** /
Gelis mangkin ipun **k**-ampih / ring pasisi né kebus-**an** /
Suwé ipun glalang-gliling / **ka**-panes-**an** /
Malih **ka**-tigtig ombak /

(12) *English:*

In the water now he floated on the wives, swept along.
Swiftly now he was washed along, to the shore, soaking wet all over.
For a long time he lay there, flopping about, overcome with heat.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Moreover struck again and again by the waves.

(12) Constituent analysis:

Ring toya-né ipun **ng**-umbang
loc [A] *water* [A]-pro3 pro3 [Ami] AF-*wave*

ka-hanyut-**an**
GF-*swept away*-LF

Gelis mangkin ipun **k**-ampih
swiftly [A] *now* [A] pro3 [Ami] GF-*carried along*

ring pa-sisi-né kebus-**an**
loc sta/nom-*edge*-pro3 *wet*-LF

Suwé ipun glalang-gliling
long time [A] pro3 [Ami] *flop about*

ka-panes-**an**
GF-*hot*-LF

Malih **ka**-tigtig ombak
more, again [A] GF-*strike repeatedly* *wave(s)*

In passage (12) we might argue that the use of the *ka*-R-(suffix) forms reacts to the non-volitional context, and this is in part true. However, compare this version of the event with an oral version given by Ida Bagus Sudiyasa, the author of the *geguritan* version. This speaker maintains the *alus* framing of narrative discourse in relating *satua* tales orally, but especially in rapid story-telling style, tends to use event-salient forms of organization. This comes out in example (13) following:

(13) *Balinese* (oral version of (12) above)

Dados suwé ipun kambang, tan **ny**idang-**ny**idang **ma**-kebur. Malih gelisan pasang toyo-é ampun... Inggih, sampun pasang nika raris - Nah, niki dados **ma**-rupa kadi olas

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mangkin sagara-né, tan kènten ? Dados **ka**-ampih-**ang** ipun ka sisi ring toyo-é, I Cangak, kènten. Sampun belus-**an**, dingin, kènten, rauh ring pa-sisi. Suwé ampun nika 0-dèng-dèng-**a** ring panes irika, **kè**nten.

(13) *English:*

So for a long time he floated there, he couldn't fly at all. Moreover the tide was coming in fast already. Yes, it was already coming in when - now at this point it appears that the ocean takes mercy - isn't it so ? So he's carried along there to the edge of the water, the Heron is, like that. Already soaking wet, cold, like that, (he) comes up on the shore. And for a long time he's there being dried up by the heat there, just like that.

(13) Constituent analysis:

Dados	suwé	ipun	kambang,
happen [A]	*long time* [A]	pro3 [Ami]	*float*

tan	**ny**idang-**ny**idang (**N**-R2-sida-**ang**)	**ma**-kebur.
not [A]	AF-be *able to*	sta-*fly*

Malih	gelisan	pasang
moreover [A]	*fast*-LF [A]	*rise (of tide)*

toyo-é	ampun[8]
water-pro3	+accomp [A](informal)

Inggih	sampun	pasang	nika	raris
yes	+accomp	*rise*	deicart2 [Ami]	*go on*

Nah,	niki	dados	**ma**-rupa
okay	deicart1 [Ami])	*happen* [A]	sta-*form*

kadi	olas	mangkin	sagara-né,
like [A]	*pity*	*now* [A]	*ocean* [A]-pro3

tan kènten
not deic/manner adverb [A]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dados **ka**-(a)mpih-**ang** ipun
happen [A] GF-*awash*-Tr1 pro3 [Ami]

ka sisi ring toyo-é,
alla [B/A] *edge* loc [A] *water* [A]-pro3

I Cangak, kènten.
prop *heron* '*like that*'

Sampun belus-**an**, dingin, kènten,
+accomp *wet*-LF(-vol) *cold* '*like that*'

rauh ring pa-sisi.
come, arrive [A] loc sta/nom-*edge*

Suwé ampun nika
long time [A] +accomp deicart2 [Ami]

0-dèng-dèng-**a** ring panes irika, kènten.
U-R2-*dry*-Ag3 loc/Ag *heat* *there* [A] '*like that*'

Despite the high percentage of *alus* lexemes in the framing of this passage, the overall organization shares more characteristics with the *biasa* form of (10) than it does with the *alus* forms found in either (11) or (12). Thus for example the "non-volitional" passive of this passage *(ka-ampih-ang)* is contrastive with the more telic and agentive 0-R-(suffix) ergative form *dèng-dèng-a*, while this distinction is not maintained in the *alus* passives of example (12).

These examples give testimony to the importance of context in the shaping of Balinese discourse-syntactic organization, and to the dynamic element of the Balinese speech levels, what Zurbuchen (1987) has termed their role as discourse strategies, used "to show shifting emotions,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

relationships, and points of view". (1987: 81)

8.3 Shifting speech levels: two cases of irony

Use of *alus* or *biasa* discourse imposes roles on speakers that are part of the shared prior text of Balinese society and culture. Thus a sudden shift of speech level can bring out an ironic or counter-to-expectation meaning.

We have seen an example of the ironic meaning in example (17) of Chapter Five, reproduced below as (14). Here an *alus* pronoun is matched (unusually) to a *biasa* verb with the intention of bringing out the cruelty and inappropriateness of a king's actions:

(14) Di kènkèn-é ida **Naé (N-gaé)**
'sometime'-pro3 pro3 [Asi] AF-*make, do* [B]

balih-balih-an ané **Nakut-in (N-takut-in)**
R2-*watch* [B]-LF rel AF-*afraid*-Tr2

'Sometimes He (+resp) would <u>put</u> <u>on</u> (-resp) frightening and violent spectacles.'[9]

Another example of the shifting of speech levels with ironic intent is brought out in the Balinese *mabasan* version of "The Story of Jaratkāru" (see Appendix A.I.). In this text the holy sage Jaratkāru is introduced with the status-title marker (and 3rd person pronoun) *Ida*, and this deferential reference is maintained for *mabasan* lines corresponding to 32 lines of printed text (Juynboll 1905: 24.8 - 25.8).

Following this (in line 25.9 of Juynboll 1905) there

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

is a twist in the story that reminds us of the moment of Oedipus' moment of self-discovery in Greek drama, except that in the Balinese case what is illustrated is a cultural constraint of a different order than the incest taboo. In the Hindu-Balinese tale Jaratkāru discovers that his own father is suffering the torments of purgatory because he (Jaratkāru) has devoted himself to yoga, thus depriving his father of someone to perform the ceremonies of the ancestors *(pitra-yajña)* that will save him from Hell.

Here the oedipal themes of (unwitting) concealment and revelation turn around one of the central organizing principles of Balinese social life: the principle of the "origin point" in social organization and the consequent concern of of many rituals with maintaining the circuits of ancestral power (cf. H. and C. Geertz: 1976).

At the point in this story where the suffering ancestral figure (cum Jaratkāru's father) describes the cause of his sufferings, he employs *ipun* not *ida* in referring to Jaratkāru, thus introducing a shift in pronominal useage that is maintained through the end of his monologue. Moreover, he shifts the status title marker/term of address marker for Jaratkāru from *ida* to the commoner form *I*. Thus compare pronominal reference in (15), from the narrative passage at the beginning of the Jaratkāru story with (16), where Jaratkāru's ancestor is speaking:

(15) Inggih, wènten **ida** sang ma-raga

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

yes [A] exist [A] pro3 [Ami[hon sta-*body*

brahmana, Sang Jagatkaru parab **-ida**
brahmana hon [Asi] *(name)* *name* [Asi] pro3 [Asi]

'Yes then, there was He (resp) who had taken form as a brahmana, Sang Jagatkaru was His (resp) name.'[10]

(16) Inggih, wènten punika santana-n
yes [A] exist [A] deicart2 [A] *descendant*-lig

tityang a-siki
pro1 [Ami] *one* [A]

Ipun sané ma-wasta **ipun**
pro3 [Ami] rel [A] sta-*name* [A] pro3 [Ami]

I Jaratkaru...
prop [B] *(name)*

'Yes then, I do have one descendant. He (mid-resp) is the one that is called I (-resp) Jaratkāru.'[11]

These examples illustrate the role of esthetic shaping in choice of speech levels, the concious manipulation of marked sociolinguistic vocabulary to achieve rhetorical effects. In other contexts the speech levels are juxtaposed in parallel fashion in order to illustrate an ideal form of the roles assumed desirable in assymetrical relationships.

8.4 Shifting speech levels: an example of complementarity

One of the most important patron-client relationships in traditional Bali was that of the king and his subjects, usually termed his *kawula* 'slaves' or his *panjak*, his 'pack', a combination of fighting and (ritual) work force.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

C. Geertz (1980) has argued against interpreting this relationship in terms of our definitions of feudal societies. In practice the degree to which *kawula* were obligated to their 'fuedal lord' was limited. The *raja* did not control irrigation (though he could tax the harvest of rice through officials called *sedahan*), nor did he control the "structure of land tenure, or the distribution of land tenancy". (Geertz 1980:67). The main things that a *raja* could expect from his subjects were "ritual service and military support". (1980:65)

The relationship of a *raja* and his fighting force, his *panjak*, had religious and emotional overtones in traditional Balinese society. This still comes out clearly in the dance form known as *baris* which preserves the martial elements of its origins even in contemporary forms used purely to exhibit skill in performance.

A description by de Zoete and Spies (1938) of a *Baris Demang* preformed at Singaraja some decades ago brings out the elements of adoration and martial excitement that were excited by the mere physical presence of the king. Here the authors describe the entrance of the the *raja* and the reaction of the king's lieutenants, his *demangs*:

> "The next [character] to enter was a frantic creature ...with a painted moustache, and with flowers and green leaves hanging from his ears. He and his vizer danced and dialogued in a whirling duet, with huge smiles on their faces and demonic cries on their lips.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> All the *Demangs* rose, and advanced swaying towards him. They roared and swayed in marital ecstatsy... [and] hurled animal challenges at each other in such fierce encounter that head-dresses went flying. Their prince went among them, calming them, and they crouced wide-kneed in obesiance. But only for a moment. They were irrepressibly excited by their raja's presence, and were soon dancing again with great leaps." ([1938] 1973: 63-4)

The Balinese *raja* may have shared some characteristics with the model of the "meditating king as immobile center" that a number of writers have seen as essential to the Hindu-Javanese model of kingship, but in practice the Balinese king was more linguistically than physically separated from his *panjak*.

The network of relationships that a king must master in the traditional Balinese system was thus quite large, a fact Zurbuchen (1987) has brought out in her comments on the Balinese text *Aji Purwa Basita Krama* ("Teaching on the Origin of Order in Language"):

> "A ruling noble *(prabu)* must distinguish, say, other members of the Satria group as to whether or not they are of his own rank *(andiri)* or subordinate *(mawak kaula)*... If speaking to a subordinate Satria, for example, then, he must determine if the relation is most appropriately couched in terms of 'child-father' ties *(cening-bapa)* or those of 'younger brother-older brother' *(adi-beli)*." (1987: 77)

A commoner addressing the *raja*, on the other hand, had only one alternative: to use the respectful combination of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

alus singgih and *alus sor* forms that asserts the subject status of the speaker. Notice that in this equation it is the group with less power (the subjects of the *raja*) who are constrained to use *alus* register while the individual in control of the discourse (the *raja*) has maximum flexibility. Thus (like "patrons" in Hobart's study of *banjar* politics) the *raja* had maximum access to political power through his access to informal means of communication.

In *Geguritan Jayaprana*, a well-known work of the *geguritan* genre that has been translated into English by Hooykaas (1958), there is a fine example of the linguistic expression of the ideal relationship of king and subject in the traditional Balinese view.

In this passage the *raja* speaks to his adopted commoner son *Jayaprana*, telling him that he is now of age sufficient age to be married, and that he should go and seek among the young women of the kingdom for a subject worthy to be his bride. Here the king uses the *bapa-cening* ('father-son') way of speaking in its most *kasar* form with Jayaprana, while Jayaprana for his part replies in the most formal of *alus* terms.

It is interesting to note that the narrator describes the words of the king in this passage as *alus*, referring here not to the *alus* speech level at all, but to the appropriateness of the king's choice of speech registers. Here the king conveys warmth and affection by his choice of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a register that is otherwise appropriate for the parent-child relationship. Jayaprana's reply to the king is *alus*, but in this case because his language establishes the distanciation that is appropriate in framing the relationship of commoner subject *(kaula)* to king.

(17) *Balinese:*

The king spoke, his words alus,
praising I Jaya Prana:

Né té nani /
Suba kelih enot-kola /
Eṅkèn to waṅ jeron kola /
Né melah-melah O-pilih-in /
di jaba miwah di jero /
sing O-kaṅgo ban[12] iba pupu /

English

"Come now, my boy !
You are grown up, as I can see.
Whichever of my servant girls,
the loveliest, choose for yourself,
out of the palace or within,
who would in wedlock suit you best."[13]

(18) *Balinese:*

I Jaya Prana bowed low, then spoke:

Tityaṅ **ma-n**unas **ma**-pamit /
Antuk dèrèṅ manah tityang /
Kadi ayam-é **ma**-kurung /
Ywakti duruṅ ipun binal /
Kari waṅci /
Galak antuk **ka**-keleg-**an** /

English:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Godly King, my Lord and Master !
I beg you, give me leave to go, such things are not yet in my mind:
like a fighting cock encagéd,
indeed I am on my mettle: I am alone,
as yet the flame has not been fanned."[14]

There are clear differences of morphosyntactic organization as well as vocabulary between the speech of the king and that of Jayaprana. The king, for example, uses morphologically unmarked ergative-absolutive structures throughout, and chooses (parallel) V-S order for an intransitive verb.[15] His vocabulary is consistently *kasar* or *biasa*, though he uses one *alus* lexeme *(miwah)* that responds to the courtly setting of the speech act.

Jayaprana, on the other hand, prefers morphologically marked Actor Focus forms, even using *ma-* redundantly with *nunas* (N- + *tunas*).[16] He mixes vocabulary of three types, matching *alus singgih* terms of address with self-referencing *alus sor* terms when addressing the king, switching to *alus midér* forms when citing a simile couched in the *alus midér* language appropriate to the *geguritan* form (from whose corpus of images the simile is drawn).

A comparison of constituent analyses for (17) and (18) brings out some of the formal features whose presence or absence marks a Balinese discourse as belonging to the informal, event-salient type, or the formal participant-marking type:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(17) Constituent analysis

-Né tê nani
deicart1 [K] emph pro2 [K]

Suba kelih enot -kola
+accomp [B] *adolescent* *see* [B] -pro1 [K] *'slave'*

Eṅkèn to waṅ jero-n -kola
whoever deicart2 [K] *palace women*-lig -pro 1 [K]

-Né melah-melah 0-pilih-in [17]
rel [K] R2-*good* U-choose-Tr2

di jaba miwah di jero
loc [B] *outside* *and* [Ami] loc *inside*

sing (< asing) 0-kaṅgo ba(a)n iba pupu
'whichever one' U-*use* [B] Ag/inst pro2 [K] *harvest*

(18) Constituent analysis

Tityaṅ **ma**-nunas **ma**-pamit
pro1 [Asor] sta-AF-*request* [Asor] sta-*ask leave* [Asor]

Antuk dèrèṅ
instr/*because* [A] -accomp [Asi]

manah tityang
wish [Asor] pro1 [Asor]

Kadi ayam-é **ma**-kurung
like [Ami] *chicken* [A]-pro3 sta-*pen*

Ywakti duruṅ ipun binal
clearly [Ami] -accomp [Ami] pro3 [Ami] *excited*

Kari wañci
modal [Ami] *(still)* *cowardly, mincing*

Galak antuk **ka**-keleg-**an**
wild Ag/instr [A] GF-*incite to wildness*-LF

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

8.5 Conclusion

In Chapter One of this thesis I made the claim that Balinese speech levels do not correlate with particular classes or social strata, and I argued against the claim that *alus* speech levels are the cultural property of a rapidly fossilizing elite. It seems fitting then to close this thesis with the examples of *basa biasa* and *alus* "speech levels" from *Geguritan Jayaprana* cited above. The matching of diametrically opposed speech styles in the passage of *Geguritan Jayaprana* quoted in (17) and (18) can hardly be accidental: it illustrates the keen sensitivity that the Balinese have to the role of variations in vocabulary and morphosyntax in giving form to both the fixed coordinates of the status-title system and the changing demands of *desa-kala-pattra*.

Alus discourse imposes on speakers formal linguistic norms whose effects can be likened to the repetitive and de-individualizing aspects of Balinese social structures. In both cases it is generalized "types" that are specified by the system of marking (grammatical types for the Focus affixes, human reproductive types in the case of an institution like teknonymy). By contrast, *biasa* discourse responds to the immediacy of events, to to individual "tokens" of experience shared by coequal interlocutors assumed to be on intimate terms.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Far from being a fixed system of status coordinates that can be comprehended in a paradigmatic treatment, the Balinese speech levels are discourse strategies. Their purpose is to provide a fluid and dynamic medium expressive of both social identity and social difference. They are thus concerned on the one hand with the need for an expressive intimate discourse, and on the other with the need for a "discourse of distanciation", a mode of discourse that imposes on participants the fixed and ever-repeating roles that define the "steady-state" aspects of Balinese society.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Footnotes to Chapter Eight

[1] Note that this does not occur when the verb takes the transitivizing suffix *-in*. In this case the *recipient* argument is also drawn into the core of the clause and so stands in an unmediated relation to the verb:

I	Bapa	maang-in	I	Madé	pipis
prop	*father*	AF-*give*-Tr1	prop	2nd-born	*money*

'Father gave I Madé money.'

[2] Shadeg: 1957, no. 124.4

[3] ibid, no. 124.5

[4] Satua Bali I.A.(1) 2.1-2

[5] Satua Bali III.A.(2) 9.11-12

[6] Satua Bali III.A.(2) 9.1-11

[7] The base *-gineng* probalby derives historically from Old Javanese *göng* 'great' plus the GF marker *-in-*, a form commonly found in Old Javanese phrases describing the practice of yoga:

sa-atus	yuga	yoga	haji	g-**in**-öng
one-hundred	*cosmic ages*	*yoga*	*scriptures*	GF-*great*

'...for one hundred years yoga and scripture <u>had</u> <u>been</u> <u>cultivated</u> (there).' (AW 19.5, cited in OJE I.518)

This Goal Focus form must have been generalized at a later date as a lexeme for 'to practice' with special association with the context of yoga and other spiritual exercises. Thus in Balinese *-gineng* is a base meaning 'to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

practice' (yoga) and has lost any earlier 'passive' or Goal Focus meaning.

[8] *Ampun* is a non-standard term, in the sense that it is not usually found in written Modern Balinese. It is heard frequently in the conversations of the clowns *(panasar)* in masked drama or shadow theater, and is encountered as an informal equivalent of *sampun* in *satriya* or priestly residences *(geriya)*, to the extent that such households are traditionally-minded *(kolot)* and avoid use of *biasa* and *kasar* modals and other function words within the houseyard.

[9] Satua Bali I.B.(5) 49.3

[10] In Appendix A. *Mabasan Texts* I.1b

[11] In Appendix A. *Mabasan Texts* I.97-98b

[12] *ban* = *baan*, here shortened for metrical reasons; reduction of geminate consonants or dipthongs to meet metrical requirements is a common feature of *geguritan* composition.

[13] Hooykaas 1958:39. I have retained Hooykaas' translation here.

[14] ibid

[15] *k-anggo* 'be used as' appears on the surface to be a *ka*-R 'non-volitional' form, but is in reality a 'freeze' of this form, and is regarded in Bali simply as a kind of lexical passive with the meaning 'be used as'.

[16] Jayaprana does use a type of syntactic arrangement resembling the erg-abs forms of the First Passive in phrases like *dèrèng manah tityang* 'not yet consider-I', but

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

these are marked constructions taking a modal as their Head that are a regular feature of formal rhetorical styles and differ fundamentally from the First Passive constructions we have looked at previously.

[17] Erg-abs (or First Passive) structure is commonly found in imperatives where 2nd person reference is normally suppressed. In this case all that remains to signal the 'passive' or Goal Focus meaning is the presence of the morphologically unmarked form, or ergative, form of the verb.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDICES

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A: MABASAN TEXTS

The texts assembled in this appendix represent transcriptions of *mabasan* sessions recorded in 1984 - 85. In arranging for recording of these *mabasan* sessions I am greatly endebted to a number of persons and institutions, without whose assistance my efforts would not have been successful.

On the institutional side I am endebted to the Indonesian Academy of Sciences *(Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia)* for arranging research permission and providing general assistance and to the Deparment of Historical Indonesian Literature at the Faculty of Letters of Gajah Mada University *(Jurusan Sastra Nusantara, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Gajah Mada)* for their kind sponsorship of my research on Old Javanese and *mabasan*.

For arrangement of *mabasan* sessions recorded in the Ubud area I am endebted to I Gusti Sumung of Puri Lèmpad, Ubud who acted as my guide and liason during the initial stages of the research, and continued to play an instrumental role in my work on *mabasan* in the Ubud area.

For arrangement of *mabasan* sessions recorded in Sanur I am endebted to Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa of Geriya Taman, who with great patience instructed me in the arts of *makekawin* and *makidung*, arranged my introduction to the various *sekaha bebasan* of Sanur, and continued to provide

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

valuable assistance throughout the research period.

All transcriptions are the work of the author. The final form of these transcriptions, however, would not have been possible without the able assistance of a number of Balinese sources who were kind enough to continue to correspond with me following the research period. For the transcription of *mabasan* sessions in and around the villages of Sanur and Intaran I am endebted to Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa for his recorded and written materials elucidating important details of the texts. For materials obtained in the Ubud area I am endebted to Jero Mangku Kerta and Jero Dalang Éwer, both of Padang banjar, Ubud, for their answers to questions on the texts, and to I Gusti Sumung and Steven Manteit for conveying in absentia my questions to Dalang Éwer and Jero Mangku.

I am also indebted to Steven Manteit for his valuable assistance in field recording.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mabasan excerpt 1: (OJ) *Ādiparwa* (*Mabasan Texts* III.1.a)

Episode: "The Story of Jaratkāru"

Old Javanese text read: Lontar from the collection of Ida Bagus Made Sidemen, almarhum.

Equivalent passage in published edition: Juynboll:1906, 24.3 - 26.7.

Pemaos (readers): Ida Bagus Madé

Pangartos (translators): Ida Bagus L. (24.3 - 25. 10); Ida Bagus K. (25.10 - 26.7)

Location and date: Geriya Taman Sari Delod Marggi, Sanur. April 21, 1985.

Occasion of reading: *Pakéling* ('Farewell-Remembrance-Gathering') arranged on the author's behalf by Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa and the members of Pesantian Makakawin Desa Sanur-Intaran (Lingsir and Anom) and Pesantian Kidung "Dharma-suara" Suka-Duka Umat Hindu Hotel Bali Beach.

Summary of the episode:

There is a *brahmana* by the name of Jaratkāru. He is of a compassionate nature, and fears the body, for he knows it to be impermanent in essence (*makaswabhawa kṣaya*). He takes stern ascetic vows, eating only rice that he has gleaned from the fields and roadsides. He takes no wife and lives solely to practice austerities (*tapa*).

In time Jaratkāru attains magical power (*siddhi mantra*) and is able to travel anywhere he wishes at will. One day in his travels he is carried along (*ka-wawa*) to a place called "Āyatana-sthāna" located on the border of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Heaven and Hell.

Here he comes upon a group of people hanging upside down by their, suspended from a clump of bamboo that leans out precariously over a deep chasm leading straight to the pit of Hell. At the roots of the clump of bamboo a field mouse makes his home, and every day he gnaws away a little more at the now fragile root-system that supports the clump of bamboo.

This sight brings Jaratkāru to tears, the more so because the people hanging there tortured by hunger, pain, and thirst are dressed like religious mendicants *(kadi weṣa ning wiku)*.

Jaratkāru asks one of these suffering souls the reason for their punishment, then declares that he would gladly make a gift of the fruit of his ascetic practices *(phala-ni tapa)*, whatever portion is necessary, so that their torments might cease.

Then this 'deified ancestors' *(pitara)* who hangs before Jaratkāru exclaims: "ah, I feel as if bathed in holy water", and he says to Jaratkāru:

"You ask why we are suffering like this? We are *santānam prekṣetrato*, 'those whose lineage has been cut off'. That's why we aren't in the world of the ancestors, as we should be."

The *pitara* then goes on to say:

"I myself do, in fact, have a descendant to carry on my line, Jaratkaru by name. But he wants to be released from the cycle of rebirth. He is a *śukla-brahmacārī*, a true celibate. So for the sake of Jaratkāru's austerities I hang here, cut off from the world of the ancestors."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

II. *Mabasan* text

The Kawi (Old Javanese) line is given first, numbered /1a/, /2a/, etc. The Balinese gloss follows, numbered /1b/, /2b/, etc. Both Kawi and Balinese are given in Roman typeface. The diacritics of the Kawi version correspond to those used in European transliterations of Balinese script They thus reflect the chirographic symbols of a syllabary (and phonemic system) of Indic origin, rather than the actual pronunciation of the Balinese reader *(pemaos)*. English follows in italic type. The English translates the Balinese gloss, not the Old Javanese, so there may be discrepancies between the English translation and the Old Javanese meaning where the Balinese gloss diverges from a literal translation. In most cases where there is a significant discrepancy between Balinese and Old Javanese texts an explanatory footnote has been provided.

(H)ana ta sira brāhmaṇa Sang Jagatkāru ngaran ira /1a/
Inggih, wènten Ida sang ma-raga brahmana, Sang Jagatkaru parab ida /1b/[1]
Yes then, there was He (resp) who was embodied as a brahmana. His name was Sang Jaratkaru.

matangnyan Jaratkāru ling ning (h)aji /2a/
Inggih, mahawinan Jaratkaru punika ka-baos ring kecap sastroné /2b/
Yes, the meaning is that Jaratkaru is spoken of in the holy words of the shastras.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

jarātikṣayam ity āhuḥ, jarat ngaran ing kṣaya /3a/
Inggih, artos Jaraté punika, kesaya artos ipun /3b/
Yes, the meaning of Jarat: it's meaning is 'kesaya', broken off, not whole.

kāruṇikasya tad bhayaṃ /4a/
Ida wantah, wantah pakayunan idané kalangkung paryangenan pisan /4b/
And He (resp) - his thoughts were of the utmost discerning kind.

karuṇyabuddhi śaraṇa ri seḍeng-ing katakut /5a/
Inggih, punika pinaka-kantèn ida, ri tatkala mapikayun ajerih /6b/
Yes, that was what He used as an ally, at the time when He felt fear in his heart.

teka-ning katakutnyāśarīra /6a/
Inggih, rauh sané sakalwir kajrihin Ida, ring anggan idané /6b/
Yes, for even in regards to his own person, He felt fear of all things.

yogya ta katakutana /7a/
Inggih, patut, patut punika sané kajrihin antuk Ida /7b/
Yes, it's fitting, fitting indeed that He should fear those things.

apan makaswabhāwa kṣaya /8a/
Ri antukan Ida maparilaksana kesaya punika /8b/
For He was carrying out that vow of 'kesaya', the 'breaking off from all things'.

Mènget pwa sira /9a/
Éling wyakti Ida /9b/
Clearly he remembered...

an mangkana jadma ning śarīra /10a/
[Nah, ida sampun éling kawanten ring ragal /10b/[2]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yes he had already taken heed of his body.

Jaratkaru iti smṛtaḥ, matangnyan Sang Jaratkāru nama-nira /11a/
Punika makawinan Sang Jaratkaru parab Idané /11b/
That was the reason that his name [A] *was Jaratkaru.*

maweḍi ri kasangsaran-ing jadma /12a/
Ida ajerih, ajerih pisan ring indik jaga malih numadi /12b/
He was very much afraid, afraid that he would incarnate again.

ya ta warakulotmannaḥ, wekā-ning wiku warabrata sira /13a/
Inggih, Ida wantah kaputra antuk pandita lewih-ing mabrata /13b/
Yes, He indeed was the son of a sage who was foremost in vows.

Sang wiku santoṣa /14a/
Ida wantah, pandita sampun sampurna pisan /14b/
And He indeed was a sage of the most accomplished type.

mālap wīja kasawur /15a/[3]
Ri setata wyakti Ida ngerereh, beras sané sampun sambrag /15b/
Everday He searched for gleanings of rice that had been left strewn about (in the fields).

mwang ikang (h)uwus kasingsal ing (h)awan /16a/
Inggih, semalih punika sané kecag-kecag-kecag ring marginé /16b/
And what was all smashed up and broken, lying by the side of the road.

yatikā inasehan-ira /17a/
Punika wyakti karuruh, rarés kabersihin /17b/
It was that which he searched for, then cleaned.

akwéh pwa ya wekasan /18a/
Inggih, pamuputné dados punika katah /18b/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yes, in the end the result was that (He) had a lot of food.

irika ta yan liniwet ira /19a/[4]
Kala punika rarés, rarés punika sané katulek antuk Ida /19b/
And then at that time, he would make that rice into porridge.

tatkāla pinaka-caru ri bhaṭāra /20a/
Inggih, ri kanjekan taler punika, ka-, kanggèn aturan ring Ida Batara /20b/
Yes then, in connection also with that, it would be used as an offering to God.

mwang pawéh nirèng tamuy /21a/
Sapunika taler kaatur miwah kaicèn punika tamyu-tamyuné /21b/
And also offered to guests, whether those of higher status, or those of lower.

mangkana brata-ning kawitan-ira /22a/
Inggih, Ratu Sang Prabu Janamejaya, asapunika - mungguing kautaman bebratan pelingsènin Ida Sang Jaratkaru /23b/
Yes, it's in connection with Sang Prabu Janamejaya - in regard to the greatness of vows of the ancestor of Sang Jaratkaru.

kumawaśāken apriya, tan kening istrī /23a/[5]
Inggih, mrasidayang wyakti Ida ngewasayang indik, ka-indriyané, nènten Ida ngerereh rabi /24b/
Yes, for he clearly had been successful in gaining control of his senses (ka-indriya-n); he had never sought a wife.

Kéwala tapa ginöng ira /24a/[6]
Sakéwanten tapané punika sané setata katelebang antuk Ida /24b/
For indeed it was austerities alone that He put his entire heart into.

inajar-nira /25a/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Punika setata sané kapalajahin antuk Ida, katelebang antuk Ida /25b/
It was (austerities) alone that he made the object of his study, for which he put forth all his effort.

kalaran magawé tapa /26a/
Langgeng, langgeng pisan Ida ngardinin yasa /26a/
Steadfast, steadfast indeed was He in carrying out holy vows.

i seḍeng Mahārāja Parikṣit maburu-buru /27a/
Inggih, ceritayang ri tatkala Ida Sang Prabu Parikesit maboros /27a/
Yes, they tell now of the time that the lord King Pariksit went hunting.

ikā ta kāraṇa-niran śināpa dé Bhagawan Sregi /28a/[7]
Punika larapan Ida Sang Prabu Parikesit kapastu antuk Begawan Sregi /28b/
That is in connection with the time that Lord Pariksit was cursed by Begawan Sregi.

panganen dé ning naga-takśaka /29a/
Mangde sida katadah antuk I Naga Taksaka /29b/
So that he would be bitten by the serpant Taksaka.

Samangkana ta Sang Jaratkāru magawé tapa /30a/
Inggih, sedaweg punika Sang Jaratkaru ngewèntenan yasa /30b/
Yes then, at this time Sang Jaratkaru was carrying out vows and spiritual practices.

(h)uwus pwa sira siddhi mantra /31a/
Uningayang tityang sampun, sampun puput Ida, sid(dh)i ring indik mantra /31b/[8]
I will speak now of the time when He was already accomplished, powerful in the art of mantra.

mahas ta sirèng sarwa loka /32a/
Rarés masupsupan Ida ring genah-genahé /32b/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

And he was going about from place to place.

tekā ring asing sakaharep pinaran ira /33a/[9]
Rauh Ida selwir sané kapikayun, pacang karauhin antuk Ida /33b/
Any where that He thought of in his mind - He would arrive there (just like that).

mwang lumaku tīrt(h)a /34a/
Inggih, semalih Ida mamargi, matirta-yatra /34b/
Yes, moreover he went on journeys to sacred springs.

kalung(h)ā-lung(h)ā ta laku-nira /35a/
Inggih, wyakti ngelangkung wyakti pamargan Ida /35b/
Yes, now clearly his journey had gone on very far.

kawawa sirèng Āyatana-st(h)āna /36a/
Inggih, sampun wyakti rauh Ida, ring bates-bates tèngahé punika /36b/
Yes then, now indeed he had arrived at that place that is in between (the worlds).

Ikang loka pāntara swarga lawan naraka /37a/
Inggih, genahé punika bates tèngah swarga ring nerakané /37b/
Yes, that place that is on the borders between heaven and hell.

Kahanan ikang pitara mangapekṣa kāraṇāntara /38a/
Iriko wyakti genah watek atmané kantun majantosan /38b/
That is the place where all souls keep wait.

an pangguha swarga-naraka /39a/
Ri tatkala jaga ngemangguhang swarga miwah jaga mgemangguhang ka Nerakan /39b/
At the time that they are going to attain Heaven, or the depths of Hell.

yatikā ka(h)aliwatan dé Sang Jaratkaru /40a/
Punika keni, keni kalintangin antuk Ida, Sang Jaratkaru

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

/40b/
That was what He came across, that Sang Jaratkaru.

(h)anèng Ayatana-sthāna /41a/
Inggih, genahé sané kabaos Ayatana-setana /41b/
Yes, that place that is called Ayatana-sthana.

(H)ana ta pitara ginantung ring petung sa(w)ulih /42a/
Inggih, wènten punika atma, magantung ring tiing sekumpal /42/
Yes, there was a 'pitara', an ancestor, hanging there from a clump of bamboo.

kinabéhan-nira /43a/
Inggih, punika wyakti katah irika /43b/
Yes, in fact there were many of them there.

katon ta-ng muka tumapek tinalyan sukun-ira /44a/
Inggih, makanten, makanten punika prerayin [Asi] Idané nyungkulin, ri antukan cokor [Asi] Idané katugel /44b/
Yes, it could be seen clearly that His body (resp) was (hanging) upside down, for He was tied up by His foot (resp).

ri sor nira jurang ajero tekèn-ing naraka-loka /45a/
Ring betèn Idané punika wènten pangkung kalangkung dalem pisan. Inggih, punika bedah ka Neraka-loka /45b/
Beneath Him there, there was a chasm that was of incredible depth. Yes, that emptied straight into Hell.

ikang inengahaken tinalyan ira, yan tikel ikang petung pagantungan ira /46a/
Inggih, punika wyakti pacang tas-tas punika tetalinyané, ri tatkala malih luung, tiing swulihé /46b/
Yes, for it was clear that the rope that bound him was fraying, and moreover the clump of bamboo was breaking up.

(H)ana ta tikus sawiji tamolah i kuwung nikang petung /47a/
Wènten irika bikul sesiki, malaksana ring gook tiing petungé /47b/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

And there was a mouse who was making his home in a hole in the (base) of the clump of bamboo.

ri pinggir ing jurang /48a/
Sané wènten irika ring sisin pangkungé /48b/
That was there on the edge of the chasm.

pratidina manigit wuku nikang wīraṇastamba /49a/
Inggih, sedina-dina punika ngorot bukun-bukun tiingé /49b/
Yes, every day he was gnawing away at the joints of the bamboo.

Ya ta katon dé Sang Jaratkāru /50a/
Inggih, punika raris ka-aksi antuk Ida Sang Jaratkaru /50b/
Yes, that then was seen by Sang Jaratkaru.

Marabas ta ya luh nirān tumon iriya /51a/
Wyakti ngerebos toyan pangaksian Ida, ri tatkala ngaksinin punika /51b/
And indeed tears streamed from His eyes when He saw this.

makanimitta kāruṇya ning citta /52a/
Inggih, ri antukan banget, banget kaparyangenan kayun Ida /52b/
Yes, for He was of a very, a very compassionate nature.

syuh drawa (h)ati nira dé nira sang anungsang /53a/
Wyakti dekdek nyag kayun Ida antuk-a ring Ida punika sané saningkèn /53b/
Truly He felt destroyed, desolate in His heart, because of (seeing) Him who was thus.

gumantung ing tungtung ning petung tinalyan sukun ira /54a/
Sané magantung ring tiing petungé (n)to, pa-, ka-tugel cokor I Déwané /54b/
Who was hanging there from the that clump of bamboo, His foot (resp) cut and in pain.

Mog(h)a Sang Jaratkāru inawéṣa /55a/
Mawastu Ida Sang Jaratkaru kakuub (?) antuk punika Sang

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Pitara /55b/
The meaning is that Sang Jaratkaru was addressed by the Pitara.

tapasa-rūpa /56a/
Sané mawarna pandita /56b/
Who had the appearance of a holy man.

kadi wéṣa ning wiku /57a/
Inggih, mawésa pandita /57b/
Yes, who wore the garb of a holy man.

majaṭadhara /58a/
Inggih, wyakti nganggèn tetup /58b/
Yes, clearly he wore the headgear of pandita.

mawalakala /59a/
Maselimpet /59b/
He wore the robes of an ascetic.

ndātan sayogya sira mang(h)iḍepa sangsāra /60a/
Yèn kapikayun, nènten je patut Ida pacang ngemanggihin indik kanerakan /60b/
If you think about it, it was not at all fitting that He should obtain suffering of that kind.

kṛtasangsāra nirāhāra /61a/
Inggih, sané mangkin puput kèniyang sakèng sangsaran Ida, kawyaktiané /61b/
Yes, now the truth of it is that now he should have been past obtaining pain and suffering like that.

sākṣāt rwan gumantung kakingan dé-ning la(h)ru /62a/
Waluya kadi daun magantung, tuh antuk ring kapanasané /62b/
It was as if He were a leaf hanging there, dried out from the heat.

makayunan tekap ing (h)angin maderes /63a/
Inggih, ngelayang punika ka-ampuhan(g) antuk angin tarik /63b/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yes. He was swaying back and forth there, blown about by a strong wind.

tar pamangan sadākāla /64a/
Inggih, semalih nènten, setata nènten marayunan /64b/
Yes, in addition, never, never did he get to eat.

an mangkana lwir Sang P:tara /65a/
Inggih, asapnika saparipolah Ida sang maraga atma /65b/
Yes, like that was the appearance of He who had the form of a soul.

tinanyan-nira ta sira /66a/[10]
Raris, raris kabaosin Sang Jaratkaru /66b/
Then, then Sang Jaratkaru was spoken to.

Ké bhavanta 'valambanté wīranastambham āśritāḥ, ling Sang Jaratkāru /67a/
Inggih, mungguing atur Ida Sang Jaratkaru /67b/
Yes in regard to the words offered by Sang Jaratkaru.

aparan ta rahadyan sang (h)ulun kabéh /68a/
Inggih, sapasira puniki. Inggih peranda sareng sami /68b/
Excuse me then, who are all of you here, all of you high priests ?[11]

ginantung ri petung sawulih /69a/
magantung iriki ring tiing petung seulihé /69b/
...hanging here from a single clump of bamboo.

méh tikela dé ni[ng] panigit [n]ling tikus /70a/[12]
Semalih nyiriang, nyiriang luung punika, kapigugut antuk ipun I bikul /70b/
Moreover it gives clear signs of coming to pieces and its being gnawed away at by Mr. Mouse.

ikang jurang ri sornya /71a/
Inggih, semalih pangkungé sané ring betèn punika /71b/
And moreover that chasm that widens below you...

tan kinawruhan jero nika /72a/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Nènten keni antuk ngewilangin /72b/
There's no way that you can measure it.

ya tikāngdé lara-[a]ngeres i manah [ni]ng-hulun/73a/[13]
Inggih, punika wyakti ngardinin res jejeh puniki manah tityangé /73b/
Yes then, it is that which brings this feeling of pain and fear to my heart.

mog(h)āwelas a(h)yun tumulungé kita /74a/
Mewastu tityang kaparyangenan, mamanah jagi nulungin jeroné /74b/
The meaning is that I am moved to compassion, and I would like to help you (resp/neutral) in any way I can.

(change of reader and translator)

Tāpasah kṛta balena, ng(h)ulun ketā magawé tapa sangka raray /75a/
Nah, inggih, inggih, inggih. Tiang puniki wantah sakèng alit tityang ngardinin tapa /75b/
Now. Yes, yes, yes. Since I was a little boy I have been practicing austerities.

amahaken tanggung ni[ng] tapa ning (h)ulun /76a/
Jaga kapicayang, katurang puniki piulih-ulihan tapan tityang /76b/
I would like to make a gift of it, offering here the merit obtained from my austerities.

sasar pakṣa nika /77a/
Inggih, kadi kasasar, kaon kadadosnyané /77b/
Yes, it's like it's off somewhow, it's wrong what's happened here.

dé ni[ng] welasku-n mulat i kasangsāran-ta /78a/
Ulihan tityang kaparyangènan, mamanggihin indik kesangsaran I Déwané /78b/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

That's the reason that I am moved to pity, finding you here, my Lord, in pain like this.

yan pira kari pawéha phala ni tapa-ning-(h)ulun /79a/
Inggih, indik piolih-olihan tapan tityang punika /79b/
Yes, in regard to the merit earned as a result of my austerities.

yatanya-n kita mulihèng swargga /80a/
Semangdéné sida, kadi I Déwa, budal malih kewanten ke swarga /80b/
May it be used by one like you, my Lord, so that you can just return to heaven.

maryāng(h)iḍepa sangsāra /81a/
Mangde wuwusan, wuwusan mamangguhang manah kanarakanin iriki /81b/
So that it will be finished, cut off and you will no longer have your heart tortured like this any more.

athawa saparpatan yan satengah /82a/
Yadin paèmpatan punika /82b/
Whether it's a fourth...

yekanang satengah /83a/[14]
Yadiapin atènga /83b/
...or if it's a half...

(pawéha ng wang) pawéha mami samārga-ntā-[a]manggiha ng swarga juga /84a/[15]
Aturan tityang indik punika, inggih, makadaging larapané mangde, mamangguhang malih swarga /84b/
I would offer that much, yes, whatever it takes so that you will once more attain to Heaven.

Nahan ta ling Sang Jaratkāru /86a/
Inggih, inggih, sampun munguwing atur Ida, Sang Jaratkaru /86b/
Yes then, we are finished now with the words of Sang Jaratkaru.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

karengö ta ujar nira dé-ning pitara /87a/
Sanpun, sampun pisan kalumrah, mungguwing bebaos Idané sampun ring jagaté /87b/
Already famed, already widespread were his words throughout the world.[16]

sumahur ta sira /88a/
Sakèng punika duanin raris mawacanan makadi Ida /88b/

That was the reason that He (the pitara) then spoke:

mahatīs kadi sinirām ning amreta manah nira /89a/
Inggih, kalangkung kayun Idané dayuh, ical raris anggan Idané, kadi kasiratin antuk mreta /89b/
Yes then, He was overwhelmed with a cool feeling; he forgot about (the pain) in his body, as if he had been showered with amrit, the water of immortality.

tapa-wrata karma wayam: sang(h)ulun tinanan-ta /90a/[17]
Inggih, inggih jeroné, makadi tiang puniki takènin I Déwa /90b/
Yes then sir, one such as myself have been asked a question by my Lord.

ya kawarah krama ning(h)ulun kabéh /91a/
Sané mangkin tiyang jaga nguningayang indik saparipolah tiyang sami /91b/
Now I am going to inform you about what has happened here to all of us.

umarambham kretakarma /92a/[18]
Malih indik, indik saparipolah tiyang /92b/
And also, also about my own situation.
santānam prekṣayetrata: kunang tāpan pegat wangśa mami /93a/
Inggih, inggih, sakéwanten ri antuk pegat punika, tan ngelantur punika indik perti-santanan tiyang /93/
Yes, yes, it's just that it's been cut off: you see I have no offspring who will continue my line.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Nahān ta (h)étu mamipegat sakèng pitreloka /94a/
Punika indik makawinan pegat katutugan tityang sakèng pitre-loka /94b/
And that's the reason that I've been cut off, banished from the world of the ancestors.

magantungan petung sawulih /95a/
Magantung tityang iriki ring tiing saulihé, waluya, waluya sampun mamangguhang kanerakan banget /95b/
And I hang here from this single clump of bamboo, suffering as it were the worst kind of torture.

tatwa nikang petung sawulih /96a/
Inggih, indik katuturan puniki, tiing saulih puniki /96b/
Yes then, about the teaching of this, of this single clump of bamboo.

Hana wangśa mami sasiki /97a/
Inggih, wènten punika santanan tityang asiki /97b/
In fact I do have one descendant.

Jaratkāru ngaranya /98a/
Ipun sané mawasta ipun I Jaratkaru /98b/[19]
It is he (here: non-respect) who is named Jaratkaru.

ndān mokṣa-wit ta ya /99a/
(Moksa-wit ta ya), sakéwanten, sakéwanten, lewih ambekan ipuné /99b/
For, for he is extremely high-minded.

ma(h)yun luputèng sarwa jadma-band(h)ana /100a/[20]
Antuk ipun mamanah mangde lèmpas ring indik punar-b(h)awa /100b/
For he desires that he will be freed from the cycle of rebirth.

tatan pa-stri /101a/
Nènten ipun ngerereh anak luh /101b/
He takes no interest in women.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ya śukla-bra(h)macāri /102a/
Ipun punika ngelaran bebratan nyukla-brahmacari /102b/
Moreover he carries out the vow of 'sukla-brahmacari', the purest form of abstinence.

yatikā māwakankua /103a/
Inggih, sakèng punika saning-wisésa tiyang /103b/
That's what's special about my particular case.

ikang wīraṇastamba /104a/
Iriki mamangguhang kanerakan /104b/
That I have obtained such punishment here.

mapan ikang brata samād(h)i /105a/
Ri antukan punika brata-semadi /105b/
Because of someone's religious vows.

ri sang grehāst(h)āśrama yadin pegata ning wangśanya /106a/
Punika wantah anggé-anggé(h)an, agem-agem Ida Sang Grehasta-srama /106a/
For that indeed is what is fitting, that indeed is the proper posture of one who is a 'Grehasta-asrama', a householder...

Ikang kapangguh p(h)alanya nanā /107a/
Yèn sampun nyidang maduwé perti-santana, irika pacang kapi-kolihan piulih-ulihanyané /107b/
If he has succeeded in having offspring, in continuing his line, then he will obtain all the fruits of his (spritual) efforts.

Witan ikang suka kagawé dé mami /108a/
Ri antukan panglaksana, kasungkané punika wantah sané gawènin tiang /108b/
And that is the reason that my (religious) practices only have lead to pain and suffering.

makādi niyama warabrata /109a/
Pamekas, pingajeng, punika, puniki indik kautaman bebratan

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

/110b/

Especially, ah, especially concerning those, ah, my own achievements in the practice of austerities.

yatikā wartamānā mangké ri tan pawangśa mami /110a/
Punika kangkat sané ngewisésa uug mangkin, ri antukan ten wènten perti-santanan tityang sané mangkin /110b/
For it is that which has brought about my destruction here, for I have no descendant to continue my line.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mabasan excerpt 2: (OJ) *Rāmāyaṇa* II.1-5 (*Mabasan Texts* I.1)

Episode 1: Pemargin Sang Rama lunga ke alasé - *Rāma's Journey to the Forest*

Old Javanese Text: Kekawin *Rāmāyaṇa:* II.1 - 5[21]

Equivalent passages in *Bhaṭṭikāvyam:* II.1,2,3,5,10,11[22]

Meter *(wirama)*: Basanta Tilaka --0/-00/0-0/0-0/--00

Meter of similar passages in Bhaṭṭikāvyam: Upendravajrā

Pemaos *(readers)*: Jero Mangku Kertha (verses 1 & 2); I Déwa Aji Mangku from Bedulu (verses 3 - 5)

Pangartos *(translators)*: Jero Dalang Éwer and 'Ratu Kakiang',a *brahmana* (Ida Bagus) from Tegal Linggah.

Location and date: household of researcher Bruce Carpenter in Kedéwatan Kelod, Gianyar district, Ubud Kecamatan; South Bali foothills, overlooking Sayan gorge. August 4, 1984.

Occasion: formal reading sponsored by the author, with French researcher Dr. Michel Picard of the *Centré Researche Nationalé*, and American researhcer and writer Bruce Carpenter. All arrangements were made with the kind assistance of I Gusti Sumung of Puri Lèmpad, Ubud.

I. Pangaksama *(Apologia)* given by Jero Mangku Kertha

Balinese:

Jero Mangku: Om awignam astu namo Siwo-Budayam.[23]

Inggih, para pamiarsa pidaging tityang naweg geng ampura pisan jagi matur-nguningayang indik pepacan Ramayana. Tityang mewasta Dogoh, Madé, Mangku Padang. Gumanti sané pacang ngartos, nere siyos I Éwer, Wayan, Dalang. Kimunampurayang pisan, duanin(g) wau-wau perangkat.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Menawi wènten kirang-langkungipun, ampura sareng sami. Yéning wantah arse sakirangané, wewehin. Menawi kelangkungan, kirangin, asapunika. Sané kebaos mangkin ring pemargin Ida Sang Ramadewa jago lungo ke alasé. Inggih, asapunika.

English:

Om. May there be no hinderance. Homage to Śiva-Buddhāyam.

Yes then, all you who listen here, I beg pardon very much of all of you, for I would like now to speak of the Ramayana. I am called Dogoh, Madé, the mangku[24] *of Padang (Banjar).*[25] *And the one who will give the (Balinese) meaning is none other than I Éwer, Wayan, the Dalang.*[26] *Please forgive me then, very much, for I am just about to begin. If there are deficiencies or excesses may all of you forgive me. And if there is felt to be something missing, please speak up and fill it in. If there are excesses, reduce them please, just like that. What will be spoken of now will be the journey of Sang Rama when he left for the forest. Yes, just so is the content of my words.*

II. *Kawi* text with *mabasan* gloss

1. *Kawi:*

kāwit saratsamaya /1/ kāla nirār parangkā /2/
nton tang paradeśa ri hawan nira /3/ kapwa rāmya /4/
kwéh lwah magöng katemu dé nira /5/ tīrtha dibya /6/
udyana lèn talaga /7/ nirjhara kapwa mahenih /8/

Balinese:

Inggih, né mangkin tepungan sasih ketiga, rapat ring kartika kapat /1/

Ri kalan Ida ning rauhin /2/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mekanten watek désané sané kemarginin antuk Ida /3/

Kelintang dahat dumilah pisan /4/

Akéh tukad-tukad sané ageng-ageng kapanggihin antuk Ida /5/

Malih toyo sané nirmalo mautamö, nir-tanpa-teleteh /6/
Malih panggihin Ida tetamanan, sarasi /7/
Sami toya-nyané nirmalö, mautamö, nir-tanpa-teleteh /8/[27]

English:

Yes then, it was now during the third month, close to the beginning of Kartikka, the fourth - /1/

At the time that they set out. /2/

They could see all the villagers of the places that they passed by - /3/

And everything was very beautiful, as if shining. /4/

They came upon many great rivers. /5/

And springs of the purest water, exceedingly fine, clear and without any cloudiness. /6/

Moreover they came upon lovely ponds and gardens, /7/

Whose waters were spotless and of the highest quality, completely pure and without any stain. /8/

2. *Kawi:*

tuñjung putih pwa ya tuñjung abaṅ seḍeng rūm /1/
kumbaṅ-nya ghurṇita maśabda humuṅ /2/ sadarppa /3/
lèn mandamāruta mirir ya /4/ sugandha māmbö /5/
Saṅ Rāma Lakṣamaṇa /6/ rikaṅ kṣaṇa tuṣṭa dé-nya /7/

Balinese:

Irika panggéhin ida tunjung putih, tunjung barak sedeng becik-e /1/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Punika mawinan i tam(b)ulilingan, riuh-n-ipun maswara muug /2/

Seantukan legan manahnyané lega /3/

Malih ke-,...keampuhang antuk angin asirsir /4/

Mawinan melupug antuk bonyané /5/

Yèn mungguhing Ida mangkin Sang Rama, Sang Laksamana /6/

Punika mekawinan kayun ida lédang antuk pararyan Ida /7/

English:

And there they came upon white lotuses and red lotuses that were at the peak of their bloom. /1/

And the black bee could be heard buzzing loudly. /2/

Because he was happy, his heart was glad. /3/

Those lotuses were swaying softly from the pressure of gentle breezes. /4/

So that the air was filled everywhere with their fragrance. /5/

If we speak of Sang Rama, and of Sang Laksamana - /6/

Those were the reasons that they felt pleased to take their rest for the night. /7/

3. *Kawi:*

kembaṅ turut sisi rikaṅ pāda-mārgga lumrā /1/
Saṅ Rāmabhadra maneher maṅalap ta kembaṅ /2/
mādyus sirācamana /3/ kapwa maśoca riṅ lwah /4/
ṅkané śilātala jenek ta sirān parāryan /5/

Balinese:

Semalih sekar-sekarnyané bedéré ri sisin marginé /1/

Ida Sang Ramadewa ngeraris, [ng]idung, ngempol-ngempol

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sekar /2/

Irika raris Ida masiram, membersih /3/

Madularan, raris, Ida merauh iriko ring tukadé /4/

Irika ring batuné sané asah, jenek Ida irika mararyan /5/

English:

In addition, there were all kinds of flowers in rows by the side of the path. /1/

And Ramadewa enjoyed their perfumes, picking some to enjoy later. /2/

He bathed then, refreshing and cleansing himself. /3/

And joined by his brother he went into the river. /4/

There on a large, flat rock they found a pleasant resting spot. /5/

4. *Kawi:*

utphulla tań kumuda kapwa mekar paḍābań /1/
ryak-ryak nikań talaga /2/ yéka dumèh ya cāla[28] /3/
byaktan katon kadi dilah ning apuy ya molah /4/
kumbań bhramanta i ruhur-nya aken kukus-nya /5/

Balinese:

Raris né mangkin baosan sampun barak ipun i sekar tunjung, mumpung kembang, sami pada barak /1/

Semalih loncahan toyan telagané /2/

Punika makajalaran punika ipun sami pada maloncahan /3/

Kasinahan ipun sampun mejanten kadi dilah geni, wyakti dumilah /4/

Semalih ipun i tam(b)ulilingan meuduran irika beduwur, waluya punika pinaka-andus-nya-né /5/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

English:

Going on, we will speak now of the lotuses that were at there reddest, for they were all blossoming, all very red. /1/

And the water of the lake rippled softly. /2/

So it seemed that everything was in movement, like ripples on water. /3/

Yes, so that it appeared that (the lake waters and the lotuses) were the flames of a fire, shining very brightly. /4/

And the black bee, who was circling about above, seemed to be the smoke of the fire. /5/

5. *Kawi:*

rāmya ṅ alas /1/ kadi mahā maṅilo tumuṅkul /2/
cāyā-ny yèniṅet-ingöt /3/ ya mawās rikaṅ lwah /4/
mèdi deleg agul-gul /5/ magelis ya molah /6/
cāyālilaṅ malimunan /7/ makusut ya dé nya /8/

Balinese:

Yèn mungguing kearsian wane punike /1/

Waluya ipun megelohan, mekanten muntul /2/

Irika raris katelektekang punike lawatnyané /3/

Punika makawinan sinah pekantenan iriko ring tu-kadé /4/

Waluya kadi babiki ipun i deleg agung /5/

Duanin kelangkung gancang, wyakti ipun melecat /6/

Makawinan lawaté punike raris ical pu-l[29] /7/

Makawinan layu, layu ipun oléh i deleg /8/

English:

Then in regards to the pleasures of the trees (by the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

shore of the lake). /1/

As they swayed there back and forth it seemed that they were gazing deeply into the lake. /2/

And there they were met with their own reflections. /3/

So that it appeared as if they were really there in the lake. /4/

But the great pike was in a mood to play tricks. /5/

So he swam about violently, and could be seen to leap in the air. /6/

So that the reflections of the trees disappeared completely. /7/

As if the trees themselves had wilted, wilted because of the playful pike. /8/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Notes to Mabasan Texts

[1] Both reader and 'translator' use *Jagatkaru* for *Jaratkaru* in the first stanza.

[2] The replacement text here is form a version of the same passage read in Ubud and translated by Jero Dalang Éwer.

[3] Juynboll: *kasawus*

[4] Juynboll: *liniwet-nira*

[5] Juynboll: *kenéng strī*

[6] Juynboll: *ginöng-nira*

[7] Juynboll: *Srugi*

[8] The Balinese pronunciation of *siddhi* lacks the /dh/ consonant of the Sanskrit original, yet readers are aware that the *wayah*, or 'ancient' character for /dh/ is represented in the word. The question here is: for a culture mixing oral and written literacy, should the spoken or chirographic variant be chosen in transcription ?

[9] Junboll: *pinaran-nira*

[10] ? (not in Juynboll)

[11] *peranda* = *pedanda* 'High Priest'

[12] Juynboll: *ni* and *ing* for *ning/ning* of the Balinese reader.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[13] Juynboll: *larāngeres* and *ng-hulun*

[14] Juynboll: *yan atengah*

[15] The phrase *pawéha ng wang* was not given by the Balinese reader. (As far as meaning is concerned it is redundant.)

[16] This is one of the few cases where the *pangartos* has apparently misheard the *Kawi*. The Ubud translation confirms the correct reading:

> Kapireng raris atur Sang Jaratkaru, antuk Ida Sang pitara.
>
> *Then the words of Sang Jaratkaru (resp) were heard by the reverend ancestor.*

[17] The *Kawi* reader sings the Sanskrit passage here using a Balinese *wirama* melody *(reng)*.

[18] Juynboll: *kṛtam karma*

[19] Note the switch to the less respectful pronoun *ipun* [Ami] in reference to Jaratkaru. The *pangartos* thus capitalizes on the rhetorical possibilities of status-marked vocabulary, implying that the *pitara* considers Jaratkaru as unworthy of the pronoun *Ida* [Asi] used earlier in the episode. (See Section 8.3 above for elaboration of this point.)

[20] Juynboll: *janma-banddhana*

[21] The Old Javanese text and an English translation of these passages can be found in Soewito Santoso: 1980: 48-49.

[22] The changes of sequence between the Sanskrit

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Bhaṭṭi-kāvyam and the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* are examined in Hooykaas 1959:20-21. Another English translation of the passages from Bhaṭṭi can be found in Sebastiano 1972:6-7.

23 The question of whether Śaivism and Buddhism had coalesced during the Singosari-Majapahit era of East Javanese history has been taken up by a number of authors. A good summary of these views is to be found in Soewito Santoso's translation & introduction to the Buddhist *Kekawin Sutasoma* (Soewito Santoso 1968/1971: 48-203). Santoso concludes that Śaiva and Boda sects were separate until the latter part of the Majapahit dynasty, when they merged into the sect of Bhāṭara Guru. Ensink has analyzed philosophical differences between the two sects in lines 38.1-42.4 of the *Kekawin Sutasoma* (Ensink 1974:196-226). Hooykaas in turn (1973) has shown that the Balinese Bauddha lineages have merged with Śaiva lineages in Bali, both of them now included under the single over-arching classification of *brahmana*. How ordinary Balinese view the subject is brought out very clearly in Jero Mangku Kertha's invocation to *Siwo-Budayam* in the *mabasan* passage cited here.

24 The speaker here gives his personal name *(Dogoh)* and his birth-order name *(Madé)*, along with *I*, the term of address/title marker appropriate to those of commoner status. In practice this individual was consistently referred to with the more respectful term *Jero Mangku* that stressed his occupation as a temple-priest. When being introduced he was sometimes referred to as *Jero Mangku Padang*, thus emphasizing the *banjar* (hamlet) of his residence.

In later correspondence I learned that *Jero Mangku* had taken the additional name 'Kertha', and now prefers to be addressed as 'Jero Mangku Kertha'. This title brings out the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

idea of someone learned in the 'words of the scriptures' *(kekecap sastra)*. This new name answers both to *Jero Mangku's* desire to state professed spiritual aims, and to his awareness that a growing consensus of his peers would accept such a designation, his skill in reading lontars being widely acknowledged in the Ubud area.

25 A detailed treatment of the *banjar* as one of several cross-cutting types of social organization is found in H. and C. Geertz: 1975. The term is translated (roughly) as *hamlet* in that work.

26 Jero Dalang Éwer was a popular *dalang* in the Ubud area during the lifetime of the legendary artist I Gusti Lèmpad, whose son I Gusti Sumung arranged the *mabasan* session recorded here. Dalang Éwer was of great assistance in the collection of *mabasan* texts used in this thesis, and has also been a principle informant for recent a study of Balinese wayang (Hobart 1987).

27 The Sanskrit word *nirjhara* 'waterfall' found in the Old Javanese text is consistently (mis)understood as *nir-her-a* by Balinese ('mistakenly', taking an etic view of the enterprise of philology). This can be explained in view of a number of facts of Balinese phonology and lexicon: (1) the consonant /j^h/ does not exist in Balinese (nor are other consonants ever aspirated). (2) the special letter *(akṣara wayah)* used in Bali for /j^h/ strongly resembles that used for /ai/ (3) *er*, or *air* is a very old and common word for 'water' in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago. (4) The Sanskrit prefix *nir-* could be used either as a prefix or free morpheme in Old Javanese, and came to mean 'without' in Old Javanese and literary Balinese. This confusing mixture of elements thus suggests the impossible meaning 'without water' in Balinese. The overall sense of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the clause, however, suggests 'without stain' *(nir-tanpa-teleteh)*, and this is exactly the translation most often chosen by Balinese when glossing this word. In the process the overall meaning of the line is retained, but the specific meaning of 'waterfall' found in the Old Javanese is lost in most Balinese glosses.

28 *Cala* was written in the typescript text read here, though *cāla* is found usually. The *pemaos* pronounces this as a long syllable in keeping with the meter *(Basanta Tilaka)*.

29 The Balinese word *puul/pul* 'completely' is a recent borrowing of English 'full'. Other recent imports of a similar nature, and wide distribution in Bali include *setop* 'that's far enough, stop', and *kontrol* 'to patrol, check in on periodically'.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B: SATUA TEXTS

I have spoken of the Balinese *satua* tales in Chapter Eight as a living descendant of the rich body of animal tales that had its classical form in Old Javanese works like the *Tantri Kāmandaka*, and its Middle Javanese *kidung* versions (*Tantri Kaḍiri* and *Tantri Demung*). In a recent article Marrison (1987) has discussed the development of efforts in Modern Indonesia aimed at the collection and preservation of these important elements of Balinese folk literature, noting the origin of the word *satua* in Sanskrit *sattva*:

> "Folk tales have a significant place in modern Balinese literature. The term *satwa*, = Sanskrit *sattva*, a creature, hence an animal, indicates the character of many of them. Van der Tuuk... describes them as 'tales, generally oral, such as are told by women to children: some of them summarize the contens of a poem known to the teller, others have been worked up into poems. This relationship of the oral to the written literature is significant, firstly because the tales provide some of the evidence on which the history and criticism of Balinese literature can be built, and secondly because it is widely recognized that both in language and sentiment they provide a nearly ideal representation of the indigenous Balinese outlook. (1987:482)

As Marrison notes the collection and preservation of *Satua* tales can be roughly divided into four periods:

> "First there are a few examples in the Van der Tuuk

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

collection. Secondly there was the wide and intensive collecting by the Kirtya in the years immediately before the Second World War... The third stage has been their use in the schools of Bali, especially since independence. Fourthly, the Department of Education and Culture in Bali, and the Udayana University, Den Pasar, have engaged in further collecting and study." (ibid)

Satua tales used as sources of materials in Chapters Six and Seven of this thesis are drawn from the series *Satua Bali* IA - IIIB compiled by the Team Penyusun Buku-buku Satua Bali for use by students in the elementary schools. The majority of the tales in these books were adapted from written *satua* tales in the collection of the Gedong Kirtya in Singaraja, and are aimed at increasing awareness of personal, cultural, and national values among children in the public schools. This is brought out by the editors in their Forward *(Kata Pengantar)* to the 1975 edition:

"By using folk tales as reading materials for the teaching of Balinese language we fullfill the aim of language teaching to instill in the children a taste for high-minded thinking.

In addition these Balinese folk tales are a part of the local culture which represents an element in the national Indonesian culture which it is clear deserves to be protected, cared for and developed so that we can continue to live within the framework of a true and complete trusteeship of a national culture."[1]

The *Satua Bali* series of textbooks are still commonly available in Bali, and have been used as sources of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

evidence in previous grammatical studies, including I Wayan Warna et al (1983). These volumes are arranged so that there is a slow shift from *basa biasa* organization and lexicon towards more *alus* styles. For this reason Balinese informants questioned on the subject of appropriate study materials for Balinese pointed to the *Satua Bali* series.[2]

The tales reproduced in this appendix represent a series of adaptations of a single modern *satua* tale told to the author by Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa, a composer of traditional Balinese literature in the *geguritan* form, and a co-founder of the contemporary *pesantian kewawin* and *pesantian kidung* of Desa Sanur-Intaran.

At the time of my research in Bali I was very much interested in investigating living traces of the *Tantri* tradition of animal tales. I knew of Balinese verbs like *nantri* 'to tell *Tantri* stories' and *nyèmbada* 'to engage in calumny for political ends, like the wolf *Sembada*', and had seen a number of fine paintings executed in the first half of the twentieth century that suggested a healthy tradition of *Tantri* tales at that time.[3]

But none of these paintings were recent, and in other respects as well it seemed to me that I had arrived in Bali a moment too late, for not only had *Tantri* tales ceased being a popular subject of painting, but as a number of informants pointed out, telling *Tantri* tales to pass time in the rice fields is a practice that is now unknown in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

most areas.

As I came to understand, however, this does not mean that the *Tantri* tales have died out, but simply that they have been absorbed into the better known form of the *satua* tales, just as in Java the *Tantri* tales find their modern incarnation in the form of tales of the *Amongsastra* type, the term itself derived from the name of the author of *Serat Kancil*, a Javanese work based on *Tantri* and *Si Kancil* themes.[4]

As van der Tuuk noted these tales are sometimes adapted as poems, especially in the Balinese *geguritan*, or *sekar alit*, meters equivalent to Javanese *macapatan* meters.[5] Thus we find works like *Geguritan Pañca Puspita* that incorporate well-known *Tantri* tales like the Story of the Turtles and the Swans, or the Story of the Greedy Heron.

The latter tale is especially popular in Bali, being illustrated in the *Tantri* friezes of the *Gedung Kertha Gosa* in Klungkung, as well as in paintings like *Pedanda Baka* of I Keteg (Puri Lukisan, Ubud No. 437/c/m: 1940). In addition a lengthy version of a *geguritan* version of this tale by I Nyoman Redé has recently been produced as a cassette tape.[6]

During the period that I was studying Balinese language and recitation of *kekawin* and *kidung* with Ida Bagus Sudiyasa I had mentioned this story a number of times, finding that Ida Bagus was well acquainted with the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tale. The tale takes its inspiration from the one-legged stance of the heron, which from the time of the Indian *Pañcatantra* has been likened to the typical pose of the *yogi*. The tale can be summarized as follows:

A heron tires of chasing fish and devises a strategy to trick the fish. He poses as a holy man *(wiku, pendeta, pedanda)* and encourages the fish to approach. When they do so he feigns tears, and tells them in a sobbing voice that he has heard that the fishermen are coming to dry up the lake and so catch all the fish. The fish are alarmed at this news and ask their 'holy man heron' for help. Whereupon the heron tells them that he can save them all by flying them in his beak to a lake higher up in the mountains where the fishermen will never come.

The fish are taken in and allow themselves to be flown away, only to meet their deaths on the rocks of the mountain where the greedy heron devours them one by one.

At last the stock of fish runs low, so the heron tries his trick with the crab. But the crab is known for its wisdom and insists that <u>he</u> fly away by grasping the heron's neck. The heron relents and they fly off. But the crab spies the remains of the heron's savage feasts. He declares the heron a fraud, and clamps down tightly on its neck, demanding to be flown home to his own lake. The heron complies, begging for its life, but in the end the crab snaps the neck of the heron.

In *Geguritan Pañca Puspita* the crab explains the heron's greed in terms of excessive desire for food, playing that off against an ironic reference to the "pure state" that was the announced aim of the heron in his "incarnation" as a holy man:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Mr. Heron, in the past you were that kind of bird,
who would eat anything living at all.
You just couldn't get along just eating fruits and vegetables.

And because of that you could never change your evil ways.
So now - so that you can attain a pure state - I'm going to let you die without eating.

It's clear that your way is evil.
You tried to fool me, even wanted to kill me -
just so you could keep on eating.

And in the end you lost all sense of shame, begging for your life -
But if I let you go you'll just do it again,
so now take your medicine !"

This tale appealed very much to Ida Bagus, and not too long after we had read a *kidung* version of it together I found that he had invented a sequel to the Story of the Heron, and worked it into his *Geguritan Pañca Sattwa*. This is a *geguritan* based on an Indonesian rendering (by I Gusti Ngurah Ketut Sangka)of the *Wana Parwa*, one of the books of the *Mahābharata* that was not translated into the Old Javanese/*Kawi Parwa* literature.[7]

Ida Bagus' method of composition was to sing a new line or two of the verse, then write down the product on a chalkboard in Balinese script, later transferring this to manuscript notebooks.

During this period I overheard Ida Bagus telling this tale very rapidly to a commoner friend who was also very

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

deeply involved in *pesantian* activities. I had heard Ida Bagus use *biasa* lexicon in the context of everyday life, but he had until then scrupulously avoided it with me, as he did with other students and visitors from outside his houseyard. Hoping to find out what the *basa biasa* of the priestly *Geriya* would be like, on another occassion I asked Ida Bagus if he would tell me the Story of the Heron in normal *satua* style. This he explained was not a problem, since for a *satua* story the principle of *désa-kala-patra* dictates the use of *biasa* language, just as in certain contexts *kekawin* passages should be translated in *basa biasa* styles.[8]

Version 2 of the *Satua* texts below represents a transcription of this oral version of The Story of the Heron that Ida Bagus gave the Balinese name *Satua I Cangak*. While Ida Bagus retains the use of *basa alus* modals, deictics and conjunctions in the framing of the story, within the dialogues he uses *basa biasa* and *basa kasar*.

Version 3 represents a reworking of the oral text into a more literary prose form. This was produced by Ida Bagus at a later date when he became aware of the difficulty I had experienced in trying to transcribe the very rapid fire form of the oral text. The language of this text is considerably more restrained than that of the oral version, although *biasa* and *kasar* elements are preserved in the dialogue sections.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Version 1 of *Satua I Cangak* below represents a portion of the finished *geguritan* version of the tale, transcribed from a recording made in April 1985. In this version the language is *basa alus* throughout, and there is no trace of the style of discourse organization found in oral and prose versions produced during the same time period.

I. Summary of the story

The Pandawa brothers have been exiled from their palace *(puri)* and are wandering the countryside. They arrive at the ocean and are very pleased by the beauties of the seashore.

One of the things they see there is a heron, whose one-legged pose and great patience make him resemble a holy man.

The heron stands there for a long time but catches no fish. Then he spys an osprey, or 'sea-hawk', who is able to plunge straight down into the water from on high, and so catch many fish. The heron decides to imitate this method of fishing.

However, the heron knows nothing of the art of diving, so he fails to turn and hits the water full force, soaking his wings in the process. Now he is unable to fly at all.

Then it seems that the ocean takes pity, for the heron is washed up on the shore. There, however, he is still unable to move, and so begins to be burned up by the sun.

At this point a crab happens by, and is amazed to see the heron sprawled helplessly on the beach.

"Hey Mr. Heron," he says, "how'd you get like that. You

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

used to be so strong, and you were capable on both land and water ?"

The heron replies that he was indeed once strong, but that now he needs helf. Then heron says to the crab: "but, you've forgotten that you're in debt to me through my ancestor", and he cites the *Tantri* tale of the Heron as evidence that in ages past his ancestory had protected the ancestors of the crab.

The crab is dubious, but offers to repay the heron, citing a common proverb *(sesongan, pepatah)* to the effect that one should neither stay too long in debt, nor be too aggressive in seeking payment a debt.

The heron then asks the crab to drag him into the shade, thus to fulfil his ancestral debt to the heron. The crab gladly complies. But no sooner does the heron recover his strength, than he thinks of food, and pretending to scratch his neck jabs at the crab.

But the crab has kept his eyes open, aware of the heron's evil ways, and he ducks the heron's strike and comes back by clamping his pincers down on the heron's beak.

Then says the heron: "you've been evil for a long time now Mr. Heron, and now you're going to get repaid. But don't worry, I'm not going to kill you. I'm just going to take half your beak, so that you won't be 'long-beaked' anymore."[9] The crab then snaps off half the heron's beak. Now the heron goes home, only to be met at the gate by his wife and children, who are eager to know what he has brought home to eat. Instead they find Mr. Heron bleeding, and with only half a beak.

In the oral version of the tale the heron summarizes the situation thus to his wife:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Ah, it's like this dear wife, little sister. For a long time older brother has been going along (doing evil). But now at last I understand, I believe firmly what's said in the *satua* tales: it's not good to have a long beak, to lie and cheat. So from now on I'm through with this long beak of mine. Because this is the fruit *(pala)* that people get from having a long beak. So now I understand, now I know the long and short of it."[10]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Satua Texts: Satua I Cangak. *The Return of Heron and Crab*

Version 1: *Geguritan* version by Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa

1. Verse (a)

Balinese:

Tan kacarita malih / Sang Pandawa /2/
Sami pada lédang / nyingak daging sagarané /4/
Wènten paksi cangak (nge)rentug / duwur batuné maninggil /6/
Kadi ngineng yogo / nyadangin ulamé rawuh /8/
Suwé ipun manyantosang / sepi pisan /10/
Ulamé jejeh mamarggi / I Cangak mangkin sèngitan /12/

English:

Not further shall we speak / of the Pandawas /2/
They all felt glad / looking at the sea /4/
There was a heron at its perch / standing alone atop a rock /6/
As if doing yoga there / (really) he awaited fish /8/
A long time there he watched / but quiet reigned /10/
The fish were afraid to pass / the heron by now was angry /12/

2. Verse (b)

Gedeg ipun kasuryakin / sareng katah /2/
Ring paksi ning-indang / pasliyur sami ngedèkin /4/
Ring paksi ning (ng)indang / pasliyur sami ngedék-in /4/
Ring toya ning umbang / Déning ipun kapitutug /6/
Mewasta paksi langlang ulam / duweg pisan /8/
Nyilem ngelangi munggah malih / katah polih tatunas-an /10/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

English:

His anger was then seen / by many /2/
birds that fly in the sky / swarming about they laughed /4/
There was a bird called 'kadinglalu' / who plunged straight from the sky /6/
And the water of the waves / he used to pull himself up /8/
They call him a 'sea hawk' / very clever is he /10/
He plunges, swims, flies up again / and catches lots of fish /12/

3. Verse (c)

Puniko kapanggihin / ring I Cangak /2/
Gelis ipun memanah / nyadya pacang mituwutin /4/
Mangandel ring déwèk mampu / sitem kalih kampid gedé /6/
Raris namung ipun munggah / lega I Cangak baduur /8/
Manggihin ulamé katah / masliyuran /10/
Rerad-rerod ring toya-né / I Cangak lintang ngedot pisan /12/

English:

This then being seen / by Mr. Heron /2/
Quickly he thought / I'll just follow along /4/
He thought that he'd be able / he was strong and broad of wing /6/
Then up he flew unsteadily / happy to think below /8/
He'd catch scores of fish / swarms of them /10/
As they darted here and there / the heron really hungered for them /12/

4. verse (c)

Cager ipun pacang polih / tetunasan /2/
Duaning ipun la-s gelis / macebur né mangkin /4/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ring toyané dalem pelung / belus ipun buko katig /6/
twara dadi matingtingan / bulunyané belus makuub /8/
Ring toyané ipun ngumbang / kahanyutan /10/
Gelis mangkin ipun kampih / ring pasisi né kebusan /12/

English:

The heron was really anxious now /to get some food /2/

That's why he (dove) quickly, not holding back / he dove straight in /4/

Into the water deep and blue / and soaked he was as if just doused /6/

He couldn't seem to stand at all / his feathers were all wet throughout /8/
On the waves there then he just floated / swept along /10/

Quickly now he was washed up / on the shore all soaking wet /12/

5. Verse (d) (incomplete)

Suwé ipun glalang-gliling / kapanesan /2/
Malih katigtig omba-k / tur ingarang unting-unting /4/
Duka pisan pacang ida / Yan tan saking swécan Widi /6/
Sakadi wènten nuduhang / Mangkin wènten Yuyu rawuh /8/

English:

A long while there he rolled about / o'ercome by heat /2/
And pounded often by the waves / also attacked by hosts of sand fleas /4/
His pain would have been very great / 'twere not for Ida Sangyang Widi, Almighty God. /6/
As if he'd given the order / along came Mr. Crab /8/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Satua Texts: Satua I Cangak I, *The Return of Heron and Crab*

Version 2: oral version (excerpt) by Ida **Bagus** Ketut Sudiyasa

Location and date of narration: Geriya Taman Delod Marggi, February 22, 1985.

Sapuniki - nah, mangkin wènten carita ring sampun Pandawa rauh ring sagara, tan kènten [inggéh]. /1/

Sandang becik Ida Sang Pendawo, e- **ng**aksi sagara-né sampun nyat. /2/
Inggéh, dados tan wènten toya ageng, ten kènten. /3/

Nah, mangkin punika wènten raris e- paksi cangak irika cangak, **ny**odog duur batu-é. /4/
Ipun jago **ng**-iwas-iwas-**in**, **nge**-rereh pa-tunas-an, sapuniko [inggih, inggih]. /5/

Sampun kènten suwé ipun **ng**oyong ditu dangu, nènten wènten ulam 0-pangg(ih)in-ipun. /6/
Nah, dados wènten malih sané ka-baos, ka-baos ring Bali, **ma**-wasta paksi, e-, langlang bé, [inggih]. /7/

Nika, raris, ipun tegeh, sakèng tegeh punika ipun **m**angg(ih)-**in** pa-tunas-an ring toyo-é. /8/
Dados ipun, *tidak segan-segan lagi* kènten. /9/
Nènten wènten malih ipun sumangsaya jaga **ng**èntun-**ang** sikiyan-ipun-é ring toya, **nge**-rereh te-tunas-an. /10/

Dados ipun polih. [Inggih, polih ulam]. Inggéh polih ulam, nènten belus, kènten. /11/
Nah, nika raris **ka**-panggih antuk I Cangak. /12/

Dados, wènten malih paksi ka-bawos paksi kandik-kandik. [inggih] /13/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ka-selem niko, selem-selem rupan-ipun-é [selem, inggih]. /14/

Nika dados ipun kedèk, I paksi kandik-kandik **ngedèk-in** I Cangak, kènten. /15/
Awanan ipun kadèk-**in** I Cangak antukan I Cangak kadi anak **ma**-yoga - [inggih] **ma**-megeng irika. [inggih] /16/

Nika jèngah ipun, antukan **pa**-manggih-**in** nika jadmo-é, napi wasta-n-ipun, e-, langlang bé-, **nge**-rereh ulam, tan kènten. /17/

Sakadi anak luh **ma**-cebur, **ma**-satya, las, kènten. /18/

Inggih, mangkin **pa**-tuwut-**in**-ipun, kènten ring I Cangak, kènten. /19/
Manèk ipun ma-keber, 0-panggih-**in**-ipun ulam akéh, i betèn ampun. /20/
Nah, nika ipun sahasa ampun **ma**-tuwut-**in** ipun. **Ma**-cebur taler, kènten. /21/

0-, **ma**-cebur irika **ma**-manah ipun **ma**-keber. Pa-kantèn dosa irika ipun, inggih, kènten. /22/
Antukan bulu-n-ipun-é belus, sarat. /23/

Nah, nika ampun, raris malih banget ipun 0-kedèk-**in** sakèng paksi kandik-kandik-é. /24/
Dados suwé ipun kambang, ten **ny**idang-**ny**idang ma-kebur. /25/
Malih, gelis-an pasang toyo-é ampun. *Naik-naik air laut-né.* [inggih, inggih, pasang] /26/

Inggih, sampun pasang nika raris - nah, niki dados **ma**-rupa kadi olas mangkin segaro-é - tan kènten. /27/

Dados **ka**-(a)mpih-**ang** ipun ka sisi ring toyo-é, I Cangak, kènten. /28/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sampun belusan, dingin, kènten, rauh ring pa-sisi. /29/
Suwé ampun nika 0-dèng-dèng-**a** ring panes irika, kènten. /30/
Kantun taler ipun, tan, tan **ny**ida-(**a**)**ng** **ma**-jujuk, kènten. /31/

Rauh, raris,I Yuyu, kènten, mrika, grépé-grépé. /32/

Dados baos I Yuyu ring I Cangak: /33/

"Ènco, iba cangak. /34/
Dadi iba dini belus-an, kéné, sing dadi bangun. /35/
Nah, né kènkèn ? Iba gedé. Kampid iba lumbeng. /36/
Buin iba bisa di daratan, iba bisa. /37/
Di yéh, iba bisa. /38/
To, dadi iba kéné jani, **ng**edged, tan bisa **ny**ida-(**a**)**ng** bangun." /39/

(I Cangak:)

"Patuh, beneh pisan buko rawos cayi." /40/
sapunika I Cangak. /41/
"Beneh buka raos cai, saja. /42/
Dugas kayi nu kereng, sajo, sing ado buin **ng**-asah-**ang** kayi, sing ada **ng**alah-**ang** kayi. /43/
Tur cai sing inget tutug-**ang** satwa aning malu. /44/
Tur, leluur kayi, ida Sang Baka." [ah, inggih] /45/

English

It's like this then. This is the story of (the time) after the Pandavas had already come to the ocean, you remember ? [Yes] [1] They felt very pleasant there, the Pandavas, gazing at the ocean at low tide, already dry. /2/ Yes, so there was no high water, wasn't it so ? /3/

Yes, so there was a heron there, standing on top of a rock; he's scouting around there, searching for food, like

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that. [yes, yes] /4/

Now he's already stood there for a long time, /5/ and he's still caught no fish. /6/ And there's also what we call here in Bali, in Bali it's called a sea-hawk. [yes] /7/

That sea-hawk was way up high (in the sky); from there he could get lots of fish to eat, there in the water. /8/ So he didn't hesitate at all. /9/ He would just plunge headlong straight down into the water. /10/

And he caught them. [yes, caught fish]. Yes, he caught the fish there, and he didn't get wet, like that. /11/

Now the heron saw this. /12/ So now, there were some other birds there too, called 'kandik-kandik' birds (because they have sharp little beaks, shaped like adzes). /13/ Yes, they're black all over [black, yes]. /14/ So they laughed, those 'kandik-kandik' birds, they laughed at the heron. /15/

The reason they laughed at the heron was because he looked like someone doing yoga, making great his ascetic vows. /16/ So the heron felt aggravated; he'd come upon this soul, what was it, a sea-hawk, catching fish just like that. /17/ Like a woman diving into her husband's funeral pyre, just like that, willing, with a pure heart. /18/

Yes, so he copied (the sea-hawk). /19/ He flew up high where he could see lots of fish down below. /20/ Then with all his might he copied (the sea-hawk), he dove straight down. /21/ Whoosh, he dove, plunging right into (the water). /22/ Then he tried to fly up. But that was his mistake, for his feathers were soaking-wet, and very heavy. /23/

Now that's done. What happened next, he really got laughed at by all the 'kandik- kandik' birds. /24/ Then he floated along for a long time, not able to fly at all. /25/ And the tide was coming in quickly too. The tide was rising. [yes, rising] /26/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yes, so it had already come in (the tide). /27/ So now it seemed as thought the ocean had taken pity, you know. Cuz he got carried along by the tide to the edge of the water, the heron (did). /28/ When he got to the beach there he was wet all over, and cold too. /29/ He lay there for a long time, getting dried out by the heat. /30/ And it was clear he couldn't stand up, just like that. /31/

Then along came Mr.Crab, like that you know, scuttling crab-wise along the sand. /32/

And the crab said to the heron: /33/

"Hey you, Mr.Heron. /34/ How come you're here all soaking wet like this, not even able to stand up ? /35/ Huh, what happened ? You're big, your wings are broad and strong. /36/ And you can get around on land. /37/ You can get around on water. /38/ So how is it that you're here (like this), shivering, not even able to stand up ?" /39/

(The heron replied):

"It's true, it's just as you say," /40/

That's what the heron said. /41/

"It's true, what you say is true. /42/
When I was in my prime, there were none who could equal me, none who could overcome me. /43/
But you've forgotten about what's told in that satua tale of old. /44/
(About) my own ancestor, the Reverend Mr.Heron." /45/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Satua Texts: Satua I Cangak II, *The Return of Heron and Crab*

Version 3: written version (excerpt) by Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa (March 1985)

Colophon: Satue Puniki Kasatuayang antuk Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa ring Geriya Taman Sari Delod Margi, Sanur, Bali *(This story was told by Ida Bagus Ketut Sudiyasa in Geriya Taman Sari, the section South of the Road, Sanur, Bali.)*

Section A:

Inggih, **ka**-c(a)rite ida sang Pandawa, sampun rauh ring sagara. /1/
Sami pada lédang **ny**ingakin sakawèntenan-é sané ring sagara, /2/
Sandang becik pisan toyan segara-né, nènten dalem. /3/

[see section B following for descriptive passage added in this version, removed here to facilitate comparison of corresponding passages in versions 1 and 2 above]

Wènten malih paksi cangak **ny**odog duwur batu-né. /4/
sakèng irike ipun **ng**-iwas-**in** ulam-é sané **ma**-lali punike,/5/
0-intip ipun jage 0-tunas-ipun. /6/

Ri (h)antukan nènten pisan wènten ulam **me**-lali. /7/
m(a)-awinan suwé i cangak **me**-brate. /8/

nènten pisan **n**unas ulam. /9/
awinan ipun **ka**-kedèk**in** (h)antuki paksi kandik-kandik. /10/
Katah malih paksi-né sané **ny**uryak-**in** sakèng ambaroné. /11/
semalih **ka**-beñjul-**in** ipun antuk i paksi célèng-célèng-an. /12/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

malih wènten paksi. /13/
solah ipun-é yan sawangan sekadi solah jadme ri kale i jadme punike melaibang anak luh. /14/
sampunike solah i paksi punike. /15/
ri kale ipun **ny**ander ulam-é sané pacang 0-tunas-ipun. /16/

Semalih ulung ipun-é sakèng badu(h)ur. /17/
sekadi jadme-né pacang **ny**eburin geni pacang **ma**-satye, /18/
nènten manah ipun jejeh. /19/

Ring rawuh ring toya-né, gelis ipun polih ulam katah pisan. /20/

Inggih, punike mangkin **ka-pa**-tuwut-**in** antuk i kedis cangak /21/
nge-raris ipun sareng **ny**ilem ring toya-né. /22/

Se-sampun-é ipun **ny**ilem ring toye-né, /23/
sami sampun belusan bulun ipun-é, /24/
mawinan baat sikian ipun-é. /25/
punike awinan ipun nènten nyidayang makeber. /26/

Suwé ipun kambang ring toye-né. /27/
ma-rupe olas toye-né, /28/
raris **ka**-bakte ipun. ka pe-sisi punike. /29/
awinan i cangak kampih ring byas-é. semalih kebus-**an**. /30/

Inggih. se-sampun-é ipun **k**-ampih. /31/
nènten pisan ipun **ny**ida-y-**ang** **ma**-jujuk. /32/
seantukan ipun **ke**-dingin-**an** rawuh ring buntut ipun-é sami **ng**etor pisan. /33/

0-Carita-y-**ang** mangkin I Cangak **k**-ampih ring pa-sisi, /34/
gelis raris wènten yuyu rawuh. gerayang-gerayang. /35/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

nga-rereh tetadan irike. /36/
I yuyu tangkejut pisan. /37
manggih-**in** I Cangak **nga**-liling ring biyas-é. /38/
Nga-raris i yuyu **n**angsek-**in** i cangak, /39/
raris i yuyu **ma**-takèn ring i cangak, munyi-n i **yuyu**: /40/

"Ih, ibo cangak, ape k(a)rane ibo dadi kéné ? /41/
Yèn baan kai tusing patut ibo buke kéné, /42/
sawiréh ibo gedé, buin kampid ibo lumbeng. /43/
Buin-é ibo bise di yéh-é, bise di tegala-né." /44/

Inggih, sapunike bawos i yuyu ring i cangak, /45/
raris **ma**-saur i cangak, /46/
sapuniki munyi-n i cangak, sarwi **ng**-éling: /47/

"Ah, ibo yuyu, tusing pelih buke pa-munyi-n iba-né, /48/
ané subo sajo buke rawos iba-né, /49/
tusing ade ngalahang kai dugas kai-né nu sedeng kereng-**a**.[11] /50/
Nto ibe tusing inget tekèn cerite-né ané malu - /51/
ida lalu(h)ur kai-né ané sube néwata." /52/

English:

Yes, we will tell now of the Pandavas, of the time after they had arrived at the sea. /1/ All of them felt happly gazing at all the things in the sea there. /2/ The water was very beuatiful just then, not deep at all. /3/

[See section B, translation]

There was also a heron there, standing on top of a rock. /4/ From there he could see any fish that happened to pass by. /5/ He was spying on them, intending to eat them up. /6/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

But because there were no fish going by at all, /7/ the heron appeared like someone carrying out ascetic vows. /8/ He didn't catch any fish at all to eat. /9/ That was the reason the (sharp-beaked) 'kandik-kandik' birds laughed at him. /10/ And there were a lot of other birds looking down from the sky too. /11/ Even the scavanger-birds, the gulls, were looking down their noses, mocking the heron. /12/

And there was also a bird, /13/ to make a simile, it's like the way that a young man abducts his bride, /14/ that's how he acted: /15/ he would swoop down in a flash on the fish he was about to devour. /16/

So too the way (that bird) plummeted from the heights, /17/ was like the fall of a wife who flings herself into her husband's funeral pyre in an act of true devotion (ma-satya) - /18/ with no fear at all in her heart. /19/

Now when (that bird) would plunge into the water he would very quickly catch a great many fish. /20/

Yes. So this was what the heron copied. /21/ He went right on and plunged into the water. /22/ But after he hit the water /23/ his feathers got completely soaked. /24/ So that his body got very heavy /25/ and so he could no longer fly. /26/

He floated a long time on the water. /27/ It seemed as then as if the water (toya) took pity /28/ for he was swept along to the shore there. /29/ The heron was washed up on the sand, overcome too with heat. /30/

Yes then, after he got washed ashore /31/ he couldn't get up at all, /32/ for he was cold all over now, shaking all the way down to his tailfeathers. /33/

(We) will tell now (of the time) after the heron had been washed up on shore. /34/ Along came a crab, scuttling crabwise across the sand, /35/ looking around for food.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

/36/ Mr. Crab was very startled /37/ to see a heron sprawled there in the sand. /38/ Mr. Crab approached the heron. /39/ Then Mr. Crab questioned the heron. This is what he said: /40/

> *"Hey, Mr. Heron, what happened that you've ended up like this ? /41/ Because if you ask me it's not right for you to be here like this, it doesn't follow. You're big, and your wings are broad and strong. /43/ Moverover you can get around either on water or on land." /44/*

Yes, just so were the words of Mr.Crab to Mr.Heron. /45/. Then Mr.Heron answered. /46/ This was what he said, crying as he spoke: /47/

> *"Ah, Mr.Crab, what you say is not incorrect. /48/ In times past it was as you say. /49/ There were none who could defeat me whean I was at the height of my powers. /50/*
>
> *(But) you don't seem to remember the story from olden times /51/ about my ancestor, the one who has already become a deity.*[12] */52/*

Section B (descriptive sequence added as elaboration to Version 3)

Sandang becik pisan toyan segare-né, nènten dalem.
Makawinan kacingak biyas-é, /1b/
labak tegeh sakewèntenan sané mèntik ring sagare, /2b/
semalih sané tumbuh ring parangan-é katah sané nyatan, /3b/
ri antukan segara-né sampun nyat. /4b/
Sami ulam-é sekadi anak kesakitan, /5b/
ri antuk segara-né langkung dakèn, /6b/
katah pisan undang-é sané kandasan. /7b/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mawinan katah pisan ipun ma-punduh-punduh. /8b/
Seantukan toyan segara-né gelis pisan nyat, /9b/
i (y)udang kasèpan, /10b/
yan rasayang ipun sakit hati manggihin Ida Sang Pandawa
kasungkanan, ninggalin puri. /11b/

Semalih ombak segara-né sané nèmpuh batu parangan, /12b/
raris ngèncah, dados didih putih, /13b/
sekadi rupan sekar-é putih sané keanggen mebakti; /14b/
mawinan segara-né sekadi ngaturang bakti ring Ida Sang
Pandawa. /15b/

Semalih wènten yuyu ring tèngah song ipuné jejeh medal,
takut ipun ring i gerita. /16b/

Semalih ulam-é sané wènten ring toya-né dalem, 17b/
ri kala ipun ngetut pemargin ombak-é. /18b/
Duanin pemargin ipun-é bolak-balik - /19b/
yan upamiyang sekadi anak-é taruna ri kala ipun ngintip
anak bajang, /20b/
ri kala anaké bajang ka-tongos-in antuk mémé-bapan-
ipun. /21b/

Semalih katah pisan pènyu-né sané mawab, /22b/
sakéwanten tèndas ipun-é ka-panggih, /23b/
manawi ipun sarat pisan mangde /24b/
manggihin Sang Pandawa nandang sungkan ninggalin
puri. /25b/

Malih wènten ulam alit-alit, /26b/
katah pisan ipun makecos, /27b/
makelep putih, téjan ipun-é, /28b/
mawanan galang pisan antuk-e toyan segana-né. /29b/

Malih katah pisan yuyu-né sané mewaste sing-sing

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mapunduh-punduh, /30b/
manawi ipun nyantos-ang Sang Pandawa sedeng ka-sungkan-an /31b/
semalih batu-né kukuh, /32b/
nènten pisan ipu nyak makisid, /33b/
yadyastun ipun patempuh antuk ombak. /34b/

Taler ipun nènten makisid, /35b/
yan rasayang batu-né punike sekadi anak-é metape, /36b/
nènten jerih ring gagodan. /37b/

English:

Very beautiful were the waters of the sea, not deep at al; for the bottom could be seen, /1/ the rise and fall of all that lives in the sea could be seen. /2/ Moreover the many creatures that live on the reef who had been left stranded, /3/ for the water of the sea was fast drying up. /4/ the fish and shellfish looked like invalids or the bed-ridden, /5/ because the sea had become very shallow /6/ and many hung limply on the surface. /7/

So too many shrimp and shellfish had piled up there /8/ Because the tide moved out so quickly /9/ that Mr. Shrimp was late leaving /10/ as if he'd been sick at heart seeing the sad fate of the Pandavas, when they'd lost their kingdom. /11/

And the waves of the ocean, that were pounding on the reef /13/ then bursting into white foam /13/ were like the white flowers offered with reverence in the act of worship /14/ so it seemed the ocean offered up devotion to the pandavas. /15/

There was a crab too, at the mouth of its burrow, afraid to come out because of the (aggresive) 'gerita' crab. /16/ And the fish in deep water /17/ as they swam

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with the currents /18/ went this way and that (from the churning of the water); /19/ to make a comparison, they looked like a young bachelor when he's trying to peek in on a girl /20/ as she's being watched by her parents. /21/[13]

And there were many turtles whose breath was steaming /22/ for their heads had beem exposed (to air).[14] */23/ So it seemed that perhaps they felt deeply (sad) as well /24/ coming upon the Pandavas when they had lost of their kingdom. /25/*

There were also a multitutde of tiny fish leaping in the air. /27/ flashing silver-white, like light itself. /28/ So it seemed that the ocean shone brightly (from their lustre). /29/

There were also many 'sing-sing' crabs, spotted on their shells /30/ all piling up (like visitors to the court) as if they waited there for the Pandavas to arrive. /31/.

But the rocks sat firmly /32/ for they had no urge to move /33/ even as they were pounded by the waves. /34/ Yes, the rocks had no desire to move. /35/ If you think about it, the rocks seemed like they were carrying out holy vows of austerity and meditation /36/ for they were not moved by any temptation. /37/

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Notes to Satua Texts

[1] Satua Bali II.B. intro. *(Kata Pengantar)*, p. 2

[2] Because the *Satua Bali* series is currently available commercially, I have not reproduced here larger sections of the stories used as evidence in this thesis.

[3] These include especially paintings from the Puri Lukisan Museum in Ubud, including the following paintings on *Tantri* themes:

(1) No. 67/c/m (1936) by Ida Bagus Gegel of Kamasan (1900 - 1937): "Dharmaswami thanked by the monkey, tiger, and snake". [story 8 in the *Tantri Kāmandaka*, 11 in *Tantri Kaḍiri* and *Tantri Demung*]

(2) No. 361/c/m (1934) by Ida Bagus Kembeng: "Sambada and Nandaka listen to the advice of the Pendeta Basubaga".

(3) No. 437/c/m (1940) by I Keteg: "Pedanda Baka" [illustration of the Story of the Heron and Crab, story no. 5 in *TK*, *Tk* and *Td*]

(4) No. 59/c/m (1934) by I Pantera of Batuan (1900 - 1938): "The small animals overcome the elephant". [Story 15 in *TK*, 19 in *Tk*, 18 in *Td*]

[4] cf. Dipodjojo: 1983, pp. 3 - 4; The Javanese court poet *(pujangga)* Kyai Rangga Amongsastra lived and worked during the mid-seventeenth century.

[5] cf. Zoetmulder: 1974, p. 142 for a short summary of *macapat* meters; Hinzler: 1981, pp. 194 - 198 for Balinese *macapat* meters found in various recensions of the *Bima Swarga* story.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[6] Aneka No. 280 (1980): *Geguritan Sang Cangak* I - IV by I Nyoman Redé of Yeh Embang, Negara (West Bali).

[7] Ida Bagus Sudiyasa had also produced the beginnings of a draft for a *kekawin* version of the *Wana Parwa*. This must be one of the few attempts at *kekawin* atempted in the twentieth century, and deserves further study for that fact alone. I have examined and transcribed parts of this manuscript and can report that it is not without interest, in conforming to *mabasan* standards of interpretation of *kekawin* form, and very inventive in its details.

[8] Good examples of the use of *basa biasa* in *mabasan* glossing are often found in the case of *mabasan* versions of Rāma's admonitions to Bharata (RY III 52 - 68) and to Wibhisana (RY XXIV.42 - 52). Usually a skilled *pangartos* will choose the *beli-adi* ('older brother-younger brother') form of *biasa* useage in translating these passages.

[9] *Bungut lantang* 'long-beaked' puns on *mulut lantang* 'long-mouthed', 'a liar'.

[10] Satua I Cangak I.126 - 137:

> "Béh, kéné adi-né, jani suwé suba beli ngelamp(ah)in. Jani, jani mara jani beli mandel, saja, tekèn munyin satwa, tekèn tutur (en)to. Saja, sing luung anak-é buka ma-bungut lantang, Jani beli mandel. Nah, uli jani beli suud jaga mulut lantang. Nah, kéné ka-pala-n anak-é kéné, pikolih anak-é ma-bungut lantang. Buka beli jani nawangan(g). Aji jani tawang bawakan pungut-é."

[11] *Sedeng kereng-a* illustrates a use of the ergative marker *-a* in a modal construction that also has some of the characteristics of a Balinese superlative construction.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

These are formed in with lexical modifiers *paling* [B] and *pinih* [A] 'the most', combined with the addition of the marker *-a* to the word compared. This gives the idea that the thing compared is "treated as the most (x)', a meaning that is shared with Old Javanese constructions taking the Goal Focus form *pinaka*-R that yields forms like *pinaka-natha ring rāt* 'treated as, used as the Lord of this world'. (For a review of the role of the modal constructions like *sedeng iteh-a* see above, section 6.9.)

12 '*Become a deity*' translates Balinese *néwata*, an Actor Focus verb formed with the nasalization morphophoneme plus *déwata* 'a god, ancestor'. This verb is used of deceased kin for whom the full cycle of *pitra-yajña* rituals (= *śraddha* rites) has been performed, transforming the deceased from an unclean *pirata* buried in the *Pura Dalem* (Death Temple) into a purified ancestor, fit for worship in the *Pura Puseh* (Temple of Origins), or the house-temple to the ancestors (*sanggah kamulan* [B], *mrajan* [A]).

13 The idea is that his head bobs this way and that as he tries to meet the girl's eyes, but avoid the watchful looks of her parents.

14 In Balinese folk-lore the breath of turtles is said to steam when they are exposed too long to air.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a. Linguistic theory and Austronesian linguistics

Alieva, Natalia F.

1980. "The possessive syntactical type in the Malay language". *BKI*, 136-4:417 - 425. (Leiden: KITLV)

1983. "The Austronesian language-type features as revealed in Malay". In Halim et al (1983):35 - 41.

Anderson, S.R.

1977. "On mechanisms by which languages become ergative". In Li (1977):317-63.

Becker, Alton L.

1979. "The figure a sentence makes: an interpretation of a Classical Malay sentence. In Talmy Givon (1979):243 - 259.

1988. "On Glossing". Paper presented at the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society. (March, 1988).

Becker, A.L. and I Gusti Ngurah Oka

1977. "Person in Kawi: exploration of an elementary semantic dimension." *Oceanic Linguistics* 13 (1977):229 - 55.

Becker, A.L. and Thomas M. Hunter

1988. "Binding Wild Words: Cohesion in Old Javanese Prose". In Richard McGinn (1988): 475 - 492

Benjamin, Geoffrey

1988. "Grammar and Polity, the Cultural and Political Background to Standard Malay". Paper presented at

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

no. 105. Ochos Rios, Jamaica.

Bloomfield, Leonard

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

1933. *Language*. New York: Holt.

Blust, Robert

1981. (ed) *Linguistic Studies in Indonesian Languages and Languages in Indonesia, In Nusa* series, Vol. 10. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri Nusa, Universitas Atma Jaya.

Brandes, J. L. A.

1913. *Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden*. Batavia: Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap von Kunsten en Wetenschappen.

Brandstetter, Renward

1916a. (ed) *An Introductions to Indonesian Linguistics*. (Royal Asiatic Society Monograph Series, pp. 110- 113) London: Royal Asiatic Society.

1916b. "Common Indonesian and Original Indonesian". In Bradstetter: 1916a.

Bresnan, Joan and Mchombo, Sam A.

1987. "Topic, Pronoun, and Agreement in Chichewa". In *Language*, Vol. 63, no. 4: 741-782.

Brown, R. and A. Gilman

1960. "The Pronouns of Power and Stability". in T. A. Sebeok (1960): 253 - 276.

Cartier, Alice

1983. "Strategies of the definite/indefinite patient in passive sentences". In Halim et al (1983): 251-267.

Catford, Ian

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1975. "Ergativity in Caucasian Languages". *North Eastern Linguistic Society Papers* 6: 37-48.

Chung, Sandra

1976. "An Object-Creating Rule in Bahasa Indonesia". *Linguistic Inquiry* 7: 41 - 87.

1977. "On the gradual nature of syntactic change. In Li (1977): 3-55.

Chung, Sandra and Alan Timberlake

1985. "Tense, Aspect and Mood". In Timothy Shopen (1985): 202 - 259.

Cole, Peter and Jerrold

1977. (eds) *Grammatical Relations*. In *Syntax and Semantics* Vol. 8. New York: Academic Press.

Collins, James T.

1984. "Perubahan Sintaksis: Bentuk Milik Dialek Melayu Ambon". *Majalah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Comrie, Bernard

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

1981a. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1981b. "Aspect and Voice: some reflections on perfect and passive". In Philip J. Tedeschi and Annie Zaenen (1981): 65 - 78.

Dahl, Otto Christian

1976. *Proto-Austronesian*. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series 15. Lund/London: Studentlitteratur/Curzon Press.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dempwolff, Otto

1934 - 38. *Vergleichende lauflehre des Austronesischen Wortshatzes*. (3 vols), Berlin: Reimer.

Denes, I Madé et al

1985. *Geografi Dialek Bahasa Bali*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departmen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Dixon, R. M. W.

1972. (ed) *Grammatical Categories of Australian Languages*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

1979. "Ergativity". *Language*, Vol. 55. 1: 59 - 138.

Dyen, Isidore

1947. "The Tagalog Reflexes of Malayo-Polynesian D". *Language*, Vol. 23: 227 - 38.

van Eck, Rutger

1868. "Balische spreekworden en spreekwoordelijke uitdrukkingen". In *Tijdschrift Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*, 18: 170 - 188.

1874. *Beknopte Handleiding bij de Beofening van de Balineesche Taal*. Utrecht: Kemink.

Foley, William A. and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr.

1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gerdts, Donna B.

1988. "Antipassives and Causatives in Ilokano: Evidence for an Ergative Analysis". In Richard McGinn (1988): 295 - 322.

Ginarsa, Ketut et al

1984. *Kata Tugas Bahasa Bali*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departmen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Givon, Talmy

1979. (ed) *Discourse and Syntax*. New York: Academic Press

1983. "Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Linguistic Study". In *Typological Studies in Language* Vol. 3.

Greenberg, J. H., C. Ferguson, and E. Moravcsik

1978. (eds) *Universals of Human Language. Vol. 4: Syntax*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Halim, Amran with Lois Carrington and S. A. Wurm

1982. (ed) *Papers from the Third International the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, Vol. 2: *Tracking the Travellers*. In *Pacific Linguistics*, Series C, No. 77. Canberra: Australian National University.

Halle, Morris and G. N. Clements

1983. *Problem Book in Phonology*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Haudricourt, A. G.

1965. "Problems of Austronesian Comparative Philology". *Lingua* 14: 314 - 29.

Herrfurth, Hans

1982. "Satztypologische Übereinstimmungen Zwischen dem Alta-Jawanischen und Tagalischen". *Archiv Orientalni* 50: 296 - 308.

Hook, Peter E.

1982. "The English Abstrument and Rocking Case Relations. *CLS* 19: 183 - 190.

Hopper, Paul J.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1979. "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse" In *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 11: 213 - 241. New York: Academic Press.

Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson

1980 "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse". *Language*, Vol. 56 (2): 251 - 299.

Hunter, Thomas M.

1983. "Morphological Valence in Old Javanese". (typescript)

1988. "Kajian Ringkas Masalah Valensi Morfologi dalam Bahasa Jawa Kuno". *Linguistik Indonesia*, no. 10: 15-38. Jakarta: Indonesian Linguistic Society *(Masya- rakat Linguistik Indonesia)*

Jendra, I Wayan et al

1976. *Bahasa Bali dan variasi Dialektisnya.* Denpasar: Jurusan Sastra Jawa Kuno, Universitas Udayana.

1976 - 77. *Morfologi Bahasa Bali.* Denpasar: Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Udayana.

Joseph, B.

ca 1984. *Common Balinese and High Balinese.* (typescript). Sydney: University of Sydney Deparment of Indonesian and Malay Studies.

Kana, Marit

1983. "The Syntax and Semantics of Verbal Prefices in Bahasa Indonesia." In Halim et al (1983): 21-34.

Kaswanti Purwo, H. Bambang

1982. "Bahasa Indonesia dalam Kerangka Typologi Li dan Thompson". In Harimurtia Kridalaksana and Anton Moeliono: (1982) 1 - 18.

1983. "The verbal 'aspect': a case of the Indonesian

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

'passives'". in Halim et al (1983):239 - 250.

Kern, H.

1870 - 71. "Korte Opmerkingen over Balineesch en Kawi". *BKI* 17:210 - 213; 18:25 - 31, 77 - 92.

Kersten, J., S.V.D.

1948. *Balische Grammatica*. The Hague: Van Hoeve.

1970. *Tata Bahasa Bali*. Ende, Flores: Nusa Indah.

1984. *Kamus Bahasa Bali Lumrah dan Tata Bahasa Bali*. Ende, Flores: Nusa Indah.

Kridalaksana, Harimurti and Moeliono

1982. (eds) *Pelangi Bahasa: A Festschrift for J.W.M. Verhaar*. Jakarta: Bhratara Karya Aksara.

Kurylowicz, Jerzy

1972. "The Role of Deictic Elements in Linguistic Evolution". *Semiotica*, Vol.2:174 - 183.

Li, C.N.

1977. (ed) *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

MacDonald, R.Ross

1976. *Indonesian Reference Grammar*. Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.

Makkai, Valerie Becker

1972. *Phonological Theory: Evolution and Current Practice*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston.

Mardiwarsito, L. and Harimurti Kridalaksana

1984. *Struktur Bahasa Jawa Kuna*. Ende, Flores: Nusa Indah.

McGinn, Richard

1988. (ed) *Studies in Austronesian Languages*. Mono-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

graphs in International Studies No. 76. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Center for Southeast Asian Studies

McCune, Keith

1979. "Passive Function in the Indonesian Passive". *Oceanic Linguistics*, Vol. XVIII, no. 3: 119 - 165.

Milner, George P.

1973. "It is Aspect (not Voice) that is marked in Samoan". *Oceanic Linguistics* 12: 621 - 640.

Naylor, Pas Buenaventura

1975. "Topic, Focus, and emphasis in the Tagalog verbal clause". *Oceanic Linguistics* 14: 12 - 79.

1979. (ed) *Austronesian Studies: Papers from the second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages.* Michigan: CSSEAS.

Pike, Kenneth and Evelyn G. Pike

1977. *Grammatical Analysis*. Arlington, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Poedjosoedarmo, Gloria

1976. "Hipotese Perkembangan Sintaksis Bahasa Jawa". *Bahasa dan Sastra* 11.4: 2 - 22.

Ramos, Teresita

1971. *Tagalog Structures*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Robbins, R.H.

1959. "Nominal and Verbal Derivation in Sundanese". *Lingua* 8: 337 - 369.

Schachter, Paul

1977. "Reference-related and Role-related Properties of Subjects". in Cole and Saddock (1977): 279 - 306.

Soebardi, Sardjana Sastra

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1958. "Catatan Singkat Tentang Modalitet Dalam Bahasa Indonesia." *Bahasa dan Budaya* IV.2. (December 1955). Jakarta: Lembaga Bahasa dan Budaya, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Indonesia.

Schachter, Paul and Fe T. Otanes

1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sells, Peter

1985. *Lectures on Contemporary Syntactic Theories*. Stanford: CLS

Shopen, Timothy

1985. *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* Vol.III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silverstein, Michael

1976. "Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity". In R.M. W.Dixon (1976):112 - 71.

Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley and Lawrence A.Reid

1982. "The Evolution of Focus in Austronesian" in Amran Halim et al (1982), vol.2:145 - 170.

Tedeschi, Philip J. and Annie Zaenen

1981. *Tense and Aspect*. (*Syntax and Semantics* 14) New York: Academic Press.

Teeuw, A.

1959. "A History of the Malay Language". *BKI* 115.2:138 - 156.

1965. "Old Balinese and Comparative Indonesian Linguistics". *Lingua* 14:271 - 284.

van der Tuuk, H.N.

1971. *A Grammar of Toba Batak*. The Hague:Martinus

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Nijhoff. [translation by Jeune Scott Kemball of *Tobasche Spraachkunst*, Amsterdam, 1864 - 1867].

Uhlenbeck, E. M.

1978. *Studies in Javanese Morphology*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Verhaar, John W. M.

1988. "Syntactic Ergativity in Contemporary Indonesian". In McGinn (1988): 347 - 384.

de Vroom, J.

1872. "Masorsinggih: eenige verspreide aanteekeningen over het Bestaan en Gebruik van eene hooge en eene lage taal in het Balineesch. *TBG* 18: 310 - 327.

Wallace, Stephen

1976. "The Semantics of Verb Nasalization in Jakarta Malay". Winter Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Ward, J.

1973. "Phonology, Morphophonemics and the Dimensions of Variation in Spoken Balinese", Ph. D. dissertation Cornell University.

Warna, I Wayan et al

1983. *Tata Bahasa Bali*. Denpasar: Departmen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Winstedt, R. O.

1957. *Malay Grammar*. London: Oxford University Press (first published in 1927).

Wolff, John U.

1981. "Similarities Between Indonesian and Tagalog and Their Historical Basis". In Robert Blust (1981): 83 - 89.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Zoetmulder, P. J.

1950. *De Taal van het Adiparwa: Een Grammaticale Studie van het Oudjavaans*. Bandung: A. C. Nix.

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

1954. *Bahasa Parwa: Tata Bahasa Djawa Kuna*. (2 vols) Jakarta: Obor. [reprinted in 1961]

b. Dictionaries

Barber, C. Clyde

1982. *Balinese-English Dictionary*. (2 vols) Aberdeen: University of Aberdeeen Press.

Kersten, J., S. V. D.

1984. *Kamus Bahasa Bali Lumrah dan Tata Bahasa Bali*. Ende, Flores: Nusa Indah.

Mardiwarsito, L.

1979. *Kamus Jawa Kuno (Kawi) - Indonesia*. Ende, Flores: Nusa Indah.

Monier-Williams, Sir Monier

1963. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. (reprint of 1899 edition) Oxford.

Panitia Penyusun Kamus Bali-Indonesia

1979. *Kamus Bali Indonesia (KBI)*. Denpasar: Dinas Pengajaran Propinsi Daerah Tingkat I Bali.

Shadeg, N., S. V. D.

1977. *A Basic Balinese Vocabulary*. Denpasar: Dharma Bhakti Press.

van der Tuuk, H. N.

1897 - 1912. *Kawi-Balineesch-Nederlands Woordenboek*. (4 vols) Batavia.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Zoetmulder, P.J. with S.O. Robson

1982. *Old Javanese - English Dictionary* (2 vols). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

c. Inscriptional evidence

Aichele, S.W.

1942-43. "Die Altmalaiische Literatursprache und ihr Einfloes auf das Alt Javanische". *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* XXXIII (1942-3): 37-66.

Bosch, F.D.K.

1941. "Een Maleische inscriptie in het Buitenzorgsche, *BKI* (1941): 49-53.

de Casparis, J.G.

1956. *Prasasti Indonesia II: Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the the Century A.D.* Bandung: Masa Baru.

1975. *Indonesian Palaeography - A History of Writing in Indonesia from the Beginnings to ca. A.D. 1500.* Leiden/Köln: E.J. Brill.

Chatterjee, B.R.

1933. *India and Java.* Calcutta.

Coedès, G.

1932. "Le Inscripties Malaises de Śrivijaya". *Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme-Orient* 30 (1930): 29-80.

Goris, Rulof

1954. *Prasasti Bali: Inscripties voor Anak Wungsu.* Bandung: Masa Baru.

Irfan, Nia Kurnia Sholihat

1983. *Kerajaan Sriwijaya: Pusat Pemerintahan dan Per-*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

kembangannya. Jakarta: Girimukti Pasaka.

Kern, Hendrik

1913. "Inscriptie van Kota kapur". *BKI* 67.

Sarkar, Himansu Bhusan

1971 - 72. *Corpus Inscriptionem Javanicarum*. (2 vols) Calcutta: Firma Mukhopadhyay.

d. General

Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah

1975a. "Bentuk Hormat Dalam Masalah Pembakuan Bahasa Bali". In I Gusti Ngurah Bagus (1975b): 36 - 43.

1975b. (ed) *Masalah Pembakuan Bahasa Bali*. Singaraja: Balai Penelitian Bahasa, Departmen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Bandem, I Made and Frederick Eugene de Boer

1981. *Kaja and Kelod: Balinese Dance in Transition*. NY, London: Oxford University Press.

Bateson, Gregory

1949. "The value system of a steady state". In Meyer Fortes (1949): 33 - 53. [Reprinted in Bateson: 1972, pp. 107 - 127; also in Belo: 1970]

1972. *Steps to and Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.

1979. *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. New York: E. P. Dutton.

Bauman, Richard and Joel Sherzer

1974. *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Becker, A. L.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1979. "Text-Building, epistemology, and aesthetics in Javanese shadow theater. In A.L.Becker and Aram Yengoyan (1979):211 - 243.

Becker, A.L. and Aram Yengoyan

1979. (eds) *The Imagination of Reality: essays in Southeast Asian coherence systems*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Belo, Jane

1970. *Traditional Balinese Culture*. New York, N.Y: Columbia University Press.

Benjamin, Geoffrey

1987. "Notes on the Deep Sociology of Religion". National University of Singapore Working Papers No. 85. Singapore.

Bhadra, I Wayan

1937. "Het 'Mabasan' of de Boefening van het Oud-Javaansch op Bali. *Hededeelingen Kirtya Liefrinck van der Tuuk te Singaradja* no. 5.

Bloch, Maurice

1975. (ed) *Political Language and Oratory in Traditional Society*. London: Academic Press.

Bohtlingk, Otto

1870. *Indische Spruche*. St. Petersburg: Commissionare der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Boon, James

1977. *The Anthropological Romance of Bali*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1983. "Incest Recaptured: Some Contraries of Karma in Balinese Symbology". In Charles Keyes and E.Valentine Daniel (1983):185 - 222.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Coedes, G.

1968. *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia.* (ed. by Walter F. Vella, translated by Susan Brown Cowing) Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Cole, William

1983. "Balinese Food-Related Behavior: A Study of the Effects of Ecological, Economic, Soical and Cultural Processes on Rates of Change. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Washington.

Covarrubias, Miguel

1937. *Island of Bali.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf

Cowan, C.D. and Wolters, O.W.

1976. *Southeast Asian History and Historiography.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Deshpande, Madhav

1979. *Sociolinguistic Attitudes in India: an historical reconstruction.* Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Dipodjojo, Asdi S.

1983. *Cerita Binatang dan Beberapa Relief Pada Candi Sojiwan dan Mendut.* Yogyakarta: Lukman Offset.

Djafar, Hasan

1978. *Girīndrawarddhana, Beberapa Masalah Majapahit Akhir.* Jakarta: Jurusan Ilmu-ilmu Sejarah Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.

Dumont, Louis

1970. *Homo Hierarchicus: An Essay on the Caste System.* (translated by Mark Sainsbury). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Errington, Joseph J.

1982. "On the serat Kalatidha of Ranggawarsita".

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(typescript). New Haven: Yale University Dept. of Anthropology.

1985. "On the Nature of the Sociolinguistic Sign: Describing the Javanese Speech Levels". In E. Mertz and R. Parmentier (1985): 287 - 310.

1986 "Continuity and Change in Indonesian Language Development". *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. XLV, no. 2: 329 - 354.

Forge, Anthony

1978. *Balinese Traditional Paintings, A Selection from the Forge Collection of the Australian Museum*. Sydney: Australian National Museum.

Fortes, Meyer

1949. (ed) *Social Structures: Essays Presented to A.R. Radcliffe-Brown*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Friedrich, R. H. Th.

1876-78. "An Account of the Island of Bali". *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, nos. 8 (1976): 154-218, 9 (1877): 59-120, 10 (1878): 49-97. London.

Geertz, Clifford

1960. *The Religion of Java*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1973a. *The Interpretation of Culture*. New York: Basic Books.

1973b. "Person, Time, and Conduct in Bali". In C. Geertz (1973a): 360 - 411.

1980. *Negara: The Theater State in Bali*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Geertz, Hildred and Clifford Geertz

1975. *Kinship in Bali*. Chicago: Chicago University

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Press.

Hanna, Willard A.

1976. *Bali Profile.* New York: American Universities Field Staff.

Herbst, Ed

1981. "Intrinsic Aesthetics in Balinese Artistic and Spiritual Practice". *Journal of Asian Music*, XIII.1.

Hinzler, H.I.R.

1981. *Bhima Swarga in Balinese Wayang.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. (*VKI* 90)

Hobart, Mark

1975. "Orators and Patrons: Two Types of Political Leader in Balinese Village Society. In Maurice Bloch (1975):65 - 92.

Hooykaas, Christian

1929. *Tantri, de Middel-Javaansche Pancatantra-bewerking.* Ph.D. dissertation (Proefschrift), The University of Leiden. Leiden: A.Vros

1931. *Tantri Kāmandaka: Een Oudjavaansche Pantjatantra-Bewerking in Tekst en Vertaling Uitgegeven.* Bandoeng: Bibliotheca Javanica 2.

1955. "Bharata's Departure, a passage on Artha-śāstra in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kekawin". *Journal of the Oriental Institute.* Baroda, India.

1956. "Vibhīṣaṇa's succession in Leṅkā, a passage on Nīti-śāstra in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kekawin". *Journal of the Oriental Institute.* Baroda.

1956. "Kāmandakīya Nītisāra in Old Javanese". *Journal of the Greater India Society.* Calcutta.

1958. "The Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kekawin, an exemplary kekawin as to form and content".

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Amsterdam: VKAWL

1958. *The Lay of Jayaprana, the Balinese Uriah.* London: Luzac & Co.

1962. "Śaiva-siddhānta in Java and Bali". *BKI* 118.3: 309 - 327.

1963. "Books Made in Bali". *BKI* 119-4: 371 - 86.

1964a. "Weda and Śiṣya, Ṛṣi and Bhujangga in present-day Bali". *BKI* 120.2: 231 - 244.

1964b. *Agama Tirtha.* VKAWL Nieuwe Reeks 70 (4). ——

1966. *Surya-Sevana, the Way to God of a Balinese Śiva Priest.* VKAWL Nieuwe Reeks 72 (3).

1971. *Kāma and Kāla, Materials for the study of shadow theater in Bali.* VKAWL Niewe Reeks, vol. 79.

1973. *Balinese Bauddha Brahmans.* VKAWL Nieuwe Reeks, vil. 80.

1979. *Introduction a la Litterature Balinaise.* In *Cahier D'Archipel*, no. 8. Paris: Ehess.

Hooykaas, Jacoba

1959. "A Yantra of Speech Magic in Bali Folklore and Religion". *BKI* 115.2: 176 - 191.

Jendra, I Wayan et al

1979. *Kehidupan Mababasan di Kabupaten Badung.* Denpasar: Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Jawa Kuna, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Udayana.

de Joong, J. W.

1974. "Notes on the Sources and the Texts of the Sang Hyang Kamahāyānan Mantranaya". *BKI*, 120.4: 465 - 82.

Juynboll, H. H.

1906. *Adiparwa, Oudjavaansch Prosageschrift.* The

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Kale, M.R.

1976. *Hitopadeśa of Nāryaṇa*. Vārānasī: Motilal Banarsidas.

1982. (ed) *Pañcatantra of Viṣṇuśarman*. (first printed in 1912) Vārānasī: Motilal Banarsidas.

Keeler, Ward

1975. "Musical Encounters in Java and Bali". *Indonesia* 19:85 - 126. Ithaca: Cornell Modern Indonesia Project

Keenan, Elinor

1975. "A Sliding Sense of Obligatoriness: The Polystructure of Malagasy Oratory". In Bloch (1975):93 - 112.

Kern, H.

1900. *Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, Oudjavaansch heldendicht*. The Hague.

Keyes, Charles and Daniel E. Valentine

1983. *Karma: an anthropological inquiry*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Labov, William

1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lansing, J.S.

1976. *Evil in the Morning of the World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies.

Mardiwarsito, L.

1983. *Tantri Kāmandaka: naskah dan terjemahan dengan Glosarium*. Ende, Flores: Nusa Indah.

Marrison, G.E.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1987. "Modern Balinese - A Regional Literature of Indonesia". *BKI* 143-4:468 - 498.

Mertz, Elizabeth and Richard Parmentier

1985. (eds) *Semiotic Mediation and Sociocultural Perspectives*. New York: Academic Press.

Mishra, Jvālāprasād

1952. (ed) *Kāmandakīya-Nīti-sāraḥ*. (Sanskrit and Hindi in Devanagari script) Bombay: Bombay Steam Press.

Muljana, Slamet

1983. *Pemugaran Persada sejarah Leluhur Majapahit*. Jakarta: Inti Dayu Press.

van Naerssen, F. H.

1976. "Tribute to the God and Tribute to the King". In C. D. Cowan and O. W. Wolters (1976):296 - 303.

Padmapuspita, Ki J.

1979. *Candi Sukuh dan Kidung Sudamala: Komentar, Teks, dan Alih Bahasa*. Jakarta: Proyek Pengembangan Media Kebudayaan, Ditjen. Kebudayaan Departmen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Pigeaud, Theodore

1967 - 70. *Literature of Java - Catelogue Raissone of Javanese Manuscripts in the Library of the University of Leiden and other public collections in the Netherlands*, I - IV. Leiden: University Press.

Poedjosoedarmo, Soepomo

1968. "Javanese Speech Levels". *Indonesia*, Vol. 6: 54 - 82. Ithaca: Cornell University Modern Indonesian Project.

Poerbatjaraka, R. Ng.

1926. *Arjuna Wiwāha: Tekst en Vertaling*. *BKI* 82: 181 -

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

305.

1933. *Nītiśāstra: Oud-Javaansche Tekst met Vertaling Uitgegen.* (*Bibliotheca Javanica* no. 4). Bandung.

Raffles, Sir Thomas Stanford

1817. *The History of Java.* (2 vols) London.

Raghu Vira, Prof. Dr.

1956. *Svara-vyañjana: a Kawi-Balinese and Devanāgarī script-manual.* New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

Reid, Anthony and Lance Castles

1975. *Pre-colonial State Systems in Southeast Asia.* (Monograph Series No. 6) Kuala Lumpur: The Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Robson, S. O.

1971. *Wangbang Wideya: A Javanese Panji Romance.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

1972. "The Kawi Classics in Bali". *BKI* 128.

Sharada Rani

1957. *Ślokāntara: and Old javanese didactic text.* New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

Soebadio, Haryati

1971. *Jñānasiddhānta.* (*Bibliotheca Indonesica* series , no. 7) The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Soewito Santosa

1980. *Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin.* (*Śāta-pitaka Series*, no. 251) New Delhi: International Institute for Indian Culture.

Stutterheim, W. F.

1935. "Indian Influences in Old Balinese Art". London: The India Society.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sternbach, Ludwik

1969. *The Spreading of Cāṇakya's aphorisms over 'Greater India'*. Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Book Agency.

1974. *Subhāṣitā, gnomic, and didactic literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.

Sweeney, Amin

1980. *Authors and Audiences in Traditional Malay Literature*. University of California Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies Monograph Series, no.20) Berkeley: CSSEAS .

Swellengrebel, J.L.

1936. *Korawāśrama: Een Oudjavaans gedicht*. Groningen.

1960 (ed) *Bali: Studies in Life, Thought, and Ritual*. The Hague and Bandung: W. van Hoeve

1969. (ed) *Bali: Further Studies in Life, Thought, and Ritual*. The Hague: W. van Hoeve

Teeuw, A.

1950. *Hariwaṅśa*. (2 vols) The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

1967 - 1979. *Modern Indonesian Literature*. In *KITLV* Translation Series 10, 11. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

1983a. *Membaca dan Menilai Sastra*. Jakarta: Gramedia.

1983b. "Studi dan Penelitian Bahasa dan Sastra Jawa Kuno di Jaman Modern". In A.Teeuw (1983a):75 - 91.

Tisna, I Gusti Nyoman Panji

1935. *Ni Rawit, Tjeti Pendjoeal Orang*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Venkatasubbiah, A.

1928a. "The Pañcatantra of Durgasiṃha". *Zeitschrift*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

für Indologie und Iranistik, no. 6.

1928b. "Pañcatantra Studies". *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*. (1928, Vol.4).

Vickers, A.

1984. "Ritual and Representation in Nineteenth Century Bali". *Review of Indonesian and Malay Affairs (RIMA)*, Vol.18: 1 - 64.

Wallis, Richard H.

1980. "The Voice as a Mode of Cultural Expression in Bali". Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan.

Wulff, K.

1935. *Sang Hyang Kamahāyānan Mantrānaya. Ansprache bei der Weihe buddhistischer Mönche aus dem altjavanischen übersetzt und sprachlich erläutert*. Kobenhaven.

Worsley, P.J.

1972. *Babad Buleleng: A Balinese Dynastic Genealogy*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

1984. "E71468". *RIMA*, Vol.18:65 - 109.

Young, Elizabeth

1980. "Topeng in Bali: Change and Continuity in a Traditional Dramatic Genre. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, San Diego.

de Zoete, Beryl and Walter Spies

1938. *Dance and Drama in Bali*. London: Faber [Reprinted 1952, 1973, London: Oxford University Press].

Zoetmulder, P.J.

1974. *Kalangwan, a Survey of Old Javanese Literature*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Zurbuchen, Mary Sabina

1981. *The Shadow Theater of Bali: explorations in*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

language and text. Ph.D. dissertaton, The University of Michigan. (revised and reprinted as Zurbuchen: 1987)

1987. *The Shadow Theater of Bali*. Princton: Princeton University Press.

e. books published in Bali

Agastia, Ida Bagus

1982. *Sastra Jawa Kuna dan Kita*. Denpasar: Wyāsa Sanggraha.

Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah

1979. *Ni Dyah Tantri*. (translation into Indonesian of I Made Pasek: 1976) Denpasar: Departmen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Pugeh, I Gede Nyoman and I Dewa Made Seregeg

ca. 1984. *Kekawin Arjuna-Wiwāha*. Tabanan: Santi "Widya-Satya" Veteran.

Pasek, I Made

1976. *Ni Dyah Tantri*. (Balinese script) Denpasar: Parisada Hindu Dharma

Santi "Widya-Satya" Veteran

ca. 1984. *Kekawin Rāmāyaṇa*. (Balinese script). Tabanan: Wiya-Satya

Satua Bali

1979. *Satua Bali*, Jilid IA - IIIB. (Balinese language, Roman script) Denpasar: Team Penyusun Buku-buku Sub. Bidang Satua Bali, Pemda Bali.

Simpen, W.

1972. *Purwa Akṣara, pelajaran huruf Bali untuk murid S.D.* Denpasar: Bali Post.

1982. *Basita Parihasa*. (Balinese language, Roman

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

script) Denpasar: Mabhakti.

Sudiyasa, Ida Bagus Ketut

1985. *Geguritan Pañca Satua.* (unpublished manuscript in Balinese script; used by permission of the author). Sanur: Geriya Taman delod marggi.

Sugriwa, I Gusti Bagus

1978. *Penuntun Pelajaran Kekawin.* Denpasar: Proyek Sasana Budaya Bali.

Sukrata, Ketut

1981. *Tuñjung Mekar: Bacaan Bali Huruf Bali.* (Balinese script). Denpasar: Pt. Mabhakti.

Tista, I Gusti Ayu et. al

1982. *Titi Basa Bali,* Jilid I - II. (Balinese language, Roman script). Denpasar: Mabhakti

Tonjaya, I Nyoman Gede Bandesa K.

1983. *Kanda Pat Sari.* (Balinese language, Roman script). Denpasar: Ria Bookstore.

f. Manuscripts

Aji Gurnita. Kirtya no. 2390, romanized copy by I Wayan Mendra.

B(h)agawan Kamandaka. Kodex Museum Bali, no. 1862, romanized copy of a lontar in the Kirtya collection.

B(h)agawan Kamandaka. Kodex Museum Bali, no. 11c. 155/2, romanized copy of a lontar in the Kirtya collection.

Geguritan Pañca Puspita. Kirtya Z 3308, romanized copy of a lontar obtained from I Gusti Bagus Kuta of Jero Celuknegara, Amlapura (Karang Asem district).

Geguritan Tantri Kamandaka. Kirtya Z 3027, romanized copy of a lontar obtained from I Gusti Gede Taman, Jero

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Selat (same content as *Peparikan Tantri* below).

Peparikan Tantri. Kirtya Z 3530, romanized copy of a lontar obtained from I Dewa Made Oka of Jero Selat (Karang Asem district).

Sutasoma Kekawin. Kirtya 114 (romanized copy).

Tantri Kāmandaka. Kirtya Z 3479, romanized copy by I Gusti Ngurah Ketut Sangka from a lontar obtained from Ni Ketut Menuh of Jadi, Tabanan district.

Tantri Demung. Kirtya Z 3529, romanized copy by Sagung Putri from a lontar obtained from Ni Ketut Menuh of Jadi, Tabanan district. (collected by I Gusti Ngurah Ketut Sangka).

Abbreviations Used in the Bibliography

BKI	*Bijdragen tot de taal-, land, en Volkenkunde*, KITLV.
CLS	Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University
CSSEAS	Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies
KITLV	Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, Leiden.
TBG	*Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.
VKAWL	Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde.
VKI	Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Abbreviations Used in the Text and Footnotes

Ad	*Ādiparwa* (Juynboll: 1906)
AW	*Arjuna Wiwāha* (Poerbatjaraka: 1926)
BP	*Bahasa Parwa* (Zoetmulder and Poedjawijatna: 1954)
HW	*Hariwaṅśa* (Teeuw: 1950)
JñS	*Jñānasiddhānta* (Soebadio: 1971)
Kor	*Korawāśrama* (Swellengrebel: 1936)
OJO	*Oudjavaansche Oorkonden* (Brandes: 1913)
PB	*Prasasti Bali* (Goris: 1954)
PI	*Prasasti Indonesia* (de Casparis: 1956)
RY	*Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin* (Kern: 1900)
Sut	*Sutasoma* (Kirtya No. 114)
TBB	*Tata Bahasa Bali* (Kersten: 1984)
TK	*Tantri Kāmandaka* (Hooykaas: 1929)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.