

# On Old-Javanese Sentence Structure<sup>1</sup>

by J. Gonda,  
Utrecht

One of the difficulties with which the student of Old-Javanese syntax is confronted concerns sentence connection. It has often been observed that cases of subordination are comparatively few, that the coherence between the different syntactic groups which constitute the utterance is rather loose, that the conjunctions are often ambiguous. Editors, for instance H. H. Juynboll in his *Ādiparwa*, have not always adopted a consistent system of punctuation, betraying their doubt and uncertainty with regard to the length of the clauses and sentences and their mutual relations. The punctuation marks occurring in the manuscripts have not rarely been neglected or arbitrarily modified, because they did not appear to give the sense required by a modern interpretation. Some editors obviously were at a loss to account for part of the practical difficulties, because the syntax of Old-Javanese does not conform to what they considered to be a logically founded syntax, or to what in the reminiscences they had of Latin, Dutch or English syntax, ought to be a correct expression of thought and a well-considered succession of clauses and sentences. Others overlooking the fact that these very terms may be dangerous, because we traditionally associate more or less fixed interpretations with them, add to the confusion by omitting to define these terms when applied to Indonesian idioms, or they blur out real distinctions by using one and the same term, for instance sentence, for any word group containing a predicate.

As an example of arbitrary and unsatisfactory punctuation some lines, chosen at random, may be quoted from Purbatjaraka's edition of the *Calon Arang*<sup>2</sup>, p. 117, l. 1—4: *anuli ta ya lumampah sang putri kinen umulih, kasurupan sang hyang prabhangkara ta tēka nireng Lēmah-tulis; pinituturan ta ya sarātri sang Wedawatī de sang munindra, laku mareng kayogyan. Mamintuhu ta sang Wedawatī ring ling sang mahāmuni*. I must confess that I fail to see why there is a comma after *umulih*, a semicolon after *Lēmah-tulis*, and a full-stop after *kayogyan*. The editor might perhaps answer that the connection between unit I and unit II is more intimate than those between II and III or III and IV, that there is a more marked separation to be indicated between II and III, and that there is complete separation between III and IV, but this is by no means obvious. If the contents of the

---

<sup>1</sup> This contribution is written in English for the sake of Asian and American readers.

<sup>2</sup> *Calon Arang, Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 82 (1926), p. 115 ff.

communication are considered each unit relates a different stage in the narrative. The scene of unit I is laid in the crematory: "then the girl had to come home with (him)". Unit II relates the arrival in the evening: "when she arrived the sun had already set". Neither the march itself nor the events following the arrival are mentioned. Unit III dwells on the way in which they spent the night: "the holy man taught her". Unit IV relates that this instruction was successful: the girl was obedient. These four different stages in the narrative which do not follow each other in immediate succession are related by means of four separate sentences, each of them being from the grammatical point of view complete. There does not seem room for the contention that any of these four units occurs as part of a larger form or unit, that it may be said to be in included position<sup>3</sup>. They are independent linguistic forms, not included by virtue of any grammatical construction in any larger linguistic form. They may therefore in a printed text be separated by full-stops or semicolons: the choice will largely depend on the ideas fostered by the editor with regard to the best way of delivering and reciting the narrative in general and this passage in particular.

An example of the inconsiderate use of technical terms was unwittingly furnished by I. Dyen<sup>4</sup>. In discussing some Old-Javanese utterances quoted in my 'Sanskrit in Indonesia'<sup>5</sup>, viz. *matapaa wiprāya sang Ambilikāsuta*, and *mahārāja Dhṛtarāṣṭra mwang dewī Gāndhārī, malungguh pwa ri dampa sphaṭjika, ingastuti de sang Pāṇḍawa* it is his implicit contention that one term suffices to characterize the first utterance as well as the second: the constituents of the latter as well as the latter considered as a whole; and this term must be, he says, 'sentence'. Now there is no objection to calling both *matapaa* — *Ambilikāsuta* and *mahārāja* — *Pāṇḍawa* sentences, but does this terminology help us in describing the differences between these two utterances or in determining the differences between the constituents of the latter utterance and this utterance taken as a whole? Quoting the examples given in Sanskrit in Indonesia incompletely he expresses with regard to *matapaa* — *Ambilikāsuta* his preference for 'sentence', but he does not say what is the character of the constituents of the second utterance. Now, it is well known that in any utterance a linguistic form may appear either as a constituent of some larger form, or as an independent form. The words *matapaa* — *Ambilikāsuta* may appear in absolute position, i. e. as an independent unit (or 'sentence'): they may also occur in included position, i. e. as a constituent of a larger form. Is it not confusing and annoying to call the five words *mah. Dh. m. d. G.* and the five words *mal. p. r. ḍ. s.* also sentences as seems to be Dyen's opinion? In another publication<sup>6</sup> I suggested introducing the Greek term colon "member" which has the advantage of being practically unknown to almost all students of Indonesian languages. The

<sup>3</sup> For this term see L. Bloomfield, *Language*, London 1933, p. 170.

<sup>4</sup> I. Dyen in *Journal Amer. Or. Soc.* 76 (1956), p. 55.

<sup>5</sup> J. Gonda, *Sanskrit in Indonesia*, Nagpur 1952, p. 388.

<sup>6</sup> *Opmerkingen over Oud-Javaanse zinsleer*, *Bijdragen* 105, p. 25 ff.

English term clause<sup>7</sup> — if defined so as to suit the Old-Javanese idiom<sup>8</sup> — might also serve: in *when the sun set he went home*, the last three words are like the preceding four a clause; in *he went home* this clause is a sentence.

Such distinctions are however purposeless if they do not correspond to linguistic reality. That is to say: there must be criteria judged by which at least part of the cola (or clauses) are no sentences, though in other cases both concepts may be identical. Whether an utterance consists of one or more than one sentence depends on its containing linguistic forms which are, or are not, by any meaningful conventional grammatical arrangement united into a larger form<sup>9</sup>. The above passage Calon Arang, p. 117, l. 1—4 is composed of four sentences, because, whatever connection there may be between the thoughts expressed in each of them, there is no 'construction', no grammatical arrangement uniting them into one larger form. The syntactic group *kanya sĕdĕng papangkas* occurring p. 115. l. 7 is on the other hand no sentence, but a 'colon', because it is in included position; it is an apposition to a proper name: "a girl of a definite age". This word group and the preceding are welded into a larger unit because of grammatical peculiarities of the second member, in casu, because of the complete absence of any expression of, or reference to, a subject and predicate of its own. In a comparable way the utterance C. A., p. 138, l. 1—2 *lumampah ta sang mahāsānta Bharadaḥ mareng Bantĕn datĕngĕng āsrama Sukti* is one sentence, the syntactic group *datĕngĕng āsrama Sukti* being no sentence by itself, because of the absence of a subject and of the -a form *datĕnga*, which in this position indicates grammatical dependence (subordination). That, after a verb of speaking it might have another function is not relevant.

It will therefore be a task for researchers in this particular field to establish as completely as possible the criteria by which to distinguish between sentences and constituents of sentences. It is self-evident that this is a point of outstanding interest, not only for linguists, but also for philologists (e. g. for editors of texts), and translators. Whereas Purbatjaraka, for instance, omits any punctuation mark before the above *datĕnga* he places, on the same page, l. 18, a comma in a similar case (before *titihana*): *dadi*

<sup>7</sup> Dutch grammarians may envy their English colleagues this term; whereas in English a subordinate clause is distinguished from a sentence, Dutch grammar speaks of *bijzin*, *hoofdzin* or *zin* in general.

<sup>8</sup> In Old-Javanese various elements of a sentence, for instance an expanded nominal group — compare the above *mah. Dh. m. d. G.* —, temporal adjuncts etc., to which the English term clause is not applicable are as constituents of a sentence, of the same rank as clauses proper, which have a subject and predicate of their own. See also *Opmerkingen over Oud-Javaanse zinsleer*, *Bijdragen Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 105, p. 25 ff., esp. p. 31 f.

<sup>9</sup> The operational definition of 'sentence' proposed by A. Meillet — "la phrase peut-être définie: un ensemble d'articulations liées entre elles par des rapports grammaticaux et qui, ne dépendant grammaticalement d'aucun autre ensemble, se suffisent à elles-mêmes" (Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes<sup>8</sup>, Paris 1937, p. 355) has in a slightly modified form — "a sentence is a grammatical form which is not in construction with any other grammatical form" (see e. g. Ch. F. Hockett, *A course in modern linguistics*, New York 1958, p. 199) — been almost generally accepted in practice.

hana rwan ikang kalangcang ngkaneng kikisik, yeka ta kambangakēna ing samudra, titihana denira sang mahāmuni Bharadah, proceeding the other way about in his translation (p. 172). It would be better, first to punctuate both passages in the same way — or, if such might be preferred, to omit punctuating in both cases —, and in the second place, to divide the cola *dadi—kikisik* and *yeka—samudra* by another mark than the latter and *titihana—Bharadah*, because the division of the utterance beginning with *yeka ta* is marked, by these very words, as being in absolute position. Similar instances of inconsistent punctuation may be encountered in many editions of Old-Javanese texts.

The same distinction between linguistic forms in included and in absolute position may be made in the case of longer and more complex utterances. That it is also of no little consequence for the interpretation of the text may appear from Calon Arang, p. 139, l. 5ff. . . . *palibhayanira mahyun anēda suka nira sang jatiwara, dening śiṣya ning pantēnbhayanira . . . , maputra pwa ya kalih siki* (the punctuation is that of the printed text). These words were translated as follows (p. 173): "dat ik uw goedvinden verlang te krijgen en wel naar aanleiding hiervan, dat mijn leerling . . . twee zoons heeft". This communication is in the Dutch translation not very intelligible. Now the last division of the utterance is not marked off as a dependent clause by any primary grammatical construction. It is complete in itself. Moreover, the word group *pwa ya* does not, if appearances are not deceptive, occur in this work in the construction which would require the above translation. The translation must be: "I want to have your approval, on account of my pupil . . . : he has two sons", the text continuing "one of these will be king of Bali, the other . . .".

Another difficulty in translating concerns the difference in predilection for paratactic or hypotactic sentence connection in the two languages. Whereas the written Western languages under the influence of classical Latin — which was itself largely modelled upon the tradition of the great Greek rhetors and authors since the days of Gorgias ( $\pm$  425 B. C.)<sup>10</sup> — have a marked preference for complex sentence structures and hypotactic connections, archaic, popular, naive and non-literate usage, children's speech, colloquial language, oral tradition and literature, in short all speech that is not produced under the influence of a certain intellectual schooling and a long and intensive 'grammatical culture'<sup>11</sup> is in general decidedly inclined to parataxis.

<sup>10</sup> For Latin influence on European syntax see the interesting relative articles in the recent publication *The classical pattern of modern western civilization*, Language (= vol. V of the *Acta congressus Madvigiani, Hafniae MDMLIV*), Copenhagen 1957.

<sup>11</sup> I deliberately avoid using the comprehensive term 'primitive speech' which seems to give rise to endless misunderstandings, irritating those who falsely ascribed to it a political sense or (like Dyen, o. c.) wrongly consider it a pejorative, arguing a dangerous intellectual haughtiness of those who dare to use it, and puzzling those who (like recently P. Thieme, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 2, p. 223) obviously are not acquainted with the relevant literature in the fields of cultural anthropology, general linguistics and the comparative study of the history of

Not any succession of (main) sentences is parataxis<sup>12</sup>. *It's a hot day, I should not mind a glass of beer* is not necessarily a case of parataxis. It is parataxis if these two units are practically connected and if this connection is grammatically expressed. Students of ancient and 'exotic' languages studying written texts are however prone to forget that these connections are far from being always indicated by separate words. Here the use of secondary phonemes, modulation or what is called by Havers<sup>13</sup> 'indirekte Ausdrucksmittel', plays an important part. In many languages secondary phonemes of pitch or, more generally, accentuation mark the end of sentences and distinguish statements, interrogations, exclamations etc. It is this use of secondary phonemes — intonation, stress, pauses, rhythm, tempo, inflection of voice, etc., in short all variations in pronouncing the meaningful sound combinations which constitute words, clauses and sentences, — which also makes possible those paratactic constructions in which two linguistic forms (units) are not united by words. If someone says, in English, *It's a hot day. I should not mind a glass of beer* with the final falling pitch of a statement on *beer* he has spoken two unconnected sentences, but if this final pitch is replaced by a pause-pitch the two linguistic forms are united into a paratactic construction with only one sentence pitch. Parataxis may therefore be said to occur if in a succession of otherwise independent parts of the utterance<sup>14</sup> there is no modulatory sentence end.

Authors of grammars of exotic languages and of 'non-literary' idioms in observing that these forms of human expression are often comparatively poor in conjunctions, sometimes state that the constituents of a compound sentence follow each other unconnected or without the use of conjunctions, but they do not always explain from what they infer that the structures about

---

in other publications: I reject any assumption of a radical difference between religions. To repeat once more what I have — almost *ad nauseam* — observed 'primitive' and 'civilized' mentality, between language and speech habits of the primitives and those of 'educated people'; I use the term 'primitive' and 'synonyms' such as 'pre-scientific' exclusively in the scientific and technical sense given to it for instance by the late Dutch professor of the History of Religions G. van der Leeuw (see especially *L'homme primitif et la religion*, Paris 1940) who did not tire of arguing that 'primitiveness' — as contrasted with modernity — is not, or not primarily, a chronological distinction, but a difference in 'anthropological structure'; although elements of primitiveness may predominate in archaic man, in children, in poets, in the 'uneducated' of all times and countries, civilized and educated Western people are by no means free from it: see e. g. also F. Boas, *Primitive Art*, New York 1955. For the influence of 'primitive thought' on language one might consult the well-known *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax* by W. Havers (Heidelberg 1931), *passim* (for a succinct and now partly antiquated bibliography: p. 217).

<sup>12</sup> The definitions given of this grammatical concept are not rarely far from perfect: "use or arrangement of successive clauses etc. without connecting words" (H. C. Wyld, *The Universal Dictionary of the English Language*<sup>9</sup>, London 1946, p. 829); "procédé qui consiste à disposer côte à côte deux propositions . . . sans marquer le rapport de dépendance qui les unit" (J. Marouzeau, *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique*, Paris 1933, p. 135 f.).

<sup>13</sup> Havers, *o. c.*, p. 145.

<sup>14</sup> i. e. linguistic forms in absolute position or constitutes which are not constituents (Hockett).

which they write really are compound sentences<sup>15</sup>. Phenomena of modulation are too often — and in grammars of Indonesian languages almost always<sup>16</sup> — left out of consideration or completely misunderstood<sup>17</sup>. Western intellectuals, being trained in the use of hypotactic structures, are often apt to *misinterpret the conjunctions of predominantly paratactic idioms, to misunderstand their modulatory devices, to regard as hypotaxis what actually is parataxis*. They are prone to forget that, also in their own colloquial usage, logical relations between the units of the utterance are often indicated only by modulation, context and situation.

That is not to contend that in translating into idiomatic German, Dutch, or English we should slavishly follow the peculiarities of the original. What is however indispensable is a correct insight into the sentence structure and the principles of sentence connection of the foreign language and a knowledge of the differences between that language and one's mother tongue into which the foreign text is to be translated<sup>18</sup>.

It seems therefore convenient in the first place consistently to distinguish between asyndetic parataxis, dispensing with 'conjunctions' and syndetic parataxis, characterized by the use of conjunctions. Being favourite in the often animated and emotional colloquial language asyndetic parataxis — which has, in a great variety of languages, often found its way into written documents — can do without explicit indications of logical relations. These relations are various: in the Homeric X 393 ἠράμεθα μέγα κῦδος: ἐπέφρομεν

---

<sup>15</sup> See e. g. D. Westermann, *Grammatik der Ewe-Sprache*, Berlin 1907, p. 106. "Schon in par. 150 ff. ist gezeigt worden, daß die Verba, und somit auch die Sätze, sehr gern unverbunden nebeneinander gestellt werden; Bindewörter werden also seltener gebraucht als im Deutschen". Compare also S. J. Esser, *Klank-en vorm-leer van het Morisch*, Bandung 1933, p. 266; N. Adriani, *Spraakkunst der Bare'e taal*, Bandung 1931, p. 398; B. F. Matthes, *Makassaarsche Spraakkunst*, Amsterdam 1858, p. 127; P. Drabbe, *Spraakkunst van de Kamoro-taal*, 's-Gravenhage 1953, p. 78. Or the statement is made that our conjunctions are "left untranslated" (cf. e. g. A. Dirr, *Gramm. der annamitischen Sprache*, Wien, p. 27).

<sup>16</sup> Exceptions are: H. Costenoble, *Die Chamoro Sprache*, 's-Gravenhage 1940, p. 516 ff.; J. C. Anceaux, *The Wolio language*, 's-Gravenhage 1952, p. 51 ff. according to whom the pitch of the last vowel of a sentence, when being as high as the pitch of the second last vowel and then falling slightly indicates that "a further sentence is to follow".

<sup>17</sup> For instance: in saying that there are in the mainly paratactic Kpelle 'Ansätze' to mark subordinate clauses — he means that there are phenomena of modulation marking the occurrence of paratactic units — D. Westermann, *Die Kpelle, ein Negerstamm in Liberia*, Göttingen-Leipzig 1921, p. 168 overlooks the difference between parataxis and subordination.

<sup>18</sup> It is in the eyes of many scholars an axiom that parataxis was the original form of expression (see e. g. B. Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax der indogermanischen Sprache*, III, Straßburg 1900, p. 412, and L. R. Palmer, *The Latin language*, London 1954, p. 328 "in the primitive state [this use of the term primitive is not mine, J. G.] separate utterances were simply juxtaposed without explicit indication of their logical relationship"). This is one of those undiscussable contentions about a primitive state of affairs which only add to the confusion of thought. The view of the speech habits of the ancient Indonesians wrongly imputed to me by Dyen (o. c.) — "when the Indians came to the East Indies they found peoples who, being uneducated, mostly talked in cola, but who might by inadvertence or other chance slip out and speak a sentence" — is mere nonsense.

"Ἐκτορα δῖον a motive is implied: "we have won us great glory; we have slain the divine Hector"; in translating the Latin sentence Plaut. Merc. 770 *cras petito, dabitur* we are tempted to insert "then": "come for it to-morrow: you'll get it"; in Plaut. Asin. 874 *fundum alienum arat, incultum familiarem deserit* "he makes it his business to plough other people's fields, < but > leaves his own uncultivated (or: leaving his own . . .)". It may safely be assumed that a large number of Old-Javanese passages come under this heading: cf. e. g. Korawāśrama, p. 92, 8 S. *ya kita anêngkana, pinet pwa ya* "thou art therein < and therefore > people try to get it"; 102, 15 *mami añjaluk pēhanya, tanpaweh pwa ya* "I asked for the milk, < but > he did not give it". Direct speech is, in colloquial and vivid language, often asyndetically inserted in the utterance, even if the *verbum dicendi* is omitted: C. A. p. 135, l. 28 *hana pawēkas mami iri kita: 'haywa tan wilaseng kasyasih'* "there is something I would like to enjoin on you: 'take pity on the miserable'"; compare, in Dutch: *hé daar, 'wat heeft dat te betekenen'?*; in Latin, Plaut. Bacch. 816 *responde: 'quin me vendit'* "answer me 'who is selling me?'", and Śri Tañjung 6, 15 *marma ningsun tēka đewek 'muliha ring rama ningsun'* "the motive of my coming alone: 'I will return to my mother'". Compare also instances such as Kor. p. 134, l. 31 *mangkana pwa ya: sang K. dalamakan ing suku* "like this: K. in the foot-soles". Words which predominantly act as 'affect-bearers', such as interjections, and also formulas of politeness, affirmative formulas etc. usually join other clauses in this way: Cicero, Epist. ad Att. 8, 3, 5 *age iam, cum patre an sine eo?*; Kor. p. 42, l. 31 *sangtabya si aji, uwa aji de pinakenghulun, mami awaraha . . .*

Sometimes a special order of words may lead us to consider a set of sentences to constitute a case of asyndetic parataxis. Thus C. A. p. 136, X, l. 20 *mahyūn adēgakēneng nusantara sasiki, sasiki mangadēgeng Jawadwipa* "he wanted one of them to be made king in the Archipelago, the other to rule Java", where the chiasmus while contrasting by the immediate succession of the corresponding and identical intermediate terms the two persons who are the subject of the communication, could be replaced by a paratactic or hypotactic conjunction. This procedure, which is no doubt characterized by a special modulation, indicating that the former *sasiki* is not in final position, is widespread: Cicero, Rep. 2, 33 *matrem habemus, ignoramus patrem*; August. Conf. 1, 6 *quia illae intus erant, foris autem illi*.

Calon Arang p. 136, X, l. 15 is a fine instance of a tricolon abundans, a set of three parallel units the last of which is — in accordance with the tendency to increasing magnitude<sup>19</sup> — the longest: *lanđuh ikang hudan, dadi ikang lahun, amurah kang sarwa tinađah* "rain was abundant, the harvest was successful, all sorts of victuals were cheap". It may safely be assumed that these three cola constitute one single sentence: compare the modulation of parallel structures in living languages: Shakespeare, K. Lear 2, 4 *but yet thou*

<sup>19</sup> See O. Behaghel, *Indogerm. Forschungen* 25 (1909), p. 111 ff.; Havers, *Handbuch*, p. 178; 262; E. Lindholm, *Stilistische Studien zur Erweiterung der Satzglieder im Lateinischen*, Thesis Lund 1931.

*art my flesh, my blood, my daughter*; Duhamel, *Entretiens*, p. 122 *de passer à vos yeux pour un niais, pour une 'bellure', pour une tendre betterave*<sup>20</sup>.

A succession of rather short cola exhibiting anaphoric repetition may likewise be regarded as a case of asyndetic parataxis: C. A., p. 122, l. 2 *śawa haneng setra tumpuk, lyan haneng tĕgal, lyan haneng lebuĥ, waneĥ lungkrah haneng weśmánya* "dead bodies lay in heaps in the cemeteries, others on the fields, others in the squares, others decomposed in the houses". Like the first *sasiki* in the above example, the first and second words for "others" keep the audience in suspense and this suspense was in all probability reflected in the modulation of the sentence. A similar effect may be achieved by epiphoric repetition: Kor. p. 86, l. 12 *wus wulangun pwa kita, atinggal kahyangan pwa kita, . . .* "gij zijt verbijsterd geweest (en) hebt het godenverblijf verlaten . . ." (Swellengrebel).

Two as a rule short sentences expressing the same or a similar thought in a positive and negative way are often paratactically placed one after the other, the well known  $\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\tau' \acute{\alpha}\rho\sigma\iota\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\nu$  of the ancient Greeks<sup>21</sup>. Thus we find, in the *Iliad*, A 416  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\ \nu\acute{\upsilon}\ \tau\omicron\iota\ \alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\alpha\ \mu\acute{\iota}\nu\upsilon\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\epsilon\rho\ \omicron\upsilon\ \tau\iota\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\ \delta\eta\nu$  "seeing your span of life is brief <and> does not endure long"; I 70  $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\omicron\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\zeta$  "this were right, not unseemly for you"; in German *du kannst jetzt gehen, du brauchst nicht mehr hier zu bleiben*, in Dutch, Vondel, Adam 1177 *ay zucht niet, staeck dit droef gezucht*, and similarly, in Old-Javanese, C. A. p. 141, l. 2 *haywa masowe, dandani tumuli* "don't linger, get it ready directly".

A structure of frequent recurrence is what might be called contracted or telescoped parataxis<sup>22</sup>. C. A. p. 119, III, l. 17 *sang brĕtya humulĕng keśa sang rangġa, lumiga kaġganya, umahyūn lumuwĕkeng sang rangġa* "the soldier seized the hair of the widow, unsheathed his sword, wished to stab the widow". Here one of the principal elements of the second part of the utterance, the subject, is not repeated, it is *sous entendu*. Another example is Kor. 96, l. 4 *tinigas tĕnġas ikang sūkara, inguntalakĕn mangulwan* "the head of the pig was cut off, flung towards the West". Hence also C. A. p. 119, l. 18 . . . *agĕring tika wwang . . . , makweĥ pĕjahnya, animpal-tinimpal*, and not: *pĕjahnya. Animpal-t.* as in the edition. In the syndetic form this idiom is very common in a variety of languages: in Dutch, *hij nam een stoel en ging er bij zitten*.

Parenthesis is not rarely an important factor. It is an old and widespread procedure to interrupt the communication by inserting phrases of more or less subjective character betraying reserve, impulses, or inhibitions on the part of the speaker. These interruptions<sup>23</sup> are as a rule on both sides

<sup>20</sup> See also Stylistic repetition in the *Veda*, Amsterdam 1958, p. 68 ff.; *Bijdragen T., L., V.* 105, p. 36.

<sup>21</sup> See Stylistic repetition in the *Veda*, chapter IV.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. e. g. G. S. Overdiep, *Stilistische grammatica van het moderne Nederlandsch*, Zwolle 1937, p. 555 ff.; (on 'Ersparung gemeinsamer Satzglieder') O. Behaghel, *Deutsche Syntax*, III, Heidelberg 1928, p. 433 ff.; 453 ff.

<sup>23</sup> See E. Schwyzer, *Die Parenthese*, *Abh. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Ph.-h. Kl.* 1939, 6.

asyndetically paratactic: a Latin example is Ter. Ad. 191 *minis viginti tu illam emisti — quae res tibi vortat male! — argenti tantum dabitur*, a Javanese Koraw. p. 84 f. S. *lamon dewalā, sakeh para-sišya de Bhaṭṭāra — namaš Śiwāya — makādi M . . .* "as to the gods, they are all of them pupils of the Lord — reverence to Śiwa —: to begin with M . . .". Elsewhere an insertion is exegetical in character: Koraw. p. 122, l. 12 S. *mahu pwa sira mangambĕkakĕn yoga bhagawān R., sakāṣṭhā sowenya, kathācil tĕka . . .* "nauwelijks had . . . R. zich op de concentratie toegelegd — gedurende een minimum van tijd —, of daar kwam opeens . . ." (Swellengrebel).

Even bipartite hypothetic utterances may be expressed in this way notwithstanding the fact that in colloquial usage and likewise in ancient texts a condition or hypothesis is often marked by a subordinating conjunction: compare e. g. in colloquial Dutch: *doet hij het niet, dan zullen we hem wel leren!*; in Latin, Ter. Eun. 252 *negat quis? nego. ait? aio* "<if> one says no. I say no; <if> one says yes. I say yes". Similarly, in Javanese: Sri Tañj. 5, 17 *sira amanggiha kewuh, ingsun makabelamane* "should you meet with difficulties, I would follow you in death". The same procedure may be followed in expressing an event occurring synchronously with, or in a certain temporal relation to, other events: Sri Tañj. 5, 4 *surup mangke hyang Teja ring ranus, dewi Suci mangke agaganda . . .* lit. "now the sun set in the water, Suci scented herself", i. e. "when the sun set . . ., S. scented herself".

The last-mentioned examples may show us how a paratactic structure in a foreign language is, at least in writing, naturally rendered by a hypotactic construction. Not rarely two translations are, both of them, perfectly legitimate, a paratactic which impresses us as more natural, unlaboured, as more free and easy, as more or less colloquial, and a more stiff and formal hypotactic one: Sri Tañj. 6, 15 *marma ningsun tĕka dewek, muliha ring rama ningsun* (see above) may also be rendered by: "I come alone, because I will return to my mother". Logical connection between paratactically co-ordinated syntactic groups, clauses, or sentences are, as already observed, very often implicit; sometimes they even remain, for us, obscure or doubtful. Not rarely an early instance of parataxis is in a later stage of the same language, when logical and intellectual schooling has made its influence felt on linguistic expression, replaced by hypotaxis (subordination): the Homeric Z 94 ff. . . . αἴ κ' ἐλέησῃ / ἄστῦ . . . , αἴ κεν Τυδῆος υἱὸν ἀπόσχη Ἰλίου which 'literally' means "if she will have compassion on the city . . . if she may hold back from I. the son of T." would in the classical written language run as follows: ἐὰν ἐλέησῃ . . . ἀποσχούσα Τ. υἱὸν . . .

Some other examples may therefore be added of structures which while being paratactic in the original Old-Javanese admit of, or even require, a hypotactic equivalent when rendered in another language: Koraw. p. 78, l. 21 *bhaṭṭara Brahmā sinangguh uttamāngga lima, anānĕngguh papat* "of B. they say that he has five heads, <whereas> others say: four"; C. A., p. 117, l. 18 *ḍatang pwa sira sakeng mayajĕna hayu, malinggih ta sira . . .* "<when> he came back . . . , he sat down . . ."; p. 122, IV, l. 2 *tan prana-suka, kepwan i ri polahan ira* "hij was niet vrolijk, <daar> hij niet wist wat hij doen

moest" (Poerbatjaraka); p. 123, l. 20 *tumurun ta ken kanuruhan sakeng sakaṭa, umañjing pwa sire . . .* "< toen > de k. van zijn wagen afgestegen was, ging hij . . . binnen" (P.); p. 131, l. 13 *lampah nikeng wadwa sēsēk, supēnuh ikang hawan* "the population went in crowds < so that > the way was packed".

That there are more forms of sentence connection than the extremes of asyndetic parataxis and hypotaxis by means of connective words — the traditional schoolboy lore, however, preferently opposing syndetic coordination and syndetic subordination — may appear from English sentences such as *should he come, I would be glad* where the hypothetical former clause has the inverted word order, and from the peculiarity of Vedic, the accented verb of the conjunctionless introductory clause, if this is 'equivalent' to one introduced by "if" or "when"<sup>24</sup>. In these cases the order of words or the accentuation fulfill the function elsewhere assigned to subordinative conjunctions. It is evident that there is beside 'syndetic hypotaxis' also 'asyndetic hypotaxis'.

A point of no mean interest — which is often overlooked or dealt with rather neglectfully — concerns the use of words which without being conjunctions may serve to mark or emphasize, modify or specify, a paratactic relation. Particles, pronouns, and adverbs may apart from fulfilling their proper function, do at the same time duty as connectives. In order to avoid misunderstanding it would often be better when translating into written English to insert a conjunction: Plaut. Bacch. 63 *istaec lepida sunt memoratui, eadem in usu . . . aculeata sunt* "those words of yours have a pretty sound, < but > when one takes them up, they are barbed". Here also a great variety of logical relations may be implicit: logically speaking the Greek particle δέ when connecting two co-ordinated clauses may be equivalent to a subordinative conjunction: Γ 134 οἱ δὴ νῦν ἔσται σιγῆ, πόλεμος δὲ πέπυται answers to the standard English "they abide now in silence, < because > the battle has ceased", but Z 148 φύλλα τὰ μὲν τ' ἀνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δὲ ὀΰλη / τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη implies a temporal connection: "as to the leaves, the wind scatters some upon the earth, but the forest, as it buds, puts forth others < when > the season of spring has come". It goes without saying that the particle δέ 'means' neither "because" nor "when".

A similar function may be assumed for Old-Javanese particles, e. g. *ta*: C. A. p. 117, l. 18 *ḍatang pwa sira sakeng mayajña hayu, malinggih ta sireng patani sewan* "he came back from sacrificing . . . , he sat down", or "when he came back . . . , he sat down . . ."; p. 123, l. 3 *dadi umētu ng rahina, sama matur ta ya ri sang prabhu . . .*; l. 18 *kawēngyan sireng hawan, lumaku juga la sirāmajang lek*, where both *sira* and *ta* appear to have this connective function: lit. "he was on his way overtaken by the evening, yet he went on availing himself of the moonlight", i. e. "although he was . . . , yet he . . .". This particle occurs however also in sentences which are not particularly

<sup>24</sup> For particulars see e. g. A. A. Macdonell, *A Vedic Grammar for students*, Oxford 1953, p. 467f.

connected with what precedes (e. g. p. 125, V, l. 4) and in structures which must be regarded as hypotactic (e. g. 125, V, l. 5f.).

It is clear that in a variety of paratactic structures a germ is contained out of which hypotaxis may sooner or later develop. That type of modulation which is characteristic of parataxis may, for instance, by omission of a pause, change; thus the English *I know: he's coming*, which is paratactic, developed into the hypotactic *I know he's coming; the man, I saw, was old* > the conjunctionless hypotactic *the man I saw was old*. This point has too often been overlooked by those who studied ancient texts, intended to be recited orally. Moreover the emotion, haste or spontaneity of the speaker are not always shared by the hearer who sometimes fails to interpret the former's utterances exactly as they were conceived and produced. A hearer who is not in the same excited mood as the speaker is apt to interpret a 'staccato' as a 'legato'. The German *frisch gewagt ist halb gewonnen* which now is one sentence originates in a paratactic structure *frisch gewagt! ist halb gewonnen*. Since *frisch gewagt* was both logically and modulatorily intimately connected with the following sentence it lost its own emotional force and independence and came to fuse with the second part of the utterance. Shift or omission of a pause and a change in the modulation may condition a modification of the syntactic function of definite words. The German *trotz* originates in the homonymous substantive: *ich gehe fort: Trotz (sei) deinem Befehle* > *ich gehe fort trotz deinem Befehle*. The German (Dutch etc.) conjunction *dasz* (*dat* etc.) has arisen from the demonstrative pronoun, a structure of the type *meine Wille ist das: du bleibst* developing into *meine Wille ist, dasz du bleibst*. A hypotactic structure is characterized by the inclusion of a subordinate clause which may, or may not, be introduced by a subordinative conjunction; in any case a subordinate clause is different in form from a non-subordinate or independent clause which is one in proper shape to occur as a simple sentence. Thus the German *dasz*, the English *whatever*, the Old-Javanese *yan, duk, or huwusnya* etc. mark their clauses as subordinate.

The functional development of definite Old-Javanese words may, *mutatis mutandis*, have been similar. Compare, e. g. C. A., p. 131, l. 27 *hulun hëlëm sumahura . . . , dening tan sipi-sipi gënge hularg inghulun* "I shall repay (you) later (for it) . . . , on account of the greatness of my debt . . . ": here *de . . .* originally doubtless was an apposition to the preceding part of the utterance; another word used in a similar way is *matang* "cause, motive, ground, aim, purpose": p. 119, l. 5 *apa sadhyanta marëkenghulun, matangnyan kita dinulur ing para sisyantana kabeh . . .* lit. "what is your aim in coming to me, the motive of your being accompanied by all your pupils?", i. e. "what is your aim . . . why you are accompanied . . . ?"

The word *dumeh* which occurs in 'nominal function' to express the idea of "ground, cause, motive" may sometimes be translated by a conjunction: cf. e. g. Kor. 78, l. 26 where it doubtless introduces a subordinate clause: *bhaṭṭāra P. pwa tinakwanakën de aji, dwameh tan tunggal ling ing āgama* "you ask with regard to P., why the words of the Doctrine do not agree?"

Cf. also Kor, 96, l. 26 with the loan-word *kāraṇa*-<sup>25</sup>: *sira arēp mangēnakēn yoga . . . , kāraṇa nira mulia maring Śūnya-Taya* "he wanted to perform yoga, because he would return to Śūnya-Taya".

Even in the case of more complex structures their paratactic origin may be evident: C. A. p. 141, l. 17 *sang putra, sampun ing abhuṣaṇa, mijil ta sira . . .* is at first sight an exact counterpart of the English construction "the princes, after having dressed, made their appearance . . ." which may serve as a translation. The subject of the whole utterance occupies in accordance with the frequently applied device of 'Herausstellung'<sup>26</sup> the initial position. The incomplete character of the second colon and the nature of that incompleteness, the frequency of phrases such as *sampun ing* in similar construction, and the parallelism between this utterance and the type Sri Tañj. 3, 23, *sagara lor wetan kidul, yan tinon kaya tēmpura* "the northern sea . . . , if one has a look at them, it is as if they unite" may lead us to the conclusion that the second colon is subordinate.

It is interesting to see that also in these Old-Javanese texts paratactic and hypotactic expression of the same thought may occur in the same passage. Thus C. A. p. 130, VIII, l. 7 *nghulun umuhuta ri kita, ni warang C. A. huwus paratra* "I shall tell you, C. A. is dead" is distinct from the less spontaneous injunction, following the communication of this news, l. 9 *laku kiteng nagara matura śri narendra, yan C. A. huwus pējah* "go to the town to inform the king that C. is dead".

It is the conviction of the present author that a detailed and accurate collection of all relevant facts in addition to the information to be gathered from the modern spoken language, may smooth away many difficulties with regard to the length, structure and composition of Old-Javanese sentences and clear up many knotty points of punctuation which hitherto have disfigured our editions.

---

<sup>25</sup> See especially Sanskrit in Indonesia, p. 389 f.

<sup>26</sup> See e. g. W. Havers, Der sogenannte 'nominativus pendens', Indogerm. Forsch. 43, p. 207 ff.; Bijdragen 114, p. 112 f.