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By accident I came across Ms. Zurbuchen's *Introduction to Old Javanese language and literature: A Kawi Prose Anthology*, a thesis defended at the University of Michigan and published in 1976 as No. 3 of the Michigan Series in South and Southeast Asian Languages and Linguistics.

Apart from Echols' translation (1972) of Teselkin's Russian grammar of Old Javanese (1963), it is the only introductory text on Old Javanese in English. The main part of Ms. Zurbuchen's thesis consists of an anthology organized in four sections:

1. 19 isolated sentences with a word-by-word and a sentence-by-sentence translation, and with some notes (p. 13-21),
2. two short Pañcatantra-tales with translation and notes (p. 23-26),
3. two tales from the Adiparwa, again with translation and notes (p. 37-64), and
4. two pieces taken from the Tantu Panggélaran and the Pararaton, also with translation and notes (p. 65-87). A glossary (p. 89-135) and a bibliography (p. 137-150) conclude the work.

This anthology together with the few introductory pages is of such a quality that it cannot serve as an aid to the study of Old Javanese texts. As a guide to this field of study, so far completely unknown to American scholarship, it is unreliable, and this for the following reasons: (1) the text fragments are rendered inaccurately, partly because of the use of secondary sources (mostly school-books in use in Indonesia) instead of the relevant Dutch text editions and sources of lexical information, (2) the English translations, even of simple sentences, are full of errors, to a large extent due to the fact that the knowledge of the translator of Old Javanese morphology, syntax, and lexicology was insufficient for this task, and (3) the notes added to the translation are either wrong or irrelevant, and when correct, trivial, mainly again because of the lack of grammatical knowledge of Old Javanese. Moreover the author operates from a general misconception about the nature of what she prefers to call Kawi, a term, like Old Javanese, used to designate literary texts written within a
period of at least five centuries. Finally one notices, not without dismay, that the author is prone, on the scantiest of evidence, to set up hypotheses about general features of Old Javanese literature which will lead the uninformed reader astray. The above criticisms are of such a serious nature that they have to be substantiated in detail. For most readers unfamiliar with Old Javanese the following pages will not be of much interest, but they simply cannot be omitted or greatly reduced. However, the limits of a review-article do not allow me to pay equal attention to all the four sections of the anthology. I will discuss the first section as fully as possible and be more selective as to the third section. On the remainder only a few remarks will be made. After the examination of the book itself some more general observations will be made concerning the unsatisfactory situation which is revealed by the publication of this book.

First then the sentences and the short paragraphs. No information about the origin of the sentences is provided, except that they have been used in a "class in Old Javanese language taught by S. Wojowasito and A. L. Becker in Ann Arbor in 1973-1974" (p. 11). However, nearly all of them are easy to locate: the sentences 1-11 are from the Adiparwa, the sentences 13-19 from the Tantri Kāmandaka.

The Adiparwa-sentences give rise to the following remarks. In sentence 2 tadanantara, lit. “there is no time in between”, means “immediately thereafter”, not “later”. Sentence 4: Kami ta kawēkas ngke ring alas, is a sentence spoken by Yudhiṣṭhira to Hidimbī (Adiparwa ed. Juynboll 145:16). The translation should not be “It is I who am left in the forest”, but “We (the Pāṇḍawas except Bhimā) stay here in the forest”, as kami ta contrasts with the previous sentence: alap tāringku sang Bhimā, “take with you my younger brother Bhimā”. Sentence 5: Ri wēnginya pwa ya ta, irika ta sang Aśwatthāmā amuk ri kulēm is not presented in full: after sang Aśwatthāmā the words mwang sang Kṛpa lāwan Kṛtawarmma have been omitted (cf. A. ed. J. 4:20-22), while after ri kulēm the sentence goes on with: umāti sang pāṇça kumāra etc. Furthermore, ta in pwa ya ta is not at all an indicator of the topic of the sentence: pwa ya ta here (as elsewhere) functions as a whole to highlight ri wēnginya. The following irika is not to be translated as “there”, or “then”, but has clearly a temporal value here, referring back to ri wēnginya. Accordingly the translation is “On that night, at that moment Aśwatthāma together with Kṛpa and Kṛtawarmma made a nocturnal attack to kill the five princes”. Sentence 6, rendered as: Sang hyang Basuki sira amikēti nikang parwata, has been translated surprisingly enough as an imperative preceded by an interjection “He, Basuki, bound that mountain”. The sentence (A. ed. J. 32:6) actually runs as follows: Sang hyang Bāsuki sira pinakatali, amilēti (not: amikēti) pārswa nikang parwata, the divine Bāsuki, he was used as a rope to wind around
the sides of the mountain. The presence of *nikang parwata* should have warned the author that a noun is missing. Sentence 7 is not a complete sentence, but only the first five words of a sentence. The sentence actually is: *Kunang ikang antiga kāri sasaki pinahayu, kina-yainakēn de sang Winatā* (cf. A. ed. J. 31:8). Therefore the translation cannot be “There is that one egg remaining”. The correct translation is “But the one remaining egg was looked after (and) carefully tended by the revered Winatā”. It appears from this and other sentences, such as sentence 10, that Ms. Zurbuchen is not familiar with the meaning of *kunang*, a frequently used conjunction, often translatable — if appearing at the beginning of a sentence or a clause — by “but, however”, but never by “there is” or by “then” as Ms. Zurbuchen regularly does (sentences 7, 10 and 16, see also p. 44, second paragraph). If she had been able to consult Zoetmulder 1950:192-198, she would have found all the information she needed. In sentence 8 the first two words are not *ìnēh nireng*, but *ìnērahnira ing* (with sandhi); we have here a passive form with prefix *in*- and pronominal suffix of the usual type. The awkward translation “the girl was placed in the chariot by him” should be changed into “he placed the girls in the chariot”, as *ikang kanyā* refers to three girls and not to one (cf. A. ed. J. 98, final line). A better translation of sentence 9 would be “After the death of Hiḍimba, Hiḍimbī made a *sēmbah* to the divine Kunti”. Sentence 10 is again incomplete: after *murub* the words *tan kahanan pađēm* follow (cf. A. ed. J. 169:21). The translation should not be “There is that fire in the brazier, always burning”, but “But the fire in the sacrificial pot is burning continuously without being extinguished”, as the words *ikang agni haneng kunda* form one complex noun phrase. In sentence 11 the conjunction yapwan is left untranslated. Here, in this context one should translate it not as “if”, but as “as for”: As for the one who drew the bow, that was the one named Arjuna. In sentence 13 *hulun*, servant, is translated with “head”! As a matter of fact, the author consistently translates this word with “head”. See also the note on *nghulun* on p. 62 in which it is said that “*nghulun*, literary ‘the head’, is used as a polite first person pronoun, and is a linguistic token for the most important body part”. Regrettably she follows on this point her teachers, who also hold the view that *hulun* has the same meaning as *hulu*, head (Becker and Oka 1974:242), and who indulge in other remarkable etymologies: *rahadyan* from *rah*, blood! Here, in sentence 13 *hulun paṇḍita* is not “the head of scholars”, but “their servant”. Already the assumption that a king should be the head of a *paṇḍita* is utterly strange in this cultural context.

With this sentence 13 we are getting to the sentences taken from Tantri Kāmandaka, see ed. Hooykaas, Bibliotheca Javanica 2 (1931) 128-129. In sentence 14 the author translates *kawawa pwa ya tēkeng*
samudra as “he went along arriving at the ocean”, but kawawa means “he was brought”, and ya does not mean “that”, but is the common personal pronoun of the third person. Accordingly the translation should be: He was brought (in his search) even to the ocean (free translation: His search brought him even to the ocean), (but) he did not find water and fruit. In sentence 16 kunang is this time translated with “thus”. In sentence 17, actually more than one sentence, the final clause: ndi ta ikang tinonta ngūni, should be translated as “where is what you have seen earlier”, as ikang tinonta ngūni refers to the monkey seen dancing in the middle of the ocean on a black stone. Moreover, one should write not tinon ta, but tinonta, as -ta / -nta is the pronominal suffix of the second person. In sentence 19 tuhwāsam-bāwa (= tuhu + asambhawa) does not mean “very strange”, but “truly absurd”. Munggwing (= munggu + ing) does not mean either “to dwell” or “to live”, but simply “to be”. Finally, the text does not have makakambang, but makakambangan, with prefix maka-, having as kambangan. Elsewhere in the text ma-kambang, “floating”, is used, but not makakambang.

The five paragraphs are all Âdiparwa-fragments. The first one (A. ed. J. 8:8) runs as follows:

Samangkana ta mahārāja Janamejaya mulih mareng kadatwanira, makering sang Somaśrawā, pinakapurohita haji, magawe sāntikarma, matang yan tanpaphala sāpa sang Saramā ri sira.

The translation given is:

Thus it was that Maharāja Janamejaya went home; he came to his palace together with Somaśrawā, who acted as the royal priest and performed a ceremony of penitence. That’s the reason why Saramā’s curse had no effect on him.

The translation should be:

Then Maharāja Janamejaya went home to his residence, accompanied by Somaśrawā (lit. having Somaśrawā as his companion), who served as his priest and who performed the propitiatory rites for averting evil, so that Saramā’s curse on him (= Maharāja Janamejaya) would be without effect.

Mulih mareng does not constitute two separate predicates as Ms. Zurbuchen’s translation suggests, and phalā has a “long” final vowel, which indicates that phalā is an irrealis form. This is a clear indication that matang yan tanpaphalā sāpa sang Saramā ri sira is not a separate sentence, but a subordinate clause to be connected directly with magawe sāntikarma. Furthermore, ri sira does not belong to tanpa-
phalä, but to śāpa sang Saramā, Saramā’s curse on him. Apart from these syntactic shortcomings, there are several lexical ones, which can easily be determined by comparing the two translations.

The second paragraph (A. ed. J. 13:21-23) runs as follows according to Ms. Zurbuchen:

Mojar ta sang Sāwitrī: ‘Sojar mpu; mahābhāra ikung kuṇḍala, apan wiśeṣa ning sarwaratna ike. Hana ta nāga Taķšaka ngaranya, lagi mrāthanākēn ikang kuṇḍala teja. Haywa ta mpu tanprajatnā rikā’.

Here it becomes clear that the author has blindly trusted the Ādiparwa version of Siman Widyatmanta (1962). Comparison with Juynboll’s edition would have shown that there are two misprints; one is innocent: prayatnā should be prajatnā, but the second one has serious consequences: mrāthanākēn should be mrārthanākēn, which is from prārthanā, desire. Ms. Zurbuchen’s suggestion that the root is wrāt, “which means weighty, heavy, extended with causative suffix -akēn to mean: to value greatly” (note 3, p. 20), is simply an error. Moreover mrāthanākēn could never be derived from wrāt in view of the th; while an -akēn form based on wrāt has not been attested for Old Javanese. Since neither Widyatmanta nor Ms. Zurbuchen have taken a critical look at Juynboll’s edition, they have not seen that ikung kuṇḍala is a misprint: all manuscripts have iking, which is obviously the correct reading. As Sāwitrī when speaking has the kuṇḍala in her hands, iking fully corresponds with the following ike. If this had been realized, footnote 2 on p. 20 about the “shifting of focus” could have been left unwritten.

The third paragraph shows the same dangerous reliance on Widyatmanta’s text. The text (A. ed. J. 15:6-7) runs as follows:

Tuminghal ta nāga Taķšaka, masō ta ya malap ikang kuṇḍala. Katon mara ya de sang Uttangka, inusī nira ta ya.

Translated as:

Gazing upon it was the serpent Taķšaka. He approached, and took that jewel. He was seen coming by Uttangka, and was chased away.

After inusī, the suffix -nira which regularly occurs in combination with the in-passive has been omitted, as comparison with Juynboll’s edition reveals. Mara is not the verb “to come”, but a particle which puts emphasis on katōn. This mara is a common word, frequently used for instance in the Rāmāyaṇa kakawin. Tuminghal is not: gazing. In fact -um- forms do not have a “durative” aspect. Paying attention to the context of this fragment (Uttangka went bathing in a stream and left the jewel on the bhūtala: ikang kuṇḍala inēnahakēnira ing bhūtala),
an acceptable translation would be: The serpent Takṣaka saw it, approached and took the jewel, Uttangka saw it and chased him away.

The fourth paragraph (A. ed. J. 18:10) need not be reproduced here in full, except for the final part, as there are mainly lexical shortcomings. Kawitan, the normal word in Old Javanese for ancestors, is based on wit, which does not mean “tree”, as in modern Javanese, but “trunk, stem” (see footnote 6, p. 20). Moreover, it is not true that “the ka- and -an affixes have the meaning ‘to be in a condition of’” (same footnote). Here again Zoetmulder 1950:73-79 and also Zoetmulder-Poedjawijatna 1954, which is included in Ms. Zurbuchen’s bibliography, could have provided better information. As to the final part, this runs as follows:

...yatikā kahyun sanghulun, pirēngon sanghulun kabeḥ, matang yan wistārākna dentācarita.

Translated as:

It is my wish that it be heard by all of us; thus, let your tale be told.

The very frequent imperative wistārākna has not been correctly translated; it does not have the meaning “unfold a story”, as footnote 7 says. Wistāra means “elaborate, full, in detail”; wistārākna dentā carita therefore should be translated as “let your telling of the story be in detail”, as wistārākna functions as the comment and dentā carita, your telling of the story, as the topic (I am using here the distinction topic-comment as I have used it elsewhere). Wistārākna dentācarita has essentially the same binary structure as the next sentence in this paragraph, ikang swadharma nagaranya pati lawan hurip, which should not be rendered by “That is known as one’s own dharma, death together with life”, but by “Life and death, that is what is called swadharma”.

The fifth and final paragraph (A. ed. J. 22:12-17) is the well-known passage in which a dewadūta addresses Ruru, who is grieving over the death of his wife Pramathanā. The dewadūta says to Ruru: Ya ta kawruhananta, tan hana juga ahuripa, yan māsanya huwus pējah, which means: This is what you have to know: one cannot go on living, if the time of one’s death has already arrived, and not: “There is no continuous life, but when time is up, death” (p. 19). Also the end of this paragraph: apan pagawenya ngūni dumadyakēn ikā, is not adequately rendered. Ms. Zurbuchen translates “because it happened in conjunction with her previous actions”. However, ikā, which refers to the previous pējah ni strīnta, is object of dumadyakēn. Therefore the translation should be “because her deeds in the past caused it”. The author adds three notes to this paragraph. The first is about the relation between kamu and kita in which it is stated — wrongly —
that *kamu* is a personal pronoun (second person) used for talking intimately to the addressee. No information is provided which justifies this opinion. There is also no evidence that *kita* is a more respectful pronoun. The second note is for me, and doubtless for many others, quite incomprehensible. It runs as follows: “It may be noted that naming things is important in Old Javanese, because ideas that come from a variety of cultural traditions are constantly being given new contexts” (p. 20). There are several such unclear, somewhat romantic passages in this book, which do not have any basis in known facts. The third note makes the (wrong) observation that in this short speech of the *dewadāta* the speaker’s attitude changes from empathy with the death of Ruru’s wife (*ike pati, ‘that death close to me’*) to impersonal detachment (*ikā, ‘that yonder, not close to me or you’*). However, this is sheer fantasy. As already mentioned, *ikā* is simply used anaphorically, referring to *pējah ni strīnta*, the death of your wife, and there is nothing in the text from which any conclusion about empathy or detachment of the celestial messenger might be derived.

Let us now turn to the two stories both taken from the *Adiparwa* (ed. J. 60-62 and 90-96). The first, the short story of Maharāja Basuparicāra, was an unfortunate choice, as the text is corrupt to a certain extent. Because she again trusted the version of Widyatmanta, the text has given the author insuperable problems of interpretation and in addition has seduced her into making a number of statements about “unintentional intersection of different stories” (note 10, p. 47), the power of royal semen and the absence of linear sequencing of events in the story (notes 14 and 8 on pp. 47 and 46), which impress more by their boldness than by the solidity of their factual basis.

The story of King Basuparicāra itself begins simply enough: the mountain Kolagiri unites with the stream Ėkutimati which used to flow freely up to the king’s residence. Because of her union with the mountain, her waters are interrupted. The king sees this, defeats the mountain (in the Skt. Mahābhārata he gives the mountain a kick) and finds two children, a boy and a girl, born out of the union of stream and mountain. The king takes the girl, aptly called *Girikā*, as his wife, while the boy is later on appointed as his army-commander.

The simplest way to make clear what is wrong with the text is to present the relevant passage in full as found in Juynboll’s edition:

Hana ta nadi Ėkutimati ngaranya, lwah ning Kolagiri, lawan ta wawai-nya umili tēkeng kađatwan, masangga pwekang Kulagiri mwang ikang Ėkutimati. [Ngkāna ta sirān panēmu rare rwang siki jalu-stri, sang Basuprada ngaran ira, arinya strī paripūrṇeng ahayu, inaranan sang Girikā. Ya ta pinakastrī nira, lumāmpah ta sirāburu muwah, mwang ikang Ėkutimati] kahērēt wwäinyra tan tēkeng kađatwan. Wruh pwa mahārāja Basuparicāra yan ikang wukir humērēt wwaik nikang Ėkutimati, inalahakēn ira ikang gunung humērēt, kapanggih tang rare laki-
strīriya, anak ikang nadi Çuktimati, ikang atuha laki-laki. Ya tikā huwusnya matuha pinakasenapati de nira, sang Wasuprada ngaranya, arinya strī paripūrṇeng hayu. Ya ta inaran sang Girikā, pinakarabi nira mahārāja Basuparicāra. Lumaku ta sira maburuburu, katon tang sarwakusuma ring alas manēdhēng. Matutur ta sire hayu sang Girikā, katon manis-manis ing waja nira lāwan līṇḍi ning matāṅgkēn nilotpa-ladhāla, mwang rupit ning susu saha ros ning tēngah nira, ērdhwata ta cī mahārāja Basuparicāra, mijil kāma nira, tinaḍahan ira ta ya roṇḍon, sarwabhāsajñā pwa sira, wruh ri swācābda ning sarwasatwa.

Deletion of the passage put between square brackets completely restores the text, as the following translation makes understandable also for those who have no knowledge of Old Javanese:

There was a river, called Çuktimati, a stream from the Kola-mountain, and its waters flowed right up to the royal residence. The Kula-mountain came together with Çuktimati. Its waters were obstructed and did not reach the royal residence. The king called Basuparicāra saw that the mountain obstructed the waters of Çuktimati. He defeated the obstructing mountain (and) found a boy and a girl, children of the river Çuktimati. The elder was a boy. When he had become older he was made by him commander of the army, with the name of Wasuprada; his younger sister was called Girikā and King Basuparicāra took her as his wife. He went hunting, and seeing all the flowers in the forest, he was reminded of the beauty of Girikā, he saw before him the sweetness of her teeth and the loveliness of her eyes like the blue lotus together with the tightness of her breasts and her slender waist. The king had an erection, his semen came out, (but) he caught it on a leaf. He was sarwabhāsajñā, that is, he knew the languages of all the living creatures (and then the story goes on with the king’s request to a cyena or hēlang (falcon or buzzard) to carry the leaf with his semen to his wife Girikā).

That the passage between brackets ought to be removed also becomes clear from examination of the passage itself. That sira in ngkāna ta sira refers to the king is grammatically impossible, as the immediately preceding sentences do not contain any reference to the king. In addition the word muwah, “again”, in lumāṃpah ta sirā buru muwah does not make sense, as in the preceding sentences no mention has been made of an earlier royal hunting trip. This imperfection of the text, although easily mended, has misled Ms. Zurbuchen into all kinds of speculations about the way stories are told in Old Javanese: according to her the story is not a narrative and it has no linear sequencing of events (p. 46). All such unusual reflections can now safely be discarded as they all rest on the assumption that the text is correct.

The text itself apparently also posed several problems. Lwah ning Kulagiri is a noun phrase of a very frequent type, and does not mean
“In the valley of the Kulagiri mountain”; *Iwah* is “stream”. *Lāwan* *ta* *wwainya* *umili* *tēkeng* *kađatwan*, does not mean “its waters, flowing together, came to the kingdom”. If the text is correct and *lāwan* should not be replaced by *Iwa*, “broad, wide”, then *lāwan* can only be translated with “and”; *kađatwan*, is *kraton*, “royal residence”. *Lumdmpah* *ta* *sira* *aburu* *muwah*, is not “meanwhile, he was out hunting”, but “he went hunting again”, as there is no basis for the hypothesis that the sentence has a durative aspect; footnote 7, which is based on that assumption, does not make sense. *Wruh* simply means in this context “(he) saw”, or “observed”, not “(he) knew”. The text has not *kinalahakēn*, but the normal form *inalahakēn*. *Nilotpaladhala* should be changed into *nilotpala*: *dhala*, “leaf”, has been added by Juynboll. The best manuscript (Cod. 5026) has *nilotpala*. *Rupit* is not “pointedness”, but “tight, narrow, strait”. It is also said of roads. The Sanskrit expression: *sarwabhāsajña*, “knowing all languages”, is explained in the text in simple terms: *wruh* *ri* *swaśābda* *ning* *sarwa-satwa*. Therefore it is better not to translate the Sanskrit term (see my translation). This phenomenon is very common. It occurs again later in the story of Čakuntalā, when the Sanskrit loan *nirāhara* is explained by: *tan* *pamangan* *tan* *panginum* *wwe* (A. ed. J. 67:2). Also in the rest of the story (not reproduced here) there are a number of mistakes: *dinalih* *molih* *mangsa*, means “he was thought to have got a prey”, and not “thinking he would get some food”. The following *pinarēbutan* *ikang* *rođon* *mesi* *reta*, *rujit* *ta* *ya* *de* *ning* *kukunya* means “They fought over the leaf which held the semen, it became torn by their claws”, and not “It became a fight. The leaf holding that seed was torn by their claws”. The nominal phrase *kāma* *ning* *kadi* *sira* *prabhū* *wiśeṣa*, means “the semen of all who are like mighty kings”, and not “that noble seed, semen like the king himself” (p. 45). Recognition of the meaning of the *kadi* construction makes it necessary to revise the peculiar footnote 14 on p. 47. *Parēnah*, means “related to, standing in a certain relation to”, and has nothing to do with the verb *ēnah*, as the wordlist suggests; *parēnah* *wadvā* *de* *mahārāja* *Basuparīcāra*, simply means “he was a subject of King B.”; *hulun juru* *tambangan*, means “he was the king’s ferryman”. The translation “Under King B.’s rule given a job as head of ferrymen”, is therefore unacceptable, also syntactically, as *parēnah* *wadvā* *de* *m. B.*, and *hulun juru* *tambangan* are independent clauses. The following sentence is not correctly interpreted either: *Ya* *ta* *makolih* *irikang* *iwak* *magb’ng*, *ndan* *pwa* *cābdra* *ri* *pūrwakarma* *ikā*, *moghā* *tātan* *pinangan* *ikang* *iwak* *denya*, that is: He was the one who got the fish, but (according to) a pronouncement (made) at an action done in a former existence, the fish was (contrary to what one would expect) not eaten by him. *Ndan*, together with the following *pwa*, indicates a strong contrast between the preceding clause and the following one. The translation given:
“It was he who caught the fish, as it had been uttered in the old curse. But the fish was not eaten by him”, does not pay attention to the important syntactic role of *ndan pwa*, while the meanings of *pūrwa-karma* and of *mogha* are not rendered correctly (on *amogha* and *mogha*, see the very extensive information given in Zoetmulder 1950:243-246). *Kunang* in the next sentence is again mistranslated: But (and not: then) the fish became a *widyādhari* again. She went back to heaven, *apan antaçāpa nyūni rakwa katēmu mangke*, “because the end of her former curse now took place”. The translation of Ms. Zurbuchen: “In such a way, it is said, did the fulfillment of the old curse come about”, is untenable: *apan* = because, *antaçāpa* = the end of a curse, lit. “curse-end”, *-nya* refers back to the *widyādhari*, as this suffix also does in *denya* in the following sentence; *denya* = by her, not: by that. The sentence *ya ta makajanma ike ling nira*, is again not understood: These (= the children) are the embodiment of this (that is: his *reta*), so he thought, or so he said. The translation of Ms. Zurbuchen: “Here was the embodiment of his word”, rests upon a misconception of the *maka*-form and the syntactic position of *ike*. *Makajanma* means “to have as *jānma*, to have as realization”. The following *ike* is to be connected with *makajanma*, and not with *lingnira*, which is frequently used as an intercalation. The following *apan čāri mahārāja trus tinghal*, because the king saw it at once, has been translated by Ms. Zurbuchen as: “Then the king gazed long upon them” (sic), which cannot be correct given the meaning of *apan* and *trus*. It is also surprising that the author has not become worried about the fact that her translation does not make sense. On the contrary, she adds the following highly peculiar footnote 15 to the sentence (p. 47): “*Trus tramīnghal* (this is clearly a misprint for *trus tinghal*) is significant here. Peace, harmony and security are seen as emanating concentrically from the king, the center of the kingdom’s power. For the king to turn his face (seen as radiating divine light) on the children means they are close to the center, and thus magically as well as materially safe”. I do not think that any critical comment is needed here.

As to the Çakuntalā-story, one observes the same type of shortcomings as in the earlier sections. The text is not reproduced correctly, again because of the reliance on Indonesian school-books, the translations leave much to be desired, and the notes as far as they give grammatical information are invariably wrong.

The following critical remarks must suffice. The text of the story has been divided by Ms. Zurbuchen into paragraphs in a most unfortunate way. For instance on the very first page (p. 48) the following division has been made (the text is here reproduced exactly as printed in the book):

Hana sira mahārāja Duçwanta ngaran ira, *prthiwyāḥ sāgarantāyāḥ*. 
Sira ta kumawaçākēn pṛthiwimāṇḍala makahingan makahingan catus samudra, tātān hana wwang magawe hala salawas nirān sumiwi, kewala dharma ginawayakēnya, tumiru kadharmeṣṭan sang nātha nitya-kāla. Lumāmpah ta sira buru-buru, ry alas nikang Himāwanpāda, nānāwidha mṛga ulih nira buru.

Kalunghā-lunghā ta laku nira. Amangguh ta sira patapan, atyanta ramyā nikā ning sarwa kusuma, ngūni-ngūniṅkā sarwaphala, inupa-rēnga ring nādi cuci nirmala, sutīrthā wenya mahēnēng, tekwan ikang sarwamṛga hanerikā, makādi singha mwang wyāghra, kadi silihasih, katūsan de ning kopaçaman sang wiku sidhamantra, ikang sarwakrūra tan wēnang krūra. Maçabda pwekang manuk. Puṇyasādhāyasamghustam wānaraḥkṣanistiṃītām.

However, if one wants to divide the text into paragraphs, then lumāmpah ta sira buru-buru clearly introduces a new passage, and not kalunghā-lunghā ta laku nira. Also the division between paragraphs 2 and 3 is misleading. There is a very close relationship between what begins with maçabda pwa ikang manuk, “the birds said”, and all that precedes mangkana pwa çabdanya, “that is what they (the birds) said”. There is also no reason for breaking off this third section at this point, as the following sentence is (in translation): “Amazed was the king when he heard what the birds said”. Maka-hingan is here printed twice, as it is in Widyatmanta 1962; the same is the case with dāhat on p. 50, while de has been omitted in the second paragraph: ning sarwa kusuma instead of de ning sarwa kusuma. In ginawayakēnya (par. 1) the suffix -nya refers to the preceding wwang, and tumiru means “to follow, imitate”. The translation should be: “There were no people who did wrong as long as he was reigning, only good was done by them, always following the righteousness of the king”. Nānāwidha means not “many”, but “various, in great variety”.

The passage beginning with tēkwān has been wrongly translated, because the meanings of makādi and tēkwān were unknown to the author. An acceptable translation would be: “Moreover, the various animals there, in the first place the lions and the tigers, gave the impression that they liked each other, overwhelmed by the peace of mind of the monk endowed with supernatural powers. All that is savage could no longer be savage”. This has been translated as follows: “All the animals there, even lions and tigers, were affectionate toward each other. Soothed by the calmness of the ascetic with his great mantras, all those wild creatures could no longer be wild” (p. 49). Kadi is not “even”, but “like”, and katuśan not “soothed”, but lit. “flooded, suffused by”. Still more important is that the syntactic
structure has not become clear. \textit{Katúsan de ning} etc. is to be connected with the preceding \textit{ikang sarwamśga haneriṅkā}, and not with \textit{ikang sarwakrūra} etc. Also the passage about the birds has not become clear to Ms. Zurbuchen. The birds are not singing, but telling something to the king, and what they are telling is paragraph 3, the content of which may be viewed as a paraphrase of the Sanskrit line. Accordingly the translation should not be: “The birds were singing, and the various monkeys and bears were like people reciting Vedic chants, thus their voices” (p. 49), but: “The birds said, ‘and different is the appearance of the monkeys and the bears, they are like those reciting Vedic chants and mantras’. That was what the birds were saying.”

In the following paragraph the text is incomplete: after \textit{sādatēngnire} the word \textit{jēro} has been left out. Now the presence of \textit{-nire} becomes clear. The following \textit{sire} should be \textit{sira} (perhaps a misprint). After these corrections the text is quite transparent: “He went into the ashram, wishing to see the hermit, but all his followers (\textit{kunang} is left untranslated by Ms. Zurbuchen this time) were ordered to wait far away, otherwise the hermitage might be disturbed by them. After his arrival in the ashram, there was no hermit, the ashram was deserted. He sat down in the pavilion” (not: he sat in the assembly, p. 49).

The answer of \textit{Cakuntalā} to King Duçwanta (p. 50) has also not been rendered correctly. The translation should not be: “Lord Kaṅva is his name who dwells in the hermitage, and he has gone out, looking for firewood. Perhaps he will come in a moment” (p. 51), but: “Reverend Kaṅva is the name of the holy man who lives in this hermitage, but he has just gone out, his plan being to look for firewood. He is likely to be back in a moment”. \textit{Ndan} again means “but”, while \textit{abhiprāyanira} is the topic of \textit{amet samidha}. For the meaning of \textit{yaya} Zoetmulder (1950:211-214) provides all the information one needs. The following two sentences are not connected as Ms. Zurbuchen’s translation suggests: “As the girl thus spoke, the king was quickly struck with desire” (p. 51). \textit{An mangkana ling sang kanyā} refers to the words just spoken by \textit{Cakuntalā}: “Such were the words of the girl”. The following \textit{mogha ta mahārāja katēkan rāga} is an independent sentence: “Suddenly the king was overcome by passion”.

Misprints and omission of words in the text will sometimes make it impossible for a beginner to understand the text. Some examples: the word \textit{cakti} is missing between \textit{wiku} and \textit{siddhi} (p. 52: 3 lines from the bottom); the article \textit{ng} before \textit{kacakrawartyan} has been omitted (p. 54: 9 lines from the bottom); \textit{umon} should be \textit{umom}, “to agree” (p. 56: 4); \textit{ta} after \textit{yogya} is missing, which makes the sentence syntactically unclear (p. 56: 7); after \textit{cakrawartī} the word \textit{makastri} has been omitted in the text, but rendered in the translation which proves Ms. Zurbuchen’s reliance on Widyatmanta (1962), who
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has the same omission; kaharepa and mwān should not be printed separately, as mwā is a suffix (or better, a combination of two suffixes -mu + the irrealis suffix -a); angaseng should be angaseng (p. 56: 20); hatinta should be hatinta (p. 56: 26); mwawah sang hyang atma has been omitted (p. 56: 29); in the next line the article is missing: ta should be kita (p. 58: 24); a few lines later the words mangkana lingnikang ākāçāwākya are missing, an omission which makes the sentence, now beginning with ya (not found in the text), quite incomprehensible. The preceding anaknyekwa should be anaknyekwā, as a is a prefix of the following swāmi: having (you) as her husband.

Because of lack of space I will not discuss the translation of the story of Ĉakuntala, but a few remarks have to be made about the short introductions and the notes added to the later sections of the anthology. As to the introductory pages on the parwas, the author relies completely on Zoetmulder (1974) and what she writes is relatively unobjectionable, except for the speculations on the story of king Basuparicāra (p. 40) and the remarks made about the wayang in Java and Bali (p. 38-39). However, as far as the Pararaton and the Tantu Panggēlaran are concerned, the author had apparently no access to the edition by Brandes and to Pigeaud’s dissertation, although both are found in her bibliography. Especially Pigeaud’s edition would have been useful to her, as his Dutch translation of the text would have helped her in avoiding all sorts of mistranslations (such as mayuhgra with “united”, instead of by “performed yoga”, p. 70). Tantu Panggēlaran is not to be translated with “place of struggle, place of endurance, with connotations of meditation and the search for insight, or ‘weaving of the text’, meaning the process of intertwining diverse perspectives and traditions” (note 1, p. 74). Tantu is “the fixed order”, and the text contains mainly an exposé of the various religious places in Java (see Pigeaud 1924:20-23 and Zoetmulder's Old javanese Dictionary, to appear in 1981, s.v. tantu). The characterization of the Tantu Panggēlaran as a chronicle of origins is not adequate. In her introduction to the Pararaton and Tantu Panggēlaran fragments, the author makes all kinds of generally unclear and untenable statements such as: “Neither Austronesian languages nor Old Javanese chronicles are primarily concerned with the temporal sequencing of events” (p. 65). As to the notes, it is said about the verb form kayatnakna that ka- is a dative focusing on the patient (note 2, p. 74). In note 6 we are informed that pinakalingga is from paka, to use, and lingga, phallus, and means: “a sacred place holding the world together, a linchpin of sorts”, but paka is a prefix, while pinakalingga is a passive verb (with the prefix pinaka- cf. makalingga, active; pinakalingga, passive; pakalingga, passive imperative). In note 8 it is said that “mandaraparwata comes from the name of a flower
that the gods are said to wear, the *mandara*. However, *mandara* in *mandaragiri, mandarddri*, is the name of a mythological mountain used as churning-stick in the churning of the ocean (see A. ed. J. 31-32). There is also a word *mandāra*, which is a name of a certain tree (Juynboll 1923). In note 12 *pawinihan* is said to be derived from *wini*, instead of *winih*, seed. Accordingly the translation is not: “wife-place” or “marriage” (which would not make sense in the text), but “seed-bed”: *gunung Pawinihan* which occurs in the text means “the mountain where Brahmā and Viṣṇu created men”. In note 13 *karma* is poorly explained, while in note 15 no distinction is made between Skt. *rasa* and the meaning of this word in Old Javanese.

As could be expected, the wordlist is in harmony with the quality of the anthology proper. The grammatical information which precedes the list (p. 89) is extremely poor: The list of the most frequently occurring affixes is not only incomplete, but also the description of their grammatical role is mostly wrong. *Paha-* is not an intensifier. It is a prefix by which causative verbs are derived from adjectives: *mahalēba: pinahalēba: pahalēba*. That verbs with prefix *ka-*, indicate non-intentional action is simply not true, while verbs with *-um-* do not have a durative aspect in Old Javanese. That “words beginning or ending with *ta* or *pwa* may be composed of topic marker (*ta, pwa*) plus wordbase”, is also wrong. *Ta* and *pwa* are clitics, attached at the end of a word only: *prihatin ta sang Uttangka, “Uttangka was in sorrow”, and hundreds of similar cases (see Zoetmulder 1950 passim, and Uhlenbeck 1970). Apart from this *ta*, there is in Old Javanese a prefix *ta-* alternating with *t-* for the formation of imperatives, and a pronominal second person suffix *-ta* alternating with *-nta*.

As to the wordlist itself, one observes time and again the uncertainty of the author about Old Javanese word formation: *apande*, but not *pande* is found; like *apanganten*, it is put under *a*. *Inak* is glossed as: “pleasant, good”, while being a noun; *tery* is put under *iri*, “jealous”. The complex *pinakapamañcananing* (p. 110) is wrongly analyzed: it has nothing to do with *mañca*. Actually we have: *pinaka - pamañcanaling: pamañcana* from *bañcana* (not given in the wordlist); what is especially distressing is that the author is not worried about the unrelatedness of the meaning of *mañca*, “foreign”, and the translation given of the *pinaka-* form. *Masēhi* is derived from a non-existing *asēh* instead of from *wasēh* (p. 112); *sinangaskāra* is said to be derived from *askāra* instead of from *sangaskāra*, the Javanese form of Skt. *samskāra*, “consecration” (p. 125). *Karaksakan* cannot be from *rakṣa* (p. 119); it is derived from *raksaka*; *pwa* never means “it, that” (p. 121). *Tiniru-tiru* is listed without any indication that the root is *tiru*, which is not found in the list (p. 129). *Tihang* is glossed as “aim”, but the word *tihang* means “pole, mast”; the root *tihang*, as in *aihang “ready, prepared”, tumihang “to be prepared”, anihangakēn, tumi-
hangakēn “to make ready, to make preparations (for shooting)”, is not found in kakawin or parwa. Under wighna one finds wighnani, “to disturb”, instead of mighnani (p. 133). Yapwan is glossed as “there is”, instead of “if, as for” (p. 134); kayatnakna is glossed as “to be overcome with mindfulness” (!), instead of something like “let it be watched carefully, be on your guard against (it)”.  

In view of all that has been said above, one begins to wonder why this book was ever published, and even how it came to be accepted as a thesis at a university as respected as the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. While not being in a position to answer these questions, one assumes that the author was well enough aware of the responsibility she had shouldered when undertaking the serious task to introduce American readers to a field as difficult and as vast as that of Old Javanese literature, especially after she had made acquaintance with works such as Pigeaud’s extensive catalogue (1967-1970) or Zoetmulder’s Kalangwan (1974), or a text-edition such as Teeuw et al.’s Śivarātrikalpa (1969), all found in her bibliography. If only she had limited herself to translating the modest grammar of Zoetmulder and Poedjajwiratna or to publishing the anthology Sēkar Sumawur with English translations, then she would have rendered herself and her prospective American readers an important service.  

However, the basic problem seems to be that no-one made the suggestion that the author should take the step of learning Dutch, as this would have enabled her to use works in Dutch such as Zoetmulder’s De Taal van het Ādiparwa (1950) and Juynboll’s Oud-javaansch-Nederlandsche Woordenlijst (1923), both of which are in fact indispensable for a study of parwa and other prose materials. To fail to do this is to ignore the fact that elsewhere, namely in the Netherlands, the study of Old Javanese has been going on for many decades, and that other than Dutch scholars such as Poerbatjaraka have made important contributions to our knowledge of Old Javanese by writing in Dutch.  

After the Second World War our institute has done much to make the existing literature on Indonesian languages and cultures internationally accessible. It is enough to mention its series of critical bibliographies and its translation series. Perhaps more should have been done. In any case, to learn Dutch remains a necessity. Scholars such as Aichele, Coedes and Wulff in the past, and more recently Robson, Worsley and Ricklefs, have been very well aware of this. They (and others) have been able to surmount the language-barrier. One can only express the hope that their example will be followed more widely, and that the lack of communication which is shown to exist by this anthology will disappear soon.
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