SPELLING OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

The deductions made in the previous section as to the age and provenance of the mss. receive further support from a study of the spelling employed. It is noticeable that, particularly with regard to proper names, L is usually much closer to the correct form than is S, e.g. the name Tunderu', spelt as such by the copyist of L, occurs in S sometimes as t-n-d-r, sometimes as t-a-n-d-a-r and sometimes as t-n-d-a-r. Again, the word sunderik, which L reproduces as such, with the glottal stop, appears to be confused with the word sindir by the copyist of S, who regularly spells it as s-n-d-i-r — rather as though faced by a word he had never seen before. Noteworthy too are the unsuccessful attempts made by the copyist of S to spell the not exactly uncommon name Ternaté. Sometimes he spells it as t-r-n-a-n-i and once even as t-r-n-n-t-i. This evidence suggests that the copyist of L was closer to the events and personalities narrated — closer in time or space, or both — than the copyist of S, who often appears to be at a loss when confronted by the name of a person or thing more familiar in the East of the archipelago than in the West.

In view of the subject matter, one's first thought is to look for traces of Macassarese influence upon the copyist of L, but — as was noted above in the case of vocabulary and style — such influence is difficult to find. One might perhaps see in L’s dj-n-r-ä-1 as contrasted with S’s dj-n-d-r-ä-l — a reflection of the speech habits of Macassarese, which, unlike Malay, has no need of a homorganic voiced stop (+ pepet-sound) to act as a liaison between a nasal and a liquid, but the fragmentary nature of L makes it difficult to draw any definite conclusions. The much longer S obviously offers much greater scope for deductions.

---
1 See note to v. 31d.
2 e.g. in v. 31d.
3 e.g. in v. 32a.
4 e.g. in v. 76a.
5 e.g. in v. 46b.
6 e.g. in v. 365c.
7 v. 495b.
8 e.g. v. 32b.
9 e.g. v. 35a.
of a phonological nature, although based as they are exclusively upon a written source, such deductions should be made with a certain amount of diffidence, particularly when, as is the case with S, consistency seems to have troubled the copyist not at all. Thus, noting that the copyist of S very often inserts an alif where modern standard Malay would require the pepet-sound, producing spellings such as ṭ-ā-r-ng \(^{10}\) (perang), d-ā-ng-r-k-n \(^{11}\) (dengarkan), m-m-b-ā-r-i \(^{12}\) (memberi) and even k-ā-n-i-k-n \(^{13}\) (kenaikan), one's first thought is of Minangkabau influence.\(^{14}\) However, one also notices that the, by modern standards, redundant alif is inserted not only in open syllables, but into closed syllables too and that spellings such as b-r-p-r-ā-ng \(^{15}\) (berperang), s-d-ā-r-h-ā-n \(^{16}\) (sederhana) and m-ng-d-ā-p \(^{17}\) (mengadap) are common. Concentrating, for example, on a word which is obviously one of the commonest in the sja'ir --- perang, which is used altogether some 79 times in the sja'ir, we find it spelt in the following ways:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{as } & p-ū-ā-r-ng & \text{once} \\
\text{as } & p-ā-r-ā-ng & \text{twice} \\
\text{as } & p-ā-r-ng & \text{forty-four times} \\
\text{as } & p-r-ā-ng & \text{twelve times} \\
\text{as } & p-r-ng & \text{twenty times}
\end{align*}
\]

and although we may still feel that, in the copyist's dialect, the (modern) pepet-sound was pronounced 'a' à la Minangkabau, the conclusion will not perhaps be quite so compelling as before.

Again, forms such as S's patub (patut) and musta'ib (musta'id) which are certainly typical of Minangkabau Malay\(^{18}\) are also to be found in Riau-Johor\(^{19}\) and Achehnese Malay: \(^{20}\) musta'ib, in fact, has

\(^{10}\) e.g. in v. 522a.
\(^{11}\) e.g. in v. 500a.
\(^{12}\) e.g. in v. 203d.
\(^{13}\) v. 162a.
\(^{14}\) Particularly the Agam dialect, cf. van der Toorn MSK, p. ix: "On the basis of the difference in vowels, one can distinguish two sub-dialects of the Minangkabau of the Padang Highlands. Where Riau (Malay) has an ē, the Agam dialect has an a (bēras becomes barèh) and the Tanah Datar dialect has an ō (bēras becomes bōrèh)."
\(^{15}\) e.g. in v. 44c.
\(^{16}\) v. 68b.
\(^{17}\) e.g. in v. 42b.
\(^{18}\) van der Toorn: MSK, p. xii gives patub as the normal spelling of patut in Minangkabau writings.
\(^{19}\) cf. 'Ali: TNF, e.g. p. 34, line 24.
\(^{20}\) cf. Drewes and Voorhoeve: ATJ, e.g. folio 73b, line 10.
been described as a "common corruption of musta' id which is often encountered in Malay mss." 21 Likewise forms such as gelab (gelap) and tutub (tutup) may perhaps reflect certain of the characteristics of the copyist's dialect, but in that case it should be pointed out that such characteristics are apparently typical of Bandjarese (Kutai) Malay too. 22 Similarly the use of the me- prefix without nasralization before an h, as is found in the sja'ir's mehimpunkan, 23 is said to be typical of Minangkabau Malay: 24 it is however also found in Bandjarese Malay 25 and can also be encountered in the pages of the Riau-Johor Tukfl al-nafls. 26

Nevertheless, while it is true that each of the features commented on above can be found in one or more dialects other than that of the Minangkabau area, it is only the Minangkabau dialect, particularly that associated with the Agam district, that combines all the features mentioned. This fact, together with spellings such as d-r-a-dj 27 for durdja and s-r-a-b 28 for serba, and the use of words such as serau 29 and (men) djaput 30 — whose Minangkabau status is less open to dispute than many words so classified — do tend to suggest Minangkabau influence in the spellings adopted by the copyist of S.

In a sja'ir, the most likely source of information as to the author/ copyist's pronunciation lies in the end-rhymes used. For example, vv. 54, 81, 333, 386, 393 and 430, where words that in 'classical' Malay are both spelt and pronounced with a final -ai are regularly rhymed with Macassarese words that were probably pronounced in correct Macassarese fashion with a final -è (San(de) raboné, Boné, bura'né etc.), and vv. 175 and 208, where words that in classical Malay are both spelt and pronounced with a final -au are regularly rhymed with Macassarese words pronounced with a final -o (Pat(t)iro and tjilo-tjilo) rather

---

21 Kern: CSK, p. 93.
22 'Ali: TNF, e.g. p. 66, line 10.
23 e.g. in v. 157c.
24 cf. van der Toorn: MSK, p. 61: "The prefix ma- takes no nasal when the initial letter (of the stem) is a vowel, an h, r, l, ng, m, n, or nj, e.g. mahanta (meng(h)antar: CS) . . ."
25 Kern: KVK, p. 300.
26 v. 354b. cf. de Hollander: HMT, p. 45 (Note 1): "In the Minangkabau dialect, the inserted ē is even represented by an alif, so that one finds sarato for ser(c)ta . . ."
27 v. 126a.
28 v. 152b.
suggest that the sounds -ai and -au did not exist as finals for our author, only -é and -o.31

Reminiscent of Minangkabau pronunciation is v. 401 where the end-rhymes are spelt amiral, kapal, berchabar and Mengkasar,32 and vv. 86, 195 and 314, where ketjil (so spelt) is obviously to be pronounced as ketji’, is certainly more of a 'Western' than an 'Eastern' pronunciation.33 But what then of v. 264, with its end-rhymes pil, ketjil, bedil and batil? Does this latter verse indicate that the author used now one and now the other of ketji’ and ketjil, or is it to be taken as a visual rhyme only, and not a phonetic one? 34

To sum up this rather inconclusive discussion, we may say that it is not unlikely that the copyist of S spoke a dialect of Malay something like that associated with the Minangkabau area, a conclusion that obtains some support from the proximity of the Minangkabau area to Bangkahulu (Bengkulen), where a former owner of the ms., Marsden, spent some eight years.

Not noted in the apparatus criticus are the following spelling peculiarities, which differ from modern practice:

1. The absence of final vowels, in particular -ā, but occasionally -ī (e.g. b-ā-b (v. 119c) for babī).

2. The occasional insertion of final vowels, usually -ā (e.g. p-r-ā-d-ā (v. 185c) for perada). The particle di- is sometimes spelt d-ī- 35 while itu is sometimes spelt ā-ī-ū.

3. The occasional absence of the vowel grapheme in a non-final open syllable (e.g. r-n-t-k (v. 210d) for rentaka).

4. The frequent insertion of -ā- (and less frequently -ī-) where

31 This theory seems more likely than to suppose a hyper-correct pronunciation of the words given (as Sanderabonai, Bonai, bura’ain, Patirau, tjilaun- tiulan.) In most parts of Indonesia to-day, particularly in the Eastern areas, words spelt with final -ai and -au are commonly pronounced as -é and -o respectively, despite the officially 'recommended' pronunciation, which attempts to preserve the Riau-Johore tradition of equating spelling and pronunciation.

32 cf. van der Toorn: MSK, p. ix: "the r and l are not pronounced when word-final: -al and -ar sound like -a, e.g. maha (mahal), danga (de- ngar) . . ."

33 ketji’ is, of course, still the standard Peninsular Malay pronunciation.

34 Visual rhymes occur but rarely in the sja’ir, i.e. v. 41 (in L only, see app. crit.), v. 352 and v. 433.

modern spelling has the ‘e pepet’ (e.g. ṗ-ā-r-ng (v. 317a) for perang and ṗ-ī-t-t (v. 206d) for peti).

(5) The insertion of -ā- into a closed syllable (e.g. d-ā-n-d-ā-m (v. 428a) for dendam).

(6) *tj* is frequently used for *dj* and vice versa.

(7) *k* is frequently used for *g* and vice versa.

(8) *s* is frequently used for *sj*.

(9) *sj* is occasionally used for *s* usually in words of foreign origin (e.g. b-ng-sj-ā-w-ā-n (v. 151c) for bangsawan).

(10) As frequently occurs in contemporary mss., bunji, sunji and their derivatives are usually, but not consistently, spelt as b-ā-n-ī and s-ā-n-ī.

(11) Contrary to modern practice, *h* is used:

   (a) **Initially** (before words commencing with a vowel): It is fairly common to find spellings such as h-ā-s-p (v. 182d) for asap.

   (b) **Medially**: This usage is not very common, but the Sanskrit-derived semua is regularly spelt with an *h* (e.g. s-m-h-ā-nj (v. 234b) for semuanja).

   (c) **Finally** (in words ending with a vowel): This usage is common (e.g. m-l-ū-k-h (v. 136d) for Meluku).

(12) A final glottal stop is represented sometimes by -q, sometimes by -k and sometimes by -‘ (hamzah).

(13) Arabic-derived words:

   Arabic words obviously mis-spelt have (as far as the normative romanisation has allowed) been tacitly corrected, e.g. it has not been considered necessary to note in the apparatus criticus

---

36 For reasonably contemporary examples see e.g. Drewes: BUR, p. 44 etc., Doorenbos: GHP, p. 22 etc., Johns: MSU, p. 6 etc.

37 e.g. in v. 349d.

38 e.g. in v. 265a.

39 see System of Romanisation adopted.
that the word *ṣāḥib* has been spelt *ṣahib*. However, the dividing line between 'mis-spelling' and 'Malayanising' is not easily definable, and where the possibility of such 'Malayanising' exists, the apparatus gives the forms used by the copyist, e.g. in v. 7b the edited text, following Purwadarminta, has *termazkur*, while the apparatus criticus shows that what the copyist in fact wrote was *t-r-m-l-ā-k-ā-r.*

In passing, it may be noted that some twenty per cent of the Arabic-derived words used in the sja'ir are spelt incorrectly ('incorrectly', that is from an Arabic view-point); thus, in v. 19c, *z-k-‘-t* has been written for *zakāt.*

Finally, one may note the following points:

The form *ā-m-ā-r-h* (amarah) occurs twice (v. 261, v. 399) but generally the form *m-ā-r-h* is preferred.

On one occasion (v. 225b) the word *dan* occurs with the meaning of *dengan* (as it does in the Cod. Or. 2016 ms. of Hamzah Fansuri), but this is quite possibly an error.

The form *d-ū-l-ā-p-n* is used for *delapan* (v. 38a).

---

40 v. 9c.
41 Doorenbos: GHP, p. 93, line 30.