



A. Day

Babad Kandha, Babad Kraton and variation in modern Javanese literature

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 134 (1978), no: 4, Leiden, 433-450

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

ANTHONY DAY

BABAD KANDHA, BABAD KRATON AND VARIATION IN MODERN JAVANESE LITERATURE

We find it difficult to grasp something that is multiform. It seems necessary to construct an ideal text or to seek an original, and we remain dissatisfied with an ever-changing phenomenon.

Albert B. Lord (1974: 100) ¹

Students of Modern Javanese literature have long been aware of, but seldom grappled with, interpretative problems posed by variant versions of historical and mythical tales written in *tĕmbang macapat*. In 1779, for example, Josua van Iperen surmised that his fragmentary *Sadjara Radja Djawa*, which had been acquired in Surakarta in 1750, was the product of constant additions to and alterations of a repeatedly copied "text". (van Iperen 1779: 136). At the end of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth, Brandes and Djajadiningrat encountered the bewildering multiplicity of Modern Javanese poetic versions of Java's real and imaginary past. (Brandes 1897: 176ff.; Djajadiningrat 1913: 195-288). But Brandes was less interested in that multiplicity than in simplifying it in order to discover the truth about Majapahit, while Djajadiningrat's division of texts into two groups, those which treat mythical history briefly and those which do so at length, did not even begin to illuminate the problem of how to analyze poems in all their varieties of age, provenance, genre and style.

More recently, as if in answer to Brandes' plea for an investigation of Javanese manuscripts in the Raffles, Crawford and Mackenzie collections ("...vooral van belang om hare oudheid tegenover latere verzamelingen..." Brandes: 176), M. C. Ricklefs has addressed himself to the issue of textual variation in the interest of historical "precision" through a series of studies on the early political and literary history of Yogyakarta. In his "A Consideration of Three Versions of the *Babad Tanah Djawi*" (1972), for example, he compares the Yogyakarta *Babad*

Kraton (1777-78), the Surakarta *Babad Tanah Jawi* (the so-called "Major *Babad*", copied in 1836) and the condensed prose *Meinsma Babad* (1874) and their treatments of the fall of Majapahit. The historian in Ricklefs "instinctively favours" *Babad Kraton* because it is closest to Majapahit in time and to earlier (hypothetical) recensions of the *Babad Tanah Jawi*. Its "less flamboyant idiom" as compared to the nineteenth century Surakarta text also makes it more trustworthy. Ricklefs concludes on a cautious note, however. Neither the Yogyakarta nor the Surakarta poem should be used as sources of accurate historical information about Majapahit. Instead, they must be read as documents which reveal the "thought world" of the Yogyakarta and Surakarta kratons in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in which the "growing consciousness of Islam as a part of the Javanese identity over the period 1777-1836" can be discerned. (Ricklefs 1972: 295).²

In the course of my own research on Surakarta poetic tradition in the nineteenth century, I have had occasion to examine *Babad Kandha* (KITLV Or 11), listed by Pigeaud in his *Literature of Java*, Vol. II, p. 824. In the last stanza of the poem the copyist states that he completed writing it on March 27, 1860 but does not say where he did so. Pigeaud identifies the script as "Central Pasisir", mentions some of the mythical and historical incidents the *babad* contains and concludes by remarking that the contents are "partly the same" as those of the Surakarta "Major *Babad*". Since I had been reading *Babad Kraton* and other texts from Yogyakarta along with Surakarta poetry, I became curious to learn to what extent *Babad Kandha* belonged to either of these Central Javanese textual traditions. Pigeaud suggests that *Babad Kandha* is related to Surakarta *babad* texts, but this contradicts what Juynboll proposes in his list of Javanese manuscripts in the KITLV. (Juynboll 1914: 396-97). There it is remarked that the first lines of the first six cantos of *Babad Kandha* are identical to those listed by Brandes in his "Register" (1900). This text of the *Babad Tanah Jawi*, which Brandes does not place in either Yogyakarta or Surakarta tradition, is clearly a version of the nineteenth century Yogyakarta *babad*, identical in many places to the eighteenth century *Babad Kraton*.

In the table below I set out the preliminary results of my study of *Babad Kandha*. A short discussion follows. Since it has not been my intention to investigate this particular poem in great depth, I have restricted myself to the first twelve cantos and to presenting an outline of poetic metres, indicating the narrative content of each canto only briefly. Three other poems are used for comparison with *Babad Kandha*

MB	BK	LOr 6483	BKA
I. <i>Dhandhanggula</i> , 17 stanzas; Adam, Wisnu, Nini Mëndhang.	I. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 158 stan- zas; in places iden- tical to <i>MB</i> ; identical throughout to LOr 6483 and after st. 112, to <i>BKA</i> .	I. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 156 st's. = <i>BK</i> ↓	
II. <i>Asmarandana</i> , 47 st's; Watu Gunung.			
III. <i>Sinom</i> , 37 st's.			
IV. <i>Pangkur</i> , 29 st's.			
V. <i>Durma</i> , 57 st's.			
VI. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 88 st's. MB VI, 1 → MB VI, 10 →	= <i>BK</i> I, 101 ≠ <i>BK</i> I, 112	→	= <i>BKA</i> I (<i>Dhandh.</i>), 1. BKA I is 42 st's long.
MB VI, 11-17 → MB VI, 18 → MB mentions Banja- ran Sari in one line, then begins the history of Ratu Pamėkas of Pajajaran.	= <i>BK</i> ≠ <i>BK</i> I, 119, where <i>BK</i> explains the genealogy of Lėmbu Miluhur and begins the history of Banjaran Sari of Galuh.	↓ = <i>BK</i>	↓

MB	BK	LOr 6483	BKA
VI. (cont'd) Raden Susuruh.	II. <i>Mijil</i> , 119 st's. Banjaran Sari.	= II. <i>Mijil</i> , 121 st's.	= II. <i>Mijil</i> , 100 st's.
	III. <i>Asmar.</i> , 64 st's.	= III. <i>Asmar.</i> , 65 st's.	= III. <i>Asmar.</i> , 62 st's.
	IV. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 43 st's.	= IV. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 44 st's.	= IV. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 44 st's.
	V. <i>Durma</i> , 20 st's.	= V. <i>Durma</i> , 19 st's.	= V. <i>Durma</i> , 17 st's.
	VI. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 28 st's. Ratu Pamėkas. ↓ BK VI	≠ VI. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 11 st's. LOr 6483 VI-XXX present the history of Baron Sakendher. At XXX, 14 LOr 6483 returns to Ratu Pamėkas and paral- lels BK and BKA. →	≠ VI. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 19 st's. Ratu Pamėkas. ↓ = BKA VI
	VII. <i>Durma</i> , 26 st's; Pajajaran.	= XXXI, <i>Durma</i> , 25 st's. Pajajaran.	{ VII. <i>Durma</i> , 13 st's. + VIII. <i>Pangkur</i> , 11 st's. BKA is not identical to BK-LOr 6483 here but is clearly based on a version of BK.

MB	BK	LOr 6483	BKA
VII. <i>Pangkur</i> , 30 st's. R. Susuruh, Ajar Camara Tunggal	VIII. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 46 st's.	= XXXII, <i>Dhandh.</i> , 47 st's.	{ IX. <i>Dhandh.</i> , 12 st's. + X. <i>Pangkur</i> , 46 st's. BKA IX and X are clearly based on BK VIII.
VIII. <i>Mijil</i> , 61 st's. R. Susuruh-Ki Ajar.	IX. <i>Sinom</i> , 76 st's. Ki Ajar, the founding of Majapahit. BK IX, 53 →	= XXXIII, <i>Sinom</i> , 55 st's. ↓ = LOr 6483 XXXIII, 55 →	= XI. <i>Sinom</i> , 57 st's. ↓ = BKA XI, 34
IX. <i>Durma</i> , 39 st's. Founding of Majapahit.	BK Ki Dilah	XXXIV. <i>Asmar.</i> , 57 st's. Pulo Undrus, Sekar Mandapa, Mur Jangkung.	= BKA Ki Dilah
X. <i>Asmar.</i> , 84 st's. Majapahit, beginning of Arya Dilah.		XXXV. <i>Durma</i> , 18 st's. Flight of the Pangeran of Jakarta.	

MB	BK	LOr 6483	BKA
<p>XI. <i>Dhandh.</i>, 205 st's. Arya Dilah, Raden Patah, etc.</p>	<p>= X. <i>Dhandh.</i>, 75 st's. Identical to <i>MB</i>, omitting Rahmat-Santri story (<i>MB</i> XI, 27-63); contains some descriptive passages left out in <i>BKA</i>. Switches to <i>Sinom</i> at <i>MB</i> XI, 124.</p> <p>XI. <i>Sinom</i>, 18 st's.</p>	<p>XXXVI. <i>Sinom</i>, 14 st's. Majapahit.</p> <p>XXXVII. <i>Pocung</i>, 8 st's.</p> <p>XXXVIII. <i>Sinom</i>, 26 st's.</p> <p>XXXIX. <i>Pangkur</i>, 18 st's. Jaka Dilah goes to Majapahit.</p>	<p>= XII. <i>Dhandh.</i>, 134 st's. Identical to <i>MB</i>, omitting some descriptive passages.</p>

(*BKA*): the Surakarta "Major *Babad*", as printed by Balai Pustaka in 1939-41 (*MB*); *Babad Kraton* (*BK*);³ and LOr 6483, a version of the nineteenth century Yogyakarta *Babad Tanah Jawi* written in 1851 and identical to two other Leiden texts, NBS 158 and LOr 2046, both of which were written in Yogyakarta in 1821.

The comparative table indicates that for the first twelve cantos *Babad Kandha* is nearly identical to *Babad Kraton*. Cantos I-VI are exactly the same except for omissions of descriptive stanzas and substitutions of synonyms and other variant forms.⁴ In *BKA* VII and VIII, the copyist has written two cantos, in *durma* and *pangkur*, which are based on the *durma* of *BK* rather than on the roughly equivalent *dhandhanggula* passage in *MB*. *BKA* IX and X can also be best related to *BK* VIII. The table sketches the relationship between *BKA* and *BK* in the final *sinom* and *dhandhanggula* cantos XI and XII. It seems beyond question that *BKA* is a version of the Yogyakarta *Babad Tanah Jawi*, one which approximates the eighteenth century *Babad Kraton* more nearly than the nineteenth century LOr 6483.

For the first five cantos, however, all three Yogyakarta texts are very close to one another. This section contains the history of Banjaran Sari, the Queen of Galuh and Ki Satama. From canto VI onward the metrical and narrative individuality of each of the three poems unfolds, generating variations in word choice, syntax and poetic effect particular to each type of stanza used.

I hope to be able to say more about the meaning of the Banjaran Sari story elsewhere, but a few remarks about it are pertinent here. It is noteworthy that van Iperen's Surakarta *babad* fragment of 1750, which reads like a paraphrase (almost a translation) of *MB* I-IX, does not include the history of Banjaran Sari but reflects instead the terseness of *MB* VI, 18 where Banjaran Sari is mentioned in a single line. Banjaran Sari stories do not appear in nineteenth century versions of the Surakarta *Babad Tanah Jawi* either, as far as I know. They are included in the nineteenth century *Sĕrat Aji Saka* from Surakarta, but in a different form from what we find in Yogyakarta *babads*, just as the Surakarta *Sĕrat Baron Sakendher* and its mythologized variants in Ranggawarsita's *Madya* cycle are unlike the Yogyakarta version of the story. If we consider the fact that both the Banjaran Sari and Baron Sakendher tales are found in Yogyakarta *babads* by 1821, we may want to investigate the possibility that *together* they occupy a place in Yogyakarta "*babad* thought" for which there is no exact Surakarta

equivalent. Thus it may be "thematic attraction", to borrow Lord's phrase, rather than any other reason which explains why nineteenth century Yogyakarta *babads* have positioned the Sakendher story just after the history of Banjaran Sari and the founding of Batavia and before the history of Pajajaran, while the final episodes of the *Sĕrat Baron Sakendher* which deal with the defeat of the Pangeran of Jakarta occur, forebodingly, right after the founding of Majapahit.⁵ In Yogyakarta *babad* myth from 1821 onward, as this sequencing might suggest, Europeans are present at the foundation or demise of the great kingdoms of Java's distant past (Galuh, "Batavia", Pajajaran, Majapahit), just as they presided over the founding of Yogyakarta under Mangkubumi and the sacking of his *kraton* during the reign of his son, Sultan Sĕpuh. The table above indicates that a comparative study of Yogyakarta *babad* texts from different periods is desirable, in order to trace the development of Yogyakarta thinking about Java's early past and as a necessary preliminary to attempting any "cross-cultural" study of Yogyakarta and Surakarta *babad* traditions.

Such a study is possible, to be sure, but not on the basis of what we merely guess to be significant differences between only two versions of the *Babad Tanah Jawi* and not until we understand how to interpret the expansions and omissions of plot and description, the flamboyant and restrained in poetic style, in both Surakarta and Yogyakarta *babad* poetry. Consider for a moment the metrical diversity of *MB* and *BK* which counterpoints their essential narrative/genealogical identity. Both texts begin in *dhandhanggula*, and for seventeen stanzas there are many lines and entire stanzas in the two poems which are identical. Then *MB* continues for 170 stanzas in four different metres, returning to *dhandhanggula* with a stanza which is nearly identical to *BK* I, 101. The poems parallel one another until *MB* VI, 18 = *BK* I, 119, at which point *BK* enlarges upon the genealogy of Lĕmbu Miluhur for one stanza, then embarks upon the history of Banjaran Sari. *MB* mentions Banjaran Sari in passing, being intent upon the history of Ratu Pamĕkas of Pajajaran. The two poems differ from each other metrically and in other, possibly significant, ways until *dhandhanggula* in *MB* XI and *BK* X. *BK* leaves out the story of Raden Rahmat and Raden Santri (= *MB* XI, 27-63) but parallels *MB* more "fully" than *BKA* in other respects (*BKA* omits the wonderful description of Raden Patah's journey through the forest, *MB* XI, 83-94, for example) until *BK* X, 75 = *MB* XI, 121, when *BK* changes the metre to *sinom*. By this point *MB* has covered 595 stanzas with ten changes of metre, while *BK* has

presented 655 stanzas in nine different metres. In spite of these quantitative similarities (interesting considering the at times wide dissimilarity in content), *MB* and *BK* are metrically and in many small ways stylistically distinct. Yet would it be apparent from a comparison of the poems which is "earlier" and which is "later", if we did not know when either text was copied and if we were not guided by *a priori* assumptions about what makes certain styles historically more "precise" and "older" than others?

It might help us to place versions of the same text in the proper relationship to one another if we were surer about just what kind of "literature" Javanese *babads* are and knew more about how the Javanese composed their long poems in *těmbang macapat*. *Macapat* is a written literary form, but it is written down in order to be sung. At least until the late nineteenth century the Modern Javanese word for "to read" (*maca*) meant "to sing poetry".⁸ *Macapat* is still performed today in Java, and I have seen and heard an old Surakarta *kraton* scribe find his place in a *babad* by singing his way, line by line and faster than he would in public performance, to the line he sought. It is not unthinkable that composition, even sheer "copying", often involved private, oral performances of this kind. It is in any case this oral, performative quality which is basic to Javanese poetry and which helps explain why the closely related poems outlined above are so distinct in terms of overall metrical construction and in terms of the total pattern of descriptive and narrative content, sometimes presented "fully", sometimes less so. We should also not forget that no two singers would "read" (*maca*) in the same sort of *sinom* or *pangkur*. We can have no sense of the effect of singing styles, sometimes highly ornamented, sometimes sober in the extreme, on the meaning of the poems themselves simply by looking at a page of manuscript; the metrical diversity evident from the table above gives only the very roughest indication of the possibilities for significant elaboration or restraint in actual, sung performance.

A partial insight into the nature (although not the meaning) of variation in Javanese poetic composition is provided by a chance discovery made during my study of *Babad Kandha*. At two places in portions of the *Babad Kraton* used for comparison with *Babad Kandha* the copyist has made mistakes. First at *BK* X, 29 (= *MB* XI, 70) he has written two lines, then crossed out four by placing an "i" (*wulu*) above and an "u" (*suku*) below every *aksara*, then finished the stanza correctly. The four misplaced lines belong in stanza 33 (= *MB* XI, 74). Apparently the

copyist strayed from his place, lured to stanza 33 by the same word "Patah" at the end of the second line. Below is stanza 29 with the mistake, followed by stanza 33. Note that line 6 ("amirsa kang węcana/mirsa ikang węcana") contains *different* forms for the verb and relative pronoun in the two places, only four stanzas apart, in which it appears.

st. 29 // Prameswari Putri Cina angling,
putranisun sira Raden Patah,

*ya bęcńr iku tarkane,
myang prameswarinipun,
Putri Cina tan kęcna angling,
amirsa kang węcana,

idhęcpan rama ujare,
sira dadiya ratu,
mumpung isun męcnangi urip,
angregol marang sira,
yen dadiya ratu,
eca yen isun anendra,
lan bukti yen sira wus dadi aji,
gumantiya ramanya // ⁷

st. 33 // Arya Damar męcńng tan mangleni,
ing caranira Raden Patah,
ya bęcńr iku tarkane,
myang prameswarinipun,
Putri Cina tan kęcna angling,
mirsa ikang węcana,
sira ikang sunu,
Raden Patah pan prayoga,
lir wong tuwa sęcmune wus gumanti,
mring kang aweh titipan // ⁸

Stanzas 29 and 33 seem to have been written by the same hand, although we cannot be absolutely sure of this or that the same copyist wrote both stanzas within the space of a few minutes. Whatever the case may be, the small variations in line 6 are characteristic, if insignificant, examples of the variability pervasive at lexical, narrative and purely "poetic" levels in *macapat*. Only at the level of the basic thematic

balungan, the “stable skeleton”, as Lord would call it, of a *babad* can we expect to find elements which are unchanged and unalterable as we move from one version to another.⁹

The second and more significant scribal error occurs at the end of *BK X*, at st. 75 (= *MB XI*, 124 = *BKA XII*, 56). *BK X*, 74 (= *MB XI*, 123 = *BKA XII*, 55) describes the arrival of Raden Patah and Raden Husen at Mt. Rasya Muka. In the “Major *Babad*” this stanza is followed by nine more in which the incident is related. At *BK*, *st. 75, however, the copyist began a stanza which he then rejected:

*st. 75 // Adipati ing Těrung aběkti,
 nulya němbah tumukul dyan rěpa,
 abukuh ing paluguhe,
 nulya sira umatur,
 kakang Patah kula puniki,

Then the stanza in *dhandhanggula* breaks off and a new one is written, in which no more mention is made of Rasya Muka. This stanza takes the brothers to Surabaya and concludes *BK X*.

The misplaced half-stanza makes no sense in the context in which we find it, but we cannot look ahead a few stanzas in *dhandhanggula* for where it belongs: *BK* changes to *sinom* in one more stanza. If we glance at the comparative table, however, we notice that in both *MB XI* and *BKA XII*, *dhandhanggula* continues for many more stanzas. And at st. 197 of the “Major *Babad*” (= *BKA XII*, 124), in the middle of the account of how Adipati Těrung summoned Raden Patah to Majapahit, we come upon the stray verses inadvertently written at *BK X*, *75 :

st. 197 // Adipati ing Těrung aběkti,
 nulya lěnggah tumungkul mangrěpa,
 andhěku ing palungguhe,
 nulya sira umatur,
 kakang Patah ulun puniki,
 dinuta ing Sang Nata,
 rěke Majalangu,
 kita kakang ingandikan,
 de sang nata pinarak ing Maospati,
 sang natarsa pangguha // ¹⁰

It seems certain that the copyist of *Babad Kraton*, at least for the first eleven cantos, worked from a version of the *Babad Tanah Jawi* which contained the stanza we find at *MB* XI, 197 and *BKA* XII, 124. Nor is it rash to conclude that this copy contained the whole canto in *dhandhanggula* which we find in varying degrees of completeness in both the Surakarta *babad* and *Babad Kandha*, which reflects Yogyakarta tradition. Far from being a text "free from problems of doubtful origin" and "later interpolation" (Ricklefs 1974: xxiii),¹¹ *Babad Kraton*, despite the fact that it is the oldest dated version of the *Babad Tanah Jawi* we know, seems in places to be less "original" than the more elaborate nineteenth century "Major *Babad*" and *Babad Kandha*. In cantos X and XI the copyist has, as it were, simply omitted the "flamboyance" of the full *dhandhanggula* canto and recast much of it in a more concise *sinom*.¹²

If we assume that the Surakarta *babad* of 1836 is full of ornate, Islamic interpolations and that both these qualities are special characteristics of nineteenth century Javanese *babad* poetry, then it is easy to read the eighteenth century *Babad Kraton* as a simpler and hence(?) less Islamic version of the later poem. We may even be inclined to call *Babad Kraton* more historically "precise", if indeed greater stylistic simplicity and the apparent muting of reference to Islam are hallmarks of historicity in either a Javanese or a Western sense. But now that we have good reason to think that *Babad Kraton's* "less flamboyant idiom" is not, as Ricklefs has implied, an original quality of either the copyist's own literary style or of the "thought world" of the Yogyakarta *kraton* in the late eighteenth century, but is rather a stylistic effect created by the omission of narrative and poetic embellishments found in the older text from which *Babad Kraton* was copied, we may want to re-examine our critical assumptions. How can we be sure, for example, that the copyist's simplifying intent was not purely aesthetic rather than ideological? Perhaps he felt that the extended account of Majapahit's fall, well-known to those who had listened to a "fuller" version of the *babad*, did not have to be reproduced in his copy of the story at canto XIII because he regarded it as "ornament". Ricklefs has himself suggested, in a more cautious moment, that the "author" of *Babad Kraton* "simply left out" the dramatically Islamic aspects of the history of Majapahit's end. (Ricklefs 1972: 292). Perhaps, too, we are wrong to read *Babad Kraton* as a magico-political, mystical-chronological charter, as Ricklefs would have us do. (Ricklefs 1974: 176-226). Rather, the legitimacy which the poem inherited and transmitted may have rested

on its close adherence to the older copy of the text which formed its point of constant reference and creative departure. We might even consider the *babad* in the light of a well-known Javanese proverb which states the relationship between parent and child: "Kacang ora tinggal lanjaran" (The bean plant does not leave the bean pole).¹³ This saying could be taken as a metaphor for the relationship between the "parental" thematic structures (or *balungan*) of a Javanese *babad* and their poetic "offspring", those narrative or stylistic embellishments and simplifications which at once preserve, regenerate and ornamentally "entwine" the basic themes of the original poem which have fathered them and which guide their growth.¹⁴ A functionalist approach concentrating on how *babads* were (theoretically) used in *kraton* society in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries does not help us perceive let alone understand the textual interplay of permanence and change, origin and growth, in Javanese poetry — an "ever-changing phenomenon" which is essential to how and what *babads* mean.

It should be clear that we must be at least wary of theories about eighteenth and nineteenth century Javanese literature and culture which equate stylistic elaborateness and prolixity with "lateness" or cultural decline. Ricklefs is not the only proponent of such a view. Pigeaud's *Literature of Java*, for example, is full of remarks about "high-flown" nineteenth century poetic style; Poerbatjaraka, a relentless foe of "interpolations" in Old Javanese literature, scorned the ornateness of Rangga-warsita's "decadent" verse; and Geertz has often implied that "agricultural involution" is mirrored in the elaborately "vague" cultural and political forms of Java in the late and post-colonial periods. And yet, a close comparative reading of *MB*, *BK*, LOr 6483 and *BKA* shows beyond a doubt that some of the most elaborate sections of the *Babad Tanah Jawi* belong to the oldest portions of the poem which we can identify as such with certainty. I have mentioned *MB* XI. The descriptive language of the *taman sari* section in *BK* I, describing Banjaran Sari's encounter with the Queen of Galuh, is more "flamboyant" than anything we find in the nineteenth century Surakarta *babad*.

What began as an attempt to identify *Babad Kandha* has ended as a discussion of issues which are important for our understanding of poems in Modern Javanese. What variations in narrative and poetic ornament in *tĕmbang macapat* mean is a basic problem still to be explored.

NOTES

- ¹ This and other references to Lord's classic study of oral epic in the course of my paper are not meant to imply that I think *tĕmbang macapat* is "oral" in the strict sense of Lord's definition of the term (p. 4). It is my contention, however, that *macapat* displays traits which are "oral" and as such central to its meaning. See Robson (1976), for example, for a discussion which hints at the possible significance of sung, non-semantic features of *tĕmbang macapat*. Gonda (1958) clearly, if unintentionally, demonstrates the oral character of *written* Middle Javanese *kidung*. See further: Voorhoeve (1964), esp. p. 262; Sweeney (1973), for an analytically weak but detail-packed study which suggests that there are many parallels between Malay "oral" literature and Javanese "literary" poetry; Smith (1977), ill-mannered and inaccurate in its critique of Lord, but of comparative interest because of its material taken from India; and Ong (1971) for a stimulating discussion of "residual orality" in literate Western European culture.
- ² Ricklefs regards the Surakarta *babad* as more "Islamic" on the grounds that its narrative treatment of the "Muslim overthrow" of Majapahit is more extensive — an emphasis which he implies is of dubious historical accuracy (p. 292). Implicit in this view are two interconnected assumptions: (1) Islamic influence on *kraton* culture was in fact stronger in 1836 than in 1777-78; (2) Javanese texts written in 1836 are more embellished and interpolated than those written in 1777-78. The second assumption will be examined in this essay. The first contention has yet to be thoroughly investigated. The *Sĕrat Babad Nĕtik* (KITLV Or 231), a "diary" in *tĕmbang macapat* describing daily events in the Mangkunegaran and Surakarta from 1780 to 1791, for example, suggests that Orthodox *santris* played a highly prominent role in the court of Mangkunegara I. Dr. Ann Kumar, who is currently preparing a study of *kraton* life in Surakarta in the late eighteenth century, kindly drew my attention to this point.
- ³ BL Add. 12320, described in Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977), p. 50. The Leiden texts are described in Pigeaud (1968) Vol. II.
- ⁴ Cf. Worsley (1972), p. 100. My use of the word "identical" assumes the presence of variations of the type cited here.
- ⁵ In Ricklefs (1974), p. 376 we read that the story of the founding of Batavia, with which the *Banjaran Sari* section ends, was "primarily intended" to explain the meaning of the name "Batavia" and to provide the transition to the *Sakendher* legend. My contention, on the contrary, is that the *whole* of the *Banjaran Sari* tale is thematically related to the *whole* of the history of Baron *Sakendher*. *BKA* V, p. 30a. ff. is identical to *BK* for the Batavia passages, except that the pun on Batavia/ *bata wiyah* ("ordinary bricks") is missing: *BKA* calls the city simply "Jakarta". This might suggest that the word-play on Batavia is not the crucial, enduring linch-pin joining the two stories together in narrative sequence. Cf. Winter (1862), I, p. 185, where the position of the *Sĕrat Baron Sakendher* in a list of *babads* also suggests possibilities for interpretation.
- ⁶ For informative observations on *macapat* in nineteenth century Java, see Poensen (1869), pp. 154-57 and *passim*.
- ⁷ "The Queen, Putri Cina, said: 'My son, Raden Patah, pay heed to your father's words, that you should become king. As long as I live I will seek your protection(?). If you become king I will rest at ease, and I will pay you homage when you are king, replacing your father.'"
- ⁸ "Arya Damar was silent and did not reply to what Raden Patah said. 'It is

true,' he thought. As for the Queen, Putri Cina, she could not speak as she listened to the words of her son. 'Raden Patah is well-suited; he looks like his father and has taken the place of the one who made the gift(?)'." The meaning of the last two lines is unclear to me. Perhaps a *double entendre* is intended: in both st. 29 and st. 33, Putri Cina seems to refer to Raden Patah's dual royal destiny, as son of Brawijaya of Majapahit and as foster-son of Arya Damar of Palembang.

- ⁹ *Balungan* is a term commonly used to designate the basic thematic structure of a *wayang* play or *gamelan gendhing* and comes from the root, *balung*, meaning "bone". In Dialogue 69 of the *Javaansche Zamenspraken* (Winter 1862: 162), the Dutchman "Tuan Anu" and the Javanese literatus, "Kawireja", discuss the differences between Old and Modern Javanese literature in terms of three structural elements: the *balungan*; the *cariyos* (story, narrative); and *ungêl* (the sung, poetic "sound"). Cf. the metaphoric extensions of the meaning of "bone" on the Eastern Indonesian island of Roti, where it is identified with a person's "...enduring social person as embodied in his genealogical name." (Fox 1971: 245).
- ¹⁰ "Adipati Têrûng paid him homage, sat down, bowed and spoke entreatingly, bending low in his place: 'My brother, Patah, I have been sent by His Majesty of Majapahit. The King commands you to come to Majapahit. He wishes to meet with you.'" Cf. *BKA* XII, 124, and note the variations:

st. 124 // Adipati Têrûng atur bêkti,
 mring kang raka manêmbah suku sang,
 amangusapi lëbune,
 lungguh agya umatur,
 kakang Patah ulun puniki,
 dinuta ing sang nata,
 nenggi Majalangu,
 dika mangke ingandikan,
 de sang nata pinarêk ing Majapahit,
 sang nata sawangguwa //

- ¹¹ On p. 212 (Ricklefs 1974), Dr. Ricklefs discusses the authorship of *Babad Kraton* by R. T. Jayengrat. The word which links Jayengrat to the *babad* is *ayasa* which means "to make, create, have made or have created"; thus, Jayengrat was not necessarily the copyist himself but was more probably the "founder" or patron of the poem. Gericke and Roorda (1901: II, 449) stress that *ayasa* always means "to establish, make for the first time" (italics mine). *BK* was unique because of the variations introduced by the copyist, not because it was a new literary work created *ex nihilo*. Cf. Ong (1971: 80) who writes on the use of "commonplace collections" by authors in Tudor England: "The most resounding and most quoted passages of Shakespeare are generally his reworked versions of what anyone could find here. Like Alexander Pope a century later, Shakespeare was less an originator than a consummately expert retoucher of thought and expression."
- ¹² See the table. The six narrative units which make up *MB* XI, 134-205 are clearly demarcated by stock expressions like: "Data tita lingira ing uni."
- ¹³ On the meaning of *lanjaran* ("bean pole"), see Gericke and Roorda (1901), II, p. 89. *Lanjaran* can also mean: "a child adopted by a childless couple, as a means of getting children of their own." Also see Anderson for an excellent discussion of related themes in Soetomo's *Kenang-Kenangan*.
- ¹⁴ Cf. what Fox says about adaptation and embellishment in Rotinese chants in

Fox (1975), p. 103 ff. Fox's observation that the significance of mythic tales in Roti "does not seem to reside wholly or even primarily at the message level of the narrative structure" also holds true for Javanese poetic tales, in which meaning lies in the interaction of *balungan*, *cariyos* and sung rendition. See also Siegel (1976) for a fascinating discussion of the meaning of performance and prosody in Acehnese *hikayats*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations:

- BKI — Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Instituut.
 BL — British Library.
 BSOAS — Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.
 JMBRAS — Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
 KITLV — Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde.
 MNZG — Mededeelingen vanwege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap.
 RIMA — Review of Indonesian and Malayan Affairs.
 VBG — Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen.

I. Javanese sources:

- Babad Kandha*, KITLV Or 11.
Babad Kraton, BL Add. 12320.
Babad Tanah Jawi (Surakarta version), 31 volumes, Balai Pustaka, Batavia, [1939-41].
Babad Tanah Jawi (Yogyakarta version), LOr 6483.

II. Other references:

- Anderson, B. O'G.
 — "A Time of Darkness and a Time of Light: Transposition in Early Indonesian Nationalist Thought." Paper presented at the Congress of Human Sciences, Mexico City, August 1976 (unpublished).
 Brandes, J.
 1897 Pararaton, VBG 49: 1-314.
 1900 Register op de Proza-Overzetting van de Babad Tanah Djawi, VBG 51: 1-201.
 Djajadiningrat, H.
 1913 *Critische Beschouwing van den Sadjarah Banten*. Joh. Enschedé en Zonen, Haarlem.
 Fox, J. J.
 1971 "Sister's Child as Plant: Metaphors in an Idiom of Consanguinity," in Needham, R. (ed.), *Rethinking Kinship and Marriage*, ASA Vol. 11: 219-52. Tavistock, London.
 1975 "On Binary Categories and Primary Symbols: Some Rotinese Perspectives," in Willis, R. (ed.), *The Interpretation of Symbolism*: 99-132. Malaby Press, London.
 Gericke, J. F. C. and Roorda, T.
 1901 *Javaansch-Nederlandsch Handwoordenboek*, 2 vols., E. J. Brill, Leiden.
 Gonda, J.
 1958 Some Notes on the Relations between Syntactic and Metrical Unity in a Javanese Kidung. *BKI* 114: 98-116.

- van Iperen, J.
 1779-1781 Begin van eene Javaansche Historie, Genaamd *Sadjara Radja Djawa*. VBG I (1779): 134-72; VBG II (1780): 262-88; VBG III (1781): 117-33.
- Juynboll, H. H.
 1914 Catalogus der Javaansche, Balineesche en Madureesche Handschriften van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië. *BKI* 69: 386-418.
- Lord, Albert B.
 1974 *A Singer of Tales*. Atheneum, New York.
- Ong, Walter J.
 1971 *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology*. Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca and London.
- Pigeaud, Th.
 1967-1970 *Literature of Java*, 3 vols. Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague.
- Poensen, C.
 1869 Bijdragen tot de Kennis van den Godsdienstigen en Zedelijken Toestand der Javanen. *MNZG* 13: 153-236.
- Ricklefs, M. C.
 1972 A Consideration of Three Versions of the Babad Tanah Djawi, with Excerpts on the Fall of Madjapahit. *BSOAS* 35, Part 2: 285-315.
 1974 *Jogjakarta under Sultan Mangkubumi, 1749-1792*. OUP, London.
- Ricklefs, M. C. and Voorhoeve, P.
 1977 *Indonesian Manuscripts in Great Britain*. OUP, London.
- Robson, S. O.
 1976 The Power of Poetry. *RIMA* 10,1: 76-81.
- Siegel, J.
 1976 "Awareness of the Past in the *Hikajat Potjoet Moehamat*," in Cowan, C. D. and Wolters, O. W. (eds.), *Southeast Asian History and Historiography*: 321-31. Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca and London.
- Smith, John D.
 1977 The Singer or the Song? A Reassessment of Lord's 'Oral Theory'. *Man* 12,1: 141-53.
- Sweeney, A.
 1973 Professional Malay Story-Telling. *JMBRAS* 46, Part 2: 1-53.
- Voorhoeve, P.
 1964 "A Malay Scriptorium," in Bastin, J. and Roolvink, R. (eds.), *Malayan and Indonesian Studies*: 256-66. OUP, London.
- Winter Sr., C. F.
 1862 *Javaansche Zamenspraken*, Eerste deel. Johannes Müller, Amsterdam.
- Worsley, P. J.
 1972 *Babad Buleleng: A Balinese Dynastic Genealogy*. Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague.