M. Ricklefs

On the authorship of Leiden Cod. Or. 2191, Babad Mangkubumi

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 127 (1971), no: 2, Leiden, 264-273

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

ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF LEIDEN COD.OR. 2191, BABAD MANGKUBUMI

In his *Literature of Java*, Dr. Pigeaud says of Leiden *cod. or.* 2191, *Babad Mangkubumi*, that it "apparently ... represents Yogyakarta Court tradition. The ms is well written in cursive Yogyakarta script with decorated initial pages."¹ It will be seen that an analysis of the obscure opening stanzas of the text confirms Dr. Pigeaud's conclusion, and further assigns the authorship of this important manuscript to the Crown Prince of Jogjakarta, later Sultan Hamengkubuwana II (1792-1810, 1811-12, 1826-28).

The establishment of the authorship of any Javanese text is essential if the document is to be employed for a concrete analysis of Javanese society or history. Too often a haphazard approach has led to conclusions too general in their scope to be of lasting relevance. The views of a court official in Jogjakarta in the eighteenth century differed from those of a Surakarta dignitary, both of these must have varied from the perceptions of a Sultan of Dmak or Sultan Agung in previous centuries, and none of these corresponded with the views of a nineteenth-century Smarang trading family or of Sukarno. One cannot select a document at random to explain what "the Javanese" believed on any particular question. One can only take a specific text from a verifiable place, time, and social origin, and say that it reflects the views, as in this case, of the Crown Prince of Jogjakarta in the latter quarter of the eighteenth century. Any more general interpretations will be meaningful only after a groundwork of such specific texts has been laid.

The history of eighteenth-century Jogjakarta has suffered from this lack of attention to source materials. Poensen's articles on the first two Sultans of Jogjakarta² have remained the standard reference on the

¹ Th. G. Th. Pigeaud, *Literature of Java* (3 vols.; The Hague & Leiden, 1967-70), vol. II, pp. 83-84.

² C. Poensen, "Mangkubumi. Ngajogyakarta's Eerste Sultan (Naar Aanleiding van een Javaansch Handschrift)," *BKI*, vol. 52 (1901), pp. 223-361; "Amngku Buwn II (Spuh). Ngajogyakarta's Tweede Sultan (Naar Aanleiding van een Javaansch Handschrift)," *BKI*, vol. 58 (1905), pp. 73-346.

period 1755-1813. Poensen, however, did not take sufficient account of the fact that his manuscript source (now Leiden *cod. or.* 5765)³ gave a very biased picture of these years because it reflected the views of the first Prince Pakualam (1813-29). Before being elevated as the Prince Pakualam, Pangeran Natakusuma had been deeply involved in the intrigues among the sons of Sultan Hamengkubuwana I (1755-1792), and was particularly in conflict with his brother, Sultan Hamengkubuwana II. It is not surprising, therefore, that this *babad* should be extremely critical of the second Sultan. Yet Poensen appears to have been unconcerned about this problem. Although he knew of the Pakualaman origin of his manuscript,⁴ Poensen nevertheless treated it as a reasonably straightforward work of history rather than as a very one-sided view of events.

A very different picture of developments during the reign of Sultan Hamengkubuwana I is to be found in Leiden *cod. or.* 2191, *Babad Mangkubumi*. When the authorship of this text is understood, the departure from the viewpoint of Poensen's Pakualaman *babad* is readily explained.

Babad Mangkubumi begins with these stanzas (pp. 1-2, Canto I, Midjil):⁵

1. Midjil ri Sang Wiranom murwani
wau kang tjarijos
Srërat Babat Mëntaram wijose
Pranarendra ngrat Djawa winuni
këng minulja sami
kalipah Jang Agung
2. ing ri Akad purwanja tinulis
dera Sang Wiranom
djam sèdasa endjang ing wantjine
ping salikur tanggalnja narëngi
Madilawal sasi
Alip taunipun

³ See C. Poensen, *Bloemlezing uit Javaansche Proza-Geschriften* (Leiden, 1893), p. xiii; Pigeaud, *Literature of Java*, vol. II, pp. 338-339.

⁴ Poensen, *Bloemlezing*, p. xiii.

⁵ The system of romanization used here is based upon that in Th. Pigeaud, *Javaans-Nederlands Handwoordenboek* (Groningen & Batavia, [1938]), with the following exceptions: *oe* here becomes *u*; *é* and *è* become *e*; *e* (*pěpět*) becomes *ě*.

3. mongsa kanēm kang windu Tjetra di
wukunja gumantos
mapan Wukir sēngkalane mangke
paṇḍita ṣṭa amudja sēmedi
de Sang Murweng Kawi
kinarja ngimur kung
4. mugjantuka brēkahnja kēng sjargi
lēluhur Sang Anom
kang sumare ing Nusja Djawine
supangatnja para Nabi Wali
sinunga tyas wēning
manggija rahaju
5. tinēbihna goḍa rēntjananing
kēng murung lēlakon
manelada sudarma wignjane
pinandjangnja josjanira sami
luhura kēng singgih
mangabdi Sang Prabu.

These lines may be translated as follows:

1. (The meter :) Midjil. *Sang Wiranom* originates
then the tale,
beginning from *Sērat Babad Mataram*,
telling of the Kings of the Land of Java,
who are together glorified as
the caliphs of God.
2. On Sunday was the writing begun,
by *Sang Wiranom*,
at ten o'clock in the morning,
the twenty-first the date
of the month Djumadilawal,
Alip the year,
3. the sixth *mangsa* (of) the *windu* (which began in the month)
Tjetra [thus, *mangsa* Karo],
the *wuku*
Wukir; the chronogram then:
"The seers eight pray, meditate [AH 1187]."
By *Sang Murweng Kawi*
may there be made a diversion from care;

4. may he receive the blessing of his deceased
ancestors, *Sang Anom*,
who lie buried in the Island Java,
and the mediation of the Prophets and Apostles;
may he be given a pure heart
and encounter good fortune;
5. far away be the seductions and temptations
which frustrate the course of life;
may he take as an example his father's wisdom,
may their lives be equally prolonged;
be exalted indeed he who
serves the king.

The date given here converts to 10 August, AD 1773, but this was a Tuesday, not a Sunday. The rest of the date is correct. Such complex dates are usual in Modern Javanese texts. But it is somewhat unusual, although certainly not unique, to find the year in a courtly text given in the Arabic *Anno Hidjrah* (AH 1187), and to encounter the Old Javanese/Sanskrit month Tjetra (Sanskrit *Caitra*). Also unusual is the calculation of the "sixth *mangsa* of the *windu* which began in the month Tjetra." This *windu* (eight-year cycle) did indeed begin in Tjetra (on 25 March, AD 1773), and the sixth *mangsa* thereafter (counting Tjetra/Kasanga as the first) would therefore be *mangsa* Karo (2/3 August-25 August), which is correct. Of more importance than this date, which is internally consistent except for the mistake in the day of the week, is the question of authorship. Who is this *Sang Wiranom* or *Sang Anom*, also referred to as the "originator of the text" (*Sang Murweng Kawi*)?

The Javanese word *sang* is a prefix attached to the names or titles of gods or elevated personages, and may be thought of as similar to the English "honored" or "honorable". *Anom* means "young", and the phrase *Sang Anom* may be roughly understood as "Honorable Youth". In Javanese poetry, *Sang Anom* could be used as a refined literary reference for a young aristocrat. Moreover, *anom* was particularly associated in the courts of Surakarta and Jogjakarta with the Crown Prince, whose titles were "Kangdjeng Gusti Pangeran Adipati *Anom* Hamengkunegara", and whose domain was sometimes referred to as the "Kanomman". *Wira* means "outstanding, manful, hero", etc., particularly in the military sense. The combination *Sang Wiranom* (*wira*

plus *anom*) may be taken as "Honorable Young Hero".⁶

The phrases *Sang Anom* and *Sang Wiranom* thus imply both the elevated status and the young age of the author of this manuscript, and further suggest that the "Young Hero's" identity is to be sought in some young aristocrat, perhaps the Crown Prince. The scribe who copied the introductory stanzas of the manuscript also invokes as an example the life of the young man's father, who it seems from the context may be the King, and it will be remembered that the following pages concern the reign of Sultan Hamengkubuwana I. This immediately suggests that the *Sang Anom/Sang Wiranom* referred to here may be the Sultan's son, the later Sultan Hamengkubuwana II. It then becomes clear that the example he is urged to follow is that contained in the text itself, the life of his father the Sultan, and that the ancestors whose blessing is invoked in the fourth stanza are the same as the Kings of Java in the first stanza, from whom the Crown Prince was descended.

The suggestion that the author was the Crown Prince may be further tested in two ways. First, the Crown Prince of Jogjakarta appears often in *Babad Mangkubumi*, and in the usual poetic style various euphonious pseudonyms are employed. One may search the text to see whether any of these pseudonyms, which clearly refer to the Crown Prince, are similar to *Sang Anom* or *Sang Wiranom*. The most common form for the Crown Prince is *Djěng* (or *Kangdjěng*) *Gusti* (*passim*), but one also finds, *inter alia*, *Dipati Anom* (pp. 268, 477), *Sang Pěkik* (p. 451), *Sang Bagus* (pp. 454, 461), and finally *Sang Prawiranom* (p. 454). This latter term, *Sang Prawiranom*, is synonymous with *Sang Wiranom*, "Honorable Young Hero". It may be seen, then, that some of the euphonious references to the Crown Prince employed in the text bear a generic relationship to the terms *Sang Anom* and *Sang Wiranom* at the beginning of the manuscript, both playing upon the person's elevation (thus deserving of the prefix *sang*) and his youth (*anom*) or its associated attribute, beauty (*pěkik*, *bagus*). This reinforces the belief aroused by the opening stanzas that the Crown Prince is referred to there.

A second means of testing this suggestion is to compare the text and style of *Babad Mangkubumi* with a second work which is clearly and unequivocally ascribed to the Crown Prince, the Jogjakarta *kraton*

⁶ See J. F. C. Gericke & T. Roorda, *Javaansch-Nederlandsch Handwoordenboek* (ed. A. C. Vreede & J. G. H. Gunning; revised ed.; 2 vols.; Amsterdam & Leiden, 1901).

manuscript *Kangdjěng Kjai Surja Radja*. This is dated Monday-Lěgi, 8 Muharram, Ehe, *purna linang ing pandita* (AJ 1700/21 March, AD 1774), thus little more than one-half year after the date of *Babad Mangkubumi*. One finds here a general similarity of style and some striking parallels with the *Babad Mangkubumi* text, suggesting a common authorship. For instance, *Babad Mangkubumi* describes the accession of the Crown Prince in 1758 in these words (pp. 143-144, Canto XX, *Ḍaṇḍanggula*):

45. ...
 sanadyan kaṭah amangke
 atmadjengira Prabu
 mung kang dadya tělěng ingkang sih
 Djěng Den Mas Timur nama
 langkung sih Sang Prabu
 apan baḍe gěntanana [sic]
 mring kang raka djuměněng Pangran Dipati
 Anom Měngkuněgara
46. Kangdjěng Raden Mas Timur ing mangkin
 ingkang juswa dawěg wolung warsa
 ...

This may be translated as follows:

45. ...
 Although many then
 were the children of the King,
 the only one who was the center of his affection,
 was the Honored Raden Mas Timur by name,
 exceedingly beloved of the King,
 who would replace
 his elder brother, becoming Pangeran Adipati
 Anom Haměngkuněgara [Crown Prince]
46. The Honored Raden Mas Timur, then,
 his age was just eight years [i.e. one *windu*]
 ...

This should be compared with the Crown Prince's description of himself in *Kangdjěng Kjai Surja Radja* (vol. I, p. 7, Canto I, *Asma-radana*):

5. ...
Sri Nalendra ing Matarum
pan katalah atmadjanira
6. nging Putra ingkang satunggil
kang dadya tĕlĕng ing drija
ginadang sumilih Katong
ajusja padlikur warsa
...

These lines are to be translated as follows:

5. ...
The King of Mataram,
now many are his children,
6. but only one Child
is the center of his heart,
designated to replace the King,
his age is twenty-four years [i.e. three *windus*]
...

These two passages, one describing the Crown Prince in 1758, the other in 1774, but both written in 1773-74, show a close similarity of concept. Of the many royal children, one is the center of the King's affection, designated in the one case to become Crown Prince, in the other to become Sultan, the Prince's age then being mentioned. The choice of words and phraseology is also very similar. Although other Javanese texts have somewhat similar passages, the affinity of these two excerpts argues in favor of a shared authorship between *Babad Mangkubumi* and *Kangdjĕng Kjai Surja Radja*, the latter being clearly ascribed to the Crown Prince.

Thus, an examination of *Babad Mankubumi's* literary style, its use of euphonic pseudonyms, and the information provided in the first stanzas, all support the suggestion that the author of the text, the mysterious *Sang Anom/Sang Wiranom*, is in fact the Crown Prince of Jogjakarta.

This, then, explains why, particularly in the later sections of the manuscript, the history of Jogjakarta in the latter quarter of the eighteenth century is described in a style distinctly more favorable to the Crown Prince than is the case in Poensen's Pakualaman *babad*. It also

suggests why *Babad Mangkubumi* should be seen as a major source for eighteenth-century Jogjakarta *kraton* history, although in its own way it is no less prone to bias than Poensen's text.⁷

The question of authorship of this manuscript is, however, bound up with a more general problem. Did Javanese aristocrats actually write books? Or did court scribes compose and copy the book, and simply ascribe it to their patron? Scraps of evidence can be mustered for either view, and surely the answer to this question must have differed with different individuals. In the case of the Crown Prince of Jogjakarta, the question is of some importance. While the ascription of *Babad Mangkubumi* to him depends only slightly upon a comparison with *Kangdjëng Kjai Surja Radja*, nevertheless if the similarity of the two books should result merely from the same scribe having composed both, the apparent shared authorship would have nothing to do with the Crown Prince. Indeed, if this were the case, one might conclude that the identity of the aristocrat to whom a scribe attributed his work was a question of very limited interest or importance, except insofar as it confirmed the courtly origin of the manuscript.

Fortunately, in this case there is some evidence that the scribes involved in producing *Babad Mangkubumi* and *Kangdjëng Kjai Surja Radja* were different, so that the similarities between the two texts can only have come from a common authorship by the Crown Prince. *Kangdjëng Kjai Surja Radja* names the scribes Sëstraprawira and Wirjawidjaja as having been ordered to copy the book from the "original creation of the Crown Prince" (vol. I, p. 2: "kang kinen anurun surat sangking wit pangirtyanireng Kangdjëng Gusti").

No scribes are specifically named as having copied *Babad Mangkubumi*. It is striking, however, that two court scribes, *tjariks* named

⁷ The present writer is currently engaged in reconstructing the history of Jogjakarta during the reign of Sultan Hamëngkubuwana I, using both *Babad Mangkubumi* and Poensen's *babad*, as well as Dutch sources.

It should be pointed out that *Babad Mangkubumi* was apparently written in two (or more) segments. The first section was composed in AH 1187/AD 1773, and appears to have ended somewhere between pp. 418-420 (Canto LXIV) and pp. 436-437 (Canto LXVI), and included events up to the time of writing. Then at some later date, probably shortly after AD 1792, another section was added completing the story of Sultan Hamëngkubuwana I's reign to his death in 1792. In the present author's study of the Sultan's reign, it will be suggested that *Babad Mangkubumi* was originally composed in 1773 because the Sultan was considering abdicating in favor of his son, in which situation it was appropriate that a *babad* of his reign should be written. When the abdication was not then carried through, it subsequently became necessary to extend *Babad Mangkubumi* to include the later years of his reign.

Tjakrawidjaja and Tjakrakrēti, appear frequently in the text in an unusually common fashion (e.g., pp. 4, 11-12, 20, 24-25, 46-47, 54, 68, 74, 137, 140, 228, 393). This suggests that perhaps they were responsible for copying the text and took the opportunity to introduce themselves into the story. These two are also occasionally found in other contemporary sources. For instance, in 1759 the "Ingabaijs Tjokerocartie en Tjokcrowiegeijo" went to Sēmarang to collect the Sultan's annual funds from the Dutch East India Company.⁸ And in a letter of felicitation to the new Governor-General P. A. van der Parra written in AJ 1688/AD 1762, Sultan Hamēngkubuwana mentioned among the dignitaries he was sending to Batavia "den Hoff schrijver Ingabeij Tjacrawidjaja".⁹ There are also references to these two in *Babad Gijanti*.¹⁰ These references in other sources, including East India Company archives, suggest that Tjakrawidjaja and Tjakrakrēti were of sufficient importance to deserve some mention in *Babad Mangkubumi*. Nevertheless, the frequency with which they appear in the *babad* seems excessive, and this may be so because they had a hand in its writing.

If, then, the scribes who produced the finished copies of *Babad Mangkubumi* and *Kangdjēng Kjai Surja Radja* were different individuals, as is suggested by this admittedly rather flimsy evidence, then the similarity between the two texts derives from the fact that the Crown Prince originally composed both. In the case of *Kangdjēng Kjai Surja Radja* there is no doubt of the ascription to the Crown Prince, and in the case of *Babad Mangkubumi* it seems reasonably clear even without the necessity of comparing it with the former manuscript. Their similarity, then, suggests that the Crown Prince's personal style and ideas came through the process during which the two texts were copied by different scribes. In other words, the books in fact represent, at least to some extent, the views of the Crown Prince, and apparently are not the independent creations of scribes

⁸ C. Donkel (Jogjakarta Resident) to Governor N. Hartingh (Sēmarang), 3 March, 1759, in *Djokjo* 32, "Djokjokarta Brieven naar Samarang, 1756-61," Arsip Nasional, Djakarta.

⁹ Hamēngkubuwana I to van der Parra and Council of the Indies, 28 Mulud, Be, 1688 (17 October, 1762), received at Batavia 16 November, 1762, in *Kol. Arch.* 2956 (*Overgekom. Brief. 1763*, vol. 35), Rijksarchief, The Hague.

This letter is preserved only in Dutch translation. The phrase "Hoff schrijver" is probably a translation of the Javanese *abdi-dalēm tjarik* or *tjarik-dalēm*, "royal scribe."

¹⁰ Jasadipura I, *Babad Gijanti* (21 vols.; Batavia, 1937-39), vol. XVI p. 71, vol. XVII p. 69.

who ascribed them to a Prince having nothing to do with their composition. The historian or Javanist can thus say with some confidence that these texts represent views held by the Crown Prince and by extension that they are, as Dr. Pigeaud has said, Jogjakarta court tradition.

The reader may, however, be curious why the identity of the Crown Prince should be concealed at the beginning of *Babad Mangkubumi*. The answer is that it is not. The use of *Sang Anom*, *Sang Wiranom*, *Sang Murweng Kawi*, *Sang Pĕkik*, etc., is an effort not to conceal, but rather to elevate the poetic style. The use of euphonious pseudonyms is common throughout this text, as it is in most works of Javanese poetry. This is an element in all refined Javanese verse, consistent with the traditional Javanese proclivity for riddles (*wangsalan*) and word-play. Elsewhere in the text there is no doubt about who is referred to with these pseudonyms because of the context, which is usually perfectly clear. But in these first stanzas, without context, the reader who approaches the text from a different time and culture is easily confused. It seems highly unlikely, however, that anyone listening to a reading of this book within the court of Jogjakarta in the latter decades of the eighteenth century would have had any doubts about the identity of the "Honorable Young Hero" who composed *Babad Mangkubumi*.

M. C. RICKLEFS