V. Matheson

The Tuhfat al-Nafis: Structure and sources

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 127 (1971), no: 3, Leiden, 375-392

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

THE TUHFAT AL-NAFIS: STRUCTURE AND SOURCES*

Although the *Tuhfat al-Nafis* is recognised as a historical work of some importance for eighteenth and nineteenth century Malaysian history, it seems that not one critical article has ever been written about the text itself — a text which was first brought to the attention of European scholars by W. E. Maxwell as long ago as 1890.¹ What little work has been done on the *Tuhfat* since then, has been primarily concerned with the historical content of the work, and biographical details of its author.²

In fact, one gains the impression that the *Tuhfat al-Nafis* has been regarded as a text which should be mentioned in overall surveys of Malay literature, or indigenous histories, but that beyond this commentators are at a loss. The most common description of it (originating from Sir Richard Winstedt)³ reads: "The *Tuhfat* is the most important

* This article is a revised version of a paper originally presented to the *Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association's 13 Congress* (August 1970), at Monash University.

¹ In his article entitled: Raja Haji, *JMBRAS* Vol. 22 (1890), p. 173 and p. 212, and again in the same journal, p. 321, The Ruling Family of Selangor, where he gives a summary of "an interesting historical work entitled *Tuhfat-el-Nafis* ..."

² These works include J. J. de Hollander's *Handleiding bij de Beoefening der Maleische Taal en Letterkunde*, Breda, 1882. (In a footnote to p. 304 he removed the confusion surrounding Riau's two Raja Ali's — one was the YangdiPertuan Muda of Riau between 1844-1857, the other was his cousin, author and religious expert). Zaaba: Modern Developments, in *JMBRAS* Vol. 17 (1939), pt. 3, pp. 142-3; C. Skinner's *Prosa Melayu Baharu*, London, 1959; T. Iskandar: Raja Ali Haji Tokoh dari Pusat Kebudayaan Johor-Riau, *Dewan Bahasa*, Vol. 8 (1964), no. 12, p. 533; Drs. Li Chuan Siu: *Ikhtisar Sejarah Kesusasteraan Melayu Baru 1830-1945*, Kuala Lumpur, 1966; and Zuber Usman's *Kesusasteraan Lama Indonesia*, Melaka, 1966. There are also two (unpublished) Academic Exercises on the *Tuhfat*, Mohammad bin Anas's *Geographical Notes to the Tuhfat al-Nafis*, University of Malaya 1958, and Ismail bin Abdul Rahman's, *The Arabic Influence in the Tuhfat al-Nafis*, University of Malaya, 1959.

³ In: A History of Malay Literature, *JMBRAS* Vol. 17 (1939), pt. 3, p. 111.

Malay historical work after the *Sejarah Melayu . . .*,” and since 1939 little else has been added to that pronouncement.

It is the aim of this paper to try and provide some textual information about the *Tuhfat*, together with a survey of its sources, and notes on other Riau MSS. Problems concerning authorship and dating will not be described here.⁴

There seem to be only three copies of the *Tuhfat al-Nafis* still extant — one of them presents a shorter version of the *Tuhfat*, and the other two present a longer text. The MS. of the shorter text is from the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, (KITLV), a copy made at Penyengat in 1896, for the Dutch Resident of Riau, A. L. van Hasselt. A note in the front of the MS. signed by van Hasselt, says that it was a true copy of a MS. in the archives of the Yangdipertuan Muda of Riau, and was presented to him to mark his retirement as Resident. It was catalogued by Ph. S. van Ronkel⁵ under the title *Sjadjarah Radja² Riouw*. In 1937 van der Linden mentioned this text in his *De Europeaan in de Maleische Literatuur*,⁶ where he outlines the contents of the MS. together with Winstedt's 1932 text of the *Tuhfat*. He makes no differentiation between these texts,⁷ and does not explain the relationship between them. Apart from the notes of van Ronkel and van der Linden, there seem to be no other references to this MS.

A longer text of the *Tuhfat* known as the Maxwell 2 MS., is preserved in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society in London.⁸ This is a copy made for Sir William Maxwell, then British Resident of Selangor, in March 1890. This MS. was mentioned recently by Amin Sweeney,⁹ when he drew attention to the pencilled note on the fly-leaf, which reads:

Tuhfat al-Nafis. Commenced by Raja Haji Ahamad (otherwise called Ungku Haji Tua) son of Raja Haji, who died at Riau at the age of 103 years — It was carried on and completed by his son Raja Haji Ali. He died at the age of 78.

⁴ Although they will be discussed in the author's thesis on the *Tuhfat al-Nafis*.

⁵ Catalogus der Maleische Handschriften van het Koninklijk Instituut voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Ned.-Indië, *BKI* Vol. 60 (1908), p. 207.

⁶ A. L. V. L. van der Linden: *De Europeaan in de Maleische Literatuur*, Mepel, 1937.

⁷ Van der Linden, *op. cit.*, p. 272, where he does say that the *Tuhfat al-Nafis* (Winstedt's text), is richer in anecdotes than the *Sejarah Raja² Riouw*, but does not elaborate further.

⁸ Catalogued by Dr. P. Voorhoeve: *JRAS*, April 1963, p. 68.

⁹ Amin Sweeney: Sir Richard Winstedt's Summary of the "Tuhfat Ul-Nafis", *JMBRAS* Vol. 40 (1967), pt. 1, p. 155.

At the end of this MS., following the text of the *Tuhfat* proper, is a page of later Riau history. This is exclusive to the Maxwell 2 MS., and is dated 1306 A.H. (1888-89 A.D.), which is one year before Maxwell's text was copied. This suggests as a possible stemma:

```

X   Tuhfat text
|
X   Tuhfat text with added history page
|
X   Maxwell 2.

```

If this is so, the Maxwell 2 MS. is a copy of a copy.

The third copy of the *Tuhfat* is not strictly speaking a MS. at all, but a printed Jawi text, and as such is subject to printing errors in addition to the normal scribal mistakes. This is Sir Richard Winstedt's text,¹⁰ which he says is based on a 1923 text belonging to Tengku Fatimah, daughter of the late-nineteenth century ruler of Johore, Sultan Abu Bakar. Again, Winstedt's text is a copy of a copy, as Tengku Fatimah's text was copied from "an older MS."¹¹ As this is the only published text of the *Tuhfat*, it is the only one which is generally known. When commentators refer to the *Tuhfat al-Nafis*, they refer to this text (or its romanized counterpart).¹²

Since Winstedt's text is not a manuscript and is adequately represented by Maxwell's text, the KITLV and London manuscripts have been used for a comparison of the longer and shorter versions. The shorter KITLV text, HS 630, is designated A, the Maxwell 2 text is referred to as B, and Winstedt's JMBRAS 1932 text is C.

A comparison of the relative lengths of the texts shows that A is about 88,000 words, and the average of B and C is about 126,000 words, i.e. the longer version has approximately 38,000 more words.

The longer and shorter versions of the Tuhfat al-Nafis

The differences between A and B are basically of two kinds:

- (i) Embellishments
- (ii) Insertion of extra subject matter.

¹⁰ Published in *JMBRAS* Vol. 10 (1932), pt. 2.

¹¹ Winstedt, *op. cit.*, p. 320.

¹² *Tuhfat al-Nafis Sejarah Melayu dan Bugis*, Malaysia Publications, Singapore, 1965. It was romanized by Inche Munir Bin Ali. A comparison with Winstedt's Jawi text reveals a number of errors in transcription, (see a review by C. Skinner, *JSEAH* Vol. 8, no. 2, 1967, p. 325).

Version B, the longer text, seems to be an embellished form of A. In other words, it seems there is a base text, (A), and a redaction (B and C).

Embellishments

Among the types of embellishment and stylistic differences are:

- (a) B's consistently greater use of Arabic quotations, aphorisms, etc.
- (b) B's use of clichés, repetition, honorifics, the particles *-lah* and *-pun*, and explicit subjects and objects, (A often leaves them implied).
- (c) Differences in Syntax; A often uses inversion, B does not.

The following example provides some indication of the differences between the texts. The additions from B are bracketed, so that the unbracketed text is that of A. The notes below give A's form where B has changed the wording — note 3 indicates inversion of the subject in A.

Maka yangdipertuan muda (pun) berangkatlah kaSelangor membawa paduka adinda (baginda) Raja Haji. Maka apabila sampai kaSelangor (maka) lalu mendudukkan paduka adinda (baginda itu) Raja Haji dengan (paduka adinda itu Engku Kelana Muda yang bernama) Engku Enche'¹) Aishah. (Maka dinikahkan oleh yangdipertuan muda itu) betapa adat (istiadat) raja² (nikah kahwin), maka berkaseh-kasehanlah (seperti adat orang) laki isteri. Shahadan (maka) tiada berapa lama (nya sakedudukan itu), make Engku Enche' Aishahpun² mangkatlah³ (kembali karahmat Allah ta'ālā innā lillāhi wa innā ilaihi rāji'un. Maka ditanam oleh oranglah betapa adat ditanam anak raja² mangkat. Shahadan) kemudian (daripada itu, maka tiada berapa lamanya maka Tengku Raja Haji itupun) beristeri pula ...

- Notes:
- 1. "Engku Enche'": A = "Raja"
 - 2. "Engku Enche' Aishahpun": A = abs
 - 3. "mangkatlah": A adds "Raja Aishah"

No further examples of embellishment will be given here because it is a consistent feature of the text, and is not unusual in the classical Malay literary tradition. Dr. Voorhoeve in his article *A Malay Scriptorium*,¹³ gives a similar example of a base text and a revised embellished one.¹⁴

¹³ In: *Malayan and Indonesian Studies. Essays presented to Sir Richard Winstedt on his eighty-fifth birthday*, John Bastin and R. Roolvink, (ed.), Oxford, 1964, p. 262 ff.

¹⁴ In: *The Answer of Pasai, JMBRAS* Vol. 38 (1965), pt. 2, p. 133 and p. 134, Dr. Roolvink gives an example of two redactions of an episode in the *Sejarah Melayu*. In the case of the *Tuhfat*, version B has obviously tried to improve on A.

Insertion of extra subject matter

Version B presents material which is absent in A. This use of extra material can be linked to the use of sources by both versions of the *Tuhfat*.¹⁵ The following table sets out all the sources which are mentioned by name in the *Tuhfat*, and the frequency of mention in both the longer and shorter versions.

TABLE I
OCCURRENCE OF NAMED SOURCES IN THE TUHFAT AL-NAFIS

Text	Named Sources						
	Siak history	Engku Busu's work	Selangor history	Terengganu history	Pontianak history	Named Individuals	General Sources
A Shorter base text.	7	3	2	1	—	1	28
B Longer embellished text.	11	4	4	1	1	5	19
Total	18	7	6	2	1	6	47

It can be seen that A has more references to general sources (i.e. *konon*, *kata orang tua*, etc.) than B, but that B outweighs A in mention of specific sources, the most often named source being the 'Siak history'.

Before discussing the use of source material in each version, the use made of material which was not the author's own will be examined. For this purpose the source material can be divided into three categories.

- (1) Sources which the author acknowledges by a specific name, which have been identified.
- (2) Sources which the author acknowledges by a specific name, which have not yet been identified.
- (3) Unacknowledged sources.

It should be mentioned here that sources were only used for approximately the first two-thirds of the *Tuhfat*, the last third covers events

¹⁵ One of the most interesting features of the *Tuhfat* is that it acknowledges by name some of the works used in its compilation.

in the author's own lifetime, and for this he relies either on his own memory or one eye-witness accounts.¹⁶

Acknowledged named sources which have been identified

The *Tuhfat* acknowledges its reliance on other works by referring to them (as shown in Table 1), by name, e.g. *siarah Siak*, *siarah Selangor* or *siarah Pontianak*. These "titles" seem to indicate MSS. which deal specifically with the history of a particular area.

The obvious way to link these titles with surviving MSS. seemed to be to consult the description of MSS. given in the major catalogues,¹⁷ and to investigate those MSS. which contained information about Johor, Selangor, Siak and Pontianak etc.

Two of the *Tuhfat's* sources had already been identified. In his M.A. thesis,¹⁸ Ismail Hussein suggested that the text he had named *Hikayat Negri Johor*, was the *siarah Selangor* mentioned in the *Tuhfat*. Then, in his article *The Variant Versions of the Malay Annals*,¹⁹ Dr. Roolvink noted that a MS. which he described as "a Malay history which is an edited and in several places abbreviated text of the *Sejarah Melayu* followed by an eighteenth century history of the Straits of Malacca told from the Siak point of view", was in fact the 'history of Siak', repeatedly mentioned in the *Tuhfat'l-Nafis*.

Both of these source MSS. were compared with the *Tuhfat* and it can be positively said that the 'siarah Siak' has survived in the form of v. d. Wall 191 or Cod. Or. 7304,²⁰ and the 'siarah Selangor' can be

¹⁶ There are several MSS. written by Riau contemporaries of the author of the *Tuhfat*. Although they cover some of the material in the last third of the *Tuhfat*, they do not seem to have been used as sources (at least, not as directly and recognizably as previously mentioned sources.) One particular MS. is Cod. Or. 1763 (2), Tengku Said's *surat ingatan* to Governor-General van der Capellen. This gives an account of the Buginese attack on the Dutch fort at Tanjong Pinang (Dec. 1819), but it does not seem to have been used in the *Tuhfat's* description of the event. Other contemporary MSS. not used are: Bat. Gen. 159, von de Wall 274, and Cod. Or. 1761 (2). (See Appendix for further details of these MSS.)

¹⁷ H. Juynboll: *Catalogus van de Maleische en Sundaneesche Handschriften* . . . , Leiden 1899; van Ronkel: *Catalogus der Maleische Handschriften in het Museum van het KBG*, VBG 57 (1909), and his *Supplement-Catalogus der Maleische en Minangkabausche Handschriften* . . . , Leiden, 1921.

¹⁸ *Hikayat Negri Johor, Satu Penyelenggaraan Teks*, University of Malaya, 1962.

¹⁹ *BKI* Vol. 123 (1967), p. 309.

²⁰ Roolvink, *loc. cit.*, quotes von de Wall 191 as the MS. of the *history of Siak*. Many of the pages of that MS. are now illegible, so I had to consult instead, a copy of it, Cod. Or. 7304. In this paper then, Cod. Or. 7304 will be cited as the *siarah Siak*.

identified with the text presented by Ismail Hussein as the *Hikayat Negri Johor*.²¹

The source which the *Tuhfat* refers to as "sejarah dan siarah pihak Riau", or "karangan Engku Busu", is represented by the MS. Cod. Or. 1724(2). This MS. seems to be the oldest and most representative of a group of five MSS. described in catalogues under a variety of names.²²

There is one reference in the *Tuhfat*, to a *siarah Pontianak*. It is probable that this is the same text referred to in the *Tuhfat*'s 'sister' text, *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis dan sakalian Raja²nya*.²³ The reference reads:

".... telah ditaroh pada hatiku bahwa aku perbuatkan silsilat ini pada ketika aku perbuat akan satu kitab daripada tangan saudara kami yang saleh yang keperchayaan dan yaitu Sayyid al-Sharif Abdul Rahman bin Sayyid al-Sharif Kasim, Sultan Pontianak bin Sayyid al-Sharif Abdul Rahman al-Qadri dan didalam kitab itu disebutkan satengah daripada keturunan raja² dan anak raja² yang mereka itu mengembara menjauhi daripada pihak pulau Bugis".

This implies that the Pontianak text contained the Bugis genealogy and stories of the early travels of the five Bugis brothers. If this is so, it seems to be the only source for pre-Riau stories about the Bugis brothers.

Much of the early part of the *Tuhfat* was taken word for word from the *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis*, without acknowledgement, and these early sections cover the pre-Riau stories about the Bugis. The *Tuhfat* was begun before the *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis* was completed. The latter was written between September 7, 1865 and January 15, 1866, while the *Tuhfat* was begun December 22, 1865. It seems possible then, that the *Tuhfat* used the Pontianak text, via the *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis*.

There do not seem to be many catalogued MSS. dealing with both

²¹ There are two further MSS. of the *Hikayat Negri Johor* which Ismail Hussein did not use for his critical edition. One is KL. 24. A. (van Ronkel's *Supplement-Catalogus*, 1921, p. 41), and the other is *Annals of the Kings of Johor*, first noted by A. Teeuw, (*BKI* Vol. 123 (1967), p. 519). I have identified the latter as another *Hikayat Negri Johor* MS.

²² See appendix under "Karangan Engku Busu".

²³ Hereafter *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis*. This text was originally published in Singapore, Maṭḥaba al-Imām, 1911 (and was used by R. J. Wilkinson in his *Malay-English Dictionary*; for an abbreviated translation, see H. Overbeck, *JMBRAS* Vol. 4 (1926), p. 399 sqq.). It was reprinted at the command of Sultan Ibrahim of Johore by the Government Printing Office in 1956.

West-Kalimantan history, and the five Bugis brothers. The only one located thus far has been Cod. Or. 1754, the so called *Hikayat Opu Daeng Menambun*. This MS. does not contain all the information ascribed to the Pontianak text, yet it does correspond word for word with some of the passages said to be quoted from that work, in the *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis*.

Other standard works about Kalimantan's westcoast were consulted e.g. de Hollander's *Geslachtregister der Vorsten van Sambas*,²⁴ Netscher's *Kronijk van Sambas en van Soekadana*²⁵ and P. J. Veth's description of an expanded Netscher text in his *Borneo's Westerafdeeling*.²⁶ However, these were all Sambas orientated, whereas the *Hikayat Opu Daeng Menambun* and the *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis* (and therefore presumably the Pontianak text), are Sukadana orientated. Netscher's article nevertheless, is interesting in this context as it gives a Sukadana genealogy, which corresponds with that in the *Hikayat Opu Daeng Menambun*.

One explanation for the *Hikayat Opu Daeng Menambun*'s direct correspondence with passages ascribed to the Pontianak work, could be that it was taken from the Pontianak history, or is an abbreviated version of it. To this extent then, it could be said that Cod. Or. 1754 (*Hikayat Opu Daeng Menambun*) can be identified with the Pontianak *siarah*.

Historically Pontianak succeeded Sukadana as the most powerful state on Kalimantan's westcoast, the link strengthened as is the Indonesian custom, by dynastic ties of intermarriage, which perhaps accounts for Pontianak being a repository of Sukadana centred texts.

Of the named sources in the *Tuhfat*:

1. the 'Siak History' can be identified as MS. Cod. Or. 7304
2. the 'work of Engku Busu' can be identified as MS. Cod. Or. 1724 (2)
3. The 'Selangor history' can be identified as *Hikayat Negri Johor*.
4. the 'Pontianak history' can be related to MS. Cod. Or. 1754.²⁷

²⁴ *BKI* Vol. 17 (1871), pp. 185-203.

²⁵ *TBG* Vol. 1 (1852), pp. 1-41.

²⁶ *Borneo's Westerafdeeling* ..., Zaltbommel, 1854, Vol. 1, begins p. 186. H. von Dewall: Matan, Simpang Soekadana, de Karimata-eilanden en Koeboe, *TBG* Vol. 11 (1862), pp. 1-146, concentrates on the way of life and social systems in those areas. Although J. T. Willer's: *Eerste Proeve Eener Kronijk van Mampawa en Pontianak*, *TBG* Vol. 3 (1855), pp. 516-562, looks very promising, it deals mainly with the history of the Qadris of Mampawa, the rise of Pontianak and its relations with the V.O.C. - Kalimantan's ties with Riau and Johor are treated as incidental.

²⁷ The MSS. listed as identified sources are to be understood only as representative of a certain text. It is possible that better copies may later come to light.

Sources which the author acknowledges by a specific name which have not yet been identified

The main work in this category is the *sejarah pihak Terengganu*. The *Tuhfat* refers to this text several times, but no MSS. so far consulted have contained the information ascribed to this Terengganu source. An example of such information is the story of the relationship between Sultan Mahmud and Enche' Pong. Both the Siak history and Engku Busu's work mention this story, but neither of these texts can be the 'sejarah pihak Terengganu', because elsewhere in the *Tuhfat* a clear distinction is made between all three, i.e. 'Aku dapat tersebut didalam sejarah dan siarah pihak Riau satu, dan pihak Terengganu satu dan pihak Siak satu, ketiganya masing² perjalanannya.'

H. Marriott presents a MS.²⁸ which opens with a possible clue about this Terengganu source. Marriott's English translation²⁹ reads:

This is a story related by old men, partly derived from the annals of Petani and Kelantan and partly from the annals of Sultan Mansur the Great the son of Zainalabidin the son of Abdul-majid

These annals of Sultan Mansur used for the compilation of Marriott's text, may also have been used for the *Tuhfat*. Unfortunately it seems impossible to locate or identify them.³⁰

The other texts mentioned specifically in the *Tuhfat*, are referred to only in passing, and seem to be the works of individuals, rather than anonymous court chronicles. They include the *siarah Haji Kudi* and the *siarah To' Ngah*. There is also a reference to a 'surat tawarikh', which is said to describe an invulnerable person who infringed the adat. No MS. so far examined has contained this story, so the source remains unidentified.

²⁸ A Fragment of the History of Trengganu and Kelantan, *JSBRAS* Vol. 72 (1916), pp. 3-23.

²⁹ Marriott, *loc. cit.*, p. 13.

³⁰ In: 'Abdu'l-Jalil, Sultan of Johore (1699-1719), etc., *JMBRAS* Vol. 11 (1933), pt. 2, p. 161, Winstedt describes a MS. in his possession for 20 years. It contains a story of Che' Mi, daughter of the Laksamana of Johore, who was said to have been the concubine of Sultan Mahmud. She had a son, who was taken to Minangkabau by Panglima Bebas, and this son was Raja Kechik who captured Johore. Unfortunately this does not seem to be the Trengganu history — it does not contain the story of the cause of the Malay betrayal of the Bugis, which the *Tuhfat* ascribed to the Trengganu text, and also, Winstedt is convinced his MS. came from Pahang. Dato Sheppard's: A Short History of Trengganu, *JMBRAS* Vol. 22 (1949), pt. 3, p. 1, is largely based on the *Tuhfat* for the relevant period, so gives little information either from, or about, Trengganu MSS.

In this group of unidentified sources should perhaps be included the general, usually oral sources, mentioned so often in the *Tuhfat*.³¹ These are indicated in the *Tuhfat* by phrases like '*hikayat yang panjang*', '*kata rawi*', '*kata setengah kaul*', '*pada satu kaul*', '*kata ahli'l-tawarikh*', '*kata orang tua*' or '*konon*'.

Unacknowledged sources

This is the last category of sources, and may best be described as the balance of material not in either of the first two categories. It covers events in the *Tuhfat* for which no source is acknowledged, and some of these events cannot be traced to a source manuscript.

By a careful comparison of the four main source MSS. with events in the *Tuhfat*, checking through event by event, date by date, it became evident that there were only a few events in the first two-thirds of the *Tuhfat*, acknowledged or not, which could not be traced back to source MSS.

The type of material for which there is no acknowledged source seems to fall into distinct groupings.

- (a) Events which have local folk-type explanations, or material which lends itself to legend, and thus need not have a MS. source, e.g. some of the Enche' Pong stories; the story of the Linggi fish trap; two traditions about Raja Haji's burial place; the Minangkabau Lebai, Dato' Malaikat;³² stories about the name of Sultan Sulaiman's mother, Enche' Nusamah; and the origin of the name of a cannon used in the late eighteenth century Kedah war.
- (b) Some dates, which probably do have a MS. source, e.g. there are a few groups of dates, such as the 1160's A.H. (1750's A.D.) travel dates for Riau royalty, which do not appear in any of the source MSS.³³

³¹ In Table I, it is quite evident that the majority of sources are general.

³² Dato' Malaikat is mentioned in Cod. Or. 1999 (pasal 3), and on p. 312 of A. F. von de Wall's: *Beknopte Geschiedenis van het Vorstenhuis en de Rijksinstellingen van Lingga en Riau, Tijdsch. voor het Binnenlandsch Bestuur* Vol. 6 (1891), pp. 298-323. (Von de Wall presents a text which is very similar to Cod. Or. 1999). The *Tuhfat* does not acknowledge a source for the Dato' Malaikat story, so Cod. Or. 1999 is classified in this "unacknowledged" group of sources.

³³ There are some MSS. which contain many dates, yet do not seem to have been used in the *Tuhfat*. e.g. There is an interesting group of MSS. which form von de Wall 62 (I), a kind of court-diary of Bugis-Malay relations. Among dates given is one for the installation of the second Bugis YangdiPertuan Muda, but this event, although described in the *Tuhfat*, is left undated.

It is obvious that there are still MSS. which were used in the writing of the *Tuhfat*, which if they are still extant, have yet to be located. One is probably in the form of a closely dated court diary, and another or others are probably anecdotal-type MSS. of the Cod. Or. 1724 (2) type.³⁴

Use of source material in versions A and B

In Table II, the acknowledged sources have been drawn up according to the frequency of mention in A and B, and whether the reference occurred in the first, second or third section of the *Tuhfat*.³⁵

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF NAMED SOURCES

A. Shorter base text.							
Section	Sources						
	Siak history	Engku Busu's work	Selangor history	Terengganu history	Pontianak history	Named individuals	General Sources
First	4	—	—	1	—	—	13
Second	3	3	2	—	—	—	12
Third	—	—	—	—	—	1	3
B. Longer embellished text.							
First	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Second	11	4	4	1	1	4	16
Third	—	—	—	—	—	1	2

³⁴ At Penyengat, where the author of the *Tuhfat* lived, there seems to have been no lack of historical MSS. which could have been used as source material. In his "Beschrijving van een Gedeelte der Residentie Riouw", TBG 1854, p. 150, Netscher mentions that the Yangdipertuan Muda and the Sultan of Lingga had family MS. collections and traditions, in which they took great pride.

³⁵ The division into three sections is based on the number of pages in the text, the last third coincides with events in the author's lifetime.

It is quite clear that there are hardly any additions from sources in the first third of the *Tuhfat* (version A or B). The bulk of additions occurs in the middle section of the *Tuhfat* (more in version B than A), and tapers off again in the last section. This, as was explained above, is to be expected, as the last section deals with contemporary events.

Table II only gives a picture of additions from acknowledged and named sources. It is more difficult to assess and describe the pattern of additions from unacknowledged sources. However, their general trend seems to follow the pattern in Table II with a build up of additions in the middle part of the text, differing in that they do not taper off as much in the last section.

The extra material which version B presents in the last third of the *Tuhfat* centres around the Yangdipertuan Mudas and around Raja Haji Ahmad and his son Raja Haji Ali. It is interesting that there are only comparatively few remarks about Raja Haji Ali in version A, yet version B contains a considerable amount of information about him. Whenever Ali is mentioned in A, B adds further information, all the information about Raja Haji Ali's religious teaching is given by B.

The method for determining whether a source had been used in the *Tuhfat* was straightforward. The suspected source MS. was compared word for word with the *Tuhfat* text (both version A and B). The method of narration used in the *Tuhfat* is to run several threads of the narrative almost simultaneously. The author uses chronology, not place, as his central thread, which means that he does not narrate an event in one location, (e.g. Kalimantan), from beginning to end, but **interrupts it with other contemporary events.**

This technique shows that the author had a considerable degree of competence in the handling of a number of sources, and indicates that he borrowed from his sources in chunks; he tended to rely on one source for his presentation of an event in a particular location. When he shifts the focus of his narrative he usually changes his source. For example, in the early part of the *Tuhfat*, the *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis* is used for the description of the war against the Dayaks and Raden Jaga in Kalimantan, but when the narrative returns to Riau, the *Hikayat Negri Johor* is used as a source. A further change in location diverts the reader to the civil disturbance in Siak, where Raja Kechik's sons are fighting for supremacy in that state, and here the author of the *Tuhfat* quotes freely from Cod. Or. 7304.

It seems that in version A relatively small amounts were taken from the sources, whereas in version B much greater use was made of the

same source material. This "chunk" system of borrowing is mentioned because it means that it was relatively easy to identify passages in the *Tuhfat* which were taken from source MSS.

The following passage is an actual example of how a source MS. was used in the *Tuhfat*. The passage comes from the middle section of the text and would be considered as medium in length, the longest extracts from sources being taken from the 'Siak history'. The source MS. in this example is Cod. Or. 1724 (2), and in the *Tuhfat* text, the additions of version B are in brackets.

Tuhfat al-Nafis

Cod. Or. 1724 (2)

Shahadan adalah tersebut didalam
siarah yang dari (pihak sabelah)
Lingga pada hujung siarah yang dari
(pada) Engku Busu (di) Dungun (itu) maka
demikian (lah) bunyinya: maka apabila
baleklah Enche Ismail kaTerengganu
membawa surat balasan dari (pada)
Pemberam (Jakub), maka (iapun
naiklah mengadap yangdipertuan
Terengganu. Kemudian pada
keesokan harinya maka) pergilah
orang ramai² membawa/ A: menyambut/
surat (daripada Pemberam) itu, betapa
adat istiadat menyambut surat
raja² jua (adanya). Maka dibawa
oranglah surat itu naik kabalai
(rong), make diambil oleh
yangdipertuan Terengganu lalu
dibachanya. Shahadan adalah
surat itu dua puchok, satu
besar dan satu kechil. Kemudian
diberikan surat yang kechil itu
dibacha dibawah payong. Maka
surat yang kechil itu sahajalah
yang didengar oleh orang yang
banyak², dan surat yang
besar(nya) itu yangdipertuan
Terengganu sendiri membachanya.

Maka sahari sampai Enche'
Ismail semua itu, maka
iapun naiklah kadarat
mengadap yangdipertuan
Terengganu itu.
Kemudian kepada
esok harinya maka pergilah
orang menyambut surat
itu, dengan seperti
adatnya.
Telah sudah dibawa orang
naik surat itu sampai kabalai
maka diambil oleh
yangdipertuan surat itu
dua puchok
satu besar
dan satu kechil. Kemudian
maka diberikannya surat yang
kechilnya itu dibacha orang dibawah
payong itu dan surat itulah sahaja
yang didengar oleh orang
banyak² itu, dan surat yang
besar itu yangdipertuan
sendiri membachanya. Kemudian

*Tuhfat al-Nafis**Cod. Or. 1724 (2)*

Kemudian satelah sudah habis dibachanya, lalulah dibubohnya kabawah lututnya karna dengan nyatanya penglihatan mata sendiri perentahnya itu, karna sebab tatkala orang mengarak surat itu turun ramai² dengan Tengku Tengah semua anak beranak, saudara bersaudara itu turun kabalai lintang yang berinding kacha itu demikianlah adanya. Kemudian) dari (pada) itu habislah orang pulang (sakaliannya), maka Yangdipertuan Terengganupun berangkat keluar ia /A: kakuala b - y/. Maka tepak (yangdipertuan Terengganupun) itu dibawa orang naik katela. Kemudian (maka) minta ambilkan pula kapada Tengku Kechik dengan Tengku Puteri (chuchunya yangdipertuan Terengganu itu). Maka lalulah diambilkannya (dibawa naik kaatas pebalaian). Maka dibachalah kadua⁽²⁾ nya (surat itu) dengan Tengku Busu anak (nya) yangdipertuan (dengan Tengku Teh), dan Tengku Lahad dan Tengku Said dan Tengku Wo'.

satelah sudah dibachanya, lalu dibubohnya kabawah lututnya karna dengan sah nyatanya penglihatan mata sendiri melihat perentahnya itu, karna sebab tatkala orang mengarak surat itu maka turun ramai² dengan Tengku Tengah semua anak beranak, saudara bersaudara itu kabalai lintang yang berinding kacha itu demikianlah adanya. Kemudian daripada itu satelah sudah habis orang sakalian pulang itu maka yangdipertuannya berangkatlah kakuala Ibai. Maka tepaknya yangdipertuan itu dibawa orang naik katela. Kemudian maka minta ambilkan kapada Tengku Kechi' dengan Tengku Puteri chuchunya yangdipertuan itu, maka lalulah diambilkannya. Kemudian maka dibawalah naik kaatas pebalaian, maka dibachalah kadua²nya surat itu dengan Tengku Busu, anaknya yangdipertuan dengan Tengku Tengah, dan Tengku Lahad dan Tengku Said dan Tengku Wo'.

The author's attitude to his sources

The author of the *Tuhfat al-Nafis* is misleading about his attitude towards his sources. His remarks give the impression that his quotes from the sources are faithfully and wholly recorded.³⁶ However, when the passages from sources in the *Tuhfat* are compared with their

³⁶ Remarks like: "demikianlah khabar orang tua², entahkan apa hartinya wa'llahu a'lam, yang mana aku dengar dan aku lihat didalam siarah, aku suratkan", and "wa'llahu a'lam, entahkan sunggohkah, entahkan tidakkah, tiadalah aku tahu, melainkan yang mana² ada didalam siarah² yang aku dapat, atau yang aku dengar daripada mulut orang tua."

originals, it becomes obvious that the author has often altered them to coincide with his own interpretation of events: e.g. The *Hikayat Negri Johor* is pro-Bugis, while the 'Siak history', is pro-Siak, and lauds Raja Kechik, arch-enemy of the Bugis. Because of this the pro-Bugis author of the *Tuhfat* cannot always quote the Siak history verbatim, he has to change it — yet it is never mentioned that the Siak material has been altered.³⁷

Again, it seems that in cases where an event is described in more than one source, the *Tuhfat* chooses that account which denigrates opponents of the Bugis. For example, the *Hikayat Negri Johor*, the 'Siak history', and Cod. Or. 1724 (2) each describe Raja Ismail's attempts to attack Johor from the Singapore Straits. The *Hikayat Negri Johor* and the 'Siak history' say that Ismail confiscated some Selangor ships bound for Riau, and this prompted a retaliatory attack by Riau. Cod. Or. 1724 (2) says Ismail confiscated some Selangor ships, and described how one of the crew held hostage was treacherously murdered, and it was this act which provoked Riau to attack. It is this latter account which the author chose to use in the *Tuhfat*.

It can be said that in order to preserve, and be consistent in his pro-Bugis bias, the author of the *Tuhfat* has had to select and alter material from his sources. The 'Siak history' has suffered the most alteration, and the *Hikayat Negri Johor* the least, but then these are the two sources which exemplify the extremes of anti- and pro-Bugis attitudes.

Often the author will present two versions of an event and an addition in B will add "God knows best". This comment occurs only once in A, all the other evaluative comments occur in B. There are other comments in version B which indicate that the author used intelligent guesswork in cases where the sources were deficient, e.g. A reads "perang ini tiada dapat tarikhnya", and B adds, "akan tetapi dapat dikira²kan, barangkali tahun itu, didalam pada itu wa'llahu a'lam belum aku dapat akan tahunnya". In another instance B has:

³⁷ Some examples of this alteration of material are the incident where Raja Kechik sends Nakhoda Sekam to Kuala Pahang to arrest Sultan Abdul Jalil — in the *Tuhfat* Sekam murders Abdul Jalil, in the 'Siak history', Abdul Jalil admits he has betrayed Raja Kechik, and asks to be put to death. A similar incident occurs in Siantan where the *Tuhfat* says a certain Dewa Perkasa is treacherously murdered by Siak's Raja Ismail, the Siak history says Dewa Perkasa died a traitor's death. In another episode the same Ismail helps Palembang attack Mampawa, in the *Tuhfat* Ismail loses, in the 'Siak history', he wins.

maka tiada tersebut didalam siarah Pontianak, akan tetapi jika kita timbang² serta dengan pikiran antara orang bersaudara² ipar-beripar, tuan² semuanya pun lebeh² maalum.

Finally, there is a passage in version B of the *Tuhfat* where the author sets out his views on one of his source MSS., the 'Siak history'. He writes that it has no dates from beginning to end, has suffered through being copied too often so that its sense has been altered, and that the person who wrote it had insufficient regard for truth.³⁸ It is evident that the author of the *Tuhfat* valued accuracy, dating and language in his sources.

In 1962 J. C. Bottoms wrote: "the histories of Riau and the Bugis form a complicated group which it is difficult to sort out. There are altogether over a dozen works in this group. Of some of these there are a number of manuscripts, some no doubt identical; others varying in differing degrees, so that it is impossible to say which contain the same work and which contain different works without all being carefully collated and compared."³⁹

Regarding the structure of the *Tuhfat al-Nafis*, it must now be recognized that there are two versions — a shorter base text and a longer redaction. The redaction has built on the base text by "improving" the style, and by greater use of the source material already present in A.

Perhaps this study on the structure of the *Tuhfat'l-Nafis*, and the investigation of its sources, will help to clarify the problem of identifying Riau MSS. The identification of the sources of the *Tuhfat* led to an investigation of Riau MSS. in general, as sought by J. C. Bottoms, when it became evident that MSS. currently described in catalogues and elsewhere under different titles, were in fact copies of the same text. Conversely, MSS. accepted as belonging to the same group, have now been differentiated and recognised as distinct texts, and the results of this work have been set out in the appendix.

VIRGINIA MATHESON

³⁸ The passage reads: "Shahadan akan tetapinya aku terjumpa dengan satu shejarah dan siarah Sia' itu, daripada awal hingga akhirnya tiada tahun dan tiada tawarikh, apalagi bulannya dan harinya tiada sakali² aku bertemu, dan suratanpun terlalu kopinya karanganpun banyak kurang sedap dibaca sebab sudah banyak berpindah² agaknya daripada tangan saorang kapada tangan saorang serta yang menyuratnya kurang selidik pada menghasilkannya bagi sah, demikianlah sangkaku".

³⁹ p. 44 of J. C. Bottoms: *Malay Historical Works*, in K.G. Tregonning's *Malaysian Historical Sources*, Singapore, 1962.

APPENDIX

The table below shows various Riau MSS. which can be grouped together as representatives of the same text.

The MSS. of the four identified sources of the *Tuhfat al-Nafis* are given first, followed by MSS. of other Riau texts, not concerned directly with the *Tuhfat*.

The catalogue name of each MS. has been bracketed beside it, with a brief description of the contents where necessary.

Some of the reading passages in A. Meursing's *Maleisch Leesboek voor eerstbeginnenden en meergevoorderden*, part 3, (Leiden, 1842-7), were taken from Riau manuscripts, and where identified, these have been included in the table.

Name of source in <i>Tuhfat</i>	Manuscripts
Karangan Engku Busu	Cod. Or. 1724 (2). (Aturan Satiya Bugis dengan Melayu). KL. 37. (Sadjarah Radja-Radja Riau). Cod. Or. 1741 (1). R.A.S. 119. (Sejarah Raja-Raja Riau). von de Wall 195. (Sjadjarah Radja-Radja Riouw I). von de Wall 62 VI. (Sjadjarah Radja-Radja Riouw II). Leesboek, pt. III, pp. 62-71 "Oorsprong der Boeginesche vestiging op Riouw" = Cod. Or. 1724 (2), pp. 5-25.
Siarah Selangor	Cod. Or. 1741 (2). (Hikayat Negeri Djohor). Cod. Or. 3322. von de Wall 193. (Hikayat Negeri Djohor II). von de Wall 192. (Hikayat Negeri Djohor I). No. 5, (Annals of the Kings of Johor), Teeuw, "Provisional List of Malay Manuscripts" — Library of Congress (BKI 1967, p. 519). KL. 24 A. (Hikayat Riau).
Siarah Siak	von de Wall 191. (Sjadjarah Radja-Radja Malajoe). Cod. Or. 7304 (SN.H. 78, Sadjarah Radja-Radja Melajoe). R. J. Wilkinson JMBRAS 9 (1931) pt. 1, p. 28, quotes from a "Hikayat Johor". His quotation comes from a text similar to Cod. Or. 7304, pp. 403-4.
Siarah Pontianak	Cod. Or. 1754. (Hikayat Upu Daeng Menambon). The Sukadana genealogy at the end of Netscher's "Kronijk van Sambas en van Soekadana", (TBG 1852, pp. 1-41), appears at the beginning of Cod. Or. 1754.
	Cod. Or. 3199 (3), No. 5. (Tjeritera asal katurunan radja-radja Melayu). von de Wall 62 I. (Sjadjarah Radja-Radja Riouw III). von de Wall 62 V. (Sjadjarah Radja-Radja Riouw IV) = Cod. Or. 1724 (2), p. 100 to the end. Leesboek, pt. III, pp. 72-81, "Regeling van het bewind tusschen de Maleische en Boeginesche vorsten op Riouw".

Name of source
in *Tuhfat*

Manuscripts

Cod. Or. 1999.

A. H. von de Wall "Beknopte Geschiedenis van het Vorstenhuis en de Rijksinstellingen van Lingga en Riau", (Tijdsch. voor het B.B. 1891, pp. 298-323). The order of the pasals is different from Cod. Or. 1999; 2 and 3 are reversed, and 5 is absent.

Cod. Or. 1763 (2). (Memorie van Tengku Said). This is Tengku Said Muhammad Zain al-Kudsi's "surat ingatan" to Governor-General van der Capellen.

von de Wall 197. (Sjadjarah Radja-Radja Riouw V). This is a 6 page Bugis genealogy.

Bat. Gen. 159. (Sja'ir Soeltan Mahmoed). Sja'ir on the death of Yangdipertuan Muda Raja Ali, in 1857.

von de Wall 274. (Sja'ir Soeltan Mahmoed Di Lingga). Describes events in the early reign of Sultan Mahmud (c. 1840). He was deposed by the Dutch in 1857.

KL. 153. (Sja'ir Perang Siak I).

KL. 154. (Sja'ir Perang Siak II).

von de Wall 273. (Sja'ir Radja Siak).

von de Wall 62 II. (Riouwsche Contracten). The Malay version of the contract concluded by van Braam at Riau, 2nd Nov. 1784. The Dutch version is given as Bijlage XXXIII, in E. Netscher's "De Nederlanders in Djohor en Siak 1602 tot 1685", VBG. XXXV, 1870.

von de Wall 62 III. (Riouwsche Contracten). This is the Malay version of Riau's capitulation to van Braam, concluded 1st Nov. 1784, and described in Netscher's "De Nederlanders ...", Bijlage XXXIIa.

von de Wall 62 IV. (Riouwsche Contracten). The Dutch version of this contract appears as Bijlage XL, in Netscher's "De Nederlanders ...".