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MANUSCRIPT PRODUCTION IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY JAVA. CODICOLOGY AND THE WRITING OF JAVANESE LITERARY HISTORY

1. Introduction

Public collections in Indonesia and Europe hold well in excess of 19,000 Javanese manuscripts. Many thousands more - probably tens of thousands more - remain in private hands both in Indonesia and abroad. None of the private manuscripts, and only a small portion of those in public collections, have been adequately catalogued; the rest are known to us largely trom in-

---

1 This paper was prepared for the 7th International KITLV Workshop on Indonesian Studies, held in Leiden on 14-18 December 1992. I would like to thank both the KITLV and the National Library of Indonesia for the support that made its preparation possible.

2 This rough figure, which includes some Old Javanese, 'Javano-Balinese' and Balinese texts in addition to New Javanese manuscripts proper, was arrived at on the basis of the following estimates of holdings, arranged by collection: Dutch public collections, 7000; European public collections (other than Dutch), 800; Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia, 2000; Kraton Yogyakarta, 750; Museum Negeri Nusa Tenggara Barat, 1000; Museum Negeri Sono Budoyo, 1300; Paku Alaman, 300; Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia (ex-Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap), 4500; Surakarta public collections, 2000. Not included in these figures are the holdings of the major Balinese collections, and the thousands of other vernacular documents, including letters, reports, and treaties, that are housed in Indonesian, Dutch and British archives.

3 A Javanese text is adequately catalogued for research purposes only if the description includes lists of first lines of cantos, as used by Brandes in his catalogues of the Van der Tuuk collection (1901-1926), and by Poerbatjaraka in his topical guides to selected portions of the former KBG collections (1940, 1950). Identification of textual versions, or redactions, is not possible in the absence of such lists, no matter how detailed the précis, or what other particulars might be given. These observations apply only for poetic works, of course. The relatively small number of prose texts in the tradition make far more elusive philological targets than the poetic, and no cataloguing shortcuts exist to help establish redactional identities.

---

T.E. BEHREND, whose research focuses on Javanese philology, codicology, and literary history, is a lecturer in Indonesian and Javanese language and literature at the University of Auckland. From 1987 to 1993 he worked on a cataloguing and microfilming project in Yogyakarta and Jakarta; he is series editor of the Katalog induk naskah-naskah Nusatara which grew out of that work. Dr Behrend may be contacted at the Department of Asian Languages, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New Zealand.
complete lists of titles or quick thumbnail sketches drawn from a necessarily limited skimming of the text.

The surest way to know just what is contained in a given set of manuscripts is to sit down and read them one by one, forming opinions directly on the basis of personal research. But this is time-consuming and difficult work that few are able to do, and there are far too many manuscripts for any one person ever to read. As a result we are all dependent for our general impressions of the whole of Javanese literature—its major works and authors, its development during the past five centuries—on the detailed catalogues of Vreede (1892), Juynboll (1907-1911), Poerbatjaraka (1940a), and Poerbatjaraka, Voorhoeve and Hooykaas (1950), and on the synthetic histories of Poerbatjaraka (1952) and Pigeaud (1967-1970, i).

Despite the immense value of these works, all are hampered by methodological shortcomings and other constraints inherent in the earlier scholarship upon which they are based, and by their own limited goals. Their greatest strengths lie in the familiarity with Javanese texts and stories which they impart (Vreede and Juynboll), in the broad overview of literary genres which they provide (particularly Pigeaud and the Poerbatjaraka catalogues), and in their depiction of the state of Javanese letters in Surakarta during the nineteenth century (Poerbatjaraka and Pigeaud). But the literary ecology of the island, explicated diachronically and related to the social, political, and intellectual particulars of regional, ethnic and archipelagic history, is hardly hinted at in their pages, and most of those 19,000 manuscripts lining the shelves of our major collections are left out of the picture.

Three basic scholarly skills are needed to rationalize and bring order to the chaotic abundance of primary chirographic materials that these collections represent: a precise historical paleography; an intimately detailed codicology; and a highly developed philological calculus attuned to the underlying plasticity of the Javanese tradition. But the first two of these tools are almost entirely lacking, while the third has yet to come fully to terms with the complexity of its task.

No paleographic scholarship has been produced to date. No terminology has been developed that would allow discussion of morphological change in characters or punctuation signs (pepadan). Little attention has been paid to Arabic/pégon script, which in some cultural milieux is the predominant

---

4 For the purposes of this overview I have demarcated the period of New Javanese literature as beginning in 1500. I have done this intentionally to exclude the Old Javanese tradition, which differs fundamentally in its dynamics of composition and transmission.

5 Holle’s tables (1882) offer little of specific value, and De Casparis’s researches (1975) are largely limited to inscriptions that predate the New Javanese period.

6 The only publication on pégon that I know of is Patokanipoen basa Djawi kaserat aksara ‘Arab (pégon) (Soerabaja: Peneleh, 1933), a very brief and incomplete handbook written by Nitisastro, a retired school teacher from Jombang. Compare also the manuscript Kawruh sastra pégon by M.Ng. Kramaprawira, copied in 1865 by Cakraamijaya (PN/CS 55).
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alphabetic medium for recording Javanese. Such paleographic expertise as
currently exists is the result of personal exposure to manuscripts gained by
individual scholars, foremost among them Merle Ricklefs, Willem van der
Molen, Kuntara Wiriyamartana, and Nancy Florida. But like their predeces-
sors in the field, from Cohen Stuart to Pigeaud, none of these has published
an analytical record of their observations. Because paleographic knowledge
remains to such a large extent personal and experiential it must be recreated
in each generation, and no cumulative advance is possible.

Though codicology is a relatively new word and subdiscipline, some of
its material concerns have been addressed in published articles over the
years. Scholarly attention has been paid, for example, to the production and
characteristics of palm leaves and tree bark as writing materials since the
1870s. General papyrological research has been helpful in a general way, of
course, and some work on watermarks found in Malay and Javanese manu-
scripts has been done (Jones 1983; Jones [n.d.]; Behrend 1990b:682-689).
Beyond that, however, there has been no concerted codicological focus on
the Javanese manuscript as physical object, including its writing materials
and implements, inks and paints, bindings and covers. How scribes worked,
laying out pages, decorating the text, managing space, keeping sheaves
ordered – the myriad small details that belong to the physical creation of a
manuscript – remain almost entirely ignored in the literature.

Philology, on the other hand, mother discipline to both paleography and
codicology, has been central to the development of Indonesian studies since
Taco Roorda assumed his chair at Delft in 1842. The pioneering achieve-
ments of Dutch philology are numerous and incalculably valuable – fore-
most among them the recovery of Old Javanese and the initial cataloguing
of the Javanese literary heritage. Until quite recently, however, the (fre-
cently inarticulated) assumptions of classical and biblical textual criticism
have governed the application of philological methods to Javanese composi-
tions. These assumptions, including notions of textual authority and the
primacy of the original text, together with the concomitant search for the
archetypal reading, have proved to be largely at odds with the natural dy-
namics of Javanese literary production in which ‘contaminating’ lateral
transmission, rampant scribal editing, and continual recomposition are very
much the norm. Critical editing on the basis of the stemmatic method has
the effect of scouring these elements, and many other particularities of his-
torical and social significance, out of a text. A new philology, one that
works to make texts accessible without forcing them into moulds inimical
to the energy and variability of the tradition, is still being formulated. Once
it has been worked out, a re-evaluation of the entire Javanese corpus will be
necessary.5

7 For a bibliography of works on tree bark paper, see Guillot 1983; on lontar
see Ginarsa 1975.

4 Benchmark works in the development of this still inchoate new Javanese phil-
Because paleographic and codicological tools are so entirely lacking, while the philological method functioned for so lengthy a period under mistaken notions of how texts were assembled, scholars have long been hampered in the historical study of the Javanese written tradition. Consequently, in many quarters—not least of all the Javanese literature departments of Indonesia’s main universities—the Javanese literary corpus is widely perceived as a somewhat amorphous, nonparticular, and anonymous textual mass containing only the most tenuous data relevant to the construction of literary and intellectual history, particularly outside of Surakarta court circles during the Yasadipura-Ranggawarsita period.

In fact, though, the manuscript record contains a wealth of largely untapped data from which a far more detailed and regionally particularistic picture of Javanese literary history may be derived. But the greatest portion of this tantalizing evidence is relatively obscure, not easily accessible, and unusually resistant to extraction. Tapping the manuscript record requires that vast amounts of material be sifted for comparatively small bits of information relevant to matters of copying, composition, and content. Only when such tiny bits have been assembled in large numbers can we begin to fit them together, like the damaged pieces of a jumbled, incomplete jigsaw puzzle, to build a picture of Javanese letters over the centuries since Islamization that is far more coherent and authoritative than that which we presently possess.

2. Text-based methods and the philological calculus

There are two research methods, perpendicular rather than parallel, that must be employed across the range of Javanese materials to get these results. The first is text centred and largely philological; the second is manuscript centred and largely paleographic and codicological.

In the first method, related bodies, or corpora, of texts are minutely examined across the full range of the manuscript record. Every extant manuscript of each text must be identified, then organized into redactions on the basis of metrical structure; this labour will provide an overview of the textual complexity of the corpus. For many texts this work will be fairly simple, particularly for the wayang-style stories and other nonce creations of the nineteenth-century Vorstenlanden which might be said to have the textual characteristic of neither begetting nor being begotten (ora manak lan ora dianakaké). Certain other texts, too, particularly those of a directly didactic or religious nature, display little change over time, such as the Tajusalatin, the preponderance of mystical suluk, and the short hortatory and instructional texts of one or two cantos called piwulang. The vast majority of lengthier
narrative works, on the other hand, display metrical variation, and therefore redactional diversity, of sometimes astounding proportions. Texts such as the *Amad Muhammad, Yusup, Mênak* and *Asmarasupi* are found in dozens of redactions, some differing only in one or two cantos, but others diverging in fundamental ways over dozens of cantos. Generally speaking, the degree of historical popularity enjoyed by a text correlates strongly with the complexity of its textual history. In practical terms this means that the number of redactions within a given corpus usually stands in direct proportion to the number of surviving or known manuscripts.

But sorting out the various versions of a given family of texts is only the first – and by far the easiest – step in this sort of research. It must be followed by the preparation of critical texts. By critical text I mean here a text that displays all significant variants in an easily retrievable form, not one that seeks arbitrarily to create an authoritative reading. These texts must then be arranged in a harmonious format that allows verse-by-verse comparison across redactions.

The harmonizing of texts across redactions is the only reliable foundation for the detailed comparisons that make the extraction of textual genealogy and history possible. There is no substitute or short cut. The simplest corpus requires hundreds of hours of text preparation before authoritative analysis can begin; longer and more complex ones will consume months or even years of intensive labour and might best be carried out in research teams. Computer applications to simplify this work are necessarily limited, since what indicates textual relations between redactions is semantic, not morphological, parallelism.

The corpus-based method entails far more than the bare outline presented above, of course, but the basic description is sufficient to indicate the major lines of attack that must be pursued in fundamental textual research. The results of this research will be a thorough understanding of the processes of textual transmission and change over the past four to five centuries, a fixing of the general outlines of the real histories of the major Javanese texts, and the incremental establishment of philological tools equal to the challenge of literary conditions in Java. No published studies of complex Javanese texts to date fully satisfy these requirements; most do not begin to address them.

Perhaps a methodological note is pertinent here. Such text-comparing labour entails much eye work, and requires that all relevant data be displayed on the same page rather than being split between separate text, note and critical apparatus sections. With three or four versions it is relatively easy to display texts in this way, and to handle them in a single computer file. The logistics of display become increasingly difficult, however, as the number of redactions increases. In such cases the physical arrangement of the research materials becomes an extremely time consuming and difficult exercise, though absolutely necessary nevertheless.

Including Pigeaud's study of the *Centhini* (1933), Drewes's of the *Angling Darma* (1975), and Soebardi's of the *Cabolek* (1975). Kuntara's treatise on the
3. Scriptorial methods and the role of codicology

The second method, perpendicular to the textual approach of corpus-based studies, is scriptorial11 in nature and is concerned, in part, with the grouping of manuscripts (surviving as well as reported) on the basis of the place and date of copying. The 19,000 manuscripts in public collections, together with as many of those tens of thousands in private collections as may be examined, must be studied again and arranged in published catalogues according to where, when, by whom and at whose order they were copied. This is obviously a task of immense proportions, and under even optimal conditions could only ever be partially completed.

Localizing the place and time of copying for most Javanese manuscripts is a difficult task. Only a small portion of manuscripts open or close with colophonic references to the time at which copying occurred. Fewer mention the place of copying in enough detail to allow identification on the map. Fewer still give the name of the copyist who produced the manuscript, or hint at why he undertook the labour. Even when such information is found in a text, it not infrequently contains inconsistencies – especially in chronometry – that raise troubling new questions. For the great majority of Javanese manuscripts, therefore, other types of data must be relied on to discover where and when they were copied. External data in the form of codicological and paleographic characteristics are the most readily accessible clues in this undertaking, since they do not require a thorough reading of the manuscript in search of internal textual references that can be converted into the termini of philological argument.

The practical aspects of reorganizing and cataloguing the Javanese manuscript record on codicological principals are dismaying. To begin with, as mentioned above, the basic tools needed to conduct the work have not yet been formulated in writing, though a good deal of knowledge exists in the cortical synapses of leading scholars in the field. The scholarly dereliction of these subjects means there is a lack of formal vocabulary for describ-
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ing codicological and paleographic phenomena; without nomenclature and technical nuance the potential for significant discourse is greatly limited.

One of the most pressing tasks that must be undertaken in order to achieve a historically informed codicological organization of surviving manuscripts, then, is the development of a standard terminology, in English and Indonesian at the very least, that is capable of describing succinctly and accurately the features of script and codex that vary and therefore serve as phenomenological mileposts in the geographical and temporal classification of manuscripts. The creation of an appropriate vocabulary should be founded on existing terminologies in the vernacular traditions wherever possible. Research in this direction should be minimally theoretical in the first instance, taking the form of sharply focused case studies of initially more accessible parts of the manuscript record — those that are unequivocally dated and localized through colophons and other reliable devices. That almost certainly means beginning with the courts and only moving into the countryside in slow stages. Village texts tend to be structurally complex, textually heterogeneous, roughly crafted, inexpertly written, orthographically obscure, enigmatically assembled, poorly preserved, difficult to fathom, and — most seriously for our purposes — incompletely dated and inadequately localized.

The vocabulary created, and the features highlighted, in case studies such as these will begin the process of recataloguing or reorganizing the manuscript record on scriptorial grounds. This, in tandem with the philological and literary re-evaluation of texts, will bring more significant portions of the still largely inaccessible mass of Javanese manuscripts within the reach of scholars of all disciplines.

The fact that this is a work of generations, not months, may be disturbing. It should be. But the size of the task makes it no less necessary. Our resounding ignorance of the greater part of Javanese literature as it developed over the better part of the past five centuries testifies to that.

4. Patterns of literary patronage

In the remainder of this paper I would like to illustrate in a small way, and based on very limited and incomplete research, something of the possibilities that exist for rethinking cataloguing along scriptorial lines. For the purpose of this discussion I will restrict myself to manuscripts produced during the nineteenth century, as these represent by far the largest group of manuscripts surviving in the collections.

Nineteenth-century Javanese manuscripts were produced under a number of contrasting conditions and for widely varying reasons. The majority were probably copied out by individuals living in small villages, motivated by the microconditions of personal psychology and face-to-face neighbourhood sociology. By contrast, most manuscripts now gathered in our collections,
and those most familiar to scholars, originated under systems of patronage wherein the labour of a scribe was commissioned and directed by another individual. In the section that follows I will focus on this latter type, examining small sets of manuscripts that arose within three very different systems of scribal patronage, and under the impetus of very different cultural motivations.

The first group consists of manuscripts copied largely as a reflex of royal tradition within the courts of Central Java. The idea of kingship in Java is inseparable from certain acts and conditions of state that are considered to flow from the cosmic/divine nature of royal authority itself. The construction or mastery of a kraton, for example, is one of the conditions of kingship: no king can exist without a palace or its ontological equivalent (Behrend 1982). Patronage of the arts is an example of an act that defines and proves the kingship of the ruler. Music, drama and literature are foremost among the arts that rulers, by their nature, must underwrite and protect. In properly functioning kraton, books are produced as naturally as wayang performances, court dances, or royal progeny, and by their production the ruler is known to be king.

The second group of manuscripts stands far outside the tradition of begetting books in royal scriptoria. They were produced in a much more self-conscious and determined way, by order of the government or its constituent parts, as part of the colonial industry. In this case I refer to the large-scale manuscript factories organized for, and run by, Dutch scholars. Their organizing principles and rationale were ostensibly scientific in nature, their conscious goals learned, pedagogical, and humanistic.

The third and final group consists of manuscripts produced by individuals, acting without organized patronage, for immediate and rational economic reasons. These manuscripts illuminate the presence of the cash nexus, in some sense, at the very heart of this portion of the literary process, governing the selection of texts for transmission and the style of their scriptorial preservation. The invisible hand of Adam Smith is unquestionably at work in the copying of these manuscripts.

None of the sociological issues hinted at above will be delved into in the sections that follow; I mention them only to anticipate the fuller textures that future studies might develop. For the time being, it is merely the existence of these families of manuscripts that I wish to document, together with certain codicological, social, historical, and biographical details that arise in obvious ways from examining the manuscripts as coherent collections.

5. Royal patrons: the scriptorium of Hamengkubuwana V

A significant number of known nineteenth-century Javanese manuscripts are products of royal scriptoria, copied under royal decree by palace servants.
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whose central tasks were literary and scribal in nature. The four Central Javanese principalities stand out as great patrons of literary arts, particularly the Kasunanan and Kasultanan; manuscript production was also important in the four courts of Cirebon, however, and at the Madurese courts, though we have little specific information on these other centres as yet. Manu-

scripts originating in the Central Javanese royal scriptories are calligraphi-
cally exceptional, frequently illuminated or otherwise embellished, copied on more expensive materials, and often handsomely bound in tooled leather. This is to be expected, given the central role of the courts in all forms of art patronage, and the workaday presence in the kraton of fine artisans and craftsmen.

The ways in which palace scriptoria were organized, to what extent the ruler was involved in setting the copying agenda, how closely the activities of manuscript making dovetailed with other court activities, such as arts production (wayang tooling and painting, for example) or secretarial labours (correspondence, palace accounts, royal diaries) — these and similar questions remain unexplicated, though it can be assumed that the situation varied from court to court and over time.

One feature of scriptorial life in the palaces is clear, though: the activities of a scriptorium were not limited to simple copying and the attendant chirographic and bibliogonic crafts. In addition to renewing the literary tradition through the continual copying of older texts, these centres of manuscript production also functioned as centres of new writing and the rewriting (casting in new metres) of texts imported from outside the palace.

Court manuscripts are much more likely than others to be introduced by a colophon explaining when the copying (or writing) was done, and for which ruler. Codicological and paleographic traits of these manuscripts are also highly characteristic: each court developed a trademark style of calligraphy and book making (in addition to purely textual hallmarks) that set it apart from the others. At the same time, the professionalization of manuscript work in the palaces meant that the same individuals worked at the same jobs for long stretches of time, and the profile of their personal contribution to the development of the tradition should be discernible in the surviving manuscripts.

There is no need to repeat, of course, that the operant word in the last sentence is should: in the absence of any descriptive scholarship on Javanese codicology as a whole it is perhaps far-fetched to expect that the sty-

12 This state of affairs is due more to the lack of researchers oriented away from the Vorstenlanden than to a shortage of materials. Though not rivaling the huge numbers of manuscripts from the Central Javanese courts, the manuscript record, even as known from the major collections, is sufficiently rich in Madurese and Cirebon materials to keep a number of researchers busy for some time to come.

13 The most information concerning some aspects of life in a kraton scriptorium is found among Day's observations on the Yasadipura family and the Kapatihan Kadipatèn of early nineteenth-century Surakarta (Day 1981:167ff).
listic features of the Kasunanan scribes working during the reign of Pakubuwana IV (PB IV), for example, would have been identified, or the body of PB IV codices marked for special reference. Though these particular scholarly labours have yet to be undertaken, it should be a relatively simple matter to get them done, since a large proportion of the royal manuscripts that have survived from nineteenth-century Surakarta remain within the walls of the courts that produced them. The same is true for Yogyakarta. An examination of these manuscripts will reveal the codicological and paleographic footprint of the various scriptoria as styles, trends, and personnel changed over the years.

I have begun such an examination of manuscripts produced during the reign of Hamengkubuwana V (hereafter HB V) of Yogyakarta. These manuscripts have been fairly easy to pick out, partly because so many are concentrated in a single collection (the Widya Budaya at the Kraton Kasultanan), partly, too, because of the extreme beauty of the palace script and the highly distinctive character of page layout and text organization. To date I have identified 121 manuscripts as probably coming from the Yogyakarta palace during HB V’s reign.

G.R.M. Gatot Menol, infant crown prince to his father, the child king Hamengkubuwana IV, inherited the Yogyakarta throne in December 1822, one month before his third birthday, and close to the eve of the Dipanagara uprising and the Java War. For the first fourteen years of his reign (including a two-year interregnum, 1826-1828, when HB II was allowed back from exile) Menol was under the tutelage of a quartet of guardians, the adminis-

14 Based on my reading of Nancy Florida’s cataloguing notes for the SMP microfilming project (1981), it seems likely to me that she has a personal sense for the developing styles of the Kasunan, the Kadipaten and Kapatihan of Surakarta, and the Mangkunegaran. One hopes that when her much anticipated catalogue is published it will be equipped with tables and indices that will allow easy identification of all dated manuscripts by decade, scriptorium, and possibly even scribe. For a report on this project, see Wyatt 1982; copies of Florida’s cataloguing notes may be consulted at the three collections filmed under the project. (The first volume of Florida’s catalogue has appeared since this article was written [Florida 1993]. While it does not expand on matters of paleographic importance, it does identify numerous scribes by name, and indexes them in a special appendix.)

15 This ‘research’ has been carried out in a very desultory way as one of a dozen thematic avocations that I have indulged in over the past several years while working on cataloguing and microfilming manuscripts in the collections of the National Library of Indonesia and University of Indonesia in Jakarta. I have not, however, been able to pursue it in any organized or concerted fashion, and the discussion that follows is consequently quite provisional.

16 This collection was the site of a microfilming project undertaken in 1986 that resulted in a detailed catalogue of both libraries of the Yogyakarta palace – the Widya Budaya and Krida Mardawa. Photocopies of the preliminary version of this catalogue, written in English, have been available since 1987. An Indonesian translation of that catalogue has just been published (Lindsay, Feinstein and Soetanto 1994). It is principally through this catalogue that I was able to pinpoint a large number of HB V manuscripts without undue difficulty.
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tration of his lands fell to the Patih, and the royal seal was entrusted to the Resident. From November 1836, still only sixteen years old, Menol became sultan in his own right. His reign, which lasted until his death in June 1855, was a period marked by political discontent and palace intrigue, among other things over the issue of the Sultan’s alleged impotence and lack of an heir.17 But whatever his administrative and personal failings might have been, HB V remains remarkable for the role he played as an avid patron of the Javanese arts, and in particular of manuscript production, book illumination, and the rewriting of literary masterpieces.18

Some of the codicological and other traits of HB V manuscripts are as follows.

1. They are almost invariably written in the compact, handsome, quadratic kraton script of the Yogyakarta court.19 This script, which is reminiscent of Kartasura palace styles, is dense, rigid, and perpendicular; in it the sandhangan and pasangan lines are always spatially subordinate to the main aksara line. It is also characterized by, among other features, frequent use of aksara murda, particularly of the Ra and Ña,20 both of which are unknown in Surakarta. Stanza markers (sometimes called pada mangajapa) are elaborately produced with floral motifs that I have described elsewhere with the terms ‘winged’ and ‘double-winged’.21

2. Most HB V manuscripts are inscribed in a flat, non-reflecting black ink on high quality European rag paper in folio or quarto format.

3. Signatures are of varying length, usually 5-8 sheets. They are bound with heavy thread that is almost the gauge of string or twine.

4. Original bindings are Asian rather than European, with the quires sewn flush to a wooden lath in tight-back fashion. Endleaves, linings, and pastedowns are often of dluwang gendhong. Covers are of thin, blind-tooled and stamped leather over thick leather boards;22 front and back

17 There is little published historical writing on Sultan Menol’s reign. Masjkuri and Kutoyo 1976-1977:110-125 give some of the highlights of the period from the point of view of the Yogya court. Houben’s valuable dissertation (1987) provides much more (and more reliable) detail, together with the broader colonial perspective, on both Surakarta and Yogyakarta during the period 1830-1870.

18 On HB V’s patronage of another art form, wayang wong, see Carey 1981:livii (n. 51).


20 I quote passages taken directly from manuscripts in a way that preserves original orthography as much as possible. All aksara murda and aksara rékan are represented as capital letters. The symbol ‘n’ indicates a cecak, while ‘ng’ indicates the nga.

21 See Behrend 1987:77. At times these elaborate punctuation marks take on figural shapes and appear as elephant, bird, or other animal heads. For examples see the chapter head illustrations in Behrend 1990b:89, 94, 449, 545, 595, 619, 631.

22 Boarding materials common elsewhere in Java include wood, cardboard, and
covers are typically decorated with the same tooled patterns, and the back cover has an extension in the form of an articulated fore-edge and envelope flap designed to fold over the outside of the front cover. The flap is tooled in the same manner as the portion of cover it obscures when in place.  

5. Neither pages, signatures, nor narrative/metrical sections of these manuscripts are numbered in any way, making access to their contents quite difficult. In some cases special page-size decorative devices (wadana) are used to announce points of narrative significance, particularly in historical or religious-historical texts (see below under point seven).

6. Page layout is not crowded. Large margins are left empty on all sides of the text. The scribe, or perhaps an assistant, blocked out each page before writing, using some sort of edged instrument (perhaps fingernail) to leave impressions for guide-lines. The uneven and non-standardized treatment of each page indicates that no lining press, mistar, or other device was used. Single vertical guide-lines delimit the writing field on the page; double horizontal guides for each line of writing ensure uniform letter height. Sometimes pencil (?) was used to emphasize left and right margins.

7. The great majority of HB V manuscripts are provided with colophons at the very beginning and end of the text indicating when the copyist took up and finished his task. Colophons invariably fill two facing pages and are set in a matched set of decorative frontispieces. The text block of the colophon is smaller than on other pages. The physical setting apart of the colophon text in frontispieces is achieved by one of three methods that represent a continuum of elaborations on a single idea: (1) surrounding the text with frames made of simple lines; (2) framing through the use of distinctive pada mangajapa arranged in rows at the top and bottom of the text; or (3) illuminating the opening pages with highly geometric or kekayon-like illustrations that stand as the gates into and out of the 'kraton' of the text.

Manuscripts whose opening and closing colophons are framed in this way occasionally have numerous other pages throughout the text decorated in similar style. Colophons are often set apart structurally in HB V manuscripts by being recorded on a separate folio that is then attached at the beginning or end of the book as a separate ‘signature’ in its own right. Even when this is not the case, the verso side of the right-hand page of the opening colophon is almost invariably left empty. The closing colophon follows plaited palm leaves (tikar).

33 Compare the descriptions of other Indonesian bindings and covers of the same period discussed in Plomp's article elsewhere in this volume.

34 These illustrations, called wadana or rerenggan, always come in symmetrical pairs. Excellent photographs of some beautiful Yogyakartan wadana are found in Gallop and Arps 1991:2, 78-79, 93-95 and Jessup 1990:45.
the end of the text and is not textually melded into it; this almost always results in a clear gap of white space separating the end of the main text from the text of the closing colophon.

In addition to their codicological distinctiveness, the colophons of HB V manuscripts exhibit marked textual and other characteristics as well. The Yogya dating system differs from that of Surakarta and other areas in a number of respects, most obviously in its adherence to the Thursday calendar after 1749 AJ, in the old values assigned to its Jé and Dal years, and in its use of the dualistic lambang system in place of the usual four-cycle windu. In addition, the manuscripts of HB V’s reign employ an idiosyncratic unit or ‘year’, repeating every twelve days, that is expressed with a so-called merta number. Use of this distinctive chronometric feature dates from a bout of diarrhea suffered by young Menol in April 1836 and was discontinued immediately after the Sultan’s death. Another textual feature of HB V colophons is their frequent use of sengkalan words not just to indicate years, but often for part of the numbers used in dates, seasons, ongka merta and so on. This is a deliberate stylistic feature, not usually required in metri causa, that seems neither to have predated, nor survived, the reign of HB V.

On the basis of the distinctive features outlined above, it would be possible to conduct shelf searches of existing collections and very quickly draw up a list of all HB V manuscripts surviving in public collections. A close study of those manuscripts would reveal significant amounts of detail concerning the intellectual life of the kraton, as well as the inner workings of the Sultan’s literary corps. Even on the basis of my own extremely limited notes, made during cursory readings of only the opening and closing pages of a small number of the 121 HB V codices I have identified to date, a number of illuminating bits of information have come to light.

The rate of manuscript production over the reign of HB V was by no means uniform. For most of the period between 1836 and 1855 only a very few manuscripts (averaging under three) seem to have been produced each year, and no more than two were ever in production at the same time. During three other years, though, manuscripts produced numbered 15 (1846), 35 (1847), and 14 (1851), and the number of copyists working at a given time reached as high as 10. What special circumstances occurred in 1846-1847 (Jé 1774 and Dal 1775) and 1851 (Alip 1779) that inspired the relatively huge outpouring of manuscripts at just those times, while mere months before and after production proceeded at the usual pace? Could it be related to a royal kaul made at this time in the hope of gaining a son and heir? Could there be any connection between the activities of the mysterious Tumenggung Sadosin club and the first leap in production –

25 Behrend 1990a mentions all of these peculiarities and provides some minimal explanations.
26 On ongka merta see Feinstein 1987.
perhaps related to an initiation ritual or club activity that included hand copying of manuscripts? Further investigation might well reveal the answer.

Also related to the issue of manuscript production is the question of how manuscripts were selected for copying, and by whom. Even a cursory examination of the data exposes phenomena relevant to a study of these problems. For example, a large portion of the manuscripts in my research sample (29 of 121 manuscripts, or 24 per cent) contain second copies of other HB V manuscripts produced an average of only three years earlier. What was the reason for this quick recopying? In some cases, manuscripts that seem the most haphazard collections of unrelated texts are copied regularly over the years; in others, a single text is copied over and over again all at once. In almost all these cases the texts copied out do not seem to have been used with great regularity; few HB V manuscripts have the scruffy, smudged appearance of a well-thumbed study text. Most, though, do have bits of tobacco, grains of courtyard sand, or particles of snacks preserved in their pages that attest to occasional perusal.

Some details of the organization of Sultan Menol’s scriptorium also leap out of the record. As mentioned above, it seems to have been staffed by between two and ten scribes at different times. Colophonic dates portray scribes at work every day of the week, at all hours between early morning and late night. Scribes did not seem to lay off during any month of the year, but they were particularly productive in Ruwah-Pasa and in Sura, and rather slack in between. Greater scribal activity in those months may indicate a religious factor in the planning and carrying out of literary labour. This possibility is supported by another calendrical fact. Although every day is attested in the early part of the record, almost every manuscript pro-

---

27 On the Tumenggung Sadosin see the brief mention in Houben 1987:223-225.
28 Thus for example the odd Serat Kaklempakan (Serat Sakathahipun pujî), containing an unusual amalgam of religious and primbon texts, was copied at least three times, namely in June 1847 (manuscript in my possession, Behrend 02, that may be consulted in microform, reel PN/139.03), February 1851 (YKM/W.321), and April 1853 (YKM/W.322). One can see the value in having on hand a chapbook on tic omens, a poetic rendition of the titles of the Qur'anic surah, a treatise on statecraft, and a sexual handbook based on Muhammad’s teachings to his daughter Fatima; but that one manuscript with these and twenty other assorted texts should be studiously copied at least three times in six years, hardly ever to be used in the ensuing decades, points to a logic of copying that is not perhaps immediately obvious.
29 As in the case of manuscript BL 347, YKM/W.288 and W.289 – all of which contain the same version of the Tajusalatin copied in February, June and November of 1851 respectively. Does this represent an explosion of interest in that didactic text on statecraft and morals? Or was someone busily making copies of an important text to be used as gifts, but which subsequently were never distributed?
30 Every day of the saptawara week, as well as each pasaran, is indicated in the surveyed texts. I have not yet checked to see if every day of the selapan was used for copying, or every wuku.
Manuscript production in nineteenth-century Java

Produced after 1844 was begun and finished on a Kliwon day, preferably Selasa-Kliwon. After a scribe finished copying one text on a given Kliwon, he would wait an entire pasaran (five-day period) before starting a new one on the following Kliwon. The reasons for this Kliwon rule are not yet clear.

Division of labour within the scriptorium is noted in some manuscripts. Copying, illuminating, and binding were tasks carried out by different artisans. Among copyists themselves there may have been specialists in certain matters who advised others as appropriate. At the very least, a single individual probably advised copyists on chronometric particulars such as day, pasaran, wuku, date, and so on. This is clear from one case where two manuscripts begun on the same day (YKM/W.75 and W.116a, begun 6 Ruwah 1780, or 25 May 1852), both mistakenly give the warsa as Bé rather than Ehé.

Brief and tentative as this survey is, I think that it gives ample indication of the sort of social, historical, and literary detail that can be elicited for the HB V period from the manuscripts produced during his reign.

6. Scientific patrons: Suryawijaya and the Bataviaasch Genootschap

Large numbers of manuscripts at the two major repositories – Leiden University Library and the National Library of Indonesia – are not natural, organic products of Indonesian literary culture, but copies commissioned by scholars, or by institutions acting on their behalf, for specifically European, scientific purposes.

Voorhoeve (1964) describes one such scriptorium operating in the first half of the nineteenth century under the auspices of the Algemeene Secretarie in Batavia. It produced copies of Malay manuscripts obtained from various areas around the archipelago in order to provide materials useful for the instruction of government officials in the Malay language. A number of these copies were sent to Holland to be incorporated in the collection of the Delft academy, in time being transferred to Leiden where they now form part of the core collection of the Leiden University Library. Others found their way into various European collections, or into the holdings of the Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen. Voorhoeve’s description of the work of Muhammad Ching Sa’idullah, one scribe working at the Secretariat over a period of many years, makes it clear, however, that while the organizers of this work were European, the copying proceeded in line with the transmissional dynamic of the Malay and Javanese traditions, with much variation and embellishing entering the Secretariat.

Other types of data, too, as yet unmentioned, can also be extracted from the corpus of HB V manuscripts; a list of which texts were present in Yogya in the 1840s and 1850s, for example, would be extremely valuable for a study of the intellectual history of the court.
copies. Voorhoeve concludes his report with the following warning: in using the Secretariat copies, ‘one should always remember that they were written in a government scriptorium in the first half of the nineteenth century and so reflect the literary taste of that period’ (1964:266). In other words, these manuscripts should be used in the same way that all other Malay manuscripts are – with a cautious awareness not only of when the text was written, but equally of the time and place of copying.

The manuscript collection of the Bataviaasch Genootschap, formerly at the Museum Nasional in Jakarta but housed since 1989 on the fifth floor of the National Library building in Salemba, possesses a number of Javanese manuscripts produced in Dutch-sponsored scriptoria, some of which functioned as full-scale manuscript factories for decades at a time. Almost the entire Brandes (Br) collection, for example, consists of copies made for the Indies government under Brandes’s supervision in the 1880s and 1890s. The ‘G’ collection comprises more than 200 typescript copies of manuscripts studied by Pigeaud in his lexical work of the 1930s. The codices KBG 400-532 are almost entirely copies – many of them in pégon script – made on behalf of the Netherlands Bible Society in Surakarta during the time of Gericke and Wilkens. Of particular interest, too, are the manuscripts gathered together as the Cohen Stuart collection, which passed into the hands of the Bataviaasch Genootschap in 1875, just months before Cohen Stuart’s death.

A.B. Cohen Stuart had a brilliant but altogether too short career as one of the early ambtenaren voor de beoefening der Javaansche Taal. Graduating from the academy at Delft in 1846 among the first generation of Roorda’s students, Cohen Stuart was immediately posted to the Indies. After a period assisting Winter and Wilkens with the translation into Malay and Javanese of Dutch legal codes (1847-1851) he was released to full-time study of Javanese and ‘Kawi’ (i.e. Old Javanese), probably working for a time with Ranggawarsita. He continued in Surakarta up until 1860, in which year his edition of the New Javanese Brata-Joeda’ – with its scathing appraisal of Ranggawarsita’s abilities – appeared in volumes 27 and 28 of the Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap.

---

32 Manuscripts in the Br collection, numbered from 1-665, actually total 758 volumes. Roughly ninety percent of these volumes are scientific copies.
33 Manuscripts in this collection are numbered from 1 through 200, but many numbers are not represented on the shelf at the National Library. Copies of the same typescripts are also found at the Sonobudoyo Library in Yogyakarta (B and E collections); the library of the Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Indonesia (FSUI) (G collection, with many duplicates found in the A, B and W collections); and in Leiden University Library manuscripts Or 6678-6693, 6750-6759, and 6776-6796. FSUI’s set of the Pigeaud manuscripts is the most complete. Note that manuscripts in the G collections of PN and FSUI share the same numbers from 1-184. The ‘G’ designation is an abbreviation for ‘gebonden afschriften’, or bound copies.
34 On Cohen Stuart’s life and work, see L.W.C. van den Berg’s memorial article in Tijdschrift van het Bataviaasch Genootschap (1876).
Later that year Cohen Stuart returned to Holland on furlough to recover his health. When he returned in 1862 it was to Batavia. After a second home leave for health reasons in 1871, extended to four years so he could work with Kern on publishing his epigraphic studies in Leiden, Cohen Stuart returned again to Batavia, but succumbed three months later to a fatal disease.

Among his other responsibilities in Batavia, Cohen Stuart served from 1862 to 1871 as the first formal conservator of manuscripts in the collection of the Bataviaasch Genootschap. During this time the collection grew by well over 1000 volumes. One of Cohen Stuart’s tasks as conservator was to oversee the production in Batavia of new copies of older manuscripts deemed too frail or damaged or difficult to be easily read.

A total of 191 manuscripts comprise the Cohen Stuart (CS) collection, which was turned over to the Bataviaasch Genootschap as a loan collection by government order in June 1875. Of these, 39 are in Malay, two in Balinese, and the rest in Javanese or Old Javanese. The exemplars of 133 of these manuscripts are known from notations jotted on their title pages: fifteen were received directly from the hand of the author or compiler; 35 were copied from manuscripts in the possession of private individuals (most notably Cohen Stuart himself, K.F. Holle, H.N. van der Tuuk, and Ranggawarsita); and 83 were copied from manuscripts in the BG collections, including 65 from lontar, the majority originating from the Merapi-Merbabu or other antique Javanese collections written in buda script. It is clear that Cohen Stuart took good advantage of his government commission to study and organize lesser known parts of the Bataviaasch Genootschap’s collection.

35 It remains unclear to me from which department within the government Cohen Stuart drew his salary, and from whom he obtained the commission and funding for this copying work. It seems likely that he was employed as a Javanese language and culture specialist (taalambtenaar) on assignment (secondment?) to the Bataviaasch Genootschap. The Regeeringsalmanakken for the 1860s, however, do not list Cohen Stuart as the employee of a particular department, though he is included among the honoraire leden of the Bataviaasch Genootschap. In the Notulen of the 1860s he is often listed as attending board meetings in the role of eerelid.

As regards the making of the copies now found in the CS collection, Van den Berg (1876:426) – who succeeded Cohen Stuart as conservator of manuscripts – says that the copying work was done ‘ten behoeve der Regeering’ with no further details. When the collection came under the jurisdiction of the Bataviaasch Genootschap by government order in 1875, it had the status of a loan collection and was not considered the outright property of the Bataviaasch Genootschap. Further research in the colonial archives is needed to clear up these minor points.

36 See the discussion of the government decision concerning this issue in Notulen 14 (1876) under item II.i for the board meeting of 7 September 1875. An inventory of the collection is appended as bijlage A.

37 A total of 43 copies – almost all of them Malay rather than Javanese – have no such explanatory notations. A further fifteen are original manuscripts, not copies.
Cohen Stuart ran his scriptorium during the same period that he served as manuscript conservator to the BG: 1862-1871. Over this ten-year period he employed at least twelve scribes to copy Javanese manuscripts. They are: H. Abdullah Nur (specialist in pégon script); Cakra Amijaya; R.M. Cakra Atmaja; Mas Jayapremadi; Jayasuwiya; R.M. Kusman; Mas Mangundimeja; Mas Prawira Arja; R.M. Samsi; Mas Sumadiwiryay (a scribe in the Eerste Gouvernements Secretariaat); R. Panji Suryawijaya (father of Samsi); and Uret.

The codicological style of these manuscripts is highly standardized, with little variation from copyist to copyist over the years, and is marked by certain characteristics foreign to the Javanese tradition that presumably were introduced by Cohen Stuart to make the copies more useful and accessible for study. Most manuscripts, for example, have a title page with explanations in Dutch concerning the exemplar, copyist, date of copy, and so forth. Pages of text are blocked out squarely with space in the outer and inner margins for stanza numbers (in Javanese numerals) and corresponding pages in the exemplar (Arabic numerals) respectively. The number of the current canto is also clearly recorded in Javanese numerals in the outer top corner of each page.

Literal accuracy in copying seems to have been a value that Cohen Stuart inculcated in his scribes; errors in the exemplar are sometimes noted, and intentional 'white noise' variation is not found. At least in the early days of the scriptorium, while Cohen Stuart was still training his staff, copies were double checked by a second scribe to ensure their accuracy, and the name of the scribe by whom the manuscript had been gecollationeerd was also recorded on the title page. CS copies are clearly set in the tradition of Dutch philology, their goal being much like that of photocopying today: to get a portable image, as accurate as possible, of the text under scrutiny.

Some of Cohen Stuart's scribes seem to have produced only two or three manuscripts, usually in a single year; others copied four to eight over several years' time. The most productive, however, was the petty aristocrat R.
Panji Suryawijaya, who copied or otherwise assisted with 73 of the 128 manuscripts for which attributions exist, his service spanning the full ten years of Cohen Stuart’s attachment to the Bataviaasch Genootschap.

Pigeaud mentions Suryawijaya as a Solonese gentleman residing in Batavia who worked as Cohen Stuart’s secretary (1967-1970, 1:262). It is clear, though, that Suryawijaya was not simply a secretary, but rather more a scholar in the tradition of the Yasadipura family, and very much an author in his own right. He appears to have been attached to Cohen Stuart from Surakarta days, and to have followed him to Batavia for his 1862 posting.41 Upon arrival in the capital he initially lodged with the famous painter Radèn Salèh,42 later taking up quarters in the Kwitang area, southeast across the Koningsplein from the Bataviaasch Genootschap’s museum.43

During his years working for Cohen Stuart in Batavia, Suryawijaya seems to have specialized in the copying of particularly difficult palm-leaf manuscripts, especially those written in the antique scripts of Merapi-Merbabu and other non-Balinese collections of Old Javanese texts. Most manuscripts copied in this way were equipped with an introductory section of two to five pages containing a synopsis of the text copied, as well as a table showing the paleographic style of the script in the original lontar. While the précis given never exhibit any great understanding of the texts described and the tables of alphabetic equivalents tend to remain unchanged from manuscript to manuscript and year to year, even so the transliterations seem to be accurate enough, if sloppily written.44 Cohen Stuart appears to have been satisfied with the level of Suryawijaya’s learning and abilities, as he allowed him to continue in the work for nearly a decade.45 It is unclear whence Suryawijaya obtained his knowledge of Old Javanese and the buda script, whether from Cohen Stuart himself or from earlier studies in Surakarta. His transcription of Old Javanese lontar did not begin immediately after his arrival in Batavia, but five years later in 1867.

In addition to his own task as copyist, Suryawijaya appears to have been the senior scribe in Cohen Stuart’s manuscript factory, overseeing and correcting the work of others. In the process he also undertook the training of

---

41 I have not yet undertaken primary research into Suryawijaya’s life, except to peruse the titles of the manuscripts he copied and the books he wrote. The central document with which to begin such a research would be Lor 3168, an unpublished travel diary entitled Suryawijaya, anggitan lelampahaning sarira dumugi andhèrèk ing Kangjen Tuwan A.B. Kohèn Setiwar dhateng nagari Batawi. On this text, see Juynboll’s brief synopsis (1907-1911, I:144).


43 Suryawijaya’s residence in Kwitang is mentioned in the sandiasma of his Nala wasa nala satya (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij. 1880).

44 I am indebted to I. Kuntara Wiryamartana for this evaluation of Suryawijaya’s accuracy in transliterating the Merapi-Merbabu manuscripts.

45 Cohen Stuart, of course, was an early pioneer in the study of Old Javanese whose work predated and helped lay the foundation for the important contributions of Kern, Van der Tuuk, Brandes, and others.
his son, R.M. Samsi, starting him out in 1867 with an easy manuscript in standard Javanese script, but soon thereafter teaching him the difficult buda scripts. The favouritism of the father is apparent: Samsi worked on eighteen manuscripts in the five years of his affiliation with Cohen Stuart, second only in number to Suryawijaya himself.

Before joining Cohen Stuart in Batavia, Suryawijaya was already something of an author. As mentioned above, he wrote a lengthy account of his trip from Surakarta to Batavia in 1862 to take up his post with Cohen Stuart. Shortly after his arrival he began writing other books within the scope of his scribal labours - some scientific and descriptive works as aids to Cohen Stuart, some original writings of a moralistic or religious nature, and some compilations of wisdom gleaned from his wide reading of rare texts. During the same period he also engaged in some journalistic and popular writing, publishing in 1869 a verse description of Batavia's new tram system called Serat Kidung Tramwé.

During the 1870s and 1880s Suryawijaya continued to create new works, mostly in verse but of a relatively modern character (Pigeaud 1967-1970, 1:262-263). Only some of these were published. Following Cohen Stuart's death in 1876, Suryawijaya stayed on in Batavia working as a scribe (inlandsch schrijver, juru serat) in the office of the Algemeene Secretarie.

Much more information on Suryawijaya certainly exists than I have sketched out here on the basis of my extremely limited research. The point

---

46 PN/CS 24, Tijdrekening (n.d.) and CS 32, a description of the Surakarta kraton (1865).
47 PN/CS 30, Serat Pawulang ing budi (1863); CS 91, Baratayuda sabil kha-kuliah (1869); and CS 151, Suluk Jatirasa and Serat Sri Gandana (1870) (also copied in a manuscript of the Rinkes collection, LOr 8617a, dated 1875).
48 PN/CS 103, Serat Darmamulya (1869); CS 168, Buwana kasarira (1870); CS 169, Candrabirawa (1870); and CS 170, Padéwan wasa dasanama (1870).
49 This small book of 46 pages was published in Batavia. The publisher is not listed in any of the citations, and the National Library's own copy is missing the title page. There is also some variation in the title from citation to citation. Girardet (1983:173-174) gives it as Serat Kidung Tramwé, and lists the author as Suryawijaya. Rouffaer and Muller (1908:308) ascribe it to 'Rahaden Pandji Soerjadjaja' and cite its full title as Punika serat rumpakanipun karéta tramwé. In Poerwa Soewignja and Wirawangsa (1920-1921 I:425), the title given is Tramweg (karéta gerbong), without ascribed authorship. Suryawijaya's name is contained in a sandiasma of the first stanza of the text.
50 Published works were: a collection of wangsalan with their solutions, compiled with 'F. Winter' (C.F. Winter, Jr or his son F.L. Winter ?) which appeared in Bra Martani between 1870 and 1872 (Pigeaud 1967-1970, II:364, re LOr 6384 a-b); Nala wasa nala satya (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1880; for a manuscript copy see the Leiden manuscript CB 136 [2], no. 2, which is dated 1875); Basiran basirun (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1880); and Sri Gandana (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1883). On this last text see note 46 above.
Unpublished texts from this period include: Serat Suryangalam, written for a Javanese almanac in 1875 (LOr 5542, 6203a no. 22); Serat Secawardaya (LOr 5546); Randha Guna Wecana, which Pigeaud calls a prose novel (LOr 5544b); and two volumes of dialogues for students, called Darmayasa (LOr 5544a, 5556).
of this exercise, though, has been to give a glimpse into research methodologies made possible by identifying a body of manuscripts as originating in a single scriptorium, or descending from a single patron, then treating them as a body of coherent evidence.

7. Manuscripts for profit: book touts and lending libraries

Although both categories of manuscripts discussed above have a financial dimension, since scribes in both the palaces and Dutch research institutions were salaried employees copying for their rice, yet in neither case was the intent of the patrons to make money. There exists, however, a small but interesting class of nineteenth-century Javanese manuscripts that were produced with the specific intent of turning cash profits. There are at least two types of such manuscripts: those copied to be sold on the market, usually to Dutch scholarly interests; and those copied by proprietors of local lending libraries to be rented out for small cash amounts. I will dwell on each only very briefly.

It is not unusual to find manuscripts with sale information noted inside the front or back cover. Normally they state the title of the work and give a price. For example, one manuscript in my possession51 bears the inscription:

punnika serat yuSup hargi ,, 25 ,, rupiyaḥ

This note, though, is in a very different hand from the body of the text itself: as in most such cases, it seems that a later owner of a manuscript, discovering a need for cash, attached a rupiah value to a family possession and delivered it to the market.

This scenario differs fundamentally from the topic at hand, which entails not the change of function inherent in the sale of previously-owned literary goods, but rather the production of new manuscripts with specifically commercial intent. Manuscript wares became quite common in the early twentieth century; mini industries sprouted up around Dutch scholars who advertised their interest in acquiring manuscripts of a certain kind.

Th. Pigeaud, operating mostly in Yogyakarta during the 1930s, provides one well-documented example of how the research interests of a single scholar could affect the literary landscape around him. Through his field agents M. Tanaya and M. Sinu Mundisura, Pigeaud received a steady stream

51 The manuscript is an undated fourth volume in a series of at least five volumes containing histories of the prophets. Only this fourth volume is in my possession. Volume two in the same series was collected in the 1890s by Brandes, and is preserved as Br 561 in the National Library's collection. The Brandes manuscript is dated 1814 and appears to be a product of the royal scriptorium of Pakubuwana IV of Surakarta. For a copy of my manuscript, coded Behrend 01, see National Library microfilm reel no. 139, item 2.
of texts on wayang, village ritual and local legends that reflected his collecting interests, but at the same time represented a departure from the tradition of maintaining information on such topics by oral means. The manuscripts sent in often seem hastily thrown together and are copied out in quarto exercise books; the writing tends to be large, the use of space on the page profligate in the interest of making a heftier text out of leaner materials. The research and collecting interests of Ir. J.L. Moens, contemporary and friend to Pigeaud in Yogyakarta and likewise a student of wayang and folk traditions, also affected the sorts of texts being composed and copied in the region: his prodigious interest in the writings of native informants contributed substantially to the flood of materials on these topics that flowed out of Sentolo, Sléman, Gunung Kidul and other areas around Yogya during this period.52

I have also come across another set of manuscripts obviously prepared for sale to European scholars, but dating from the previous century. The manuscripts in question consist of a run of eight codices in the KBG collection, National Library of Indonesia, as follows:

1. KBG 91 Ménak Cina
2. KBG 92 Ménak Malébari
3. KBG 93 Aji Pamasan (in two volumes)
4. KBG 94 Sruti Kawi mawi teges
5. KBG 95 Cabolèk
6. KBG 96 Cariyos Gancaring Empu
7. KBG 97 Kawi Dasanama

There is nothing extraordinary about a collection such as this, except for its source. Six of these manuscripts were copied by R.Ng. Ranggawarsita, the other two under his supervision, all of them apparently in the 1860s.53 That Ranggawarsita was the owner of these manuscripts is established on several grounds, including an octagonal red ink seal in KBG 92 which contains the legend ‘habdidalem pun ngabèhi roggawarsita’ in Javanese script. There are several different types of handwriting in some of the manuscripts, but the distinctively spiky hand of Ranggawarsita is predominant.54

52 Most of the manuscripts produced for Pigeaud are in the former Panti Boedjája library, now forming the core of the Museum Sonobudoyo collection catalogued in Behrend 1990b, and in the library of the Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia (see the catalogue-in-progress in the reading room of the FSUI collection). Moens manuscripts appear in both of these collections as well, but the largest number are contained in the two Moens collections at the Leiden University Library (LOr 10.886-10.974 and LOr 12.507-12.577), and in the Astuti Sudirja collection (AS 1-85) of the National Library.

53 The only dated manuscript among the eight is KBG 93, which bears a sandi-asma of Ranggawarsita’s name in the first stanza of the text and mentions the year 1791 AJ, janma-trus-kaswarèng-bumi, corresponding to 1862 AD. This is probably a date of composition, not copying. But given that the manuscript was acquired in 1870 (see below), the copy date must fall between 1862 and 1870.

54 To be sure of the hand, I compared closely with manuscripts CS 2 (Sajarah para sawuli) and CS 8 (Nitisastra Kawi). Cohen Stuart noted on the title pages
According to letters from the Resident of Surakarta tabled during the bestuursvergadering of the Bataviaasch Genootschap on 5 April 1870 (Notulen 8:40), these manuscripts, together with a number of printed books, were bought at auction in Surakarta on 21 February 1870. The purchase was made on behalf of the government by J.A. Wilkens, the well-known lexicographer and taalambtenaar.

No mention is made in the Notulen (and presumably the Resident's letter) that the manuscripts came from Ranggawarsita, though Wilkens could not have been ignorant of his informant's sale of these items, nor of the financial plight in which the poet found himself. By the time of the sale, Ranggawarsita had been working for Dutch scholars in Surakarta for at least 30 years. He started out in 1840 with a monthly honorarium of f 20 ("20 rupiyah paréntah") in return for his services teaching Winter and C.J. van der Vlis about Javanese literary and cultural traditions at regular Monday and Thursday night sessions chez Winter, copying manuscripts, compiling Kawi-Jarwa wordlists, transliterating texts from antique budá script into modern Javanese, and so forth.

Whether Ranggawarsita was still on a stipend from Wilkens or the Bijbel Genootschap in 1870 is uncertain, though doubtful. His economic position, never good, had greatly eroded following Pakubuwana IX's accession to the throne in 1861. The general disappointment of the Dutch scholarly community over Ranggawarsita's imperfect mastery of Old Javanese must have had a deleterious effect on his finances as well. Anecdotal evidence affirms that the 1860s were the most difficult period in Ranggawarsita's life. In this climate the poet may have turned to a sort of freelance copying work, hoping thereby to supplement his meagre income and alleviate his chronic money problems. A market for Javanese manuscripts certainly existed in the second half of the nineteenth century, with a number of public and private collectors in constant search of materials. But though demand was high, supply seems to have been very limited and prices fairly inflated.

Of these manuscripts that they were copied by Ranggawarsita. They date roughly from the same period as the KBG manuscripts (the 1850s and 1861 respectively), thus making reliable chirographic guides.

55 There was also no mention of Ranggawarsita in connection with these manuscripts when they were catalogued by Cohen Stuart – another acquaintance of the poet's – shortly after acquisition (1872:22-23).

56 Ranggawarsita's money woes have been well known, and the stuff of popular tales, since the 1840s. For a general impression see Day 1981:185-188; compare also the Leiden manuscripts containing copies of Ranggawarsita's correspondence with Winter (LOr 2235) and Van der Vlis (KITLV H-389 no. 9).

57 See the copy of Ranggawarsita's 1840 contract with Van der Vlis quoted in Padmopuspito 1991.

58 Ranggawarsita, speaking in his guise as 'Parakawi', tells 'Tuan Anu' (C.F. Winter) in the Javaansche zamenspraken (Winter 1911:343) that in Solo, '[i]there is no place where books are sure to be on sale. But there are individuals who own books and who may from time to time sell them, or loan them out to be copied. You should also know that, apart from nobles, only rarely do people have books complete through to the end. Often someone has the first part of a book, but the
In any event, Ranggawarsita prepared these manuscripts in a way that would make them more useful to Dutch scholars than other contemporaneous copies – and perhaps more valuable – by numbering cantos and stanzas in the European fashion. The copyist’s intention to sell at least some of his copies is clear from the 15 silver rupiah asking price written inside the front flyleaf of KBG 92. Codex KBG 94 is cheaper, at only six rupiah. In the hopes of convincing potential buyers of its worth Ranggawarsita has also personally added the note that ‘it would be a good idea to use this as a textbook’.

Despite reasonable prices and the advertising copy, he does not appear to have had much retail success, though. While Cohen Stuart acquired a few of his manuscripts in the 1860s (both for the Bataviaasch Genootschap and for his own collection), Ranggawarsita seems to have given up on the notion of selling his volumes piecemeal. In February 1870 he offered them for sale at auction; the brief Notulen notice does not mention how much Wilkens paid for the lot.

But manuscripts could be made to earn money through other than purely retail means. Drewes (1981:98) reports that ‘in the nineteenth century lending libraries of a kind [existed] in some towns, but these did not boast printed books, only hand-written stories in the local script’. Other scholars have already reported in great detail on the make up and functioning of several such taman pustaka in Palembang and various neighbourhoods around Batavia. Chambert-Loir’s brilliantly detailed studies, which draw social and biographical conclusions from such apparently nugatory codicological minutiae as repeated signatures and enigmatically placed diacritics, are models of the methodology which I am recommending in this paper. As a re-

---

59 PN/KBG 97 once contained a note from the original owner (copyist?) that priced the book on the basis of costs associated with producing it. Though this note is now lost, it is preserved in the minutes of the Bataviaasch Genootschap board meeting of 26 May 1868 (Notulen 6:50). Concerning these costs, the note reads as follows: ‘gekoost heeft aan schrijfloon, à 50 cts. per dag, gedurende 4 maanden, f 60; aan illustratie met 575 figuren, à 10 cts elk, f 57.50; aan band, f 7; samen f 124.50’. The rental cost is highly inflated (10-15 cts a day was the going rate), as are the figures for the illustrations (which are nevertheless unusually attractive in this manuscript), but the figure gives an idea of how much the owner hoped to realize from the sale of the manuscript. The manuscript was bought at Cohen Stuart’s recommendation – at the bargain rate of f 25.

60 The note on p. i of the manuscript reads: punnika serat wahossan ménnak mak-lebbari, dumuginnipun serat ménnak cinten\, rgi : 15 : rupiyah pethak\.  
61 KBG 94, p.i: // punnika serat srut\, kawi mawi teges\, kadamel wuwulang lam-pah hijkan prayogi, rgi , 6 , nem rupiyah pethak.  
62 See Kratz 1977, Iskandar 1981, Chambert-Loir 1984, 1991; all of these articles deal with Malay language materials only.  
63 It was, in fact, a 1984 lecture delivered by Chambert-Loir at the Faculty of Asian Studies, Australian National University, which first displayed for me the potential fruits that a closer and closer comparative reading of related codices
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sult it is unnecessary to demonstrate again here how the inventories of former lending libraries and other popular collections can be reconstructed, or what sorts of contributions to intellectual and literary history their study can provide. Instead, let me simply conclude this section with a few general observations on Javanese lending libraries.\footnote{While we have assumed that Javanese lending libraries did exist, probably on the Malay model, no studies to date have identified any manuscripts as originating in this milieu. Note, however, Pigaud 1967-1970, II:410, which mentions that LOr 6705A was copied in Yogyakarta to be rented out at ten cents a night.}

No large collections of manuscripts originating from a single library have yet come to my attention. At this writing I have found commonalities in seventeen manuscripts\footnote{Of these seventeen manuscripts, five are from the NR collection at FSUI, ten from the KBG and one from the Brandes collections at the National Library, and one from my own collection. It was my familiarity with this last that provided the first clue to the possibility of other manuscripts originating from the same hand or same tradition.} that lead me to conclude that they originated in lending libraries. Because of the small size of the sample, though, I have not yet been able to devise codicological and textual tools capable of distinguishing between manuscripts copied primarily for commercial purposes and those copied in urban areas for purely personal needs, which probably served as a model for the development of the former as the cash economy grew in the nineteenth century.

To finally pin down this distinction may not, in fact, be possible. For the present, I will defer providing a detailed codicological description of these manuscripts until further materials have been identified in European and other collections. Instead, I will simply give a few details here concerning one small collection which originated around Semarang near the middle of the nineteenth century. The colophons of the three manuscripts from this collection specifically identify them as books available for rent, thus doing away with the need for speculative arguments concerning their social provenance.

The minutes of the Bataviaasch Genootschap board meeting for 19 September 1865 (Notulen 3:140) report that a certain J.P. de Bordes had made a purchase earlier that year of three manuscripts originating ‘uit eene inland-sche leesinrigting te Samarang’.\footnote{The minutes mention that a request was sent to De Bordes to seek further information about this lending library, and on the possibility of acquiring more manuscripts from it. No response to the request was noted in subsequent numbers of the Notulen.} The manuscripts, which contain texts of a Ménak Cina, Panji Déwakusuma Kembar, and Babad Mataram, are now found in the National Library collection as items KBG 18-20. Some problems exist with the exact dating of the manuscripts because of damaged frontispieces or confused chronometric information,\footnote{KBG 20, for example, claims to have been copied in 1867, two years after it was acquired by the Bataviaasch Genootschap. The Javanese equivalent of this
from around the 1850s. All are provided with numerous simple illustrations which were captioned, and probably drawn, by the copyist. The manuscripts open with a colophon enclosed in a frame or more elaborate wadana, and close with an inverted triangular decoration which contains a note on the owner, as space permits. Pepadan ‘rubricated’ in red and green are prominent decorative features of the text, as appears to be usual with lending library manuscripts generally.

The owner and copyist of the manuscripts was Bagus Sarodin of Kampung Sekayu, also known under the ‘dasanama’ name of Kyahi Marjani. The only village named Sekayu mentioned in the gazetteers I have examined is located near Palembang; on paleographic grounds, however, there can be no mistaking Sarodin’s handwriting as anything but North Coast Central Javanese. Sekayu must be the name of a village or neighbourhood in the Semarang area.

Bagus Sarodin identifies himself as a foreman at a brickworks (mandhor bannon, KBG 18, I.3) and tenant on a Dutch property (magersari hijn wel-londa, KBG 19, I.3). In addition, though, he is an active maker of books produced specially for rental. ‘I copy these out,’ he says, ‘even though I’m unqualified,’ in the hopes that someone among my friends and acquaintances will borrow them. The cost of borrowing a book overnight is 15 cents.

Sarodin is forced into this business endeavour by his poverty, and seems embarrassed by it. He requests, with many apologies, that those who descend to rent and read his books be extra cautious in handling them, lest they do some damage. To this end, Sarodin enjoins his patrons to avoid

year is given in an improperly reversed sengkalan that reads 1-7-7-? from left to right (the last element is unclear); such a date would in fact correspond to a Gregorian year in the 1840s.

‘Dasanama’ here may suggest a deliberate semantic connection between some part or homonym of the words bagus sarodin and marjani. The basis for the play between the two aliases escapes me. Perhaps it lies in the following: Sarodin = sardhin = sardine, and Marjani = merjan = a kind of red coral; the connection between fish and coral, though, seems awfully tenuous, unless there was a fish known locally in Semarang as an iwak merjan or some such. No less outlandish solutions have occurred to me. Another possibility is that there is no connection between the two names, but that they simply are two ‘synonyms’ for the same person.

KBG 18, I.3-4: [...] hijn manjkie hakarya surat\(4\) ka\(n\) serrat punnika hugi,, hapan Ta kinnarya sêwan\.

Insistence on unworthiness, ignorance, etc. is conventional, of course. Sarodin claims over and over to be vulgar, stupid, lacking in writing skills, incapable of doing anything, and so forth. One example is KBG 20, I.7: hasa\(n\)get nistha tiyngg\(e\), ka\(n\) purun mesTanni padha,, raga sa\(n\)get hanistha,, kasiya siya kella\(n\)g\(k\)u\(g\), tannanna hijn karyannira...

KBG 20, I.2: pramila hayasa serrat\(a\), kella\(n\)g\(k\)u\(g\) nistha kawula,, bilih wonten ka\(n\)g antambut\(u\), dhumateg sannak kawula,,

The amount is given as a suwang and a seteng, which equals fifteen duit. KBG 18, I.4: mennawi pinnapnygak\(e\), ka\(n\) para sannak seddaya,, ka\(n\) sammi purun nêwa,, sadinten lawan seddalu,, suwang setTêg sêwannira...
chewing betel or smoking while reading, lest the text be stained with spittle or burned by falling ashes.73

In all these expressions, except those concerning rental, Sarodin is repeating conventions that, in one form or another, can be found in hundreds of other manuscripts copied in north coastal towns and villages over the centuries. The conventions, in fact, are not limited to the Pasisir towns of Central Java, but appear all over the island and east at least as far as Lombok. They appear in other languages as well: the prohibitions, warnings and pious ejaculations of Bagus Sarodin are exact cognates of those expressed in the two Malay manuscripts from the Palembang lending library discussed in Kratz (1977).

The existence of other Javanese lending libraries is attested in various towns and at various times among other manuscripts that I have examined. Some seem very closely related to the style found in Sarodin’s library, both in paleographic and codicological features. This is especially true of two manuscripts from Pak Sakirman, Kampung Tonya, Semarang, that date from the 1890s,74 and a single manuscript from Pak Sarman, Kampung Sareyan (Surakarta?), dated 1895.75 I suspect that these manuscripts come from libraries run by relatives or descendants of Sarodin. Other manuscripts dating from 1851 through 1893 and coming from Semarang, Rembang, Yogyakarta, and Krukut (Surabaya?) share many generic features of script, text, and codex with these – so much so that I am led to suspect stronger ties among some of them than the impersonal conventions and norms of an urban tradition.

8. Conclusion

In his first article on the Muhammad Bakir lending library in Pecenongan, Batavia, Chambert-Loir observed, then elegantly demonstrated, that the ‘dis-

73 KBG 20, I.3: pannedhanné kaŋg anulisi\, dhumateŋ kaŋ sedya maca\, dènn aguŋ paŋgra [sic] ll paŋgapuranné\, sampun maca bari nginnag\, menawawì [sic] këŋgin dumbaŋ\, sampun moça bari hudut\, menawì këŋgin dañhana\,.
74 FSUI/CI.62, Ménak Gandrung dumu gi Méñak Kandhabumi, copied 1892; and KBG 397, Babad Jaka Tingkir, copied 1896. The copyist of these texts identifies himself principally as the owner of a lending library, but he appears to have had duties of a religious nature as well (KBG 397, I.3: pak sakirman haran- nira\, hakarya surat jawa\, meŋkono panggotanipun w sinambi bekTi yyan Suk- ma\,). Sakirman’s service to God carries over into his manuscripts, the colophons of which he fills with prayers and pious intentions – all of them conventional, but nevertheless emphasized and reaffirmed by their repetition in the opening stanzas of his books.
75 This manuscript, containing a Panji tale, is in my possession. In it the copyist describes himself as a musician (or gamelan smith?) for whom book rental is a sideline (I.3: pak sarman wanstannira\, tukaŋ gendhin karyanita\, punnìka panggo- tanipun\, sinambi ñéwakken seraf\,). Note the similarity between this statement and that quoted in the previous footnote.
covery of a group of works precisely dated and localised, even if relatively recent, can provide some valuable criteria for the historical study of texts’ (1984:44). In this article I have followed these same lines of reasoning, arguing that scholarship founded on a consideration of interrelated families of manuscripts is not only valuable or interesting, but in fact indispensable in piercing the veil of anonymity and formless synchronicity obscuring much of the Javanese literary landscape. I have attempted here to sketch out, however preliminarily, some directions that such an intercodical, particularistic methodology might follow, hinting at the sorts of insights and conclusions that its adoption might be expected to provide for several types of nineteenth-century materials.

Unfortunately, catalogues of publicly accessible manuscripts do not normally allow the easy tracing of dates and provenance that is needed to gather interrelated codices scattered among several collections and to group them on the basis of where, when, and by whom they were copied, or under whose orders and supervision they were produced. At the same time, the fundamental paleographic and codicological tools needed to organize undated manuscripts into families of organically connected codices are virtually nonexistent. Until such tools are developed and the reorganization of catalogue data accomplished, our understanding of the Javanese literary tradition will remain fractured, overly random, and inadequately founded.

ABBREVIATIONS

AJ Anno Javanico
BG Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen
BL British Library
Br Brandes
CB Collectie Berg, a minor collection of Leiden University Library’s Oriental manuscripts collection
CS Cohen Stuart
FSUI Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia
G Gebonden afschriften
HB Hamengkubuwana
KBG Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen
KITLV Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde
LOr Codex orientalis of the Leiden University Library
Notulen Notulen van de Algemeene en Bestuurs- [Directie-] vergaderingen van het [Koninklijk] Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen
NR Pigeaud’s ‘Nieuwe Reeks’ collection housed at the FSUI
Or Codex Orientalis, Leiden University Library
PB Pakubuwana
PN Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia
SMP ‘Surakarta Manuscript Project’ number, as used in Florida’s catalogues
YKM/W Yogyakarta Kraton Manuscript from the Widya Budaya Collection, as catalogued in Lindsay, Feinstein and Soetanto 1994
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