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THE VARIANT VERSIONS
OF THE MALAY ANNALS

Since it was published the Sejarah Melayu has rightly been considered the most important Malay historical work, and consequently there exists a fairly extensive literature on this text, written mostly by English scholars. Nevertheless a critical edition of the Malay Annals, as it is commonly called in English, is still lacking; the problems of its genesis and structure have barely been touched, and although the text has been known for more than a century we are still in the dark as to when exactly it was written. We shall be unable to solve the various problems involved until all manuscripts known to exist have been studied and a critical edition has been brought out. The study of manuscripts, however, is very time-consuming, and not everyone is in a position, or has the leisure, to devote himself to the task. An additional difficulty in the case of the Sejarah Melayu is that the manuscripts are found scattered over libraries in various countries: in Indonesia (Djakarta, Museum Pusat), in the United Kingdom (mainly in London) and in the Netherlands (Leiden).¹

The number of manuscripts of the Malay Annals is fairly large. In the libraries mentioned above there are more than twenty, and the number rises to nearly thirty when the related texts are also taken into account. It goes without saying that not all of these manuscripts have the same value; some are fragmentary or otherwise incomplete; others are just copies of existing manuscripts, and some are even copies of the printed text. This large number, however, is remarkable in itself and bears testimony to the high regard in which the Malay Annals have always been held. Yet we should bear in mind that all these

¹ There is one more manuscript in Leningrad, see Bibliografija Wostoka (1934), p. 64: Malacicum ms. Geschichte der Malaien IIIa I; III 89b. According to Mr. B. Parnickel, Moscow, this manuscript contains the Sejarah Melayu (personal communication). It is to be assumed that in Malaya there are also several copies. At present I have no data about Malaya; the Leningrad manuscript is also not accessible for the time being: on my request for a microfilm I was informed that an edition was in preparation and that therefore a microfilm could not be made available.
manuscripts are late copies dating from the nineteenth century. Marsden, in his *History of Sumatra*, after having mentioned the *Sulalatu'l-Salatin* or *Penurunan segala raja-raja*, goes on to say that he had been unable to obtain a copy. But this may only mean that in Marsden's days the text was not to be had in Bencoolen and apparently was only available in Johore and Riau, that is, in the Malay areas in the stricter sense of the word.

Besides manuscripts there exist printed texts and translations as well, and these are set out below:

1) The first printed text was that edited by Abdullah bin Abdulkadir Munshi and published in Singapore about 1831; republished anonymously (by H. C. Klinkert) in the Netherlands (Leiden) in 1884; later published again, in a romanized edition, by Teeuw and Situmorang (Djakarta/Amsterdam) in 1952.

2) An edition by Ed. Dulaurier in the *Collection des principales Chroniques Malayes* (Paris 1849-1856), which, however, was not completed due to the death of Dulaurier.

3) The well-known Shellabear text.


5) An edition published in Indonesia and edited by Datuk Madjoindo (Djakarta 1959), Arabic characters, 2 volumes.

6) The first translation into English was made by John Leyden; it appeared posthumously in 1821, edited by Raffles: *Malay Annals: translated from the Malay language*. . . . with an Introduction by Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles (London 1821). This translation — a very free rendering of the Malay text — ends with the death of Tun Ali Hati, that is, where the edition of Abdullah also ends.

7) Finally, a French translation (incomplete) must be mentioned: *Le Sadjarah Malayou* (*L'Arbre généalogique malais) ou histoire des radjas et des sultans malais depuis les origines jusqu'à la conquête*
Before Leyden's translation appeared, however, other writers had already given extracts and translations of the subject-matter found in the *Sejarah Melayu*, namely van der Vorm and Valentijn. The latter gave an account of the history of the Malays and a genealogical list of their kings with (Christian) years. The information given by him is basically the same as that provided by van der Vorm. Elsewhere in his work, Valentijn enumerates the Malay books in his possession, among them "Soelalet Essalatina, or the genealogy of the kings of the Malay coast and of Malacca; however (he adds), this I possess not in Arabic, but in 'Dutch letters." Winstedt has tried to argue, but on insufficient grounds, that Valentijn made use of a Raffles 18 version.

Almost two decades before Valentijn, Petrus van der Vorm, in the Introduction to the second volume of the Collectanea Malaica Vocabularia, had given a brief account of the history of the Malays, from a genealogical list of the Malay kings which contained the years of their accession to the throne and the duration of their reign. By calculating backwards he found that the beginning of the Malay kingdom "fell just before or in the early days of the Hijrah year 573, which began with us on June 29 of the year of Our Lord 1177." Valentijn, who mentions van der Vorm and gives the same data, had also calculated backwards. He arrived at about 1160 as the year in which the Malay kingdom had been established, that is, about seventeen years earlier. Valentijn, however, had based his calculation on solar years, whereas van der Vorm, more correctly, had taken lunar years, and this explains the discrepancy of about seventeen years between Valentijn and him.

Van der Vorm, too, gives a list of Malay works, among them the *Sulalatu’l-Salatina*, saying: "Finally, it must be said that anyone interested in the Malay language ought to study the work entitled *Sulalatu’l-Salatina* or *penurunan segala raja*, not only on account of the language but also because of the contents which inform us about the descent of the Malay kings and the fortunes of the Malay kingdom till the coming of the Portuguese."
Exactly what kind of texts van der Vorm and Valentijn (perhaps not the same but very much alike) had at their disposal is difficult to say, because these texts have not been preserved. It is unlikely that Valentijn's romanized copy of what is named by him the *Sulalatu'l-Salatina* was copied from the kind of texts known to us at present by that name, be it the text of the Raffles 18 version or what I call for the sake of convenience the Abdullah and Shellabear texts. The latter versions did not yet exist in Valentijn's time (why this is so will become clear later in this article) and as regards the Raffles 18 version, Valentijn's translated text seems to me to be quite different, and more like another text which we shall discuss presently.

It is more likely that in both cases we have to do with fairly brief texts entitled *Sulalatu'l-Salatina*, that is, Genealogy of the Sultans.

In the Malay manuscript collection of the Leiden University Library I have come across a text, Cod. Or. 3199 (3) part 4, bearing the title *Cheritera asal raja Melayu punya keturunan* and showing in its contents a marked similarity with what was mentioned by van der Vorm and Valentijn. A relation between the texts used by van der Vorm and Valentijn and this text is obvious as names and whole phrases are sometimes identical. This *Cheritera asal raja Melayu punya keturunan* (the Malay name is an apt rendering of Arabic *Sulalatu'l-Salatin* which, however, does not appear in this text) has one salient characteristic which makes it unique: in addition to mentioning the duration of reign of the individual kings, it also gives dates, that is, years of their succession and demise. The combined occurrence of these two data is remarkable because it is not found elsewhere in *Sejarah Melayu* texts. The Raffles 18 version does indicate the periods for which the successive Malay kings occupied the throne but it does not give dates, whereas the Shellabear and the Abdullah texts contain almost no indications as to periods of reign, nor do they mention dates. Both Valentijn and van der Vorm, who as has already been said made use of texts which are very closely related to the text of Cod. Or. 3199 (3) part 4, mention the name *Sulalatu'l-Salatina*. To this name van der Vorm adds the Malay name (or translation) *penurunan segala raja*. Although the text of Cod. Or. 3199 (3) part 4 does not bear

---

8 The versions known to us (Abdullah, Shellabear, Raffles 18) without exception bear this title, although instead of *penurunan segala raja* we find *peraturan segala raja*, an error of a copyist who misunderstood an original *pertuturan segala raja* still found in several manuscripts. In Raffles 18, too, the transcription *peraturan* is wrong, the manuscript clearly reading *pertuturan*. The word *tutur*, not found in Malay any longer, still has here the same meaning.
the title *Sulalatu'l-Salatina*, but in contents and in various other respects is very similar to two texts of that name, we may infer that the name *Sulalatu'l-Salatina*, now known as the Arabic name of the *Sejarah Melayu*, was originally the name of a genealogical kinglist.

It was just stated that an indication of duration of reign and dates being found in combination was a salient characteristic not found in any of the manuscripts of the Malay Annals known to us. The question now presents itself: Did there ever exist manuscripts of the *Sejarah Melayu* of that kind? It is not possible to give a precise answer to this question. In his valuable article on Riau, Netscher \(^9\) gives a list of the Malay sultans. “This list”, he says, “is based upon the Malay historical work *Sulalatu'l-Salatin*. I have compared three manuscripts, one of which, in the possession of the present sultan of Lingga, is already very old and has apparently been kept up to date.” Further on in his article, on p. 149, he states that “the dates have been given in accordance with the information submitted by the present Raja Muda, Raja Ali, and in particular by his well-informed brother, Raja Abdullah. At the same time an accurate and thorough comparison of dates found in some Malay manuscripts has been made, and the ones which seemed the most reliable have been taken as a basis.” Netscher then gives the same information as provided by van der Vorm and Valentijn. On the strength of what Netscher tells us about these Malay manuscripts I tend to the conclusion that we are here dealing with *kinglists* like the one found in Cod. Or. 3199 (3) part 4, and not with a *Sejarah Melayu* text as in the printed versions. As already mentioned before, none of the *Sejarah Melayu* manuscripts known to us has *dates*, and it would therefore seem most strange if Netscher about 1850 had seen manuscripts of the *Sejarah Melayu* with *dates*. Salient again, however, in the description of these manuscripts given by Netscher, is the occurrence of the name *Sulalatu'l-Salatin* which, as we have seen, was also mentioned by van der Vorm and Valentijn. We may therefore safely accept the view put forward by Linehan,\(^10\) when he speaks of “the

---


first written material (pedigrees etc.), which formed a basis for the
chronicle that ultimately emerged as the Malay Annals...”, without
necessarily agreeing with his terms chronicle and annals. In other
words: The Sejarah Melayu has developed from a kinglist which
mentioned periods of reign with dates and gave concise information
about the individual rulers. This kinglist subsequently became enlarged
by various stories and otherwise historically relevant material which
was inserted into it in suitable places, but at the same time it lost its
dates. The Malay Annals or Sejarah Melayu as we know it today is
primarily a book of tales and anecdotes of the past and not so much
a historical work, although it contains a wealth of historical material.

The view that the Sejarah Melayu has developed from a kinglist
which was extended by inserting stories seems to be corroborated by
a remarkable little manuscript, namely Maxwell 105 in the library
of the Royal Asiatic Society in London. A brief description of this
manuscript was given by W. E. Maxwell as early as 1878. A few
years later he also gave a translation of the second part containing the
genealogy of the Malay rulers of Perak, under the title: “The history
of Perak from native sources. Translation of part of Perak Salsila, or
‘Book of Descent’ of the Royal Family, commencing with the death
of Sultan Mahmud, the last king of Malacca.” In his description
Maxwell informs us that he obtained the manuscript from Raja Osman,
Bendahara of Perak. On the fly-leaf of this manuscript there is a note
in pencil-by Winstedt, dated 12/9/33, saying: “This MS. starts off
as an abbreviated Sejarah Melayu and ends with the history of Johore
and especially (fols. 25-36) of Perak, which last part is translated by
Sir William Maxwell in JRASSB, No. 9, June 1882, pp. 95-108.”

12 idem, Vol. IX (1882), pp. 95-108. This second part was made use of by
Winstedt in his The Early Rulers of Perak, Pahang and Acheh (JRASMB X
(1932), Pt 1, p. 32 ff.). Winstedt states with regard to this Salasilah Perak
that it is “a detailed and valuable work”. It is this same manuscript which is
referred to by Hoesin Djajadiningrat in note 1 on p. 160 of his article Critisch
Overzicht van de in de Maleisiche werken versatte gegevens van het Sultanaat
van Atjeh, BKI 65 (1911), saying that he had not found any reference to its
where-abouts and therefore had been unable to consult it. See also the List
of Malay Manuscripts in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society by P.
Voorhoeve, JRAS, Pts 1 and 2, April 1963. Of this manuscript there is a copy
in the Leiden University Library, Cod. Or. 7645, originally belonging to
Professor Snouck Hurgronje. It was made for Maxwell in Penang in 1888
and later apparently presented by him to Snouck Hurgronje.
For our purpose, the importance of this manuscript lies in the first part, which was not translated by Maxwell. The fact is that it contains a rather brief version of the Sejarah Melayu as found in MS. Raffles 18. Now there are two possibilities: either this text is an abbreviated Sejarah Melayu as stated in Winstedt's pencil-note, or the Raffles 18 text itself is an enlarged text on the basis of a text like Maxwell 105, with inserted stories. The second possibility should not be excluded at the outset, although a decisive answer can only be given after a thorough study of all the problems involved. Maxwell 105 has no dates; it does give the duration of reigns of the successive kings; and on the one hand it is more circumstantial than the Malay kinglist mentioned before, but on the other hand is much shorter than the text of Raffles 18. Another point which ought to be mentioned is that it lacks an introduction. It has an abrupt beginning commencing in the middle of the tale of Raja Chulan envisaging the conquest of China. The manuscript itself lacks one page containing eight lines, because it begins with an illuminated left page which contains eight lines, that is, a recto side, so that only the verso side of folio 1 is missing. As a matter of fact, this verso side of fol. 1 must likewise have had the same number of lines. This, however, would be insufficient, at least compared with the relevant part of the text in Raffles 18, to form a reasonable beginning, so that we must infer that the manuscript from which it was copied was already defective.

However this may be, between Maxwell 105 and Raffles 18 there exists a direct and unmistakable connection: the complete first part of Maxwell 105 is also found in Raffles 18 but scattered through it, the opening lines of Maxwell 105 being found on p. 51 of the printed text of Raffles 18 and the closing passage of the first part on p. 216.

So far we have discussed what could be termed two prototypes of the Sejarah Melayu, and in this discussion mention has already been made of the Raffles 18 version of the Malay Annals. The number of manuscripts of the Sejarah Melayu preserved in libraries is twenty-nine in all, namely 11 in the United Kingdom (10 in London and 1 in Manchester); 12 in the Netherlands (11 in Leiden and 1 in Amsterdam); 5 in Indonesia (Djakarta) and 1 in Russia (Leningrad). Because the Leningrad manuscript is not accessible for the time being, we are left with twenty-eight. All these manuscripts are late copies, at the earliest dating from the early nineteen century. If we have a closer look at these twenty-eight manuscripts, we see that:
1) Two manuscripts represent the Raffles 18 version, namely Raffles 18 of the Royal Asiatic Society and Cod. Or. 1704 of Leiden University Library. The latter is, however, incomplete and contains the first half of the text only; 13

2) The following six manuscripts are incomplete: Raffles 35, 39, 68, 76 (London), Cod. Or. 1760 (Leiden) and KBG 11 Mal. (Djakarta). Because of their fragmentary character these manuscripts are not of primary importance to the question of the variant versions of the Sejarah Melayu;

3) A short version is contained in five manuscripts, namely Raffles 80, Farquhar 5, SOAS 36495, 36499, and KBG 189 W (Djakarta). This is the version as published by Abdullah bin Abdulkadir Munshi in 34 chapters and ending with the death of Tun Ali Hati. It is a version which is also contained in the Shellabear recension;

4) Two are copies of the (short) text printed in Singapore (the Abdullah text), namely Klinkert 5 and Cod. Or. 6669 (Leiden);

5) A long version is found in no less than nine manuscripts, namely Maxwell 26 (Royal Asiatic Society) and Manchester 1; Cod. Or. 1703, 1716, 1736, 3210 (Leiden); Koninklijk Instituut 631 (Leiden); KBG 188 W and 190 W (Djakarta). Like Shellabear, this version ends with the mention of the attack of Jambi on Johore (1673) in the colophon. The relevant differences between the short version and the long version are briefly as follows: (i) Short version chapter II has become two chapters, II and III, that is to say, the history of Minangkabau is more detailed and different. These chapters II and III are followed by a fourth chapter, missing in Shellabear, and containing the sequel to the story of Chitaram Shah (comp. the final passages of Shellabear chapter I, where Bichitaram Shah); (ii) The data about the parentage of Hang Tuah are different. In the long version mention is made of a delegation sent by Malacca to Macassar which on its return brings Hang Tuah as a gift from the king of Macassar to the sultan of Malacca (see appendix). Reference to this passage is made by R. O. Winstedt 14

13 See Voorhoeve's note on this manuscript in BKI 102 (1952), p. 208.

14 In JRASMB X (1932), Pt 3, p. 57: "... So redoubtable had the Bugis proved as fighters that some copyist of the old Malay Annals now interpolated a passage claiming that Hang Tuah was a Bugis Daing, the son of a Macassar prince". The passage in question was also known to Raja Ali Haji, see his Tuhfat an-Nafis, JRASMB X (1932), Pt 2, p. 5.
who apparently saw only one manuscript of this type; (iii) the end of the short version, the account of the death of Tun Ali Hati, is here followed by a number of chapters relating episodes of the subsequent history of the Malays; (iv) the rebellion of Hang Jebat, which in the short version is ascribed to Hang Kasturi. In addition, there is a considerable number of minor differences and variant readings which it is not possible or necessary to mention here. A combination, or perhaps we should say a blending, of this short version and the long version has resulted in the text of Shellabear. The Shellabear recension is actually the short version with added to it the extra segments of the long version after the account of the death of Tun Ali Hati, but without most of the variant readings of the first part, and so the Shellabear redaction has become a hybrid text. One of the manuscripts used by Shellabear in editing his text was Maxwell 26;

6) an enlarged version brought up to date until well into the nineteenth century is found in one manuscript, KBG 191 W (Djakarta), of which there are two copies in the Leiden University Library, Cod. Or. 7304 and Cod. Or. 6342, the latter presented to the Library by Sir Richard Winstedt. This enlarged version is 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. It is a highly important text which could perhaps best be characterized as a Hikayat Raja Akil; 15

7) one type-written romanized copy contains a drastically rewritten text which in several respects differs from the redactions mentioned above. The manuscript belongs to the Royal Institute for the Tropics in Amsterdam. Its provenance is not yet clear, but it is certain that it originates from Palembang, and I would therefore like to call it a Palembang version of the Malay Annals. The Sejarah Melayu part ends abruptly with the conquest of Malacca by the Portuguese.16

15 See the description in van Ronkel’s Catalogue of Djakarta, VBG 57, p. 274 under no. CCCLIV; it is the History of Siak, mentioned repeatedly in the Tuhfat al-Nafis.

16 For some more details, see The Answer of Pasai, JRASMB XXXVIII (1965), Pt 2, p. 129 ff.
Finally, a few words ought to be said about the introductions to the Sejarah Melayu.\textsuperscript{17}

The Raffles 18 version has here a position of its own. It has a fitting introduction which is well suited to the text. As date it mentions 1021 H, i.e. 1612 A.D. I see no cogent reasons to reject or to doubt this date, and in my opinion we may safely assume that the Raffles 18 version of the Malay Annals was drafted in this year.

Most of the other manuscripts have retained this original introduction, but preceded by a new introduction superimposed on it and even in some places overlapping, as has so convincingly been shown by Linehan.\textsuperscript{18} Winstedt was the first to note that the Arabic preamble had been cribbed from the introduction to the Bustanu'l-Salatin, written by al-Raniri in 1638.\textsuperscript{19} In London there are four manuscripts (Raffles 35, 39, 80 and Farquhar 5) which do not have this same Arabic preamble; they have a different one, but for the rest they are the same. Raffles 35 and 39 are incomplete; the other two contain the short version.

In the first part of this introduction shared by both the short version and the long version there occurs the puzzling passage of a hikayat yang dibawa orang dari Goa. This passage has given rise to various unsatisfactory interpretations. In almost all cases Goa has been interpreted as referring to Goa, the former Portuguese settlement in India. The most recent argument in favour of this interpretation is that of Gibson-Hill.\textsuperscript{20} Linehan, in his Notes already referred to several times in this article, tried to argue that not the Indian Goa was meant but that one ought to read guha or gua, and that the reference was to Gua, north of Kuala Lipis in Ulu Pahang, where a copy of the Malay Annals had been preserved and later brought to Johore and edited there in 1612.

The view held hitherto with regard to the date of the Malay Annals has been that the Raffles 18 version of the Malay Annals is the history brought from Goa, that is Goa in India, and was written before 1536, and that the ordinary version of the Malay Annals, that is the versions as found in the editions of Abdullah and Shellabear, was a reworking

\textsuperscript{17} Comp. also the discussion by R. O. Winstedt in JRASMB XVI (1938), Pt 3, p. 35 ff.
\textsuperscript{18} Notes on the text of the Malay Annals, JRASMB XX (1947), Pt 2, p. 107 ff.
\textsuperscript{19} See also R. O. Winstedt, The Date, Authorship, Contents and Some New MSS. of the Malay Romance of Alexander the Great, JRASMB XVI (1938), Pt 2, esp. p. 2-4.
\textsuperscript{20} C. A. Gibson-Hill, The History brought from Goa, JRASMB XXIX (1956), Pt 1, pp. 185-188.
of the Raffles 18 text made in Johore in 1612. I do not think that this view is correct and would like to suggest the following:

The Raffles 18 version dates from 1612 as is stated in its introduction. It mentions as the author (or editor) the Bendahara. This statement is corroborated in the second bab of the Bustanu’l-Salatin, fasal 12, where al-Raniri introduces the Bendahara Paduka Raja yang mengarang Sulalatu’l-Salatin as one of his sources with regard to the genealogy of the Malay kings.

We must assume that a Sulalatu’l-Salatin like the one contained in Raffles 18 at one time found its way to Goa in Celebes, perhaps through the intermediary of the Malay community there. Later, after the infiltration of the Buginese into the Straits of Malacca, that is after about 1720, they brought a copy of this text with them to the Riau Archipelago, and it was in their circles, the most likely being the court of the Buginese Yang Dipertuan Mudas in Riau that this hikayat was diperbaiki, that is: edited. There was also inserted therein the account of the delegation sent to Macassar which on its return brought a Mampawa princeling who was later to become the famous Malay Laksamana Hang Tuah.

The problem of the relation between the short and the long versions still needs further study. It is possible that we are here dealing with two successive redactions, the short version being the first and the long version a later redaction. The reverse, however, may also be possible, although perhaps not very likely. In that case, the short version would be a probably uncompleted text edited from an existing longer version.

As to the genesis of the text of the Sejarah Melayu we can now draw up the following table showing probable consecutive stages:

(i) a kinglist, a text like the one found in Cod. Or. 3199 (3) part 4 (van der Vorm, Valentijn, Netscher).
(ii) a text like the first part of Maxwell 105.
(iii) The Malay Annals = Raffles 18.

See Winstedt’s Preface to his edition of the Raffles 18 text of the Sejarah Melayu.

This fasal of the second bab of the Bustanu’l-Salatin was written for a special purpose, namely to show that Iskandar Thani, Sultan of Acheh, was a direct descendant of the Malay kings of Bukit Seguntang both on the spear and the distaff side and therefore had a legal claim to the Malay lands, in particular Johore, Pahang and Perak.
(iv) a. the short version, similar to the text edited and published by Abdullah Abdulkadir Munshi in 34 chapters and ending with the account of the death of Tun Ali Hati;
b. the long version, mentioning in the colophon the attack of Jambi on Johore (1673).

(v) a. an enlarged version, type KBG 191 W, an edited text relating Malay history from the Siak point of view and ending with a detailed account of the Palembang War (1819-1821) and the part played therein by Raja Akil, subsequently Sultan of Sikudana (Hikayat Raja Akil);
b. a Palembang version.

Summarizing, we come to the following conclusions:

(i) The Raffles 18 text is dated 1612, i.e. the beginning of the seventeenth century. This text has predecessors (kinglist and, possibly, a text of the type of Maxwell 105).

(ii) In the course of the eighteenth century this text was edited in Riau at the court of the Buginese Viceroy's, who had brought it with them from Goa in Celebes. The result has come down to us in two versions, a longer version and a shorter version, which are closely related.

(iii) Both the shorter version, i.e. the Abdullah text, and the longer version (and this includes also the Shellabear text) are late texts. The most plausible inference is that they date from the second half of the eighteenth century, when the Buginese Viceroy's court had firmly established itself in the Malay world.

(iv) The shorter version was the first to become known, through the translation into English by John Leyden (1821) and the edition of the Malay text by Abdullah bin Abdulkadir Munshi (about 1831).

(v) The longer version is found in a greater number of manuscripts than any of the other versions. This version is as yet only known in a very defective way through the hybrid text of Shellabear, this recension being a blending between the longer and shorter versions. This longer version apparently went unnoticed in the edition of Duluiario, where it is found, although incomplete, in the readings of Duluiario's manuscript A (= Cod. Or. 1716) in the notes.

R. ROOLVINK
Cheritera asal Raja Melayu punya keturunan.*

(Bod. Or. 3199 (3), part 4.)


Maka Seri Iskandar Shah bila sudah memegang perintah dua puluh lima tahun ya'itu tiga tahun di Singapura, dua puluh dua tahun di

* The text is reproduced here not primarily for its historical value, but only because it represents an important stage in the development of the text of the Malay Annals. Parts of words in parentheses indicate additions not found in the text; words or passages in square brackets are found in the text, but should be deleted. It will be seen that the text is not a particularly good one; in more than one place it is confused and there are several mistakes. It is not possible to deal with the contents of this text in detail from the point of view of history, as this would be beyond the scope of this article, and we must therefore leave the moot question of the early, and later, Malay Kings undiscussed.

Tamma.
Genealogy of the Malay Kings.

The lineage of the Malay kings goes back to Seri Turi Buana who himself was a descendant of Alexander the Great. He came to the island of Andelis which was ruled by the Demang of Lebar Daun. However, when the Demang met Seri Turi Buana he made an obeisance and transferred the sovereignty over the area under his rule to him. Seri Turi Buana was then installed and thereby became the first king of the Malays. His installation took place in 575H/1179. At the time, however, the Malays had not yet embraced Islam. Afterwards Seri Turi Buana left the island of Andelis and sailed to the opposite shore, named the land of sir bad, which is Persian for land below the wind. This area was also known by the name of Land's End. And there Seri Turi Buana made a settlement, Singapore, where he remained and ruled over his people till 623H/1226. In that year Seri Turi Buana died. His successor was His Highness Dikarangwira. He ruled over the Malays till 638H/1240. He did much to fortify the city against the empire of Majapahit. He was succeeded on the throne by Seri Rama Wikrama who, though still very young, was a man of courage and who during his lifetime ruled with great justice. However, Allah had ordained his people to come on evil days because His Majesty died young in 637H/1240. His successor was Seri Maharaja. Seri Maharaja, too, did not live long because he died in 663H/1265. He was succeeded by Seri Iskandar Shah. His Majesty fought gallantly against the Ruler of Majapahit until his resources were exhausted and after a struggle of three years he had to admit defeat. He left Singapore going overland in a north-westernly direction until he came to a certain place where he made a settlement which he named Malacca. This city he greatly embellished so that it became renowned everywhere.

After Seri Iskandar Shah had ruled for twenty-five years, namely three years in Singapore and twenty-two in Malacca he died and was succeeded by Sultan Megat in 678H/1279. Only two years after his succession, he died. He was succeeded by Sultan Mahmud Shah. His Majesty was a very powerful ruler because when he was on the

1 Andelis and Seri Turi Buana: Valentijn: Andelis, Siri Toeri Bowana.
2 The Demang of Lebar Daun. According to Palembang traditions Lebar Daun is a place-name, and I have translated accordingly.
3 sir bad. The Malay text has: Riau itu, an obvious misreading in jawi script for an unfamiliar sir bad. Valentijn's text had the correct reading.
4 637H in the text is likely to be a mistake for 638H. See also Netscher, pp. 150-152 of his article Beschrijving van een gedeelte der Residentie Riouw where the same material is given, which was taken, without a doubt, from an identical text.
5 The text is clearly wrong here.
6 678H should read 688H (= 1289AD).
throne all the adjacent countries were subject to him, namely Bintan, Lingga, Johor, Patani, Kedah, Perak and other countries, even on the opposite coast in the island of Andelis, and also Kampar and Haru, everybody was obedient to him. He was the first ruler to embrace Islam. He was married to a princess of Rekan and consequently also held sway over Rekan. He died in 747H/1346 and was succeeded by his son Abu Said. This Sultan was killed by the king of Rekan within two years after his accession to the throne. He was succeeded by Sultan Mudaffar Shah. This king was very wise and intelligent. It was he who promulgated the codes of Malay custom and the laws of the Malays. Moreover, he was courageous. At the time Seri Naradiraja, commander-in-chief of Sultan Mudafar Shah, acquired great fame on account of his repulsion of the Siamese invaders when the king of Siam Buwayat-nya sent his military commander Awi Chakra with an army and a fleet in order to conquer Malacca. After the Siamese king had died, he was succeeded by Saupandan who again took the field against Malacca in order to conquer the city but he, too, was repelled like his father before him by the chief army-commander Seri Naradiraja. Then Sultan Mudaffar Shah died [and was succeeded by Sultan Mahmud Shah of great fame but after some time he died] and was succeeded by his son Sultan Mansur Shah in 789H/1387. (Sultan) Mansur Shah married the daughter of the ruler of Majapahit, Raden Galuh Chendera Kirana, and the ruler of Majapahit gave Inderagiri, which was one of his dependencies, to his son-in-law, Mansur Shah, who appointed a raja there to administer it in his name. Therefore the rulers of Inderagiri have since been subject to Malacca until today. Sultan Mansur Shah was on the throne in Malacca until his death in 852H/1448. He was succeeded by his son Aludin. Sultan Aludin was succeeded by Sultan Mahmud Shah in 882H/1477. He ruled Malacca for a period of twenty-nine years and moreover was on the throne while residing in Johore. It was during his reign that the Portuguese came to Malacca and attacked it. From Malacca he went to Johore. This sultan was succeeded by his son in 918H/1512. This sultan concluded peace with the Portuguese in 919H/1513 until in 922H/1516 Sultan Ahmad Shah again took the field against the Portuguese. In 945H/1538 Sultan Ahmad Shah died and was succeeded by Aludin the Second. This sultan was succeeded in 964H/1557 by Sultan Abdul-Jalil Shah who ruled till 996H/1588 and then died. His successor was Sultan

7 Sejarah Melayu: Abu Shahid, which is the better reading.
8 So the text. Valentijn has: Boebatnja; Sejarah Melayu: Bubunnya.
9 The Malay text has here the name of the princess, Raden Galuh Chendera Kirana.
11 Compare Valentijn, Vol. V, p. 324: There (in Johore) he ruled for another two years and died in 1513, succeeded by his son, not Alodin as the Portuguese have it, but Sultan Ahmad Shah, this according to the information given to us by the Malays in this genealogical list of the kings of Malacca and Johore (my underlinings, R.).
Aludin the Third. In his reign the Dutch visited Johore and concluded a treaty of friendship with Sultan Aludin Shah the Third in 1015H/1606. When Sultan Aludin Shah died he was succeeded by Sultan Abdullah Shah who in his turn was succeeded by Sultan Mahmud Shah the Second on his death in 1026H/1617. Sultan Mahmud Shah the Second died in 1029H/1620. He was succeeded by Sultan Abdu'l-Jalil Shah the Second. It was this sultan who conquered Malacca with the help of the Dutch. He ruled for forty-seven years and died in 1076H/1666. His successor was Sultan Ibrahim Shah. This sultan ruled eleven years and died in 1087H/1676. He was succeeded by Sultan Mahmud Shah the Second, who was on the throne till 1101H/1690. On his death he was succeeded by Sultan Abdu'l-Jalil Shah the Third, who ruled for nine years and died in 1138H/1726.12 He was succeeded by Sultan Sulaiman Shah the First, who ruled for twenty-seven years and died in 1159H/1746. His successor was Sultan Abdu'l-Jalil the Fourth. It was he who opened up old Riau. He ruled for twenty-two years and died in 1191H/1777 and on his death was succeeded by Sultan Mahmud Shah the Third who resided in Lingga and ruled for thirty-six years, and died in 1227H/1812, leaving behind two sons, the elder Ungku Husain, the younger Ungku Abdu'l-Rahman. When the sultan died Ungku Husain was absent from Lingga having gone to Pahang. The Datuks and the Viceroy of Riau were unanimously agreed upon installing Ungku Abdu'l-Rahman as successor to the throne in the same year, but at the time his step-mother in Riau, Ungku Puteri, refused to hand over the royal insignia whereupon he went away to Trengganu sulking, and remained there till 1235H/1820 when the Dutch became resident in Riau again, namely Admiral Wolterbeek, Mr. Adriaan Koek and Captain Elout. These gentlemen came to an agreement with the Viceroy of Riau, Ungku Ja'far that he should bring Ungku Abdu'l-Rahman back to Lingga to be installed as sultan. At the time Mr. Raffles and Major Farquhar — they were both English — came to the Straits with a view to making a settlement there. When Ungku Husain heard of the intention of these gentlemen he too went there and offered the Straits area to them. The English then made Ungku Husain sultan of Singapore in 1236H/1821. The governor of Malacca, Mr. Timmerman Thijssen, went to Riau in order to secure the regalia which were in the hands of Ungku Puteri, and brought them to Malacca and from there took them to Batavia, to the Governor-General van der Capellen, who had them returned to Sultan Abdu'l-Rahman Shah in Lingga. He ruled till 1248H/1832. He then died and was succeeded by his son, Muhammad Shah.

The end.

12 Here and in what follows the text is often clearly in disorder with regard to dates.
The Delegation to Macassar
(romanized from a longer version).


Adapun anak raja Bajung itu Daing Mampawa namanya, umurnya baru dua belas tahun. Diceriterakan oleh orang yang empunya cahera: Sudah dua ia membunuh mengembar orang mengakom dinegerinya.


Adapun akan Hang Tuah selama ia di Melaka tiada lain kerjanya hanya bergurukan ilmu hulubalang. Barang siapa yang lebih tahunya dimasukinya. Kepada zaman itu tiadalalah dua orang mudanya sebagainya.
One day Sultan Mansur Shah was thinking of sending a delegation to Macassar. He sent for the Bendahara Paduka Raja, and said: "I intend to send a delegation to Macassar and should appreciate your views in the matter". The Bendahara answered respectfully: "Increasing the number of one's friends and diminishing the number of one's enemies is highly commendable". His Majesty said: "Then be so kind as to draft me the letter to the king of Macassar". The Bendahara took his leave and went home in order to do so. When the letter was ready he submitted it to His Majesty, who gave orders to read it. On hearing it His Majesty expressed great satisfaction. The delegation was to consist of Seri Bija Pikrama together with Tun Sura aldiraja. Both were given ceremonial dress complete with everything that pertained to it. They respectfully paid homage to His Majesty and the letter was carried to the ship with the beating of drums and the sound of music with ceremonial umbrellas, one white, and the other yellow. After having arrived at the jetty the two envoys went aboard. They received the letter which was handed over to them by four officials. When the letter was aboard, those who had come to see them off returned and Seri Bija and Tun Sura aldiraja sailed.

After some time they arrived at Macassar. The ruler of Goa was informed that a delegation had arrived from Malacca. His Majesty betook himself to the audience-hall where the men of noble rank and army officers with their attendants were present to pay him their respects in so great a number that the audience-hall was packed to capacity and still a great many people had to remain outside. His Majesty gave orders to receive the letter with all the ceremony due to paramount rulers, and so it was done by eight high-ranking officers who carried the letter in state with the sound of music. On arrival the letter was received by the bentara-in-chief who respectfully submitted it to the king of Goa. His Majesty gave orders to read it. On hearing the contents he was in full agreement with the suggestion that they should be in alliance together. Then Seri Bija Pikrama and Tun Sura aldiraja climbed the stairs to do homage to the ruler of Goa and sat with the military commanders. When the presents were brought into the presence, the king of Goa said: "Well, Sir, how is my brother in Malacca? I hope he is well? What is his intention in sending both of you? What are his wishes?" Seri Bija Pikrama answered: "He is well, my Lord, and Your Majesty's younger brother's only wish in sending a delegation to you, my Lord, is to see a mutual understanding brought about". The ruler of Goa was very pleased indeed, and said: "The very same thing happens to be what I would also like to see, Sir". Betel was ordered in plates under a yellow cloth and offered to Seri Bija Pikrama and Tun Sura aldiraja, who both took the plate and then handed it to their servants. After a while the king of Goa retired, and all the people present in the hall of audience went home. Seri Bija
Pikrama and Tun Sura aldiraja returned to their vessel. The king of Macassar gave orders to bring the two envoys betelnuts, fruits and sweet-meats. Several times during their stay Seri Bija Pikrama and Tun Sura aldiraja were entertained by the ruler of Goa and they never let an opportunity slip to pay homage to His Majesty and to speak to him.

The monsoon was already blowing and the time to return had come. One day Seri Bija Pikrama and Tun Sura aldiraja entered into the presence of the king in order to request permission to leave for home, saying: “Your Majesty, we humbly beg permission to leave, because the monsoon has already set in”. “Permission is granted, gentlemen”, was the king’s reply, “but be so good as to tell me what kind of present would please my Royal Brother in Malacca most, so that I may try and get it for him”. Seri Bija Pikrama answered respectfully: “My Lord, as for what your royal brother would appreciate, if there should be a young man, good-looking and well-built and moreover courageous, that would please him very much”. The ruler of Goa said: “What kind of young man? One of noble birth or would just anyone do?” Seri Bija Pikrama answered: “If possible, one of noble birth would be preferred, my Lord”.

On hearing this His Majesty spoke to his attendants: “Go all of you and look for a young man, a son of a Daing or of a ranking military commander, good-looking and well-built, and bring him hither”. The attendants went in search of a young man in every kampong and village, but without success. At last they heard of a son of the raja of Bajung, of extremely good looks and bearing, whose father was already dead. They went to Bajung and found what had been rumoured to them to be true. They took the boy with them and brought him before the king of Goa, who showed him to the two envoys, saying: “Gentlemen, would this boy meet the wishes of my brother in Malacca?” They looked at the boy and were highly pleased. Seri Bija Pikrama said: “This is what your royal brother would like to have”. “In that case, gentlemen, I shall send this son of the raja of Bajung to my brother in Malacca. I make this gift as a token of our agreement and out of love for my brother”. And Seri Bija Pikrama said: “Your Majesty and His Majesty your brother are in complete agreement, my Lord”.

As to the son of the raja of Bajung, his name was Daing Mampawa, and he was only twelve years old. It was said that in his own hometown he had already killed twice in a hand-to-hand fight with people who ran amuck. The following day the two envoys went to present themselves before the king of Goa in the hall of audience which was already crowded. Seri Bija Pikrama and Tun Sura aldiraja bowed respectfully and sat down. On the order of the king they were given a ceremonial costume complete with every embellishment. To show their gratefulness they made a *sembah*. Then the king of Goa spoke as follows: “Tell my brother the king of Malacca concerning Daing Mampawa that I entrust him to my brother the king of Malacca. He should treat him well. And if there is anything which my royal brother
the king of Malacca would like to have from Macassar, send Daing Mampawa to me”.

The two envoys answered respectfully: “It will be done, Your Majesty”. Then having requested permission to leave, they went away. The letter and the presents were carried with great pomp and ceremony and to the sound of music, and after arriving at the ship, were received and kept in a safe place. Then the people who saw them off went home. Daing Mampawa and Seri Bija Pikrama were together in the same perahu and the two ships set out to sea on their homeward journey.

After some time they arrived at Malacca, and Sultan Mansur Shah was informed that Seri Bija Pikrama had come. His Majesty betook himself to the hall of audience where all the men of rank, the army officers, eunuchs, heralds, court orderlies and other members of the royal household were present to do homage. His Majesty gave order to receive the letter with all the ceremony due to it. Seri Bija Pikrama and Tun Sura aldiraja went ashore bringing Daing Mampawa with them. When they had come to the hall of audience, the letter was received by a marshall of the court who respectfully handed it over to His Majesty. Then had been read, His Majesty was very pleased indeed with the contents of the letter from the king of Macassar. Seri Bija Pikrama and Tun Sura aldiraja went to His Majesty to pay their respects, and then sat down in their usual places in the royal presence. Daing Mampawa was presented to His Majesty and His Majesty was informed of the words of the king of Macassar, nothing being forgotten. Sultan Mansur Shah, seeing how good-looking and well-built Daing Mampawa was, was greatly pleased. He asked: “How is it possible that the king of Macassar can send the son of the Raja of Bajung? Did he attack the raja of Bajung and then made his son prisoner?” Seri Bija Pikrama answered: “No, my Lord, the king of Macassar asked me to state what Your Majesty would like, and I informed him that Your Majesty would be pleased to have a young man who was well-built”, and he gave a detailed account of what had happened. His Majesty, highly pleased, praised Seri Bija Pikrama. To Daing Mampawa he gave the name of Hang Tuah, and that is the origin of Hang Tuah. He was well taken care of by His Majesty, who felt a great affection for him. He presented him with a creese of Malacca make together with everything that pertained to it.

As regards Hang Tuah, as long as he was in Malacca he fancied nothing except the study of the military arts. Whosoever excelled him therein had to become his teacher. At the time here was no-one among the young men who equalled him.