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Cod. Or. 2048 and its philological value

The manuscript reproduced here in facsimile is filthy, some of its pages are missing, it has been nibbled at by rats, and the text it contains is highly corrupt. A critical edition of this text, the Old Javanese poem Arjunawijaya, has already been published. Why, then, have we selected Cod. Or. 2048 from the thousands of candidates as the first Javanese contribution to Manuskripta Indonesica, a series that intends to present philologists with the basic tools for their research?
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The philological value of Or. 2048 is not located in the contribution it may make to the reconstruction of the text as it was composed in the late fourteenth century. It is valuable primarily for the light it may shed upon the transmission of Old Javanese literature in Java and upon literary activities in the Central Javanese courts of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Our discussion of the manuscript thus focuses on the way it was produced and used in a Javanese environment.

The Old Javanese narrative poem *Arjunawijaya*

The *Arjunawijaya* belongs to the Old Javanese literary genre known to scholarship as *kakawin*, implying that it was composed in quantitative metres originating from Sanskrit or based on the Sanskrit metrical model. It tells the story of Arjuna Sahasrabahu’s victory over the demon king Dasamuka. We refer to Zoetmulder’s *Kalangwangan* for a synopsis of the narrative and a discussion of date and authorship (1974:325–329, 342–346). Zoetmulder concludes that the *Arjunawijaya* was composed by a poet using the pen-name Mpu Tantular sometime between 1365 and 1389, during the zenith of the Majapahit empire. The text has been critically edited and translated into English by Supomo (1977), who argues for the possibility that it was written between 1374 and 1379 (1977:1–15). A discussion of poetic and historical facets of the text can be found in Supomo’s edition.

The edition is largely based on manuscripts from Bali. Supomo did consult a number of manuscripts from Java but concluded that they were of less value for the reconstruction of the text than Balinese manuscripts. He used Javanese manuscripts mainly as a source of variant readings (1977:86–89). Supomo inspected Or. 2048 but discarded it because it is less complete than other manuscripts from Java (1977:84).

Cod. Or. 2048 does not contain an original title. Cod. Or. 1855 (2), a copy of a manuscript dated 1783, has a colophon naming the work as *gitaning Lokapala* ‘the poem of Lokapala’, after an appellation of a king who features in the beginning. The same manuscript bears a note identifying it as *sêrat Lokapala kawi, skar agêng* ‘the book of Lokapala in kawi, sékar agêng’.1 In a similar note in Cod. Or. 2309 (1) the work is called *sêrat Lokapala, têmbung kawi sékar agêng* ‘the book of Lokapala in kawi words and sékar agêng’. *Sêrat Lokapala kawi* is also its title in the nineteenth-century *sêrat Cabolang* (Kamajaya 1986:12). Two other titles were in use as well. The title *Arjunawijaya* ‘Arjuna’s victory’ occurs in the text itself (LXXIII.1b on fol. 92r of Or. 2048); a caption “Arjuna Widjojo.” has been added in Roman letters in the top margin above the beginning of the text (fol. 2v). This title is mentioned in several versions of the poem *Jatiswara* (Behrend 1987:137–

---

1 Kawi, in full *basa kawi or têmbung kawi*, was the name given to Old Javanese in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and possibly earlier. It was appended to the titles of literary works to distinguish them from adaptations with a more modern poetic vocabulary and syntax. These were called *jarwa* ‘paraphrased’. *Sêkar agêng* are the verse forms that, from at least the eighteenth century, were recognized in Old Javanese poems. More on sékar agêng below.
138), including the oldest version which Behrend dates to the early seventeenth century. It is also used in Winter’s Javaansche zamenspraken which was compiled in the 1840s (Winter 1911:344). Finally, an adaptation in sêkar agêng of A.D. 1803 calls itself not only kata Arjunawijaya ‘the story of Arjuna’s victory’ but also Arjuna Sasrabau (McDonald 1983:274), and the 1819 adaptation in sêkar macapat bears the latter title (Winter 1853:428).

The phrase tan tular (lit. ‘immovable, unperturbed’), that occurs several times in the final canto, was not recognized as an author’s name in nineteenth-century Java. The Lokapala kawi was ascribed to other ancient poets. Supomo (1977:1) discusses several attributions. The situation seems to have been different earlier. Behrend has noted that the name mentioned in the text itself occurs as “Mpu Tular” in the oldest version of the Jatiswara (Behrend 1987:137–138).

Physical description of the manuscript

Codex 2048 is a handwritten book of 91 folios, approximately 31.6 by 20.5 cm. In its present form it is undated. However, its present form is no longer the original one; a complete quire, among other things, has been replaced at a later moment. Basing ourselves on the type of paper and script used, we assume that the manuscript was made in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century; the restorative work leading to the replacement of the first quire must have taken place around 1790. In the following sections we shall try to adduce some arguments in support of these assumptions.

Watermarks and chain lines

The book-block is made of European hand-made paper. There are six different watermarks. The first watermark is a beehive with the letters ‘MS & C’ in a frame of fantastical flowers; it has the countermark ‘MS & C’. This figuration is only found in folios 1 and 6; the watermark is in fol. 6, the countermark in fol. 1. Fig. 1 illustrates in diagram form the position of watermark and countermark in relation to the chain lines; the actual dimensions are listed in Table 3.¹

‘MS & C’ is the abbreviation of ‘Maarten Schouten en Compagnons’. Maarten Schouten (1727–1797), the founder of the well-known paper factory Van Gelder Zonen, became engaged in paper-making in Wormer (province of North Holland, the Netherlands), around the middle of the eighteenth century. Initially, he worked for other papermakers, but from 5 September 1775 on he had a mill of his own. Before that date, around 1764 or perhaps even earlier, he was already using the name of ‘Maarten Schouten & Comp.’ in business. It continued to be used after his death, until it

¹ For the sake of convenience, we have listed all watermarks and countermarks together with the investigated folios in Table 1; information on the paper, chain, laid, and shade lines in Table 2; and the distances from watermarks and countermarks to the surrounding chain lines in Table 3.
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was changed on 23 January 1804 into ‘Van Gelder Schouten & Comp.’ (Voorn [1960]:423, 434–437; De Jongh 1934:42–43, 71). The present combination of ‘beehive’ and ‘MS & C®’ was not found in the reference books.¹

![Diagram](MS&C.jpg)

**Fig. 1.** Relative position of the watermark ‘beehive’, countermark ‘MS & C®’, and chain lines.

The second watermark, like the first, is a beehive, but with the letters ‘IV’ underneath. It is also contained in a frame of fantastical flowers; it has a countermark in the form of the letters ‘IV’. This watermark is found in fols. 4 and 5; the countermark is in the corresponding fols. 3 and 2. See Fig. 2 and Table 3.

![Diagram](IV.jpg)

**Fig. 2.** Relative position of the watermark ‘beehive’, countermark ‘IV’ and chain lines.

¹ We checked Churchill 1985; Heawood 1950; Voorn (1960).
‘IV’ is the abbreviation of ‘I. Villedary’, the name of the famous French papermaker. His name and its abbreviation became the indication of a certain quality, which was also used by other paper mills, in the Netherlands from 1674 onwards (Voorn [1960]:121). The combination of ‘beehive’ and ‘IV’ was not found in the reference books.

The third watermark is the coat of arms of Amsterdam, with the name ‘A Vorster’ as its countermark. This watermark is found in twenty-one folios. Fols. 8 and 9 and the last folio contain the countermark only; the corresponding folios with the watermark are missing. Our investigation is based on fol. 13 and 14. See Fig. 3 and Table 3.

![Watermark Diagram](image)

Fig. 3. Relative position of the watermark ‘coat of arms of Amsterdam’, countermark ‘A Vorster’, and chain lines.

There are two persons to whom the name ‘A Vorster’ could relate: Adolf or Aef Vorster and his nephew Adrianus Vorster. Adolf was born in 1662 and died before 1719; he made paper from 1681 or later in the Benedenste Jeruzalemse Molen, and from 1700 onwards in the Molen aan de Grote Vijver, both in Rozendaal (province of Gelderland, in the eastern part of the Netherlands). Adrianus Vorster was born about 1685; he started working as a papermaker in 1706 in the Kopermolen, also in Rozendaal; after 1 May 1719 he quit the papermaking business altogether (Voorn [1985]:211, 226, 233). Watermarks of Adolf nor Adrianus Vorster are reproduced by the reference books.

The fourth watermark is the coat of arms of Amsterdam, like the third, but smaller. It has no countermark. It is found in twenty folios; our investigation is based on fol. 53 and 54. See Fig. 4 and Table 3.

There is an abundant variety of coat of arms of Amsterdam watermarks. An illustration exactly matching Or. 2048 has not been found in the reference books.
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Fig. 4. Relative position of the watermark 'coat of arms of Amsterdam' and chain lines.

The fifth watermark is a 'Pro Patria'. It is found in fol. 7. We do not now whether there was a countermark, as only the half sheet with the watermark is present. See Fig. 5 and Table 3.

Fig. 5. Relative position of the watermark 'Pro Patria' and chain lines.

'Pro Patria' watermarks are as countless as the 'coat of arms of Amsterdam' ones. No specimen given by the reference books matches the one of Or. 2048.

In the sixth case, only a countermark, 'Korff & De Vries', is found. This occurs in fol. 18, consisting of a half sheet without the corresponding other half. See Fig. 6 and Table 3.

The name of 'Korff & De Vries' might refer to the partnership of Jan Korff and the brothers Pieter and Remmert de Vries. From 6 October 1785 until 13 June 1789, they shared the paper mill De Morgenster at Oost-Zaandam. However, the mill burnt down on 15 September 1787 (Voorn [1960]: 301–302). Again, the reference books fail to produce any example with the name 'Korff & De Vries'.
As the reference books are of no avail in identifying any of the six watermarks or names, it is not possible to establish the time the paper was made. At best, we might tentatively state that the paper – and consequently the manuscript – was not made before a certain year, provided our hypotheses on the possible makers of the paper are correct. As for the first watermark, even a date post quem cannot be given, because Schouten started using his label at an unknown point in time (unless one is ready to accept his birth date as such). About the watermark with the letters ‘IV’, nothing more can be said other than that this abbreviation was in use as early as 1674, and it remained so for a long time. A little bit more precise, relatively spoken, is our information concerning the paper with the name A. Vorster. The first of the two papermakers to whom the name might re:er, started making paper in 1681; neither of them continued making paper after 1719. We can skip the fourth and fifth watermark. The shared enterprise of Korff and De Vries existed officially from 1785 until 1789, in reality from 1785 until 1787, which gives us the most clearecut time limit so far.

Table 1. Investigated folios and the watermarks and countermarks found in them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Watermark</th>
<th>Countermark</th>
<th>Investigated folios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>beehive</td>
<td>MS &amp; Co</td>
<td>1 + 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>beehive</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3 + 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>coat of arms of Amsterdam</td>
<td>A Vorster</td>
<td>13 + 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>coat of arms of Amsterdam</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>53 + 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pro Patria</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Korff &amp; De Vries</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2. Dimensions of paper; chain lines and laid lines; shade lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>unfolded sheet in cm</th>
<th>number of chain lines</th>
<th>laid lines per cm</th>
<th>presence of shade lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32 x 40.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32 x 40.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.7 x 40.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.7 x 41.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.6 x 20.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6 x 20.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Distances of watermarks, countermarks, and chain lines in cm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. watermark</th>
<th>left</th>
<th>right</th>
<th>left</th>
<th>right</th>
<th>a-b</th>
<th>b-c</th>
<th>c-d</th>
<th>d-e</th>
<th>e-f</th>
<th>f-g</th>
<th>h-i</th>
<th>i-j</th>
<th>j-k</th>
<th>k-l</th>
<th>l-m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another approach to the chronology problem, by comparing dated documents we happen to know, appeared as fruitless as the first method. The Leiden University Library has a manuscript on loan, written in the same type of writing as most of Or. 2048 (see below). This is manuscript NBG 95 of the Netherlands Bible Society, containing a copy of the Darmasunya Kēling (see Pigeaud 1968: 738–739; 1970: Plate 35). In contrast to Or. 2048, this manuscript mentions the date on which it was finished, namely in 1716. An investigation of the five different types of wire marks did not bring any identical watermark to light, however.

Quires

The manuscript contains ten quires, which show the following structure. Quire I consists of three sheets folded one into the other, followed by two half sheets pasted unto them. Fig. 7 illustrates in
diagram form the composition of this quire. (The figures refer to an actual numbering; see below in the section on ‘numbering’.)

Fig. 7. Quire I.

Quire II consists of four sheets folded into each other, with a half sheet both at the front and at the back side. See Fig. 8.

Fig. 8. Quire II.

The quires III to IX consist of five sheets, folded one into the other. Quire III is shown in Fig. 9.

Fig. 9. Quire III.

Quire X consists of one sheet with one half sheet pasted to the back of it. See Fig. 10.

Fig. 10. Quire X.

The order of the text in quire X is as indicated by the figures. After the last folio, which bears no number, evidently one folio is missing, because the text stops abruptly. Moreover, between fol. 90
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and the last folio there is a lacuna of about one folio of text (see Appendix, canto LXXII). Therefore, the original situation must have been as depicted in Fig. 11.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
89 & 90 & 91 & 92 \quad 93
\end{array}
\]

Fig. 11. Original situation of quire X.

In this diagram, fols. 91 and 93 represent the lost folios; fol. 92 is the folio which in Fig. 10 has no number.

A peculiarity of all quires is that they have narrow strips of paper, about 2 cm wide, pasted onto them, along the outer fold of each quire. In many cases, strips are pasted along the folds of the inner sheets and the centre of the quire as well. The paper used is of the \textit{dluwang} variety, the well-known indigenous Javanese paper, which has no watermarks or chain lines and therefore cannot be assigned a date. The strips were not in the original manuscript, as they cover the text at some places (which is then sometimes written upon in a different variety of the Javanese script).

\textit{Lay-out}

The text of the \textit{Lokapala} starts on fol. 2v. Fols. 2 to 6 contain fifteen lines of text on each side. For the sake of neatness, use has been made of ruling: blind ruling for the delineation of the left- and right-hand margins, and ruling with a pencil for the horizontal lines. The lay-out of the page, as measured on fols. 3v and 4r, is as follows: the distance from the text to the edge of the paper is, on fol. 3v, 2.8 cm to the left and 2.2 cm to the right; the lines are 15.5 cm. Fol. 4r is a mirror of this: the distance of the text to the edge is 2.3 at the left side and 3 cm at the right side, while the lines are 15.1 cm. Vertically, the lay-out of both pages is identical: the distance from the first line to the top of the paper is 4.6 cm, and from the last line to the bottom of the paper 4.4 cm; the distance between the lines is 1.65 cm. See Fig. 12 for a schematic representation.

The vertical, blind ruling of fols. 3v and 4r has pushed through to fols. 2v (and 1v), and 5r and 6r, respectively; on those folios the horizontal ruling has been applied by pencil, as on fols. 3v and 4r, more or less with the same proportions.

The lay-out of fol. 7 has been delineated in the same way: blind ruling for the margins and pencil ruling for the lines (on 7r no pencil traces are visible). The number of lines is also fifteen, just like on fols. 2–6. The text column is narrower, however: the distance from the text to the edge of the paper on fol. 7r is 2.5 to the left and 4.7 to the right; the lines are 13 cm. The delineation of the margins has been pressed through to the verso side, resulting in an identical lay-out: the distance from
the text to the edge is 4.7 to the left and 2.4 to the right; the lines are 13 cm. From top to bottom, the lay-out of both pages is of course also the same: the distance from the first line to the top of the paper is 5.3 and 5.4 cm respectively, and from the last line to the bottom 5.6 and 5.5 cm respectively; the distance between the lines is on both sides 1.5 cm.

The lay-out of fols. 8 to 17, and of fol. 19 to the end is different again. Here there are thirteen lines to the page; the lines have been indicated by blind ruling (extended to the left and right up to the next chain line outside the text-block). The only thing these folios have in common with the first seven folios is the blind ruling, as a means of delineating the margins, albeit with different dimensions. The lay-out of the page, measured on fols. 43v and 44r, is as follows: the distance of the text to the edge of the paper on fol. 43v is 6.5 cm to the left and 2.3 cm to the right; the lines are 11.5 cm. Fol. 44r is a mirror of this; the distance of the text to the edge is 2.1 cm to the left and 6.6 cm to the right, while the lines are 11.1 cm. Vertically, the lay-out of both pages is identical: the distance from the first line to the top of the paper is 6.8 cm, from the last line to the bottom also 6.8 cm; the distance between the lines is 1.6 cm. See Fig. 13.

The relief in the paper, brought about by the blind ruling, shows that, contrary to the first quire, instead of a given number of leaves having been handled together, a whole quire, folded, has been ruled at once. The orientation of the impressions in the successive quires is reversed in each case: low – high – low, etc. The dimensions, however, are in each case the same.
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Fig. 13. Lay-out of fols. 43v and 44r.

The text-block is surrounded by a frame of two double lines. This frame is found on all pages from fol. 8 to fol. 17, and from fol. 19 to the end. Only fols. 64v to 68r do not have this frame. Fig. 14 contains an illustration with a specification of the dimensions.

Fig. 14. Frame around the text of fols. 43v and 44r.

xvi
The two outer corners of each folio from 8 to 17 and from 19 to the end are rounded off.

In the middle of so much regularity, fol. 18 stands out by its deviant lay-out. The way the lay-out is applied to the page is the same as on the other folios, as is the number of lines, thirteen, but the frame around the text is lacking. Also the dimensions are different. The distance from the text to the edge of the paper on fol. 18r is 1.8 cm to the left and 4.3 to the right; the lines are 14.2 cm. Fol. 18v reflects these dimensions in mirror image. Vertically, the lay-out of the page on the recto side is the same as on the verso side: the distance from the first line to the top of the paper is 6.6 cm and from the last line to the bottom 6.5 cm; the distance between the lines varies from 1.4 to 1.6 cm.

Nowhere in the various types of lay-out did the scribes keep very strictly to the ruling: lines are exceeded to the right, or started too high or too low. In some cases the deviations amount to 0.5 cm.

Writing

The text of Or. 2048 is written in two different types of the Javanese script: a perpendicular type and an italic one. Fols. 2–7 and fol. 18 are written with the italic type, the remainder is written in perpendicular characters.

The aksara of the perpendicular type can be divided into two groups: the aksara with a straight descender after an initial small rising line, and the aksara with a twist in that descender. To the first group belong the «ha, da, ta, wa, pa, ḍa, ya»; to the second group belong the «na, ca, ra, ka, sa, ja, Ꞥa, ga, ba, ṭa, ṇa». The difference between these two groups is that in the first group the straight descender changes to a horizontal line to the right, while the descender with the twist of the second group is followed by another ascender, as if a run up had to be taken for this rising line. Compare for example the «wa» and the «ga» in Fig. 15. It seems that this phenomenon is a matter of aesthetics; it does not play a role in differentiating between characters.

Fig. 15. Perpendicular «wa» and «ga».

There are two aksara which fall outside this division because they do not fit in with either of the two

---

1 Narrow (i.e., diplomatic) transliterations are enclosed in «...». See the Appendix for transliteration conventions.
2 The illustrations in Figs. 15–17 are not copied from the manuscript but represent our interpretation of the forms of the letters.
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patterns: the «la» and the «ma». As for the «ma», there is no descender: the initial ascender continues horizontally. The special position of this letter can thus be accounted for by its form. Why the «la» does not comply with the general pattern, is not so easily discernible. Its form – descender followed by ascender – would bring it into the second group, the one with the aesthetic run up. But this is not the case; what happens is that the descender combines with the following ascender to an elongated loop, or sometimes coincides with it. This irregularity in the writing system of Or. 2048 has no doubt to do with the close proximity of another letter. If the «la» was written in the way we would expect, it would be indistinguishable from the «sa», which already happens to be written in that way. See Fig. 16.

Fig. 16. Perpendicular «sa», «la», and «ma».

Another characteristic of this perpendicular script is the close similarity between the aksara «ya» and «ha» on the one hand, and between the aksara «ya» and «da» on the other hand, depending on whether the «ya» is written in one stroke or in two strokes. When the «ya» is written in one stroke, the only difference with the «ha» is the direction of the final ascender: vertically in the case of the «ya», and diagonally in the case of the «ha». When the «ya» is written in two strokes, with the final descender in the form of a curved line set apart from the rest, the only difference with the «da» is the connection which the latter character has between base-line and curved descender. See Fig. 17.

Fig. 17. Perpendicular «ya» and «ha», and «ya» and «da».

Yet another remarkable trait of the perpendicular script is that the final descending line of some aksara is extended downwards. This feature is limited to those aksara which have an ascending line immediately preceding their final descender, for instance «na», «ra», «ta» and the like, but not «la», «ya», «ga». The «ha» and the «ja» also belong to the second category. The length of the final descender varies in any case, but in aksara liable to this extension, it may become twice as long, a length never realized by the ‘short’ descenders. It is this feature which led to the characterization of this type of script as ‘spiky’ in the catalogues.¹

¹ Juyنبoli (1907:165) characterizes NBG 95’s script as “very peculiar, sharp, angular” ([z]eer eigenaardig scherp, hoekig). Pigeaud identifies it as “large perpendicular spiky Pasisir script” (1968:739). It is unknown on
In addition to these overall features, there are a number of features which are peculiar to certain letters only. The aksara «ca, ta, wa» are written down in two strokes of the pen; so are – albeit not always – the aksara «da» and «ya». The pasangan «ka, ta, la» are always written in full, even if no sandhiangan or pasangan «wa» is attached to them. The «ga» has two legs.

The characters of the italic writing of fols. 2–7 and fol. 18, in addition to their obliquity, show a completely different form and structure. The similarity of «ya» with «ha» and «da», for example, does not exist. Instead, other narrow oppositions are in force, for example between the aksara «sa» and «ca», which are only distinguished from each other by the sharp angular connection between final ascender en descender in the «ca». There is nothing exclusive about the aksara «la», because the descender-with-the-twist does not exist here. Those aksara, which in the perpendicular writing need two strokes, are here completed in one stroke. The aksara «ba, fa, ta, ga» on the other hand, which in the perpendicular writing are made in one stroke, here consist of two distinct parts. The pasangan «ka, ta, la», if not followed by a sandhiangan or pasangan «wa» attached to them, are written without the final ascending and descending line of the corresponding aksara. The «ga» has three legs.

Because there is no palaeography of Modern Javanese, it is not possible to determine the chronology of these two writing systems. Looking for dated manuscripts written in a similar type of perpendicular script, we were struck by the great similarity between Or. 2048 and manuscript NBG 95 of 1716, referred to in our discussion of the paper. All the characteristic traits of Or. 2048 – the threefold division of the characters, the near similarity of some characters, the unique position of the aksara «la», the remarkable form of the «ga», etc. – are without any exception found in exactly the same way in NBG 95. Which position this writing may have had at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and how long it has been in use, is unknown. Other documents of the same time, such as a Menak manuscript of 1715 and a letter of 1725, both of Kartasura, are written in a different script (see Poerbatjaraka 1940:1–33; Pigeaud 1968:351).

The italic script of Or. 2048 is evidently a variety of modern Javanese script. But then, ‘modern Javanese script’ is not a monolithic entity: the nine dated specimens reproduced by Carey [s.a.], show as many distinct styles, although they cover a period of not more than twenty years (namely 1792–1812). Further research is needed before we can assign the ‘modern’ writing of Or. 2048 its proper place in history.

_Illumination_

The division of the text into smaller and larger units is marked by certain graphic signs: _pada_ for the

---

what basis Pigeaud associates it with the _parisir_ (north coast). In his description of Or. 2048, Pigeaud states that its origin is probably the north coast (1968:64). This idea may be based on his impression of the script.
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stanzas and pada puhuh for the cantos. These are coloured, the pada red with a gold rim, the pada puhuh additionally with black and green. This illumination is not found on fols. 2–7 and 18.

Moreover, the margins of fols. 31v and 32r, and the verso side of the last folio, are covered with coloured branches, leaves, and flowers, in yellow, green, red, gold, and black. These so-called wadana (lit. ‘faces’) have somewhat different designs. On fols. 31v and 32r the outline of the frame resembles a rhombus superimposed on a rectangle; the outer edges of the margins are left free.¹ The final page is fully covered and no geometrical outline is apparent.

The occurrence of wadana on fols. 31v and 32r was undoubtedly motivated by the narrative. These pages contain canto XIX and the beginning of canto XX, where King Arjuna Sahasrabahu and Queen Citrawati are introduced.² The illumination on the last remaining page of the manuscript was probably complemented by a similar design on the facing page, which is now lost. It is likely that the first two inscribed pages of the original manuscript, which are also lost, were illuminated too.

Numbering

Or. 2048 is foliated with two different sets of figures. One series is written with Arabic figures in pencil in the upper right-hand corner of the recto side of each folio, in what seems to us to be a twentieth-century hand. The sequence of numbers is: 1–88, 90, 89, leaf without a figure. On fols. 1–10, moreover, the figure is written in the upper left-hand corner of the verso side.

The irregular order of fol. 90 and 89 has to do with the reversed order in which this sheet (quire X; see Fig. 10) was attached to the preceding quire. Apparently, the manuscript was rebound after it had been foliated.

The second set starts on fol. 7r of the first set. It is also written in Arabic figures, but with a pen, in the lower left-hand corner of the recto side of each folio. It is written in an older hand than the first series. The sequence of the numbers is: 1–82, leaf without a figure (corresponding to number 90 in pencil), 83 (= number 89 in pencil), 86 (= leave without a figure of the numbering in pencil).

Two questions arise: why does this set of numbers start on fol. 7, and why does it jump from 83 to 86? (The wrong order of the fol. without a number and fol. 83 is, of course, explained in the same way as the wrong order of fols. 90 and 89 in the first set.) We cannot yet answer the first question. As to the second, the jump confirms our conjecture about the missing, in quire X, of a folio between

¹ The outline – though not the filling pattern – is like that of the opening wadana of Cod. NBG 95, the second half of which is reproduced in Figuard 1970: Plate 35. Similar designs are also found in more recent Javanese manuscripts (see, e.g., Behrend 1990:xx; Gallop and Arps 1991:85, 93; cf. also id. p. 77, No. 49) and in Malay manuscripts (e.g., Gallop and Arps 1991:68–69).
² This was pointed out by Day (1981:52). The use of wadana at important junctures in literary works is also known from early nineteenth-century Yogyakarta (Gallop and Arps 1991:92).
fol. 90 and the last folio (see Fig. 11). Compare the information from the numbering in ink as illustrated in Fig. 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>89</th>
<th>90 91</th>
<th>92 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>84 85</td>
<td>86 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

numbering in pencil

numbering in ink

Fig. 18. Quire X. Numbering in pencil and in ink.

The order of the quires is indicated in the shape of Arabic figures, written in ink on the recto side of the first folio of the quires III–VI and VIII. The quires I, VII, IX en X have no number. In quire II, the figure is written on fol. 18v. Quire X may not be given a mark because its place was evident. The same holds for quire IX as the last quinio, and may have held for quire I as the first one. Why the number of the second quire should be on fol. 18v, instead of on fol. 9r, and why quire VII should not bear a quire mark, remains unclear to us.

Binding

The quires are sewn together and connected to the binding by two fly-leaves made of dluwang. The binding is made of cardboard covered with paper.

Notes and present condition

Scattered throughout the manuscript are traces of scholarly and administrative concern, as well as of wear and tear.

The class-marks of the present owner are found on the fly-leaves and the first and last folios. In the beginning of the manuscript, at the left hand side of the fly-leaf, is written in ink on a piece of paper pasted onto the fly-leaf: “Arjoena Widiang | Cod. 2048 | Catal. Vreede p. 4. | |” At the right-hand side of the fly-leaf is written in ink: “M.S. Orient. | N° 2048 | |”, with under that a stamp of the Leiden University Library, in the shape of a circle around the text “Acad. | Lugd. Bat. | Bibl. | |”. The expression “Catal. Vreede” refers to Vreede’s catalogue of Javanese manuscripts of 1892. Fol. 89v has a stamp of Leiden University Library in the centre of the bottom margin. As we would expect such a stamp on the last folio preceding the folio fully covered with the illumination, it must have been placed after the manuscript was rebound (compare the section on numbering).

Several other classificatory remarks are found on the first folios. On fol. 1r is written in ink: “N° 5.” We do not know to which collection this refers. On fol. 2r is written in pencil in Javanese script:
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"buku, surat; | sri paţwata[jaya]raja | dewa, kun [da] <g>inwa ke raḥ, | ". Under that is written in Latin characters but crossed out: "[ No. 2. | Boekoe | Soerat Romo <Kawie> njang poenja Karang, | (in Javanese characters:) sri paţwatarajadeva —. | ]". After that follows, also in Latin characters: "No. [2] <g>. | Boekoe | Soerat, Romo Kawie, njang poenja | Karang Betororomo- 

On fol. 2v is written in ink in Latin characters over the Javanese text: "Ardjoeno Widjojo. —".

Previous readers have confided their scholarly jottings to several pages. On fol. 7v, at the bottom of the page, in the left hand margin, is written in pencil in Dutch, in Latin script: "tot ms 151b | 8, 4 | ", preceded by a vertical line corresponding with a similar line in the text. On fol. 12v is written in pencil at the bottom in the left hand margin in Latin script: "zie bl 35 — | Ardjoena Sasrahoe bl 50 volgg | en ms. 131b bl 12 |", with an arrow referring to the middle of the page. On fol. 75v is written in the bottom left hand margin, in pencil in Latin script: "Het begin van Romo | [...] Ardjoena | [Arдж] Sasra | [...] | [...] ". On fol. 79r something illegible is added in pencil in the middle of the right-hand margin.

Or. 2048 was appreciated not only for its choice reading. From fol. 40 until the end of the manuscript, there is a hole in the bottom margin, where the paper has been eaten away in small bits. Other damage also occurred in the course of time. The edges of the folios are worn. The bottom right-hand corner of fols. 48 and 66 was torn off. Fol. 39 misses a small strip of about 1 cm wide, which was apparently cut off. Fol. 90 is torn over 5 cm in the middle, starting from the spine. At the bottom of fols. 90v/89r, a piece of paper pasted across the paper probably covers another tear. The manuscript is slightly discoloured because of water-damage, from the beginning of the book-block to fol. 18, in a gradually lessening degree, at the top of the pages and along the upper part of the spine, and from fols. 34v and 35r until the end of the book-block, along the top margin, in a gradually increasing degree. A horizontal fold runs across the centre of every folio.

Conclusion

To what insights about its history does the above description of the material aspects of Or. 2048 lead?

The perpendicular script was in use in 1716; how long before or after, we do not know. The name of the Vorster brothers pointed in the direction of paper made between 1681 and 1719. From this, we conclude that the paper with the watermark 'coat of arms of Amsterdam' with no countermark in it, inscribed with the same writing, stems from the same period.

The paper with the name of Korff & De Vries must have been produced between 1785 and 1787, as far as we know. Therefore, the text of fol. 18 must have been written after 1785; the same applies to the text of fols. 2–7, written on paper with other watermarks but in the same characters as fol. 18.
In Europe the lapse of time between production and use is two years on the average; for Indonesia, the same limit or perhaps a few years more, seems to apply (Jones 1988). Therefore, we hypothesize that Or. 2048 was originally committed to paper between 1681 and, say, 1725, and was renewed sometime around 1790.

From the composition of the quires in the older part of Or. 2048, we conclude that the manuscript originally consisted of nine quires of five sheets folded into each other, and one quire of two sheets which were folded but not put into each other. The first quire was then lost, except what was originally fol. 10. The lost quire was replaced by a quire of three sheets folded into each other, and one half sheet. A quire of this size was enough because the pages contain more text than the pages of the original quire. The half sheet and the folio which originally was fol. 10, were pasted to the new quire and, eventually, were given the numbers ‘7’ and ‘8’ when the manuscript was foliated. At the same time, the present fol. 18 replaced the corresponding lost folio. Quire X must still have been intact; otherwise it would have also been restored.

After the restoration of the first quire, the manuscript underwent two more restorations. The second one still took place in Java, when small strips of dluwang paper were put along the folds of the quires, probably in order to strengthen the binding. This may have been done when the new quire was added, as the manuscript will have had to be rebound then. The third restoration took place after the manuscript had been foliated in pencil. By now, quire X had lost two half sheets; the remaining sheet (of the remaining sheet and half sheet) was folded inside out. Apparently, this all happened when it was no longer possible to appeal to expert knowledge about the original condition. After that, the manuscript entered the Leiden University Library, where a stamp was placed on what was now the folio suitable for such a stamp, fol. 89.

The text of Cod. Or. 2048

It was noted earlier that the editor of the Arjunawijaya considered the manuscripts from Java of limited value for the reconstruction of the Old Javanese poem. They contain many departures from the Old Javanese lexicon and metrics that have been pieced together through careful philological study. Javanese literati in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries did not have the lexicographical and grammatical resources for the study of Old Javanese that are available today. Yet they did attempt to read and interpret the poem. They used manuscripts like Or. 2048.

The linguistic condition of the text

In outline the text of Or. 2048 parallels the text reconstructed by Supomo. As was to be expected, it contains the two cantos which Supomo discovered only in manuscripts from Java, and which he considered an interpolation although they are cast in metrically correct Old Javanese (cantos LXII-
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LXIII; cf. Supomo 1977:176–177, 326–329). Apart from these cantos there are three major differences between the reconstructed poem and Or. 2048. A few stretches of text are absent from Or. 2048. This applies to part of stanzas IX.2–3 of the edition, to XLVI.4 (canto XLIV in Or. 2048), and to LVII.5–6 (Or. 2048’s canto LV). Furthermore, there are lacunae because two folios of the manuscript are lost.

The second difference pertains to metrics. Cantos XXXII and XXXIII are presented as one canto in Or. 2048, namely XXXI, and a number of cantos have been reversified, usually by the addition or removal of one syllable per verse line. This applies to Or. 2048’s cantos III, IX (which results from a reworking of the edition’s IX into one canto with X), XVIII (edition XIX), XLIV (edition XLVI), XLVIII (edition L), and LVIII (edition LX). We refer to the Appendix for further details. Quantitative metres can no longer be detected in these cantos. This means that they were recast in a time and environment where the metrical principles of Old Javanese versification were no longer in force.

Finally, the language is what late twentieth-century philologists call corrupt. This may not have been judgement of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Javanese students of literature. Their perspective was different. It seems unlikely that the original state of the text was a major concern for them. What they were concerned with was interpretations of the text as they actually found it in manuscripts. There were aids to this interpretation. Written glosses and paraphrases of the Lokapala kawi like those discussed by Kantara (1990) for the Wiwaha kawi are unattested, even though they may have existed. But the contours of the story matter were known from other literary renditions such as the sêrat Kandha and probably from the wayang theatre as well. No doubt the interpretations arrived at will have differed, sometimes substantially, from those that Indonesians attach to the text today. We are inclined, however, to take eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Javanese interpretations seriously. They were valid in their cultural contexts. We are interested in principle in those cultural circumstances.

Orthography

The orthography found in Or. 2048 is complicated. There is, to begin with, much variation in the spelling of identical words. The narrative particle ndan ‘and then’, for instance, occurs as «ndan, dän, dån, dЂän, dЂann», the name of the demonic anti-hero of the story is spelted, inter alia, as «dasamuka, ddasamuka, ddašamuka, dyasamuka». An orthographical trait which Or. 2048 shares with other kawi manuscripts is the so-called sastra lampah, lit. ‘walking letters’. This means that where the final and initial consonants of two subsequent words are the same, only one consonant is written (as in «prapa» for rép prapta ‘it suddenly appeared’), while the sandhangan panyigëing wanda are relatively rarely used.1 This orthographical style is uncommon in Modern Javanese texts and will not have contributed to ease of reading, especially in conjunction with the vowel sandhi that occurs throughout. More recent orthographies bring out word and syllable boundaries more

---

1 For Javanese palaeographical terminology, see Van der Molen 1993.
clearly in spite of the fact that the scriptio continua always inhibits quick skimming. As is quite common in kawi manuscripts and Modern Javanese manuscripts from certain regions and times, schwa often remains unwritten between consonants (e.g., «pjah» for péjah ‘dead’, «tpi» for t’épi ‘side, flank’), even though it counts metrically. The use of aksara murda in Or. 2048 is peculiar and worth an investigation. Finally, it is striking that no long vowels are indicated, except a few instances on the replacement pages with cursive script. The initial lines of cantos are represented in narrow transliteration in the Appendix. These give an impression of the spelling and will assist the reader in acquainting himself with the script of Or. 2048.

The verse forms

Or. 2048 is the oldest known manuscript with the metrical organization of sêkar agêng (or têmbang gédhe, also known as sêkar kawi or têmbang kawi). To date these verse forms had only been attested in late eighteenth to twentieth-century manuscripts from the Surakarta and Yogyakarta courts. As far as we are aware, the kawi manuscripts written in Old Javanese script on lontar palm leaves in the now famous Měrbau collection (Van der Molen 1983:109–119, McDonald [s.a.], Kuntara 1990) do not indicate sêkar agêng. They contain Old Javanese quantitative metres or the vestiges of them. The same applies to manuscripts from Bali, Lombok, and probably also Madura.

Stanzas in sêkar agêng consist of four verse lines (with a few exceptions), each containing an identical number of syllables, known as lampah (lit. ‘walk, gait, progression’). Lines of more than eight syllables are divided into colons termed pêdhotan (lit. ‘breaks’). Pêdhotan range in length from four to eight syllables. As a rule the pêdhotan pattern is the same in each line. Hence the metrical aspect of sêkar agêng can be represented with formulas like ‘20:7-7-6’, meaning that in the verse form in question a line has twenty syllables grouped into colons of seven, seven, and six syllables, respectively. Like other Javanese verse forms, sêkar agêng stipulates not only metrical patterns but also tunes with which the texts are to be sung. In sung recitation, the verse lines and the pêdhotan are demarcated melodically.¹

The history of sêkar agêng is still obscure.² Suffice it to say that these verse forms go back to Old Javanese metres, many of which are originally Sanskrit metres, but recognize no opposition between long and short syllables. The pêdhotan of sêkar agêng often coincide with the caesurae (yati) of the Sanskrit metres that were their ancestors. This is noteworthy because it has been suggested that Old Javanese versification knew no caesurae (Zoetmulder 1974:559 n. 3).

There are two indications that Or. 2048 has been recited using sêkar agêng. Pêdhotan are indicated in it by means of punctuation marks in the shape of small circles open to the left. In most cantos the

¹ Sêkar agêng is discussed in Arps 1986. For Javanese verse forms generally, see Arps 1952:14–16.
² See McDonald 1983:26–51 and [s.a.]:8–9 for a hypothesis concerning its origins.
pédhotan are numerically regular and they conform to pédhotan patterns known from later sources.\(^1\) Marks of the same shape and with the same range of sizes as the pédhotan markers often occur at the end of typographical lines. These are fillers with an aesthetic function. When viewed in isolation, they are often indistinguishable from pédhotan markers. A skilled reciter, however, would have noticed the difference; the sékar ageng tune assisted him in recognizing the pédhotan markers. Secondly, Arabic numerals are written above the canto boundary markers (with a couple of exceptions). The numerals refer to the lampah recognized in the canto. They have been added later. The numbers have been determined with some care: they are evidently not based upon first lines only because some of these are irregular. We cannot explain why Arabic rather than Javanese numerals were used, but Kawi manuscripts from Surakarta are known where the same was done, and some of the cantos in the replacement folios of Or. 2048 also contain Arabic numerals.\(^2\) If no verse form is named in a manuscript, a reciter needs this information in order to be able to choose a verse form. He can determine the lampah by counting, but that takes time and thus obstructs the flow of sound. Determination of the number of syllables between pédhotan marks is fairly easy provided the lampah is known.

In several cantos of Or. 2048, the pédhotan are not numerically regular. This is the case in particular in cantos containing twenty-two or more syllables to the line. Among these larger metres, twenty-three-syllable metres occur most frequently in the Lokapala kawi. Here an initial penta-syllabic colon is often indicated, but the remainder of the lines is undivided or the pédhotan marks seem to be randomly placed. This may indicate a certain uneasiness with the larger metres on the part of the person who first marked the colons in the text. It is possible that the odd pédhotan marks are in fact the remainders of vowel length marks in an ancestor of our manuscript. The lampah and pédhotan of Or. 2048 are given in the Appendix.

As noted above, some cantos in Or. 2048 have been reversed. McDonald has postulated what is to our minds a plausible explanation.\(^3\) An ancestor of Or. 2048 must have contained metrically irregular cantos. At some point in the line of transmission, a copyist rewrote the stanzas in question in order to give them a regular lampah (McDonald 1983:98–99). The copyist apparently did not refer to other manuscripts of the same work, where he might have found metrical readings. The fact that some cantos are still irregular does not necessarily contradict this hypothesis. It may be due to errors later in the transmission process. It is not possible to determine pédhotan in irregular lines because pédhotan are defined numerically; the normalization of the metres and the punctuation for pédhotan may thus have been effected in that order or at the same time. Something more radical happened with regard to canto IX of Or. 2048. It appears to be an amalgamation of cantos IX and X as found in the edition with some loss of text. Comparison with other Javanese manuscripts is needed before a conclusion can be reached. Finally, the fact that cantos XXXII and XXXIII of the edition correspond to a single canto in Or. 2048, XXXI, can be explained with reference to the absence of quant-

---

1 A survey of pédhotan patterns and their sources is in Arps 1986:123–163.
2 Here Javanese numerals appear as well, both kinds being incorporated into the canto boundary markers.
3 She does not refer to Or. 2048 but to Surakarta manuscripts, but this does not affect the argument.
itative metrical rules at some stage in the transmission of the poem in Java. The Old Javanesse metres in which these cantos were cast, Jagaddhita and Jagadnātha, have the same line length and only slightly different quantitative patterns (see Zoetmulder 1974:466–467; Supomo 1977:346). A scribe must have overlooked the boundary marker in his exemplar or felt it was superfluous. That this was an accident follows from the fact that XIX and XX (the edition’s XX and XXI), which are cast in the very same Old Javanesse metres, are still presented as separate cantos.

The manuscript in literary life

There is a scene in the poem Cabolang, written in the nineteenth century but see: in the first half of the seventeenth, where Mas Cabolang, accompanied by his servant Nurwitri, comes to pay his respects to the court scholar of Mataram, a certain Raden Tuměnggung Sujanapura:

Mas Cēbolang and Nurwitri were delighted with the welcome and refreshments. There was nothing to remind them that they had only just met

as they conversed amicably.

Thereupon the raden tuměnggung handed him a sērat Lokapala kawi which ran up to Rama’s return to Ayodya.

“Well, young man, let us pass the time with this. Go to page 9,

The story of King Sumali of Alēngka, when he studied with the holy man Wisrawa.”

Having received the manuscript and opened it, he spoke timidly: “By your leave, please realize that I am unknowing and ignorant indeed of the words and tunes. This is the first time in my life I have seen a sērat kawi.

I can read it, but only just.” The raden tuměnggung calmly spoke: “Never mind, just read it out, dispense with the tunes.”
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wus winaca kalangkung rindhik
angel kēdaling lesan
dyan tumēnggung nuntu
miwhan anjarwani pisan
ragi lan'yah gigit suraosing tulis
tēmah kataman rimang

He started reading, exceedingly slow;
the words came out with difficulty.
The raden tumēnggung led the way
and paraphrased at once;
quite skillfully he strove for the essence of the text
so that they were moved.

Wēdharind kong sastra harjendra di
wus tinangkēp sērat kong winaca
makiduhupuh trapisilane

After the revelation of the eminent sastra harjendra,
he closed the manuscript they had been reading
and waited reverently, his head bowed deep.

Having thus tested Cabolang's sincerity, Sujanapura considers him ready for receiving an explanation of the secret science sastra harjendra.

Javanese authors knew their licentia poetae. The event described here is fictional. Rama's return to Ayodya is not recounted in the Lokapala kawi at all; this must be a reference to the Rama kawi, the Old Javanese Ramayana. The latter was appended to some Lokapala texts, but not, as far as we know, in their kawi manifestations. Sumali does not study with Wisrawa and the famous mystical science sastra harjendra is not explained in any version of the Lokapala kawi now known. The scene is mentioned in an early nineteenth-century adaptation of the Lokapala in sēkar agêng, but in its tenth stanza (McDonal 1983:275), which is unlikely to be found on page 9 of a manuscript of any size, certainly if this manuscript also contains the 273 cantos of the Rama kawi.

This passage has been quoted here to illustrate a different point, namely that the Lokapala kawi has at times gripped the imagination of Javanese literati. And not just the imagination. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries it has not only been copied repeatedly, showing that it was read for its own sake, it was also adapted in more modern poetic idioms on at least three occasions.

The provenance of the manuscript

Cod. Or. 2048 contains no information on the date or location of its production. The last folio of the manuscript may have contained a colophon, but it is lost. The script of the original folios, described

---

1 Quoted with adapted orthography from Kamajaya 1986:12–13.
2 Although there is a phrase in 1.11a (fol. 3v in Cod. Or. 2048) which may have been the source of the idea that Wisrawa knew something called sastra hajêng 'the letters of well-being' (Supomo 1977:285–286).
3 If the sērat Cabolang had read jajugên pada sanga 'go to the ninth stanza', the passage would have been more realistic.
4 A convenient survey of the different literary versions of the Lokapala story known to exist is in Behrend 1990:224–226. For the adaptations see also Vede 1892:4–6 (which is confused) and additional comments in Juysboll 1911:6–8, 50; furthermore Pigcud 1967:238, 241; Supomo 1977:336–338; Day 1981:46–59; and McDonald 1983:6–9, 261–273.
and analysed above, is remarkable. Due to the dearth of comparative material, we do not know to what kind of sociocultural domain it may be linked. It may have been a personal script type, a regional one, an institutional one, or even one related to the sérat kawi genre. As noted earlier, we are aware of only one other instance of the same type of script, namely Cod. NBG 95, a copy of the kawi work entitled Darmasunya Kēling. This manuscript is dated and its copyist is known. The copying of Cod. NBG 95 was concluded in November 1716, probably on the tenth of that month, and it was carried out by P.A. Dipanagara, a son of Susuhunan Pakubuwana I of Kartasura (r. 1704–1719) (Ricklefs 1978:153 n. 12; 1993:364 n. 56).1 Yet, although the scripts of Or. 2048 and NBG 95 belong to the same type, a close palaeographical examination reveals that they are not written in the same hand. It is conceivable that they were written by one person, but this would not have been at the same time or with the same state of mind. Even though there is thus no evidence supporting a definite conclusion, it is difficult to resist the temptation of hypothesizing that Or. 2048, like NBG 95, was written by or in the environment of P.A. Dipanagara, especially since later in the eighteenth century Dipanagara was known to have been a collector of kawi manuscripts (Ricklefs 1992:673).

If it once belonged to Dipanagara, Or. 2048 was probably written before or in 1723. Little is known of Dipanagara before 1718. His date of birth, for instance, is unknown. Only from 1718, when he rose in arms against his father, can fragments of his career be reconstructed. He was a major protagonist in the ensuing Second Javanese War of Succession, which ended in 1723 (Ricklefs 1993:179–201). On 25 May he surrendered to the combined Kartasura-East India Company forces in Pasuruan (Ricklefs 1993:200). He was subsequently exiled to the Cape of Good Hope (Brandes 1889:372), where he still was in December 1736 (Remmelink 1990:232). Unless he returned to Java later—a possibility that cannot be ruled out since there are precedents—Dipanagara will have parted with his manuscripts before his banishment. There can be no doubt that NBG 95 and Or. 2048 came to the Netherlands from Java. But unfortunately the linking of Or. 2048 with Dipanagara can only be tentative at the present state of our knowledge. We hope that more instances of early eighteenth-century writing in different genres will come to light in the future. What we do know with reasonable certainty is that in 1783, Or. 2048 or a manuscript transcribed from it had found its way into the palace of Surakarta.

*The sérat Lokapala kawi, Or. 2048 in particular, in Surakarta court circles*

Very little is known of literary activities in the Surakarta court between its establishment in 1745 and the 1820s, when Dutch interest in Javanese studies was finally aroused. We have only fragments of information. It is known, for instance, that a small number of Old Javanese poems were

---

1 According to Ricklefs (1993:178), Dipanagara copied the text personally. It might appear unusual that a prince would engage in such labour, which in court circles seems on the whole to have been carried out by scribes. While Van Goens noted in 1656 that most Javanese were literate, at least one ruler in the early eighteenth century was not, and the ruler of Surakarta in the early nineteenth century seems to have considered writing something degrading (De Graaf 1956:184). Yet Ricklefs’s conclusion is based on NBG 95’s colophon: *elast tinular sinurat jēngira Pangeran Dipati Dipanagara* ‘completely copied, written by the noble P.A. Dipanagara’.
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available. The case of the Rama kawi shows that these manuscripts were copied several times. According to its colophon, Cod. 86na in the Sanapustaka Library of the Surakarta court (Florida 1993:235) was completed on 27 January 1753. A note (pemut) has been appended to the colophon. It states that a copy was completed on 14 January 1770. While the colophon is in the same hand as the main text, the note is not; it probably refers to a copy that was made using 86na as the exemplar. Cod. Or. 1790 and NBG 121 in the Leiden University Library are nineteenth-century copies of a third Rama kawi manuscript, which belonged to the susuhunan. They reproduce the colophon of the exemplar with a dating that translates into 11 April 1783.

From the available sources one gains the impression that the copying of kawi manuscripts was associated with princes. Cod. 86na was written "by order of the great heir apparent, exalted and serene, in the great palace of the state of Surakarta". Exactly the same formulation is found in Or. 1790 and NBG 121, which means that it was also part of the 1783 manuscript. Kawi texts were considered appropriate reading matter (or rather: singing matter) for young men of the blood. Several admonitions to this effect exist in texts (Arps 1986:42–45).

We do not know whether the Lokapala kawi was transcribed several times like the Rama kawi. We have a clear indication of only one manuscript. In June 1783, a Lokapala kawi was finished for a prince of Surakarta. The present whereabouts of this manuscript are unknown, but we have a guide to its appearance and text in the shape of a copy registered in the Library of the University of Leiden as Cod. Or. 1855 (2). The copy was made in Surakarta, probably in the 1830s or 1840s. A note in pencil on p. [-3] states that it was copied "from a very beautiful MS in small quarto, embellished with floral patterns and belonging to the emperor".

1 The first date is given as Saturday-Pon, 22 Mulad, wuku Matal. Je “liman sapta mangoyag bumi” (1678 A.J.). The wuku is inconsistent with the other elements. The second date is Sunday-Wage, 16 Ramelatan, Dal 1695 (in Javanese ciphers). It is internally consistent if the months of Dal 1695 A.J. are not given the abnormal durations introduced from 1675 A.J. (cf. Ricklefs 1978:228).
2 Friday-Wage, wuku Kuning[an], 8 Jumadiwali, Jimawal “trus sah saptuning sang raja” (1709 A.J.).
3 Ing agnerikang mahaprabhatarana di hing, irika mahakadhatyani kanang proja Surakarta. The phrase prabhataruna di, lit. ‘exalted junior monarch’, must be a literary equivalent of adipati anom, the title of a crown prince. His identity is known to us. The later Pakubuwana IV was only born in 1768. He may have been the crown prince who rebelled against Pakubuwana III in 1753 (Ricklefs 1974:58), or another prince appointed to this position later.
4 See Supomo 1977:179 for the colophon of Or. 1855 (2), which reproduces a colophon with the date Sunday-Wage, 8 Rêjêl, wuku Wuye, Jimawal “wakira sahing sapta jugel” (1709 A.J.). The eighth of Rêjêl 1709 A.J. was 9 June 1783 but this was actually Monday-Pon in the wuku Maktal. Sunday-Wage in the wuku Wuye was 15 June 1783. The manuscript is said to have been kung kugéngan sri nrépatmaja ‘the property of the king’s son’. This may have been the later Susuhunan Pakubuwana IV, who was born in 1768 and appointed prince in 1775. He ruled from 1788 until his death in 1820.
5 Judging from Florida’s catalogue (1993), no Lokapala kawi manuscripts remain in the library of the Surakarta court.
6 "volgens een eer schoon en met bloemwerk versierd MS. in klein 4to van den Keizer". See Vreede 1892:4 and Day 1981:52 n. 77. Our use of Or. 1855 (2) as a guide to the text of 1783 is based upon the following considerations. It is likely that the exemplar of Or. 1855 (2) was the manuscript of 1783 because Or. 1855 (2) con-
While the 1783 manuscript cannot have been Or. 2048 itself because of its dimensions, it was closely related to Or. 2048. This can be concluded from the pervasive similarity, not only in wording but also in spelling, between Or. 1855 (2) and Or. 2048. Supomo made the same observation but concluded that they were copies of one manuscript (1977:84). He disregarded other possibilities probably because Or. 2048 is at present incomplete. We will argue differently; the construction of the manuscript shows that it was once complete.

Or. 2048 and Or. 1855 (2) do not have identical readings and spellings everywhere. What is most striking is that where Or. 2048 is metrically irregular, Or. 1855 (2) on the whole is not. Something similar applies to pendhotan: these are more consistently indicated in Or. 1855 (2). But the correspondences are obvious. They extend to such remarkable spellings and wordings as «duḥ sat maḥa:raḥṣaśa baga sat prabu:» (XII.1a) and «kaṇaḥ hālikaya minokē pēkēn:» (XXIV.6d). This pertains only to the original folios of Or. 2048. The divergences are greater in fols. 2–7 and 18, the later replacements.

We may establish on these grounds that the Lokapala kawi manuscript of 1783 and Or. 2048 were closely related, meaning that they descended from the same ancestor. We have found a few features that allow us to narrow down this still rather unsatisfactory inference.

A possible indication that Or. 2048 was itself the ancestor (though not necessarily the exemplar) of the 1783 manuscript is found in the Arabic numerals that have been added above the canto boundary markers. As noted, there is some metrical irregularity in Or. 2048. This is the case particularly in canto XLIV, where the first stanza is made up of lines with 22, 21, 22, and 22 syllables. Later on in the canto the irregularity persists, though lines of 21 syllables seem to dominate. The edition has
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22 syllables to the line. Judging from Or. 1855 (2), the length of verse lines was normalized in the manuscript of 1783, and the new number of syllables per verse line corresponds with the numeral written above the canto boundary marker in Or. 2048, that is 21. It is possible that this specification of the lampah served as a guide to the reversification. Unfortunately we do not know when the numerals were added to Or. 2048 and whether other manuscripts were available specifying the same numbers.

Other indications that the 1783 manuscript descended from Or. 2048 are more convincing. Line X.1c of Or. 1855 (2) contains the phrase 「ŋaran rîñ siti:」(‘name on the ground’).\(^1\) As McDonald has noted (1983:479) this is a corruption. Supomo’s edition has “ŋaran rasiki” (“her name”) in the corresponding line (X.1c). Now Cod. Or. 2048 (fol. 22v, fifth line from below) reads 「ŋaran r[i]<a>siti:」. A wulu (the vowel diacritic symbolizing the ʰi) was written but subsequently made invalid again by writing a little x-shaped mark inside it. A copyist took the resulting shape for a combination of wulu and ǣčak ən̪. This was clearly an error. The combination of wulu and ǣčak is written differently in Or. 2048 (see for instance the characters two lines above and one line below the correction). But the error is understandable in view of the resemblance. What we have here is a feature of Or. 2048 that is peculiar to this manuscript, but that is nevertheless reflected in Or. 1855 (2).

The paten or pangkon (the character that annuls the vowel that inhere in an aksara, transliterated «.,») is relatively rare in Or. 2048. It occurs with some frequency only preceding verse line boundaries, where the following obligatory caesura necessitates its use if the final word ends in a consonant for which no sandhangan panyigeging wanda exists. But in a number of cases the paten was written within a verse line, often because a following character would not have fitted onto the typographical line if it had been given the shape of a pasangan. Comparison of Or. 2048 and Or. 1855 (2) shows that when a paten as the final character of a typographical line in Or. 2048 does not coincide with a pêdhotan, no paten is found in Or. 1855 (2). When, however, such a paten in Or. 2048 does coincide with a pêdhotan, it occurs in Or. 1855 (2) as well.\(^2\) Spellings such as 「pamu:k. ʰña」rather than the ordinary 「pamu:knya」 and 「huvus: brașṭa」 rather than 「huvus: brașṭa」, spellings contingent to Cod. Or. 2048, are reflected in Or. 1855 (2).

We may draw the conclusion that Or. 2048 was the ancestor of the Lokapala kawi manuscript made for a prince of Surakarta in 1783. That at least one manuscript intervened between them is suggested by a discrepancy between their readings for line XX.1a, introducing Queen Citrawati. In our manuscript this line concludes with the phrase 「pinuji sanâgara:」 ‘[she is] praised throughout the land’, while the edition has a similar reading: “pinuji̞n̞ sanâgara” (XXI.1a; Supomo 1977:118). Or. 1855 (2), however, reads 「ya pinuji sagara:」 ‘she is praised by the oceans’. We infer that in the

\(^1\) Also in Or. 2309 (1).
\(^2\) The same applies to Or. 2309 (1).
process of copying, the aksara «na» was overlooked. The resulting line was one syllable short; it was regularized by adding «ya». Since it is improbable that these steps were both taken during the same act of copying, the 1783 manuscript may have been made from a copy (or a copy of a copy, etc.) of Or. 2048.1

Cod. Or. 2048 was still complete when it was transcribed. The 1783 manuscript was complete, judging from Or. 1855 (2), and the spellings of Or. 1855 (2) frequently differ from those on the folios added to Or. 2048 in the late eighteenth century.

It has become clear that the scribe who produced the reading of the 1783 manuscript maintained a critical attitude towards his texts. With regard to orthography he strove to remain close to the exemplar, but where the verse forms were concerned he did not copy slavishly. He evidently felt that metrical irregularities were errors that should not be continued.2 A clear example is provided by stanza XIV.1. King Maruta feels tempted to attack the demon king Dasamuka but is restrained by his guru. A juxtaposition of the readings of the edition (where the stanza is XV.1), Or. 2048, and Or. 1855 (2) may illustrate:

The edition3

tatkala shri narapati manjayat
gaŋđewa hrññira sëññumurub
sambarte ki gurunira mawuwus
kapwohut pañławana narapati

Then the king raised
his bow, the arrow blazing.
Sambarta, his teacher, spoke,
forbidding the king to resist.

Or. 2048 (fol. 27r)
tatkala shri narapati/
manjayat gaŋđewa:/
hrunira sëññumurub:/
kapwohut pañlawana narapwati:

When the king
raised his bow,
the arrow blazing,
the king was admonished4 for resisting.

1 This argument is valid only if the «ya» was not added by the scribe who produced Or. 1855 (2). We have observed that on the whole he transcribed his exemplar faithfully. However, Or. 2309 (1) does read «pinuji samagara». This leaves room for doubt, but we do not know whether Or. 2309 (1) goes back to the 1783 manuscript or an ancestor of it.
2 Cf. the present-day attitude of reciters of Javanese poems towards metrical errors, described in Arps 1992:276–277.
3 Quoted from Supomo 1977:114 with minor spelling changes to facilitate comparison with the manuscripts. The translation is ours. Supomo’s translation is on p. 209 of his book.
4 This translation is based on the assumption that kapwohut was taken as an elaborate version of the kawi passive verb kapuhut ‘be addressed frankly, be told how things stand; be restrained’. See Winter and Rangga-warsita 1987:220 s.v. puhat. Judging from the dictionaries this word base occurs in the Modern Javanese poetic vocabulary but not in Old Javanese.
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Or. 1855 (2) (pp. 26–27)

tatkalannu: ra sah sri nara\data
\da\dn\a\na\ni\ya\na: nak\da\na: nika\na: la\r\r\gb\pa:\la
\m\a\g\n\y\a\j\r\a\n\a\j\r\a\g\r\b\u\a\r\u\b:,
\\a\m\a\j\w\o\u\h\t\pa\: ni\a\w\a\na: nara\p\w\a\g\a\i/

When the noble king
then took aim with the bow
and raised the blazing arrow,
the king was admonished for resisting.

In all three versions the canto is cast in a verse form with eleven syllables to the line. In Or. 2048, line c is lacking and the words of a–b have been spread out over three lines. These lines thus contain fewer syllables than required by the verse form. The writer of the 1783 manuscript or its ancestor normalized the metre. He reworded the first three lines so that each contained eleven syllables by rephrasing lines a and b as found in Or. 2048 and attaching the first word of b to c. He also indicated a p\d\o\d\h\o\t\a\n after the fourth syllable in conformity with the verse form that he recognized in the text.\n
It is worth noting that this writer apparently had no access to manuscripts with readings better than those of Or. 2048. He copied the metrically regular lines in a painstaking way. This probably means that he held the text offered by his exemplar in awe. If other manuscripts had been available to him, he might have curbed his creative impulse and sought for metrically correct readings warranted by the written tradition.

The adaptations of the s\d\e\r\a\t Lokapala kawi

Another piece of information on literary events in the Surakarta court, recently unearthed, pertains to a rendition of the s\d\e\r\a\t Lokapala kawi in more modern language and poetic form. Such works were known as jarwa ‘paraphrases’, although they are poems in their own right and definitely not translations. As Kuntara has established, a jarwa of the s\d\e\r\a\t Wiwaha kawi was composed between 21 June and 4 October 1778 (Kuntara 1990:242–246). The author was allegedly the ruler himself, Susuhunan Pakubuwana III (1733–1788, r. 1749–1788). One day before the Wiwaha jarwa was completed, the writing of a s\d\e\k\a\r macapat adaptation of the s\d\e\r\a\t Lokapala kawi was commenced (Behrend 1990:226–227). This may have been the copying of this adaptation or its creation. According to a statement by Yasadipura II, a partial adaptation of the Lokapala kawi was composed by his father Yasadipura I in a mere twenty days at the instigation and under the supervision of Pakubuwana III (Winter 1853:429–431). We do not know how trustworthy this claim is – it was made in 1819, thirty or more years after the event was supposed to have taken place and sixteen years after Yasadipura I’s death. What is certain is that a manuscript containing a s\d\e\k\a\r macapat adaptation of the Lokapala kawi was made in 1778. Behrend concludes from the material aspects of the codex that supplies this information that it was produced in the court of Surakarta not long

1 Or. 2309 (1), pp. 32–33, has the same reading with minor differences in spelling and punctuation.
2 With the exception of line c. Or. 2309 (1) p. 33 does mark a p\d\o\d\h\o\t after «hr». In Or. 1855 (2) the verse form is named as Br\d\o\m\a\r (see Arps 1986:130 for the use and Old Javanese antecedents of this verse form). Or. 2309 (1) does not specify the verse form.
3 The most common Javanese verse forms, based on different principles from s\d\e\k\a\r \d\a\g\n\b\o\g (see Arps 1992).
4 This statement is translated and annotated in Day 1981:53–57 and partly in McDonald 1983:60–61.
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afterwards. The Leiden University Library has a manuscript on loan from the Netherlands Bible Society which contains the same work (NBG 74, pp. 122–319). Like the three other poems in this codex, the copy is dated in December 1794.¹

The writing of a second jarwa of the *Lokapala kawi* was begun on 11 April 1803.² Unlike the earlier jarwa, it was itself in sēkar agēng. It was made for a prince, probably the crown prince, of Surakarta, and the author is named in the colophon as Mas Yasapidura, without a qualification Sr. or Jr. McDonald (1983) has edited and translated parts of this poem. Finally a third adaptation, again in sēkar macapat, was composed by Yasapidura II between 11 March and 15 July 1819 at the instigation of the Surakarta crown prince.³ This work has been published by Winter (1853).

---

¹ The writing of this *Lokapala* adaptation was commenced on 5 December 1794 (Kuntara 1990:241).

² Monday 18 Dulkijah, Wawu "trus karna swareng rat" (1729 A.J.; Cod. Or. 1855 (1), p. 1). A copy was completed on Saturday 4 Sakban, wuku Warigalit, Jimakir "suddha tri wiku tunggal" (1730 A.J.), i.e. 19 November 1803 (id., p. 195).
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McDonald has made an in-depth study of the three jarwa versions of the Lokapala (1983; see [s.a.] for a summary). She has argued that the later adaptations were composed with the help of the earlier, but also with renewed reference to the Lokapala kawi itself. From a comparison between different kawi manuscripts from Java on the one hand and the adaptations on the other, she concluded that a text similar to that of Or. 1855 (2) was used in all cases (McDonald 1983:61, 69).1 Judging from its physical features, Or. 2048 was in Java at least until the late eighteenth century. Since it is in some respects different from Or. 1855 (2) and thus from the manuscript of 1783 or its exemplar, it may prove possible to determine whether it was our manuscript that the authors of one or more of the jarwa poems used as a resource. Of course the possibility must be taken into account that yet other Lokapala kawi manuscripts were or became available to Surakarta nobility and poets in the last decades of the eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth.

A reconstruction of the historical relations between the main manuscripts and works discussed is shown in Fig. 19. Vertical arrows denote the transmission of manuscripts (lower case) and works (upper case) in time, horizontal arrows denote the use of manuscripts or works for transcription or adaptation. Arrows are interrupted when transmission or influence is possible but uncertain.

The acquisition of Cod. Or. 2048

It is not certain how and when Or. 2048 passed into Dutch hands. It is not even known when exactly it was acquired by Leiden University Library. It forms part of a series of manuscripts (Or. 1969–2055) that, according to Vreede, was transferred around 1871 from the Rijksinstelling van Onderwijs in de Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde in Leiden to what was then known as the Academic Library (the present University Library). The majority of these manuscripts is supposed to have been owned by the well-known Javanist A.D. Cornets de Groot (Vreede 1892:vi). But this set of manuscripts cannot as a whole have belonged to him. Several items date from well after his departure from Java in January 1829 and his death in the Netherlands in July of the same year. An inspection of the archives of the Rijksinstelling now kept in the University Library has brought no data to light that can be unequivocally linked with Or. 2048 or Cornets de Groot. The list of acquisitions (Bibl. Archief, C. 44*) indicates that Javanese, Malay, and other manuscripts were acquired by the Rijksinstelling as sets or single items upon several occasions between 1867 and 1878 (the years covered by the list). They were signed for by officials of the Academic Library, which from the outset provided the library facilities for the Rijksinstelling.3 It seems, then, that they were

---

1 McDonald also inspected Or. 2048 “to confirm that the same or similar variant readings were common to” Or. 1855 (2), Or. 2048, and lonzar MS 219, now in the National Library of Indonesia (McDonald 1983:9).

2 Cf. Piggeaud 168:8, who states simply that they entered the library in 1871 and had belonged to Cornets de Groot.

3 This explains why the manuscripts of the Royal Academy, the so-called Delft Collection (Vreede 1892:v; Piggeaud 168:8), went directly to the Leiden Academic Library when the Royal Academy closed its doors in 1864, and not to the Rijksinstelling which can be regarded as the Royal Academy’s successor.
transferred to the University Library immediately, with the exception of a number of documents and letters that were used for teaching. These remaining items were transferred in 1878, after the Rijks- instelling was closed down. There is no indication that the manuscripts presently comprising the so-called Cornets de Groot Collection went to the University Library as one batch in or around 1871. Rather, it appears that this collection was gradually built up and originated from various sources.\footnote{If this is so, Or. 2048 may have been among the set of nine Javanese manuscripts acquired on 11 November 1868, the seventeen Javanese manuscripts acquired (along with forty-seven Malay items) on 10 September 1870, or the ten Javanese manuscripts acquired on 30 September 1870.}

Unfortunately the acquisitions list makes no mention of origins, titles, or contents.

Neither have we been able to trace a dependable reference in A.D. Cornets de Groot’s private papers kept in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek in the Hague. What is certain from the Malay notes on fol. 2r is that our manuscript was once identified by someone who could read Javanese script but noted down his identification in the Malay language and in Roman script, hence probably an Indonesian writing for a European. Such identifications are also found in other codices that supposedly belong to the Cornets de Groot Collection, such as Or. 2008. This may indeed mean that A.D. Cornets de Groot once owned these manuscripts. In a memorandum of 18 January 1829 addressed to his brothers Hugo and JanPiet (Archief Cornets de Groot 128, fol. 107, in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek), he refers to a “Pandjie Panibo” as being in the care of a Dutch clerk in Surakarta. This manuscript originated from Mas Ngabehi Awikrama, Cornets de Groot’s Javanese teacher.\footnote{On Awikrama, Yasadipura II’s brother, see Day 1981:180–181. During his time in Surakarta (1819–1828) Cornets de Groot had contacts with several other Javanese scholars, including the *patih*, Sasradiningrat II (Carey 1981:xxv, liii–liv).} The only *Panji Paniba* manuscript in Leiden (Or. 2029; see Van der Molen 1992) is part of the alleged Cornets de Groot Collection and contains a Malay identification similar to that of Or. 2048. In his memo Cornets de Groot also refers to an “Ardjoeno Sosro”. Day (1981:52 n. 77) suggests that this may have been Or. 2048, but the Cornets de Groot Collection contains other manuscripts to which this title could apply. Further research into what happened to Cornets de Groot’s manuscripts after his repatriation and death may yield more satisfactory results. It is known (*inter alia* from Archief Cornets de Groot 128, fol. 45) that J.F.C. Gericke purchased manuscripts from his estate, but he had entrusted his collection to different people and Gericke may have missed some of them.

Conclusion

Cod. Or. 2048 is one of the few remaining tangible indications that kawi classics were studied in eighteenth-century Java. Ricklefs in particular has repeatedly laid stress on the cultural and political implications of the study of kawi in the Kartasura period (1978:152–156, 213–220; 1992; 1993: 179–180). Part of the argument has been directed against the notion of a renaissance of kawi literature in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Ricklefs 1974:219–226; McDonald 1983, [s.a.]). Our findings do not in themselves render inappropriate the appellation ‘renaissance’ for liter-
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ary events at the Surakarta royal and princely courts, provided that this label for a complex historical process is properly qualified. This must wait for another occasion; many riddles remain to be solved. At any rate the study of kawi works in Kartasura times does not contradict the likelihood that in Surakarta they were infused with renewed interest and relevance and became the subject of new literary activity. The existence of Surakarta offshoots of the sêrat Lokapala kawi points towards a revitalization of the kawi manuscripts that were still available in this period, which appear to have been few in number. This revitalization took the shape of the critical transcription of manuscripts and especially their adaptation into other linguistic varieties and poetic forms. Something similar occurred in Yogyakarta, although the details are less clear.¹

In Javanese philology we are moving from the study of manuscripts with the aim of restoring texts to their archetypes to the more encompassing study of manuscripts and texts in contexts, their use by and for people: authors, copyists, readers and reciters, listeners. The manuscript reproduced here has had a chequered history. It bears the marks of careful writing and illumination but also water and rapacious rodents, of periods of neglect but also repairs and restoration. Above all, it has been copied, studied, and recited. The literary artefacts of Java and the ideas and actions that breathed life into them call for further attention. It is in this context that the present facsimile edition, in spite of the condition of the manuscript and the state of the text, may be of use as a resource for philologists.

Appendix: the cantos of Cod. Or. 2048

This Appendix provides the canto number followed by the number of stanzas comprising the canto; the number of syllables per verse line and, where applicable, the number of syllables of each colon (pêdhotan); the folios on which the canto begins and ends; and the initial verse line of the canto in a diplomatic or narrow transliteration. The number of syllables per verse line is derived from the text; in most cases it is in accordance with the Arabic numerals that have been added above the canto boundary markers.

The transliteration conventions are those of Kuntara 1990:490–492, which are based on Van der Molen 1983:293–294. A few additions were necessary in view of the orthography encountered here. The aksara swara are denoted by small capitals «A, Æ, Æ, Æ» The character that is usually written “jî” in broad transliterations of Old Javanese texts and considered the nyâ murda in Modern Javanese, is represented by «I». The pêdhotan marker is rendered as «» the filler of typographical lines as «». When a pêdhotan marker occurs at the end of a typographical line, there is no certain way of distinguishing it visually from the filler; this can only be done by counting the number of syllables or by singing the text with a sêkar âgêng tune. In such cases the mark is represented by «irre-

¹ An incomplete Rama kawi survives in a manuscript in Yogyakarta court style antedating 1816 (Gallop and Arps 1991:85) and at least two new works with kawi subject matter were produced at the Pakualaman court in a special form of sêkar âgêng with sêkar têngahan and sêkar macepat (see Arps 1992:60 for references).
spective of its function. The verse line boundary marker, which is composite, is symbolized by «/».
To facilitate interpretation, spaces and hyphens have been inserted.

I 25 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 2v–5v
   01 šri pa[rjw]<w>atarajadewa huripi: sařw<>>apramannen jagai.);]
II 8 stanzas; 11:4-7; fols. 5v–6r
   šaño:na:na: dewa wimohitasa/
III 11 stanzas; 23:5-6-6-6; fols. 6r–7v
   lwir ddri meru sakala halpih ka liétyan atišarana ka liéri–giri/
IV 17 stanzas; 21:7-7-7; fols. 8r–11r
   tyagešy yan wašnánëna: ka:binna halpih kanañi: raiyajka:tsoba:
V 10 stanzas; 14:4-4-6; fols. 11r–12v
   dumrakša wi–ra mañka ni: Arpiñ lumampañ/
VI 19 stanzas; 20:7-7-6; fols. 12v–16r
   mañka sañ rananaty: dbuta laku: pamatu: kniñi rakšasabala/
VII 7 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 16r–17r
   sañ hyán wešranan: aki rakya: cari:na: muñgw iñ dal:níñi kuña/
VIII 13 stanzas; 21:7-7-7; fols. 17r–19v
   grit kumwa–ñ syandañaty: dbuta ratanitu sañ: rananòn:ndagami/
IX 24 stanzas; 14:4-4-6; fols. 19v–22v
X 4 stanzas; 23:5-18; fols. 22v–23r
XI 12 stanzas; 12:4-4-4; fols. 23r–24v
   duñ sañ maha: rakša: fuñya sañ prábu:

---

1 This character actually resembles the (modern) «/» more than the «o». It recurs on fol. 3v, the bottom line, in the exclamation «om hom. hom: wu:ru:ju:la»; on fol. 4v, line 5 from the bottom, in «om sañ hyan»; on fol. 6r, line 5 from the top, in «kán ka liétyan», where the edition reads “ikan ka liétyan”; and on fol. 18r, line 5 from the bottom, in «omñañ», edition “omña” Or. 1855 (2) uses the same character in these places.
2 Originally the third word read «parwata:jadewa», but the «š» has been scraped away and the pasangan wa was added later in a lighter ink, which is now brown, whereas the earlier ink remains black. The colour of the ink is the same as that of the caption “Arjuna Wijoyo,” at the top of the page. The pasangan wa in «sařw<>>apramannen» is also a later addition, in the same brown ink.
3 In the edition, this canto is in a verse form with twenty-two syllables to the line (Supomo 1977:97–98).
4 This canto begins on the first remaining original page of the manuscript.
5 The initial «a» has partly been redrawn later in connection with a fold in the paper.
6 It is possible to read «halpih», but that would mean that the «a» is in an unusual position.
7 Stanzas 4b–9c are partly on fol. 18, a replacement. With fol. 19 the original manuscript continues.
8 The corresponding part of the edition has two cantos (IX and X) consisting of three stanzas with twenty-four syllables to the line followed by twenty-two stanzas with fourteen syllables to the line (Supomo 1977:106–109). Stanzas IX.1–3 and IX.1–2a of Or. 2048 are close in wording to the edition, IX.1–2b. From IX.3b the text and verse form run parallel again to the edition, X.1b and seq.
9 The group of eighteen syllables is occasionally subdivided, but there appears to be no regular pattern.
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XII 11 stanzas; 17:6-6-5; fols. 24v-26r
  nahān līnīka: mar:ddaweka sumahūr: ta sañ rawaṇna:

XIII 5 stanzas; 20:7-7-6; fols. 26r-27r
  hawiwakṣiteki la:ku sañ dasamuka maha:s i tapo-wana:

XIV 6 stanzas; 11; fols. 27r-27v
  tatkala šri narapati: maŋayat ganjewa:/

XV 2 stanzas; 20:7-7-6; fols. 27v-28r
  tann iwa:n șatiṃkāhīn: ka sañ pra:bu śira ma:šikēp sarotyama:

XVI 9 stanzas; 21:7-7-7; fols. 28r-29v
  yyan:kat šri baṇnaputra: mapagakn i sira:n: rawaṇanindya riṃ pra:n:

XVII 9 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 29v-31r
  ka šri bupati ba:naputra [mu] lumih:i șyu:nin yatēk partīwa:

XVIII 3 stanzas; 14:4-4-6; fols. 31r-31v
  byattītan reī: pja:hi:ra:ni: sañ narendra riṃ pra:n:

XIX 3 stanzas; 23:5-18; fols. 31v-32r
  tanjē: yann uca:pēn sapola:līhīn kana:n ḍda:šamuka kalaw: șala:șura:

XX 6 stanzas; 23; fols. 32r-33r
  dewi citrawati prasa:șwa paña:ran sañ ahayu: pinu:ji sanagara:

XXI 12 stanzas; 21:7-7-7; fols. 33r-35r
  bya:ți:nan sañ ha:nne:n nagara șla:ŋ anjīwēh: raga lawan lulut ku:h:

XXII 6 stanzas; 14:4-4-6; fols. 35v-36r
  kane:n ruhu:n: na kaŋ tapo:wana sañ ma:ñharśi:

XXIII 3 stanzas; 20:7 7 6; fols. 36r-36v

XXIV 6 stanzas; 11; fols. 36v-37r
  ņa:grod:da: ēn kka:yu ri tja:ṭh ika:

XXV 4 stanzas; 20:7-7-6; fols. 37r-38r
  ōmbēk šri naranata:sēmu jēnēi ri tka: pnyana:pa:sa: šab:

XXVI 2 stanzas; 14:4-4-6; fols. 38r
  akṣo:bya pa:ṭ-wwa sira tekī ba:ṭa:ra: ruddra:

XXVII 3 stanzas; 12; fols. 38r-38v
  niha:n tika:n ḍda:ma: īpas hya teja:ṛn:

XXVIII 2 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 38v-39r

XXIX 4 stanzas; 23:5-6-6-6; fols. 39r-39v
  ḍđa: ḍhayya juga: maṅkaneki kaḥa:ṛpkw iri: kita pinnakeșṭi:ṇn ati:

¹ Both verse line boundary markers are misplaced; line a ends after maŋayat. See the discussion above.
² The edition (canto XIX) has a verse form with thirteen syllables to the line (Supomo 1977:117).
³ Colons are rarely marked and numerically irregular.
⁴ There are several exceptions to this colon pattern.
XXX 17 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 39v–42v
nahan liñnira sañ: dįįjendra sumahur: marmašraha-se haji:/

XXXI 21 stanzas1; 23:5-18; fols. 42v–46r
sampun prapta-ñ st:reñ tgal-tgal alas jurañ-: jurañ ín šasmipaniññ sawah:/

XXXII 10 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 46r–48r
byatitau gati sañ- narendra kalawañ salwiir hyañi campaka:/

XXXIII 5 stanzas; 23:5-182; fols. 48r–49r
nrpati hænciriañka ñda riñ huwusmišrausu la-wañ narendrañdayita:/

XXXIV 4 stanzas; 23:5-183; fols. 49r–49v
ndan sañ-ñri paramešwari masëmu: šuñkawa miñyawañqasñ wimuñçitya:/

XXXV 2 stanzas; 214; fols. 49v–50r
mañkana demnirañgni: purakæn turidda-wuyuñi sañ piñnançokên.:/

XXXVI 10 stanzas; 20:7-7-6; fols. 50r–51v
Addänwañ kawarñmana- ri polæñhira ræ:p amukti sangama:/

XXXVII 6 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 51v–52v
Amñëk ñri narañata gañjita miñat loniñ mahanañmadda:/

XXXVIII 13 stanzas; 23:5-185; fols. 52v–55r
ddan sañ-ñri parameśwari saran hæññeh bukur i tapi:nikañ- lyah utama:/

XXXIX 9 stanzas; 17:6-6-5; fols. 55r–56v
duñhankinduñ salwiir: hyañqi ñqeqañpiññ: lññeq udañqi:/

XL 7 stanzas; 23:5-6-6-6; fols. 56v–57v
byatiañ ri hu:wus dañsaya mañqi:ñqi mañiniñ riññ ñujñiñ wukir mañnik:/

XLI 3 stanzas; 21:7-7-7; fols. 57v–58r
na tojar sañ prahæñswra:krana dañqi sumahur: sañ dasa-şwaprañ ahyän:/

XLII 4 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 58r–59r
da rakryan mapatiññ: prahæsya mawusw:sa manma prananeñ haji:/

XLIII 19 stanzas; 14:4-4-6; fols. 59r–61r
yekabaññ:ñ alin-ali:ñkiki sañ dásasñya:/

XLIV 10 stanzas; 22 or 217; fols. 61v–62v
Ahyä dasamuñña-ñ atigajirña-ña pamujinñ bala pañña suméqgnp:/

XLV 6 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 62v–63v
da rakryan mapatiññ: suwanda pinakañ:græpræñnaniñ sansjanà:/

1 In the edition this section comprises two cantos (XXXII and XXXIII; Supomo 1977:126–129). As discussed above, these cantos have the same number of syllables per verse line and their metres are very similar.
2 The latter group of syllables is sometimes divided 6-6-6.
3 The latter group of syllables is occasionally divided 6-6-6.
4 In stanza 1 the pëdhøtan vary, in stanza 2 the pattern is 7-7-7.
5 The latter group of syllables is sometimes divided 6-6-6.
6 This seems to be the pëdhøtan pattern but it is not marked in every line.
7 The edition has eleven stanzas in the corresponding canto (XLVI). Stanza 4 of the edition is missing here, as Supomo (1977:173) has noted. The edition has twenty-two syllables to the line, and this applies to some of the lines here, but the numeral added above the canto boundary actually reads “21”. No pëdhøtan are marked in most lines.
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XLVI 5 stanzas; 14:4-4-6; fols. 63v–64r
nojañ ddasa:šwa sumahut; saññ anindyamantri:/

XLVII 15 stanzas; 11; fols. 64r–65v
liñ saññ šumantri paramatiḍira:/

XLVIII 12 stanzas; 20:7–7–6; fols. 65v–67v
tatkala wirasĕna:prañ apagut asuwe lyañnikamwañwatwa:/

XLIX 13 stanzas; 19:6–6–7; fols. 67v–69v
mañkin guñnitita tekananñ ṣwila ṣalayu; krodda maharakṣañ:/

L 7 stanzas; 17:6–6–5; fols. 69v–70v
yya ḫetu śry awaŋga:ddiñña sira lawaw:mäññ addapatia/

LI 4 stanzas; 23:5–6–6–6; fols. 70v–71r
džana rukryan map:iñ śwanda sira: mojar i sahana:ṇmikañ balanana:/

LII 4 stanzas; 21:7–7–7; fols. 71r–71v
na liñ sañ wiraranja: prasañ-sama masëḷ: sañ wetk heryaṇśa:/

LIII 3 stanzas; 20:7–7–6; fols. 71v–72r
ka sañ su-[nda]wanda2 sira: wira rota juga tta:n tumbu kajalaya:

LV 6 stanzas; 19:6–6–7; fols. 72r–73r
yeκa-n ṭaṇṇiñ3 sañ: dasaśyya masikē:p sy amoja tikṣnojyaḷa:

LV 6 stanzas; 24; fols. 73r–74r
byatala ri pjañ śuwa:nda gumaruñ ddahut saḥanaṇṇiñ prawira malayu:

LVI 6 stanzas; 14:4–4–6; fols. 74r–75r
duḷḥ sañ narendra parama:diṅ būmiyala:

LVII 11 stanzas; 19:6–6–7; fols. 75r–76v
liñ sañ naṛadda: śura dira mwawwus sañ śri mahaḥuṇāti:

LVIII 6 stanzas; 23:5–6–6–6; fols. 76v–77v
ata ri śdāñ: mahaśurapati:-n prakoja sira tā:n kacaksuḥagraha:

LIX 8 stanzas; 21:7–7–7; fols. 77v–79r
ṛ ṣiga puḥṇaniwa:n dasamukha maṇḍaddē: gōrarupañgaṅgakara:

LX 11 stanzas; 19:6–6–7; fols. 79r–80v
yeka hetaṇṇi:-n triwikrama maṇṣēḷ: kroddatiso-banjēḷa:

LXI 7 stanzas; 17:6–6–5; fols. 80v–81v
Ah aḥ praḥu dasa:šya ha ndi ta wuwwu:s ṭatik ṣuṇaṭi:

1 The edition, canto L, has twenty-one syllables to the verse line.
2 The «nda» has been made invalid by means of a little dot inside.
3 The «» is written with an aksara swara «» preceded by a falling.
4 The edition (canto LVII) has eight stanzas; stanzas 5 and 6 are lacking here. The verse lines are usually undivided, though initially sometimes 8-8-8.
5 The edition (canto LX) has twenty-two syllables to the line.
6 The edition has nine stanzas. The next two cantos of Or. 2048 (LXII and LXIII) have not been incorporated in the text of the edition because they are found only in Javanese manuscripts. They are given in Supomo 1977:176–177.
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LXII 9 stanzas; 19:6-6-7; fols. 81v–83r

tan waṭan gati saṅ: daśasya kahaṛ-ñaṅ: de śri narendraḍḍīpa:/

LXIII 5 stanzas; 21; fols. 83r–84r
Ati ri päñ: narendraḍayita: śire pattigaṇiḥ asokaṇḍēṅ:/

LXIV 4 stanzas; 23:5-18; fols. 84r–84v
prāṃku kīta: saṅ maḍhaṛḍdiṅka niṅ <ś> karanaṅniṅ? pāti saṅ nareśwari:/

LXV 4 stanzas; 23; fols. 84v–85r
Aḥ saṅ dyā: rumuhun hilaḥ makalawna turidda mulahakṛṇ paṭibrata:/

LXVI 5 stanzas; 19:6-6-6-7; fols. 85r–86r
prapta-ṅ kirana: pradipta-ṅ umijil saṅ hyan hyaṇjiṅ nainmadda:/

LXVII 8 stanzas; 23:5-18; fols. 86r–87v
rakrāya tan śi: tussa-gēṅ: niki kakanta ri: huriṇu tuḥanku māraṇaṅ.:/

LXVIII 6 stanzas; 12; fols. 87v–88r
hom saṅ narendra prāṃru wira dāḍigjaya:/

LXIX 3 stanzas; 17; fols. 88r–88v
Ati ri wi: l dasaśya saka ri wiṣi panjara sa:/

LXX 4 stanzas; 21:7-7-7; fols. 88v–89r
sojāt saṅ wipra tuṣṭa: dasaṃuka masuṇṭka kaḍatyaṇṅ riṅ ṭηka:/

LXXI 7 stanzas; 23:5-6-6-6-6; fols. 89v–90v
kwa yogyaṇṭika: hayyaḥ tan sannyasa:daṃma hula[ken]aḥkaṇa: saṅ dasanaṇa:/

LXXII 9 stanzas; 19:6 6 7; fols. 90v–92r
A he saṅ parama:śi singiḥ ikanojātatiṅ guṇa:hyotama:/

LXXIII 2 stanzas; 22; fols. 92r–92v
nahan juga waḷrikanāṅ kata: buka dasaśyacarita-ṅ hinikēt.:/

LXXIV stanzas 1–3b; 23; fol. 92v
niṛṛddon taṅ saraśunyaka: ya sahanannya lumpsa riṅkaṇa duratmaka:/

1 There are occasional pāṭhotan marks that seem to indicate a pattern 5-6-6-5.
2 The pasangan ra has been added later, squeezed in between the aksara na and the pasangan ka. The ra is in the script type of the original part of the manuscript.
3 Sometimes with an initial penta-syllabic colon.
4 The manuscript is correctly foliated but wrongly bound: fol. 90 is bound in following fol. 88 and before fol. 89 (see Figs. 10 and 11). We have followed the foliation, not the bound order.
5 This number is derived from the edition and Or. 1855 (2). Stanzas 2b–9a are lacking because between the folio numbered 90 and the last, one folio is lost. The last remaining folio, which we refer to as 92, is actually unnumbered (see Fig. 11).
6 Colons are marked irregularly. This canto and the next lack Arabic numerals specifying the syllable count.
7 Or. 1855 (2) has six stanzas in this canto, the sixth being the colophon.
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