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Introduction

This special issue of Indonesia and the Malay World was compiled by friends and colleagues as a tribute to Professor E. Ulrich Kratz’s three decades of teaching Jawi and traditional Malay literature at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, and to mark his 70th birthday on 14 October 2014. Reflecting Ulrich’s deep interest in Malay manuscript texts and letters over many years (see the list of publications compiled by Helen Cordell in this issue), this Festschrift takes the rather unusual form of a compilation of reproductions of Malay manuscripts in Jawi script, accompanied by commentaries on the handwriting and spelling. Nearly all the manuscripts are dated or firmly dateable, and come from known locations. The hope is that this issue will be useful as a sourcebook for the study of the development of Jawi script, and in particular its palæography and orthography, over the course of nearly three and a half centuries. The manuscripts presented date from the end of the 16th century to the early 20th century, and originate from all corners of the Malay world, from Aceh to Aru and from Melaka to Mindanao, as well as from Malay communities in Sri Lanka and Mecca.

Arabic script in Southeast Asia

It is highly likely that there may have been an Islamic presence in Southeast Asia — in the form of individual traders and travellers of Muslim faith, as well as small groups of local converts — from the early centuries of the Hijra era, but it is generally accepted that the institutionalisation of Islam which occurred with the formal conversion of the ruler of a state first took place in the Malay archipelago around the 13th century AD in north Sumatra. On the evidence of tombstone epitaphs there are traces of an Islamic ruling dynasty in Brunei in the 14th century (Kalus and Guillot 2006: 176), while the conversion of Melaka took place in the 15th century, followed by polities along the coasts of

*I would like to thank Henri Chambert-Loir for his comments on, and meticulous checking of, an earlier version of this Jawi Sourcebook. The Introduction has also benefitted from advice from Ali Akbar, Jan van der Putten and Edwin Wieringa.
east Sumatra and north Java in the 16th century, and south Sulawesi in the early 17th century. The coming of Islam to Southeast Asia brought with it the Qur’an, as well as other liturgical texts such as prayer books, written in the Arabic language and script.

Concomitant with the spread of Islam into non-Arabic speaking lands, the Arabic script underwent a periodic process of adaptation to enable it to function as a vehicle for the vernacular languages of the new faithful. The process would have started as early as the 8th or 9th century after the Islamic conquest of Iran with the adoption of Arabic script for the Persian language. This necessitated the creation of four additional letters to represent sounds in Persian not found in Arabic – the letters pe for p, che for the sound ‘ch’ as in ‘chat’, zhe for zh, and gaf for g – through the addition to basic Arabic letter forms of dots or other marks above or below the line (Blair 2008: 10). This mode of extending the Arabic alphabet continued as necessary along the same principles in almost all areas where Islam became established. In Southeast Asia, five additional consonants were needed for Malay: p, c (ch), g, ng, and ny. 1 The resulting Malay alphabet is normally called Jawi, or in present-day Indonesia, Arab-Melayu. Conversely, a number of Arabic letters – representing Arabic sounds not found in Malay – are mainly used in foreign loanwords.

Further eastwards in Southeast Asia the process of evolution continued. Two new letters were created for writing Javanese in Arabic script – dha: dal with one or three dots below or sometimes above, and tha: ta with one or three dots below (Yulianto & Pudjiastuti 2001: 207), and the resulting alphabet is referred to as Pégon (Figure I). The basic Jawi letter set is used for other Austronesian languages such as Acehnese, Gayo, Minangkabau, Sundanese, Bugis/Makassar (the script is called Sérang), 2 Gorontalo, Ternate, Wolio from Buton, Tausug from Sulu, Maranao, Iranun and Maguindanao (Figure II) from Mindanao, and Cham from the Southeast Asian mainland. There may however be regional variations which have not yet been fully documented – for example, in the southern Philippines, the consonant g is represented not by the Jawi letter ga but by the letter ghain (Cameron 1917: 14, 36) – and which await further investigation. 3 Most distinctively, Javanese and the southern Philippine languages are usually written with full vocalisation, while Malay is rarely so; why this should be is a matter for further investigation. There are many other areas for exploration, particularly in bi-scriptural linguistic-cultural areas such as Javanese and Bugis/Makassar. Pégon is certainly the preferred choice for Islamic texts in Javanese, but Javanese script may also be used, including for words and phrases in Arabic. However, when texts on Islamic subjects are written in the Indic left-to-right Bugis/Makassar script, phrases in the text in Arabic are usually written in right-to-left Arabic script, involving

---

1 It has often been stated that in fact Malay only necessitated the creation of two additional letters as p, ch and g had already been created for Persian, but as Chambert-Loir (2009: 332) has pointed out, there is a significant difference between the Persian pe (the Arabic ḏāʾ with three dots underneath) and the Malay pa (the Arabic ǧāʾ with three dots above). Moreover the Persian gaf uses a diagonal line parallel to the upper stroke, while the Malay ga usually has one or three dots above or below. There is a likelihood therefore that both these Malay letters might have evolved independently (cf. also Ali 1987: 33–8).

2 Cho 2012.

3 See Library of Congress romanisation charts for the wide range of variations of Arabic script designed for local languages.
FIGURE II. Letter in Maguindanao in Arabic script from Sultan Muhammad Syah Amiruddin of Maguindanao to Don Pedro Zacarias Villareal, dated 20 Rabiulawal 1159 (12 April 1746). British Library, Or. 15510 A, f. 1r.
considerable dexterity in calculation and forward-planning on the part of the scribe (Figure III).

The earliest known examples of writing in Malay are in fact all in scripts of Indian origin, commencing with a group of about ten 7th-century Sriwijayan inscriptions from Palembang and Bangka, dating from 683 AD onwards. The script of this group has long been referred to generically as ‘Pallava’ but it has recently been suggested should more accurately be termed ‘Late Southern Brāhmi’ (Griffiths 2014: 54). From the 9th century onwards examples of Malay written in forms of ‘Kawi’ script (de Casparis 1975: 45) have been found over a wide geographic and temporal range, including the
Laguna Copper Plate inscription dated 900 from Manila Bay (Postma 1992), the Minye Tujuh tombstone *syair* from Aceh of 1380 (van der Molen 2007), and, most spectacularly, the oldest known Malay manuscript written on a perishable medium: the Tanjung Tanah code of law from Kerinci, written on *dluwang* (beaten tree-bark paper), and carbon-dated to the 14th century (Kozok 2006). Palaeographical and orthographical studies of these early Malay inscriptions have generally taken a broad view in considering all possible epigraphic evidence from Southeast Asia, ranging from the oldest known inscriptions in Sanskrit from Kutai in east Kalimantan possibly dating from the 5th century, and referencing contemporary developments in Old Javanese, while taking care to distinguish between script and language (see de Casparis 1975; Griffiths 2014). A similarly inclusive contextual approach is necessary for the study of the development of Jawi script, with adequate attention paid to the epigraphic record of other Southeast Asian languages written in Arabic script, and even Arabic itself. The Arabic language had and continues to have a major presence in Southeast Asian writing traditions, and it is only with a full acknowledgement of this epigraphic backdrop that a meaningful study of Jawi can be conducted.

In studying the development of Arabic script in Southeast Asia, however, a distinction must be made between writings in any medium produced locally, and those brought to the region from elsewhere in the Islamic world. Among the earliest Arabic-script inscriptions believed to have been produced in Southeast Asia are a very small number of tombstones from Pasai with epitaphs dating from the 14th century, but it is only from the early 15th century that there appears to have been an established tradition of local stone-carved tombstones in north Sumatra (Lambourn 2004: 212–4). From that time onwards a rich tradition of Arabic funerary epigraphy developed in the region of Aceh and was sustained over the next three centuries at least, with examples exported to neighbouring territories in Sumatra and the Malay peninsula. While Acehnese tombstones were almost invariably inscribed in Arabic, it is notable that a stylistically varied corpus of Islamic tombstones from Brunei, also dating from the early 15th century onwards, is inscribed in both Arabic and Malay. The earliest dated epitaph from Brunei solely in Arabic is from 1402, but elements in Malay are first recorded on a tombstone of 1418, and from 1458 onwards Malay is invariably used to express dates (Kalus and Guillot 2006: 172). Against this background, the Terengganu Stone – dated 702 AH (1303 AD), and already long feted as the earliest

---

4. See the important study by Kalus and Guillot (2008) which showed convincingly that two early tombstones dated to the 5th century AH / 11th century AD in Kufic script – one found in Champa and one at Leran in Java – had been imported into Southeast Asia in a context divorced from their inscriptive content, perhaps as shipping ballast. Similarly, a seal possibly dating from the 10th century AD and proposed as the ‘oldest Arabic inscription in Southeast Asia’ (Kalus 2000) was probably made in Iran and may have been brought to Southeast Asia at a much later date (Gallop and Porter 2012: 74–5). For studies of other imported tombstones, from China and India, see Chen (1992) and Lambourn (2003).

5. Crucially, the tombstone of the first Islamic ruler of Pasai, Sultan Malik al-Salih, dated 1297, was most probably carved in the 15th or 16th century to replace an earlier grave monument (Lambourn 2008: 273).

6. Al-Attas (1984: 9–10) is certainly correct in dismissing any doubts about reading this date as 702 AH / 1303 AD. From considering the totality of the material and ‘visual/textual’ evidence (cf. Lambourn 2008: 253–4), the presentation of the first part of the inscription within a ruled frame, with the last word of the date *dua*, ‘two’, extended to fill the space available on the final line, leaves little
known example of Malay written in Arabic script – assumes even greater significance as perhaps the earliest dated example of Arabic script produced in Southeast Asia.

No extant examples of Arabic script on perishable materials are known from Southeast Asia around this time, and although it is tempting to assume parallel developments on paper, it is probably not possible to draw any conclusions about manuscript hands during this period of sustained epigraphic activity. Michael Rogers (1988: 105–6) has drawn attention to the ‘lack of relationship’ between manuscript and lapidary\(^7\) hands, not least because of the normative effect of the chisel, and, in a study of 8th- and 9th-century tombstones from Aswan concluded that few letter forms could be linked to book hands.

The first known example of an Arabic-script manuscript from Southeast Asia is a letter in Arabic from Sultan Zainal Abidin of Samudera-Pasai to the Portuguese ‘capitão-Mor’, representing the king of Portugal, now in the Torre do Tombo archives in Lisbon (Figure IV). Although undated, on the basis of internal evidence the letter can be dated to 1516.\(^8\) It thus predates the earliest known examples of Malay written in Jawi script on paper, two by now well-known letters from the sultan of Ternate dated 1521 and 1522, addressed to the Portuguese ruler and held in the same repository (Blagden 1930; Gallop 1994: 123). While some undated Malay manuscript books may well originate from the 16th century, the earliest dated volume is a copy of the ‘Aqā’id of al-Nasafi, an Arabic text with interlinear translation in Malay, dated 1590 (al-Attas 1988). Two Malay letters of 1599 are known, one from Brunei presented here (No. 1), and

---

\(^7\) i.e. inscriptions in stone.

\(^8\) AN/TT, Cartas Orientais, no. 59. The letter was first published in typeset Arabic transcription and Portuguese translation by de Sousa (1790: 127–30), giving in the Arabic text the date of 5 Ṣaḥbān sanat 926, but in the Portuguese translation, 5 de Xabau de 916. Corresponde aos 7 de Junho de 1520. (5 Syaaban 916 = Thursday 7 November 1510 AD [Julian] while 5 Syaaban 926 = Saturday 21 July 1520 AD [Julian], using Ian Proudfoot’s AHAD date conversion software.) However, a facsimile of the original letter first published in Diplomasi Aceh (2007: 19) showed many discrepancies with the Arabic text of de Sousa, including the complete absence of a date at the end of the text (see Figure IV). A new annotated version of de Sousa’s translation was published by Joge Santos Alves (1999: 228–30), in which the letter was dated to 1516 on the basis of notes by Jean Aubin. Alves has now kindly provided the following clarification on the date: the letter was most probably written by Zainal Abidin IV (r. mid 1516 to February 1517, according to Guillot and Kalus 2008: 90) and originally intended for Afonso de Albuquerque, governor of the Estado da Índia (1509–15); when Zainal Abidin wrote the letter he was unaware that Albuquerque was dead and had been replaced by Diogo Lopes de Sequeira. In late 1515 Albuquerque had sent the Florentine Giovanni da Empoli to Pasai, and when da Empoli arrived in Pasai by April 1516 he witnessed the regicide that put Sultan Zainal Abidin IV on the throne. Da Empoli and another Florentine Raffaelo Galli also witnessed the violent acts of two Portuguese privateers, Gaspar Machado and Manuel Falcão, in Pasai in the mid and late 1516, as referred to in Zainal Abidin’s letter. The letter can therefore most likely be dated to November–December 1516 (Jorge Santos Alves, pers. comm., 12 January 2015). A new edition of the Arabic text based on the facsimile, with Indonesian translation and commentary, was published online by Taqiyuddin Muhammad (2013).
another from Ternate (Wassing-Visser 1995: 26–7). From the beginning of the 17th century onwards, there is a steady trickle of Malay manuscript books and documents. From this same period, a treatise on Islamic jurisprudence written on Javanese dluwang tree-bark paper, in Arabic with an interlinear translation in Javanese, dated 1623/4, may be the earliest dated example of a manuscript in Pégon script (see Figure I). Nonetheless, a major expansion only happens in the second half of the 18th century, while

9British Library, Sloane 2645 (Ricklefs and Voorhoeve 1977: 45; Gallop and Arps 1991: 100). This MS has been fully digitised and can be consulted on the British Library website.
perhaps 80 to 90% of all Malay manuscripts known today date from the 19th century. The
date of 1900 is often taken as a convenient marker for the wane of the Malay manuscript
tradition in the face of the spread of printing, but as the last item in this Jawi Sourcebook — a
literary work dated 1938, also from Brunei (No. 60) — attests, in many parts of Southeast
Asia the culture of writing texts by hand only died out very slowly.

**Calligraphy**

Within the Islamic world, calligraphy has always been regarded as the highest form of
Islamic art, due to the special reverence accorded to the Arabic script as the vehicle for
the word of God in the Qur’an. Studies of Islamic calligraphy are legion, covering all
media with most naturally on paper, but others in the form of inscriptions in marble
and stone, incised and inlaid on copper and bronze and precious metals, painted on cer-
amics, and woven in carpets and textiles. However, the focus of these myriad works is
almost always solely on Arabic, with some reference to Persian and Turkish, but with
hardly a mention of the many other ‘Islamic’ languages written in Arabic script, from
Swahili to Pushto and from Tamil to Malay. 10

To some extent this is understandable, for if we are to understand calligraphy as
‘fine writing’ or, as Sheila Blair (2008: xxv) has defined it, ‘script that the writer
intended to impact the viewer aesthetically, writing that not only conveys information
by its semantic content but also speaks through its formal appearance’, there is no evi-
dence of a coherent Malay calligraphic tradition. As has been summed up most
evocatively:

... fragments of the drafting sheets of celebrated calligraphers were not for sale in
Southeast Asian marketplaces. There seem not to have been brotherhoods of
initiates in the calligraphic art tracing descent from the early caliphs. In Persia or
India, a caliph or a king might be a calligrapher, but no ruler in maritime Southeast
Asia was known for his fair hand.

(Proudfoot and Hooker 1996: 72–3)

Yet pockets of excellence certainly existed in Southeast Asia, including the inscribed
‘batu Aceh’ tombstones dating from the 15th to the 18th centuries mentioned above,
with another impressive cache of architectural calligraphic wooden panels set into the
walls of houses in Terengganu from the late 19th century (Tan 2007). Calligraphic
achievements on paper are primarily found in works in Arabic, notably in copies of
the Qur’an, followed by *kitab mawlid* containing devotional works on the life of the
Prophet. More surprisingly, particular calligraphic ingenuity seems to have been inspired
by classic works on Arabic grammar such as *al-Ájurrumiyya* 11 (Figures V and VI). For
writings in Malay the highlights are rarer, one of the more fruitful fields being royal epis-
tles, and even then perhaps only in the letter headings (*kepala surat*) and ornamental
opening or closing lines. Sometimes the artistic impulse is focused only on a specific

10 A welcome recent exception is Blair (2008: xxvii).

11 The *Muqadimma* by the Moroccan Berber Abū `Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Dāwūd al-
Sanhājī, known as Ibn Ājarrūm (1273/4-1323) (Troupeau 2014).
letter: an elongated kaf from Aceh, or an elaborately knotted ta marbuta in a surah heading (Gallop 2005), or in the al-kisah or other similar ‘paragraph words’ heralding a new chapter in a book (Figure VII).

And yet the recent appearance of an important manuscript suggests that by scouring Southeast Asian manuscripts, whether in Malay or even in Arabic, we may have been looking in the wrong place. A superbly calligraphed copy of the Mawlid Sharaf al-Anām, in Arabic with tiny interlinear Malay translation and characteristic late Ottoman illumination, was written in Mecca by a scribe from Sumbawa named Ibrahim al-Khulusi bin Wudd al-Jawi al-Sambawi (Figure VIII). The date in numerals of 1042 AH / 1632-3 AD given in the colophon is erroneous, for various internal and external features place the manuscript in the mid 19th century.12 A formal letter in Arabic sent in 1849/50 to the Ottoman governor of the Hijaz, thanking him for facilitating the hajj pilgrimage, was signed and sealed by ten Jawi and Yemeni ulama in Mecca including one ‘Ibrahim bin Wudd al-Jawi’, whose seal inscription reads Ibrahim al-Khulusi ibn Wuddin (Figure IX).13 Further evidence locating this personage as a master calligrapher in the Hijaz in the mid 19th century is found in a letter in Malay and Arabic written

---

12 According to Tim Stanley of the Victoria & Albert Museum, the illumination of this manuscript is in a late Ottoman style, and the layout of the text with two scripts of different sizes was not common in 17th century Ottoman manuscripts (pers. comm., 25 November 2014).
in Mecca in 1866 by Abdul Rahman bin Muhammad Saman of Kelantan to Sultan Abdul Hamid of Pontianak, in which he states that he had come to Mecca to study the ‘Istanbul style’ of writing (menyurat Istanbul),\(^ {14}\) and that he is currently being considered the successor to his ‘late teacher Syaikh Ibrahim al-Khulusi al-Sanbawi’ in teaching ‘Istanbul writing’, even though he modestly states that he feels unworthy as he is only about 30 years of age and his calligraphy is not yet good enough.\(^ {15}\) (The young Abdul

\(^ {13}\) BOA I˙DH 211/12286, reproduced in Gallop and Porter (2012: 48); with thanks to Tim Stanley for help in reading the seal inscription.

\(^ {14}\) According to Ahmad al-Fatani, this was the term used for the Thuluth style of calligraphy (‘Ada pun Khat Tsulas, iaitu khat yang maklum pada kita dengan Khat Istambuli yang kasar’, in Mohd. Shaghir 1997: 108).

\(^ {15}\) adalah patik yang fakir yang sudah lama zaman meninggal negeri Jawi dikesadakan hendak bermukim pada negeri Mekah yang amat mulia karena diharapkan boleh bertambah amal ibadat padanya di dalam sempurna menuntut ilmu yang memerlukan moral dan menyurat Istanbul yang disukai akan dia oleh tuan penghulu dan sahabat handai sekaliannya, ... bahwasanya adalah patik ini dengan berkat tuah duli tuanku bahawanya sudah dilatih? [d.l.a.t.t] orang besar2 di Mekah akan bahwa patik inilah jadi ganti k.m.w.lah al-marhum guru patik tuan Syaikh Ibrahim al-Khulusi al-Sanbawi yang masyhur itu ... pada pihak tolong mengajarkan segala muslimin menyurat Istanbulnya tetapnya patik ini belum lagi sempurna akalnya karena adalah umurnya
Rahman may perhaps be the ‘Abdurrahman Stambul’ who is said to have copied in 1867 a fine Qur’an now held in the Sultan’s Mosque on Penyengat, Riau.¹⁶) This manuscript is therefore an extraordinarily important missing link between the Malay and Middle Eastern/Ottoman manuscript traditions,¹⁷ and suggests that the finest Malay calligraphers should most probably be sought in the centres of Islamic learning, among the Jawi community in the holy cities in the Hijaz, their ultimate aim being to produce calligraphic masterworks in the style of their Arab or Ottoman teachers.

FIGURE VII. Hikayat Iskandar Zulkarnain, copied by Muhammad Hasan ibn Haji Abdul Aziz, probably in Batavia in the early 19th century. The illustration shows the calligraphic start of a new section, Kata sahib al-hikayat, in red ink outlined in black with striped and dotted ornamentation, followed by the word bermula in bold black ink, and on the last line the word syahdan in red ink. Leiden University Library, Cod. Or. 1967, vol.2, p. 249 (detail).

¹⁶According to an information label in the mosque (seen June 2007).
²⁴ INDONESIA AND THE MALAY WORLD

¹⁷The MS bears erased ownership inscriptions of ‘Sayid Ahmad bin Salam (?) bin Syaikh Abu Bakar, 13 Ulu Palembang’, showing that the MS was at some stage brought from Mecca to Sumatra.
Within the Malay world, one of the most impressive examples of calligraphy known is a letter from Sultan Mahmud Syah of Johor and Pahang written in 1811 from his palace in Lingga to Thomas Stamford Raffles in Melaka (No. 26). But on the same occasion Raffles received an equally sumptuously illuminated letter from a senior official at the same court, Sayid Muhammad Zain al-Kudsi, written just one day later, but in a poor, cramped hand, with no nod to aesthetic considerations, despite its luminous setting. This pair of letters bears witness to what is probably the heart of the matter in that there was no consistent institutional appreciation of the aesthetic aspect of Malay calligraphy in the courts of the archipelago, even though we now do know of, and will continue to discover, individual masterworks of highly skilled scribes.

**Palaeography**

In his pioneering study of Malay palaeography, Haji Wan Ali (1987: 3–5, 79–80) emphasises the distinction between calligraphy, the study of fine penmanship, in which scripts are evaluated primarily for their artistic and aesthetic qualities, and palaeography, the study of the historical development of old forms of handwriting. The study of Arabic script has historically always emphasised the calligraphic aspects, with little or no attention being paid to ‘common’ hands and their development over the course of time and in different parts of the Islamic world. In contrast, the palaeography of Western scripts is highly advanced, with a complex system of spatial and chronological classification which in some cases will allow a manuscript to be attributed to a particular region and to be dated to within a few decades on the basis of its handwriting alone. Against this background, Malay script could be said to have experienced the worst of both worlds: the paucity of identifiable artistic masterworks noted above has ensured its neglect by scholars of Islamic calligraphy, while the absence of a tradition of Arabic palaeography has hindered the study of ordinary Malay handwriting. Reflecting just how little known the Malay tradition is within the broader study of Islamic calligraphy, in two recent studies which have considered Southeast Asian manuscripts, the term ‘Jawi’ has been understood as a descriptor of a style of hand, rather than as the name of the script itself (Stanley 1999: 25; Blair 2008: 561). Even within Southeast Asian scholarship, the neglect is marked: as Ali (1987: 4) has pointed out, de Casparis’ study of Indonesian palaeography (1975) was restricted to Indic scripts used in the archipelago only up to 1500 AD.

The differences in development between studies of handwriting in Arabic and Latin script cannot simply be attributed to the elevated position of calligraphy within Islamic arts and therefore its claim of the lion’s share of attention; one fundamental reason for the disparity is the lack of visual differentiation in Arabic script over the recent centuries. This is not just an orientalist conceit — ‘the Oriental is slow to change’ (Shellabear 1901: 76) — for where differentiation of scripts does exist, for example between the earliest,
FIGURE VIII. Mawlid Sharaf al-Anām, copied in Mecca by Ibrahim al-Khulusi bin Wudd al-Jawi al-Sambawi, in Arabic with interlinear Malay translation. The colophon gives the date 1042 AH (1632/3 AD) in numerals, but the MS was most likely copied in the mid-19th century. Islamic Arts Museum Malaysia, 2014.5.14.
slanting Ħijāzī script, leading on to the angular Kufic or, rather, ‘early ‘Abbāsid’ scripts, a body of palaeographical studies is indeed concentrated. 21 However, after the codification of the six major Arabic scripts between the 10th and 13th centuries, relatively little evolution is seen through to the present day. Thus a manuscript in Arabic or Persian from the 12th century can still easily be read today by anyone literate in Arabic script, while a 12th-century manuscript in Latin script would be impossible without specialist training, not least because of the complex system of abbreviations used in European practice. On the other hand, over this same period, it is possible to discern certain regionally distinctive Arabic scripts, such as various styles of Maghribī from north Africa, Śūdānī from Sub-Saharan Africa, biḥārī from Sultanate India, and Şīnī from China (Safadi 1978: 23, 2; Blair 2008: 365–413, 559–75).

Turning to Southeast Asia, it has been pointed out that the blanket term of naskhi is by no means applicable as it stands, even though it is true that the hands in most Malay manuscripts approximate better to naskhi than to any other recognised script style. Quite a wide range of common Malay hands exist, and each may need further qualification, for example as Malay naskhi or Malay riqā’, or naskhi tending to riqā’, etc. 22 In a survey of Qur’ān manuscripts from Southeast Asia, Ali Akbar (2004: 62) – himself a trained calligrapher – found that even in such a hallowed arena, few of the classical

21 For references see Déroche (2005: 216).
conventions of Arabic calligraphy were adhered to, and concluded that local influences had a stronger impact.

To date there has only been one detailed palaeographical study of Malay manuscripts – an attempt by Roger Tol (2001) to see if an examination of certain letter forms, and preferences in combining words, could be used to identify positively and distinguish between the hands of Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi (No. 37) and his colleague the Bugis Husin bin Ismail (No. 35), one of the most prolific Malay scribes of the 19th century. Tol examined and then tracked the way of writing specific letter forms (for example superscript \( \text{ya} \)) and a habit of conjoining words (such as ‘\( \text{dan lagi} \)’) and was able to identify certain consistencies as well as inconsistencies in Abdullah and Husin’s handwritings, which might help to identify other manuscripts by these master scribes.

**Orthography**

If Malay palaeography has been almost completely neglected, this is not true for Malay orthography or spelling, which has been the subject of a considerable number of published studies from the late 19th century to the present day. Nonetheless, a fundamental theoretical problem besets many of these earlier studies. In addition to descriptive and analytical elements – looking at sources and attempting to evaluate the internal systems of the script – many combine a prescriptive role. In an earlier period these might have been designed as teaching aids for schools or for training officials for service in the colonial administration, while latterly the agenda has been to set national standards for spelling, such as that pursued by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka in Malaysia. And inevitably, many of the studies include disparaging comments about the ‘errors’ made by traditional scribes who ‘did not know how to spell’ Malay words correctly, particularly with respect to the representation of vowels.

In Arabic, long vowels are represented by the three semi-vowel letters \( \text{alif} \), \( \text{wau} \) and \( \text{ya} \), while short vowels can (optionally) be indicated by the use of vowel points above and below the line. Malay, however, to all intents and purposes does not distinguish between short and long vowels, but has a wider range of vowels than Arabic, and the three semi-vowels therefore have to do double duty, with \( \text{alif} \) corresponding to \( a \) and \( \varepsilon \); \( \text{wau} \) corresponding to \( u \), \( o \) and the diphthong \( au \), in addition to its role as the consonant \( w \); and \( \text{ya} \) corresponding to \( i \), \( e \) and the diphthong \( ai \), in addition to the consonant \( y \) (Lewis 1958: 19). It could be argued that the great variety encountered in the spelling of Malay words in Jawi script can largely be attributed to the use of a foreign alphabet singularly ill-suited to the purpose, particularly with respect to the representation of vowels. Many of the aforementioned studies spend an inordinate amount of time and energy on the representation of vowels in Jawi. However, in a helpful departure from earlier studies which have all attempted to identify patterns in the use of the semi-vowel letters, Kratz (1999: 53) has sought to explain the lack of consistency in the

---

23 Including Hudson (1892); Shellabear (1901), Van Ophuijssen (1902); Van Ronkel (1925); Mulder (1949); Madjolelo (1953); Lewis (1958); Kang (1986); Mohd. Shaghir (1997); Hashim (1999).

24 In general the Arabic letters are referred to throughout by their Malay names, as given in the Transliteration Chart at the end of this Introduction.
presence of vowels as arising from the move from the use of Indic syllabic scripts, where all vowels are represented, to the Arabic script where short vowels – and thus all Malay vowels – are, theoretically, not specified. Kratz (2002: 23) has further suggested that it is precisely the absence of any enforced system of consistency in orthography which has enabled Jawi script over the centuries to accommodate regional dialects and accents, but which paradoxically also supports occasional efforts to develop systems in certain places and at certain times. Such a ‘tradition of inconsistency’ inherent in the use of vowels in Jawi spelling appears to offer the best interpretation so far of the evidence found in manuscripts.

In my doctoral study of inscriptions on Malay seals, I had occasion to analyse the spellings of some common words, and found indeed an extraordinarily wide variety in the indication of vowels, ranging from the representation of all vowels, or some, to none at all. In a small sample of seals all dating from the 19th century, the title raja is spelt variously r.a.j.a (#1139, Siak),26 r.a.j (#1140, Siak), r.j.a (#561, Aceh) or just r.j (#1058, Deli), while the honorific paduka has been encountered in the following spellings: p.a.d.w.k27 (#1134, Siak), p.a.d.k (#761, Siak), p.d.w.k (#20, Brunei) or simply p.d.k (#1131, Siak). And as the above mainly Sumatran examples show, there is not necessarily any consistency between seals of similar provenance or period. Conversely, in Malay manuscripts one of the main mistakes in the spelling of Arabic stems from precisely this inconsistent use of alif, ya and wau to indicate vowels. Arabic orthographical errors in Malay manuscripts arise from both a surfeit and a deficiency of semi-vowels, but excessive use is probably the more common, as, for example, in the spelling w.a.h.y.d, wāḥīd, for w.a.h.d, wāḥīd, ‘one, sole, unique’, in a royal seal from Siak (#759).

Variation and lack of consistency in Malay spelling relates not only to the semi-vowel letters but also to consonants. This is particularly notable with consonantal sounds that are phonetically differentiated in Arabic but not in Malay, for example kaf and qaf, ta and ŏta, and ha and ŏha, while the glottal stop can be represented in Malay manuscripts equally well by any of the letters kaf, qaf or hamzah. A good example of a word this is often spelt in a variety of ways is the toponym ‘Kedah’. In a manuscript of the Hikayat Merong Mahawangsa, Maier (1988: 89) commented on the appearance of three variant spellings of the word Kedah on a single page (k.d.h, q.d.h and k.d. ŏh), and suggested that as ‘writing served oral-aural purposes rather than visuality, it was not necessary to make writing consistent to the eye’. Yet this theory cannot account for the extraordinary degree of variation encountered in seals, which certainly functioned as visual symbols. Of 42 seals from Kedah documented containing this placename, four variant spellings are encountered: on 19 seals it is spelt k.d.h; on 12 seals q.d.h; on 9 seals q.d.h; and on one seal k.d.h.

25 In tacit accordance with this concept of a ‘tradition of inconsistency’, Mohd. Shaghir (1997: 96–7) rejects the idea of a chronological development in Malay orthography, suggesting that in every age there were both pockets of conformity to certain spelling standards as well as deviations therefrom, due to a range of factors including regional orthographic norms and dialectical variations, and the degree of knowledge of Arabic.

26 Here and elsewhere, a number preceded by a hashtag # refers to the unique database reference number of each Malay seal documented in Gallop (2002).

27 In each of these examples, the letter pa is written as fa (with one dot).
One possible driver of variation in Malay spelling in some instances may be due to an inherent value ascribed to foreign associations. As noted above, a number of Arabic letters – 13 in total, ثحذصرطغفق – represent consonants not found in Malay, but have entered the Malay alphabet through their use in foreign (predominantly Arabic) loanwords. Occasionally, in some constructions in Jawi we find that letters which represent Arabic sounds not found in Malay were for this very reason sometimes regarded as more ‘prestigious’ or perhaps more ‘Islamic’. For example, Voorhoeve (1952: 339) cites a fragment in an Acehnese manuscript of a magic text ‘in Malay disguised as Arabic’ where the pure Malay word aku is written aqu, with qaf. This exaltation of letters associated with the source of the faith would explain why Arabic spellings were privileged even over other foreign Islamic sourcewords. Drawing again on seals, from Asahan in north-east Sumatra where we would expect to find on one royal seal (#1151) the name Sultan Ahmad Syah — the Persian loanword, Shāh, sy.a.h, ‘king’, having been for centuries a standard component of Malay regnal titles — instead we find inscribed Sultan Ahmad Sah, with the Arabic saḥ, s.h., meaning ‘authentic, true, valid’. Similarly, on another seal from Asahan of Datuk Bandar Sekar (#1148), we find the Persian loanword syahbandar, ‘harbour master’, rendered on the seal as šahbandar, s.h.b.n.d.r.

It is possible that a similar rationale may lie behind some variant spellings of the word Kedah on seals noted above. While the most usual form k.d.h uses the standard ‘Malay’ letters, there may also have been a tendency to make the spelling as ‘Arabic’ as possible by substituting ‘q’ for ‘k’ and ‘ḥ’ for ‘h’. The fact that the ‘Arabic’ spelling q.d.ḥ is used on three of the great seals of state of Kedah (#213, 214, 212), where the seal inscription is completely in Arabic, may support this suggestion, although there are no other clear grounds for differentiating between any of the other seals. And yet this reasoning certainly does not account for all such examples, or indeed explain the manuscript cited by Maier.

The prestige of ‘foreign’ spelling may possibly also explain the not infrequent use of syin for sin in titles and honorifics, although in this case, paradoxically, the source of foreign influence can be traced to Sanskrit, reflecting pre-Islamic associations. There is certainly a marked use of syin in older manuscripts for Malay words of Sanskrit origin such as seri, spelt syeri, sy.r.y or sy.r (as commented by Braginsky in No. 11). Nonetheless the use of syin is also not infrequently found in indigenous Malay words such as besar / besyar (No. 55). Most prominently, it also commonly used in the Arabic word sulṭān, which is spelt syulṭān in at least 12 Malay seals from all over the archipelago. In this case the use of syin should perhaps be interpreted not as reflecting pronunciation, but as simply adding visual emphasis to a prestigious title. 28

Although these variations in both consonants and vowels in the spelling of Malay words are of documentary interest, in a sense they were of little practical consequence as with few exceptions they did not affect the intelligibility of the words. As has been pointed out, it was ‘precisely the ambiguity of the Jawi script which facilitated communication over long distances since it allowed people to communicate with ease in writing Malay, irrespective of local discrepancies in the way of speaking the language’ (Kratz 1999: 54).

28 cf. Wieringa’s remarks in No. 21 on the use of final ha for baginda, i.e. bagindah.
The Jawi sourcebook

This Jawi sourcebook (henceforth Sourcebook) has therefore been compiled with the aim of presenting a body of material to enable a fresh look at Jawi script. The inspiration for the format is Michelle Brown’s *A guide to western historical scripts from antiquity to 1600* (Brown 1990), despite a complete reversal of theoretical grounding. Brown’s book presented photographic facsimiles of 52 manuscripts, each illustrating an acknowledged style of script in Latin letters, dating from the Roman period through to the era of Humanism, ranging over a wide variety of ‘national’ hands from different parts of western Europe, and covering both ‘book’ and ‘chancery’ hands. Conversely, in the absence of any recognized categorisation of Malay hands, all that this Sourcebook aims to do is to present, in chronological order, the raw material that could be utilised to advance the study of Malay palaeography and orthography. This has been done by selecting a corpus of (relatively) securely dated manuscripts, each of which can be (reasonably) located in specific geographic origins. Greater latitude has been given to undated but particularly early and hence important specimens of manuscript books (Nos. 3, 6), or manuscripts from rare locations, such as the mid 19th century manuscripts from Bima (No. 38) and Sri Lanka (No. 39). For each period equal attention has been paid to codices and documents, but for the 17th and early 18th century it has been much harder to source dated manuscript books compared to letters.

For individual entries, Brown’s format has been adopted, with a reproduction of a single page of each manuscript, and on the facing page a brief description of the manuscript giving its location and shelfmark with references to published catalogue entries or studies, followed by comments on the handwriting and a transcription of a few lines, with notes on particular details. Where possible, full-page illustrations of a manuscript page are given, ‘in order to give an overall impression of mise-en-page’ (Brown 1990: 1), but bearing in mind the relatively small dimensions of the print version of this journal, in some cases the decision has been made to crop the image to the borders of the text block to ensure that the reproduction of the text is of an optimal size for reading.

Contributors to the Sourcebook were therefore invited to select a dated manuscript of known origin, and to provide a description according to the prescribed format. Apart from general guidelines aimed at consistency of transliteration, format of entry and use of conventions, editorial intervention has been kept to a minimum, and contributors were invited to comment on whatever aspects of script or spelling struck them. Orthographical variations are noted, without prejudice; in a few cases, these appear to reflect local linguistic features, for example the use of alif indicating the vowel ‘a’ rather than e pépet in Brunei (Nos. 5, 56, 60), and the verbal forms of the Betawi dialect (No. 54). Presented below are some of the palaeographical themes that emerge.

Aspect and ductus

*Aspect* refers to the general appearance of a hand — whether horizontal or vertical, rounded or square or angular, and whether slanting to right or left; *ductus* refers to the way it is

---

29The hope is that the Sourcebook may also be used as a teaching aid and for reading practice, with students encouraged to continue reading the manuscript beyond the few transcribed lines provided.
written, its speed and care of execution, and the way that letters are formed (Brown 1990: 3). The direction and degree of slant of a hand is commented on by many contributors. But to what extent can impressionistic evaluations be systematised? Can, for example, the degree of tilting towards the left or the right from the vertical axis of upright letters or strokes of letters, such as alif and lam, be used to categorise hands as slanting to the left or the right? It does not seem quite so simple, for in one MS with a hand with a ‘notable diagonal slant’, the uprights are strictly vertical (No. 29). Nonetheless, disregarding ambiguous cases, there are a large number of examples which definitely slant to the left (Nos. 2, 17, 19, 20, 37, 41, 45, 49, 50), but also a considerable number which slant to the right (Nos. 5, 13, 16, 23, 26, 53, 58). It remains to be seen whether any more nuanced spatial or temporal patterning can be teased out of this data.

Until further detailed research has been carried out, the myriad variations in the writing of Jawi letter forms themselves should simply be regarded as representing the range of manifestations of Jawi script, but just a few comments can be made on certain specific letters. The two distinct ways of writing the letter kaf – firstly with a single pen-stroke, generally yielding a horizontally elongated letter, and secondly the ‘normal’ kaf, written with two penstrokes – often coincide in a single manuscript, with few indications of any reason for the scribe’s preferences (Nos. 28, 49, 55). The letter sin may sometimes be written without its initial two small curves or ‘teeth’ (Nos. 12, 34, 36). In another manifestation of this letter, the large stylised initial sin of salam which opens Raja Ali Haji’s letter (No. 47) has been identified by van der Putten as a characteristic feature of the great man’s epistles, and it would be interesting to explore if there are similar examples of highlighting the initial letter or word of a text.

Speaking admittedly on the basis of a very small sample of manuscripts, primarily Qur’ans, Sheila Blair’s comments on the ‘general’ features of the aspect of Southeast Asian hands are nonetheless of interest in view of the magisterial breadth of her study of Islamic calligraphy:

The text in these Koran manuscripts from south-east Asia is written in a regular and even naskh like that used in other dated documents and manuscripts from the region. It shares many features with the bihari style developed in the subcontinent. Letters are posed on a flat baseline, but slant markedly to the left and are very angular in basic construction, despite their slightly rounded edges. The initial ba’ in the basmala is heightened so that it is as tall as alif or lam. (Blair 2008: 563)

This heightened ba of bismillah can be seen in Nos. 20 and 39.

**Ligatures**

One of the most striking comments is the pervasive extent to which letters which, according to standard rules for writing Arabic (and Jawi), should not be joined to the following letter, disregard this convention. This can be seen with ra, dal and wau joining to final ra, ha or ta marbuta, in words such as surat, serta, sudah and laut. It should be stressed that this phenomenon is not unique to the Malay world, for in the broader Islamic context, there are many other examples of the use of ligatures which contravene the normal conventions. For example, shikasta script evolved in
order to allow calligraphers to write nastāʾīq faster: ‘In shikasta, calligraphers are allowed to make more unauthorised connections than in regular nastāʾīq, joining alif, dal/ ḍhal, ra’/za’/zha’, and waw to the next letter’ (Blair 2008: 441). As a result, calligraphers could write a single word or even a line without lifting the pen from the paper, as unauthorised connections were permitted not just between letters, but even between words. Returning to Malay, this feature is perhaps most prominent in the word surat, often positioned in the opening line of epistles (Nos. 5, 7, 13, 14, 30). Further investigation is needed to see whether or not there is a chronologically significant dimension to the spread of this practice, which perhaps can even be elevated to the position of a characteristic feature of Malay hands (cf. comments by Ali Akbar in No. 20).

Another ligature which has received comment is the joining to final ha or ta marbuta, which is often treated inconsistently by the same scribe. In a MS from Jambi, Braginsky has differentiated between the form of the ligature following the letter ra, and the tilde-like ligature following ‘bowl’-shaped letters such as nun and ba (No. 36). However, some scribes treat the same combination of letters differently even within the same line (as noted by Mulaika Hijjas in No. 44).

Dots: presence or absence thereof

Many of the writers have commented on how, when, where and why the dots above and below certain letters are written, with particular reference to pa/fa and kaf/ga. From the evidence of the manuscripts in the Sourcebook, fa (written with one dot) is used interchangeably with pa (written with three dots), and with consistent inconsistency, with both forms even appearing on the same page in different occurrences of the same word (see van der Putten’s comment in No. 6). Indeed, Haji Wan Ali (1987: 37–8) has gone so far as to suggest that since Malay scribes seem to use the two forms indistinguishably, fa/pa should be regarded as a single letter. Yet there may be a discernible evolutionary trend towards use of one dot (i.e. the letter fa) for pa, as relatively few examples of pa with three dots are found in 19th-century manuscripts compared with those from the 17th century (though Sugahara noted both one and three dots used in a single word in No. 31). Pa with three dots is found in the sole example of Javanese in Pėgon script in the Sourcebook (No. 33).

No letter shows as much variation in its representation as ga, which is encountered either entirely without dots (and thus indistinguishable from kaf), with one dot above or below, or with three dots above or below, or with the extra parallel diagonal top stroke as in the Persian gaf (as observed by Farouk in No. 51). Tol has identified as a characteristic feature of Munsyi Abdullah’s handwriting that ga is always dotted to distinguish it from kaf (No. 37), a distinction not observed by Husin (No. 35).

In some cases, writing practices may reflect regional influences. In Acehnese manuscripts and seals, ca is often written like jim, with one dot underneath rather than three (Voorhoeve 1952: 343). The Javanese letter dha (dal with one or three dots underneath) is another case in point, occurring not only in the one example in Javanese (No. 33) but also in a number of Malay manuscripts, from Brunei (No. 5), Banten (Nos. 4, 11) and Sri Lanka (No. 39); it remains to be investigated whether usage can always be related to Javanese influence (cf. Wieringa 2003: 511–14).
The cases discussed above involve scenarios where the scribe has made a decision as to how many dots to use, or not.\(^{30}\) A different issue is how the dots are actually drawn on the paper by the scribe, for example whether the pen is lifted off the paper each time to give one, two or three clear dots (e.g. Nos. 3, 4), or whether shortcuts are taken. Most commonly, we find that a scribe may conjoin two dots yielding a short horizontal dash, and that therefore three dots are represented by one dot with a dash above or below representing the two further dots (Nos. 17, 32). In other cases, even for three dots the scribe does not lift his pen off the paper at all, and the resulting mark sometimes resembles the numeral ‘2’ (Nos. 14, 38, 44, 53, 56).

An interesting ‘primary secondary’ source on this topic is Syaikh Ahmad Patani’s diatribe on the scribal practice of not bothering to use the requisite number of dots, in his work of 1903, *Hadiqat al-azhar*. He understands that this practice has traditionally never had an adverse effect on reading or recitation, but it has caused him enormous problems at the Malay press in Mecca in preparing texts for publication using metal type, assisted by print workers who do not know Malay.\(^{31}\)

Some distinctive Malay hands

In the light of the preceding comments, and on the basis of the contributions to the Sourcebook, what can we say so far about the palaeography of Malay script? Firstly, it is important to recognise a fundamental methodological difference between the study of calligraphy and palaeography. While individual calligraphic masterpieces – such as the *kitab mawlid* of Ibrahim al-Sambawi discussed above – can be approached as works of art in their own right, a prerequisite for palaeographical research is the assembling of a group of manuscripts which share certain graphical features.\(^{32}\) In other words, individual documents, however significant, cannot shed light on the palaeography or orthography of a certain place or time unless they can be contextualised. This was observed most eloquently and forcefully with respect to the Malay world by Haji Wan Mohd. Shaghir (emphasis added at end):

Most scholars have assumed that the Terengganu Stone and the ‘*Aqaid* of al-Nasafi each represent the Malay Jawi script of their period, and they regard the spelling and letter forms as illustrating the style of writing of those centuries. My view is that neither of these inscriptions can be regarded as representing the Malay Jawi script of

\(^{30}\)For variation in the broader Islamic world, see Déroche (2005: 220–1) on the Maghribi practice of dotting fā’ and qāf.

\(^{31}\)Dan adalah kebanyakan orang menyurat sekarang ini memudah-mudah mereka itu dengan tiada ditaruhkan titik padanya kerana memadai mereka itu dengan qarinah ibarat jua [‘The majority of people writing now take the easy way out and don’t bother with dots because as long as it can be read that’s enough for them’] (Mohd. Shaghir 1997: 108).

\(^{32}\)A crucial first step in the methodology of palaeography must therefore be to establish a system of classification. In order to develop a typology of the various types of writing, palaeographers start by assembling a series of documents preferably dated or dateable, displaying similar graphical features; ideally, these documents should also contain reliable evidence of their geographical origin’ (Déroche 2005: 208).
their times, because there are still shortcomings [in our knowledge]. For both the Terengganu Stone (702 AH/1303 AD) and the ‘Aqaid of al-Nasafi (998 AH/1590 AD) we have no information on the background or the biographical details of the writer, for neither inscription records the name of the scribe. Did the scribe really write according to the general prescriptions of that time? This question simply can’t be answered. A manuscript with no comparable examples cannot be said to be representative of its time.\[^{33}\]

Secondly, despite the primary aim of palaeography as ‘the science or art of deciphering and determining the date of ancient documents of systems of writing’, it would appear to be difficult to use palaeographical considerations as an indicator of age of Malay manuscripts, because letter forms particularly associated with older manuscripts — such as the use of three distinct dots for pa mentioned above — do continue to appear in later periods. To some extent this is also the case for orthography, for features long considered archaic such as the use in Malay words of the Arabic ‘doubling’ diacritical mark called tashdid or shaddah to indicate the vowel e̱pé̱e̱t in the preceding syllable have continued to be found well into the 19th century (Jones 2005, as noted by Braginsky in No. 11). We also see the spelling atawa for atau (a.t.w.a) in a MS of 1882 from Taiping; perhaps the subject matter of divination encouraged the preservation of antiquarian features in the text (No. 51).

More fruitful, though, is the possibility of discerning regional and perhaps even socio-cultural contextual clusters, which may in themselves imply certain chronological boundaries. Such a methodology cannot account for all examples in the Sourcebook — many of which are isolated in space and time — or cover the whole archipelago, for some regions swim into focus more clearly than others, and in all cases would need further research to establish the characteristic features of each group. The following, however, are suggestions for a few such clusters which may fruitfully be investigated further.

For example, there may be an ‘Acehnese religious book hand’, apparent primarily in religious works from Aceh from the late 18th and 19th centuries, which seem to share certain features of handwriting: a small, rounded hand, with a slight slope to the left (Nos. 17, 19). These manuscripts are often written using a brownish-black ink, which only rarely contains iron gall, for this group of manuscripts is less frequently associated with the ‘ink burn’ problems which are so prevalent in some groups of manuscripts from the Malay world.\[^{35}\] It should be stressed that this cautious


\[^{34}\] Quoted in Déroche 2005: 205.

\[^{35}\] This association of related characteristics indicates the value of considering palaeography in the context of other codicological features of a manuscript.
Another distinctive cluster of manuscripts manifests what could perhaps be called the ‘19th century Straits scribal hand’, reflecting the output of a group of professional scribes working in a commercial context and centred in the environs of Singapore and Melaka, and responsible for a large volume of manuscripts held in libraries today. This hand is often highly proficient and disciplined, with angular letter-forms such as dal, and a marked slope to the left. The preeminent practitioner was Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi (No. 37), and Tol (2001) has given an exposition of the features of his style, including the care he took to distinguish between kaf and ga, and the stylish use of ‘superscript ya’ and looped tail of nga. Other scribes in this school include the prolific Husin bin Ismail (No. 35), and also the scribes of Nos. 50 and 51.36

The ‘Straits scribal hand’ is rather different in appearance from the slightly earlier (late 18th-early 19th century) ‘Kedah scribal hand’ as manifest in the works of Ibrahim (No. 25) – a Chulia from Penang, whose father Hakim Long Fakir Kandu had moved to Penang from Kedah in the early days of the settlement – and also in other Kedah/Penang manuscripts such as Nos. 24 and 32.37 The ‘Kedah’ hand is small and rounded and essentially upright without any discernible slant to left or right; a characteristic feature is the large tail of ha / jim / ca.

In European palaeographical studies, a distinction which is often utilised is between ‘book’ hands, and ‘chancery’ or ‘documentary’ hands. It appears that such a distinction may sometimes, but certainly not always, be applied usefully in a Malay-world context. The above-mentioned Ibrahim, who was Raffles’s chief scribe in Penang and later in Melaka, and was responsible for writing Raffles’s diplomatic correspondence with neighbouring Malay states, has left a large body of both manuscript books and documents, and there is no evident difference between his book and chancery hand (Gallop 1994: 157). However, elsewhere a distinctive style of handwriting may only have been observed in a body of documents, and this is the case with the ‘Maluku chancery hand’, evident in royal letters from Ternate (No. 22) and Tidore (No. 23), as well as many other documents from the royal courts of the Moluccas. Characteristic of this style is a pronounced diagonal slant to the right of the script – despite upright vertical strokes – particularly manifest in the almost obtuse-angled form, resembling a ‘v’, of the ‘bowl’-shaped final letters such as nun, nya and ya, and even in ligatures that might lend themselves to a loop or bowl, such as final ha or ta marbuta.

From the earliest days of the late 16th century right up to the early 20th century, letters and documents from the royal chancery of Brunei have displayed a very high level of calligraphic competency (Nos. 1, 5). No surviving manuscript

36 A similarly coherent group of manuscripts manifest what could be called the ‘Batavia Government Secretariat hand’, being the output of scribes associated with the Algemeene Secretarie in Batavia in the middle two quarters of the 19th century (cf. Voorhoeve 1964; Rukmi 1997; and many examples in Wieringa 1998). No examples are found in the present Sourcebook, but for an illustration of a typical hand see Figure VII.

37 However, the hand of Ibrahim’s brother, Ahmad Rijaluddin is not representative of this small group (No. 27).
books from Brunei from the early period are known, but from the late 19th century onwards into the first half the 20th century large numbers of literary and historical manuscripts are known from Brunei, nearly all held in collections within Brunei itself. In these manuscripts can be seen a highly distinctive ‘Brunei book hand’ with pronounced local characteristics – very low and horizontal, and generally upright without a marked slant to left or right, and very cursive, with clusters of dots all written with a single penstroke, and with orthography reflecting Brunei dialectal pronunciation (Nos. 56, 60).

At a recent workshop on Malay manuscripts, held on 7 November 2014 at the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures at the University of Hamburg, a specialist on west African manuscripts asked Ulrich Kratz whether it was possible to identify the regional origin of a Malay manuscript from the style of the handwriting. Ulrich’s response was that attempting to answer this question at the present would be akin to trying to run before one could walk. It is hoped that this Jawi Sourcebook may at least help to take a few steps in the right direction.

A note on transliteration of Jawi/Arabic script

The Jawi alphabet has been transliterated as shown in the chart below. In general, the romanisation or transcription of Malay and Arabic used in this Sourcebook follows the Library of Congress system (Barry 1997). Malay words are transcribed from Jawi script in their standard spelling as given in the Malaysian Kamus Dewan or the Indonesian Kamus besar bahasa Indonesia, depending on the preference of individual contributors. In general, if a word of Arabic origin appears in one of the two standard dictionaries mentioned above, it is treated as a Malay loanword and given in its Malay/Indonesian spelling, unless it appears within an Arabic grammatical context in a complete phrase or sentence, in which case it is treated as an Arabic word. This principle means that Malay words of Arabic origin might be transcribed differently at different points in the same text or even sentence. Personal names and titles of Arabic origin of Southeast Asians are generally given in the usual Malay spelling (thus Sultan Abdullah not Sulṭān ‘Abd Allāh), while those of non-Southeast Asians are given in their Arabic forms (‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī). Arabic titles of works in Malay are generally given without diacritics in headings (eg. Taj al-salatin), but may on occasion be transcribed according to Arabic norms. The following editorial conventions are used:

- **maka**: Underlining is used for words vocalised in Jawi
- `<maka>`: Angled brackets indicate words added above the line
- `[maka]`: Text added by editor
- `{maka}`: Text to be disregarded in editor’s opinion
- `/`: Line breaks
- `|`: End of a line of verse
- `||`: End of a stanza
- `…`: Text not read or missing
### Transliteration chart for the Arabic/Jawi alphabet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jawi letter</th>
<th>Romanised form</th>
<th>Arabic name</th>
<th>Malay name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>bā’</td>
<td>ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>bā’</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>thā’</td>
<td>thah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>jīm</td>
<td>jim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>[Persian che]</td>
<td>ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>hā’</td>
<td>ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>khā’</td>
<td>kha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dōl</td>
<td>dal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>dhōi</td>
<td>dhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>rā’</td>
<td>ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>zā’</td>
<td>zai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sīn</td>
<td>sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š</td>
<td>sy in Malay; sh in Arabic</td>
<td>shīn</td>
<td>syin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sād</td>
<td>sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dād</td>
<td>dad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>tā’</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>zo’</td>
<td>za</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jawi letter</th>
<th>Romanised form</th>
<th>Arabic name</th>
<th>Malay name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ع</td>
<td>ُ</td>
<td>‘āyn</td>
<td>‘ain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غ</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>ghayn</td>
<td>ghain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>nga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f (or p in Malay)</td>
<td>fā’</td>
<td>fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>qōf</td>
<td>qaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>kāf</td>
<td>kaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>[Persian gof]</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>lām</td>
<td>lam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>mīm</td>
<td>mim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>nūn</td>
<td>nun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>wāw</td>
<td>wou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>hā’</td>
<td>ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>yā’</td>
<td>ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>ْn</td>
<td>nya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>ْ</td>
<td>hamzah</td>
<td>hamzah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ؤ</td>
<td>-et</td>
<td>tā’</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ة</td>
<td>أ</td>
<td>marbūta</td>
<td>marbuta; ta bersimpul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 BRUNEI, 1599

Letter from the Sultan of Brunei


Seville, Archivo General de Indias, MP Escritura y Cifra, 32 (Leg. Filipinas, 18B, R.9, N.132\1\1).

This letter is perhaps the earliest known Malay epistle which conforms fully to the structure of formal Malay letters familiar from many thousands of examples which survive from the next three centuries. The text commences with opening compliments (puji-pujian) naming the sender and recipient, followed by the contents proper, and closes with the conventional plea to not scorn the accompanying gift for being ‘no more than a single flower’ (jangan diaibkan, upama bunga setangkai jua adaunya). Vocalised words are underlined in the transcription below.

Transcription (lines 1–4):

Surat kasih dari bawah ¹ diu pertiuan² paduka seri sultan di Brunei³ datang kepada Dong Prasisko Tilo⁴ kapitan jenar / kuhurnadur di kota negeri Mainila⁵ yang termasyur pada sekalian negeri⁶ melimpahkan adil dan syafkat⁷ akan / segala dagang dan miskin dalam negeri Mainila lagi amat murah pada berkasih-kasihan dengan segala raja-raja dan / segala orang besar².⁸ Adapun surat senyor kapitan dari Mainila yang dibawa Irnando⁹ dan Don Prasisko Tahir¹⁰ /

¹ Wau is joined to the following final ha.
² Pa generally has three dots.
³ Spelt b.r.n.y, as in No. 5; compare this with the spelling b.w.r.n.y in No. 56.
⁴ Spelt d.ng p.r.s.s.k.w t.y.l.w, i.e. Don Francisco Tello
⁵ R. Orlina notes that this spelling, m.y.n.y.l, reflects the original vernacular pronunciation ‘Mainila’.
⁶ Ga is written here with one dot below, but is undotted in segala at the start of the next line.
⁷ Arabic shafaqat, ‘compassion, mercy’.
⁸ Punctuation is provided in the form of small circle, signifying the end of the opening compliments and the start of the contents proper.
⁹ a.r.n.n.d.w
¹⁰ d.n.p.r.s.s.k.w t.a.h.r

Annabel Teh Gallop
FIGURE 1. Letter from Brunei, 1599. Archivo General de Indias, 18B, R.9, N.132\1\1 (cropped).
2 IDI, SUMATRA, 1608

A letter from Idi

Letter from Idi to the Dutch captain at Patani, 1608. 1 f. Van Ronkel (1902).
The Hague, Nationaal Archief, [reference unknown].

This manuscript is described in a contemporary Dutch hand as Copia van eene brief int maleys mij geson-
den van Siam comende van eene opra t’ soulu mandory die mij alhier geworden is op den 21 Octobris 1608 door
Eg. Chianes (?), ‘Copy of a letter in Malay sent to me from Siam originating from one opra t’ soulu
mandory, that reached me here on the 21 October 1608 through Eg. Chianes (?).’ However, the final
words tamat al-itmām, ‘finis’, written at a diagonal slant at the end of the text, raise the possibility that
this may in fact be an original epistle, written in a brisk, small, neat and very competent hand.

Although the sender is not named in the text and the letter may indeed have been conveyed via
Siam as per the annotation, it appears to have been composed by a senior personage in the state
of Idi, on the north-east coast of Sumatra (in present-day Aceh), to the Dutch captain at Patani.
The writer complains about the coarse behaviour of the Dutch factor (fetor) recently appointed at
Idi, whereas a certain Yakub (Jacob?) had already won the trust of the ruler and ministers of state
for his profound knowledge and understanding of local customs (tiada siapa lagi akan tahukan istiadat
raja-raja dan menteri dalam negeri Idi).

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Kasih mesra a.q.r.a.n1 d.y.c.k datang2 kepada kapitan Wolanda di Patani, syahdan yang amat bijaksyana
terlalu elok pekeri amat budiman pada pekerjaan segala3 / raja-raja dan menteri, dipeliharakan Allah dar-
ipada bahaya dunia dan daripada segala kejahatan. Adapun kemudian daripada itu beta memberi tahu
kepada kapitan bahwa / perbuatan yang telah lalu karena kapitan itu orang ternama daripada raja2 di
negeri Wolanda itu, maka antara itu kapitan menyu-
arcikan nama kapitan dan jangan kapitan beroleh kecelaan autāny,4 antara itu sentiasa kapitan menyuruh
orang pada barang di mana5 / kapitan beroleh ternama.6 Adapun pada ketika ini kapitan tinggalkan fetor
dalam negeri Idi kapitan adalah beroleh kecelaan, bertambah segala Wolanda /

1 Could this be akbrab, with the final nun a mistake for a ba, with the dot placed above instead of below
the bowl? And yet the letter forms are very clearly written, and there are few orthographical errors in
this letter.
2 Nga is written with one dot.
3 Ga is written with one dot underneath.
4 a.w.t.?ny. Possibly Arabic autān, plural of watān, ‘homeland’.
5 Three small diagonal lines are used at the end of this word to fill up the line.
6 Vocalised.

Annabel Teh Gallop
3 ACEH [?], BEFORE 1624

Tafsir Surat al-Kahf

A commentary on the 18th sura of the Qur’an, al-Kahf, ‘the Cave’, probably composed and copied in the sultanate of Aceh around the turn of the 17th century. The MS also contains on ff. 132r-133r a tradition citing ‘Ali as an authority, and on reciting the shahāda. Undated, but from the Erpenius collection and therefore prior to 1624 in date. 135 ff.; European paper, watermarked ‘L G’ and a unicorn; 13 x 9.6 cm. Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 112); Riddell (2014: 120–39).
Cambridge University Library, ii.6.45, f. 5r.

The Arabic text of the Qur’anic verses is written in red ink, with the Malay translated text and accompanying commentary written in black ink. The Malay text is fully vocalised until folio 14, after which vocalisation is sporadic. The handwriting is legible and well formed, with letter shapes often being more square than rounded.

Transcription (lines 1–6):

... mereka itu bahhwa\(^1\) Allah beranak. Hanya dikatakan mereka itu / katanya demikian dengan sangkanya yang jahat juwa / menukasi Allah demikian itu sebab mereka itu / tuha-tuhanya\(^2\) dahulu juwa. ... (Arabic text) ... Dan tiada bagi datu nini\(^3\) mereka itu pun pengetahwan mengatakan kata demikian itu.

\(^1\)In other cases in this MS, tashdid is used in Malay words to indicate the e pepēt in the preceding syllable.
\(^2\)Spelt t.w.h t.h.a.ny. This is an archaic form with the medial ‘h’.
\(^3\)This is a Minang form.

Peter G. Riddell
4 BANTEN, 1635

Letter from Pangeran Anom

Letter to King Charles I of England from Pangeran Anom, who was the junior co-ruler of Banten, who ruled alongside his father Pangeran Ratu from c. 1635 until his death in c. 1650. 2 ff.; European paper; 32.5 x 15.5 cm; no seal or letter heading; damaged and torn down middle. Transcription and translation in Gallop (2003: 421–3); transcription in Pudjiastuti (2007: 21–4); text in MCP.

Kew, National Archives, SP 102/4/37.

In this letter, Pangeran Anom informs Charles I that Banten is at war with the Dutch in Jayakatera, and asks for assistance from the English, at the very least in the form of armaments.

The letter is written in a small and neat but confident hand, with a slight slope to the left. Of particular note are the letters kaf and ga: sometimes these are exaggerated horizontally and written ‘long’ with a single penstroke, but in other cases are written ‘short’ with the more usual two strokes; and ga is sometimes written without dots and sometimes with three dots underneath. There does not seem to be a discernible pattern behind the scribe’s decision; in some cases a word which occurs twice is written differently each time (eg. Inggeris in lines 2 and 3 with the ‘long’ ga, and in line 11 with ‘short’ ga).

Transcription (lines 1–4):

Ini surat dhari-pada ¹ Pangeran Anom yang mempunyai ² perintah negeri ³ Banten dhatang kepada ⁴ / Raja Inggeris. Adapun ka[m] ⁵ Pangiran Anum berkirim surat kepada Raja / Inggeris memberi khabar akan Raja Inggeris [a]kan hal Raja Banten sekaran sekarang berparang / dhengan ⁶ orang Wolanda.

¹Here and elsewhere in this letter in many cases where we would expect to find the Malay letter dal the scribe has used the Pégón letter dha (dal with three dots underneath).
²Pa is always written clearly with three dots.
³Ga is written here without dots, and is written with a single penstroke and exaggerated horizontally.
⁴In this case kaf is written with two strokes.
⁵Appears to be spelt k.a.d.y
⁶Spelt with dha not dal.

Annabel Teh Gallop
5 BRUNEI, BETWEEN 1630 AND 1661

Letter from the Raja Bendahara

Letter from the Raja Bendahara Paduka Seri Maharaja Permaisuara of Brunei to ‘Sennyor Kapitan Inggeris’, the head of the English trading settlement at Jambi, on the east coast of Sumatra; undated. The English East India Company was present in Jambi from 1615 until the factory was destroyed in the attack on Jambi by Johor in 1679. The ruler of Jambi named in the letter as Pangiran Adipati probably refers to Pangiran Dipati Anom who ruled under that name from 1630 to 1661, when he took the title Pangiran Ratu, and the letter was therefore most likely written during his reign. 1 f. (damaged); European paper; 16.5 x 24 cm. Shellabear (1898: 111–12, 139–43); Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 106).

London, British Library, Harley Ch 43 A 6

This letter accompanied an embassy from the sultan of Brunei led by three senior officials — Seri Laila Diraja, Seri Setia Pahlawan and Seri Raja Khatib — to the court of Jambi, with a request to purchase sendawa, saltpetre (an essential component of gunpowder) and kain gabar, blankets. Shellabear (1898: 112) noted that ‘the handwriting of this letter is particularly good’ and further commented ‘the letter dal is here frequently written with three dots under it, which appears to me to be an indication of Javanese influence’. The paper is damaged at the end of each line, with varying degrees of loss of text, although many words/letters can be reconstructed from the context.

Figure 5a. The names of the three Brunei envoys to Jambi.

Transcription (lines 1–5):

Surat 1 ikhlas yang tiada berputusan mesra yang tiada berantara terang cuaca netiasa 2 daripada 3 beta Raja Bendahara Paduka Seri Maharaja Permaisuara 4 di negeri / Brunei datang kepada Sennyor Kapitan Inggeris yang di negeri Jambi itu 5 yang terlalu amat 6 ‘aqlilha dharipada’ segala seterus lawannya dan isalah yang amat setiawan dari pada segala [handai] / taulannya dan isalah yang amat termasyhur pada segala negeri khabarna lagi sangat berbuat derma akan segala fakir dan miskin dan isalah yang menyampaikan haj[at] / dan maksud segala hamba Allah yang bersahaja kepadanya, maka jadi masyhurlah khabarnya yang demikian itu pada segala negeri, maka jadi berbangkitlah berahi dendam s . . . / khabar yang demikian itu. Amma ba’dahu . . .

1 Ra is joined to ta.
2 Shellabear (1898: 139) notes this is the Javanese nityasa, from the Sanskrit nityaça, the Malay form being sentiasa or senentiasa.
3 From this point on the words are much damaged by creasing.
4 Note the alif above the wau--ra ligature, giving the characteristic Brunei form Permaisuara instead of the standard Permaisura.
5 Note the unusual stylish deep bowl of initial ya.
6 In all occurrences of amat in this letter, mim is not joined to ta.
7 The first dal of daripada has three dots underneath, i.e. the Javanese Pégon letter dha.

Annabel Teh Gallop
FIGURE 5. Letter from the Raja Bendahara of Brunei, between 1630 and 1661. British Library, Harley Ch 43 A 6 (cropped).
6 HILA, AMBON, BETWEEN 1653 AND 1662

Hikayat Tanah Hitu

This work was originally written by Sifar al-Rijali during his exile in Makassar between 1647 and 1653. The copying of this manuscript was done in Ambon most probably at the behest of the Nusatapi family. 106 ff.; European paper from the second half of the 17th century, the last 14 pages with fool's cap watermark and a VOC contra mark; 32 x 20 cm. Straver, Fraassen and Putten (2004). Leiden University Library, Cod. Or. 5448, f. 24v.

This manuscript contains a unique, and almost complete, copy of the Hikayat Tanah Hitu, most probably written in Hila on the island of Ambon in the Moluccas, in the late 1650s. The handwriting is plain with rather long strokes above the line (especially kaf) and elongated final ta. The spelling is rather regular with some peculiarities indicating the age of the manuscript. One characteristic is the inclusion of the tashdid in Malay words indicating a schwa in the previous syllable, such as in telah and sehelai, but also in words where this is not the case, such as sirri (cf. Jones 2005: 289). We also find the assimilation of the two vowels in certain words, such as bulum for belum and kiris for keris. Another peculiarity is vocalization of some Malay words (underlined below) which may indicate a certain unfamiliarity of the copyist with the word. This seems to be the case with the word melawat in the example below, which is vocalized as malalat and malalawt in the text.

Transcription (lines 6–14):


1The initial letter seems to have three dots above indicating a pa, while the second instance of this word on this page it starts with a fa.
2Consistently spelt as k.y.r.s.
3Final nasals are quite often mixed up, such as the final -n instead of -m for Seram, and the final -h may occur where it usually does not (membawah for membawa) and be left out where it is usually included (sirri for sirih, or suda for sudah), which is not an uncommon practice in the orthography of Malay manuscripts.

Jan van der Putten
7 TAMONTAKA, MINDANAO, 1701

Letter from Sultan Jalaluddin

Letter from Sultan Jalaluddin of Maguindanao to the Spanish Governor-General in Manila, Domingo de Zabalburu; dated 23 Ramadan 1112 (2 March 1701). 1 f.; Spanish paper; 42 x 33 cm. Lampblack round seal, inscribed al-mu'ayyad billah Sultan Jalaluddin.

Seville, Archivo General de Indias, MP-Escritura y cifra, 63.

Sultan Jalaluddin Bayanul Anwar is writing to Governor-General Domingo Zabalburu de Echevarri about the usurpation of the sultanate and subsequent chaos brought about by Sultan Kaharuddin Kuda and betrayal by the Suluks.

Although the text is written in a clearly defined naskh hand, the scribe has made a number of mistakes or omissions which have been corrected either by superscript insertions, writing directly over the erroneous text, or erasure. In this letter, full vocalisation has generally been used for Spanish words and for clarification, and is reflected in the transcription by underlining.

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Bahwa ini surat daripada Paduka Sri Sultan Jalaluddin ibn al-Sultan Muhammad Syah Sultan Magindanao datang kepada sahabat kami / Senyor Don Domingo de Sabalburu gobernador y capitan hennad de Filipinas. Amma ba’d kemudian surat yang dibawah itu adapun surat yang dibawah oleh Kapitan Do(n) Miguel Malapas dan Agustin Diaz Barada itu < dan surat yang dibawah oleh mengutus > telah sampailah kepada kami pada ketika yang baik dan pada hari yang sentosa ...

Final line:
pada tiga hari bulan Ramadan pada tahun seribu seratus dua tahun pada huruf dal akhir.

1 Spelt here s.ḥ.ḥ.ḥ.t, although Wilkinson (1985: 435) distinguishes between s.ḥ.ḥ.ḥ.t, sahabat, ‘friend’, and s.ḥ.ḥ.ḥ.t, subbat, ‘friendship’. Subbat is often encountered in a mystical Sufi (tasawwuf) context.
2 i.e., gobernador y capitan general de Filipinas, ‘governor and captain general of the Philippines’.
3 Usually used in khutbah (sermons), but also a common component of formal Malay letters.
4 Don Miguel Malapas and Agustin Diaz Barada.
5 Tiga is a correction superimposed on sepuluh.
6 Likur, the vigesimal, is used: tiga likur = 23.
7 Dal akhir, the last falsal in the traditional 8-year cycle.

Roderick Orlina
8 AMBON, 1702

Hikayat Isma Yatim

This hikayat (prose narrative) is contained in the last of three MSS bound together that formerly belonged to Valentijn (see No. 12). According to the colophon, this MS was copied by an anonymous scribe on 3 Syaaban 1113 (2 January 1702). 132 pp.; Dutch paper; 23.7 x 18.3 cm. [Jones] (1974: 38–9); a facsimile edition of the MS was published in 1994 (Syair perang et al. 1994). More than 20 MSS of Hikayat Isma Yatim are listed by Tol and Witkam (1993: ix). The first European mention of this work occurs in the list of MSS belonging to Isaac de St Martin in 1696 (de Haan 1900: 299, 300). Published by Roorda van Eysinga (1821), an anonymous editor (Hikayat 1901) and Tol and Witkam (1993), the hikayat is discussed by Siti Hawa Haji Salleh (1987), Muhammad Haji Salleh (1988) and Braginsky (2004: 400–4).

Kuala Lumpur, Muzium Seni Asia, MS UM 81.63 (3), p. 76.

Combining fantastical and didactic elements, Hikayat Isma Yatim is an unusual work, as its protagonist is not a gallant and amorous prince, but an intellectual, man of letters and high court official. Therefore Valentijn (1724-6, III–1: 26) called this work ‘very useful for making someone a vigilant ruler and outstanding servant of the state’. The preface of the hikayat mentions a certain Ismail as its author. Judging from the title of the author’s royal patron, Ismail lived in Aceh in the era of either Sultan Iskandar Thani (1636–1641) or his spouse Sultanah Taj al-Alam (1641–1675), and may have been their courtier, a mentor of the young Taj al-Alam (Braginsky 2010: 434–6).

The MS is written in a legible and generally neat hand, but with varying thickness of strokes. Relatively large and well proportioned letters diminish slightly in size towards the end of the MS. The hand is characterised by long strokes of the ‘tails’ of nga and ya in the final position, almost cupping the whole word itself (in the case of nga) or the following word (in the case of ya), long strokes for the ‘handle’ of kaf, and three variant forms of sin, with and without ‘teeth’.

Transcription (lines 10–14):

Maka kata perdana menteri, ‘Hai Isma Yatim, marilah tuanhamba mengadap dulli yang di/pertuan seraya beper-sembahkan hikayat ini supaya hamba peroleh kebaktian tuanhamba.’ Maka Isma / Yatim pun dibawah oleh perdana menteri mengadap raja. Maka tatkalah itu raja itu pun sedang d.h.a dihadap oleh segala raja-raja dan perdana menteri, sida-sida, abentara,6 biduanda, hububalang sekalian. Maka d7 dilihat raja perdana menteri datang membawa seorang kanak-kanak maka sogerah8 diha[d]ap[?] baginda.9

1Duli (a royal honorific) is written as dulli (with tashdid).
2Dibawah is written with a ha; yet what is meant is dibawa.
3The scribe has started writing dihadap, but finding not enough room, crossed out the letters d.h.a. and started again on the next line.
4Pa in dihadap is written with three dots above, and also thus in the following line.
5Ga in segala is written with three dots below.
6The usual Malay form is bentara, often translated as ‘herald’, but in fact implying ‘the court official mediating between the sultan and his subjects’; the form abentara is closer than bentara to its Sanskrit original avântara, ‘intermediate’ (Gonda 1952: 194) (cf. No 10).
7Dal of dilihat is repeated at the beginning of the next line.
8Segerah is written with a ha and ga with one dot above.
9Ga in baginda is written with one dot above.

Vladimir Braginsky
9  PALEMBANG, 1704

Letter from Sultan Ratu

Letter from Sultan Ratu of Palembang to Governor-General Johan van Hoorn at Batavia, dated 24 Syawal 1115 (1 March 1704). 1f.; European paper with watermark ‘Strasbourg Lily’, with countermark ‘WR’ and ‘4’; 42 x 27 cm. Lampblack seal (not shown).
St Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences, OIC 23 (N.P. Likhachev collection of Oost-Indische Compagnie documents).

In the opening lines, the Sultan Ratu writes that he ‘conveys the letter from an open heart accompanied by true good will towards Director General Johan van Hoorn ruling in the glorious kingdom of Bataviah’.

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Sultan Ratu yang mempunyai daerah kerajaan dalam negeri\(^1\) Palembang\(^2\) terbit daripada fuad al-ikhlas ber-kirim warkat yang sezarah ini / serta doa yang kebajikan ‘ala al-dawam dan sampai kepada saudara yang karim iaitu direktur jenral Yu’ an pan Hurn\(^3\) yang memegang perintah / dalam kerajaan Betawih yang termas-yuhur khabar wartanya pada segala alam peri kebajikannya

\(^1\)Ga is written without dots.

\(^2\)Pa is written very clearly with three dots.

\(^3\)y.w.a.’n p.n h.w.r.n, Johan van Hoorn.

I.R. Katkova
10 BANTEN, 1704

Letter from Sultan Abu al-Mahasin

Letter in Malay from Seri Sultan Abu al-Mahasin Muhammad Zainal Abidin of Banten to Governor-General Johan van Hoorn in Batavia, dated 10 Zulkaidah 1115 (16 March 1704). 1 f.; Indian paper dotted with greyish silver sprinkles, decorated with gold leaves and flowers; 37.5 x 30 cm; with a red wax seal on the right. St Peters burg, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences, OIC 11 (N.P. Likhachev collection of Oost-Indische Compagnie documents).

This letter from Sultan Abu al-Mahasin Muhammad Zainal Abidin of Banten contains nine lines written with a thick nibbed pen, with the final line containing the date in bold ornate calligraphy. At the top of the letter is a calligraphic letter heading in Arabic, Qawluh al-haqq, ‘His Word is the Truth’, with the word Qawluh written twice. In the right margin, alongside the first line, is the red wax seal of the Sultan. The letter opens with the Sultan naming the envoy who is conveying the letter to Batavia as Ngabehi Jagadi Sari[?]. Some individual letters are positioned above the line; this is evidently done for artistic effect rather than to save space.

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Bahwa anakda Seri Sultan\textsuperscript{1} Abu al-Mahasin\textsuperscript{2} Muhammad Zayn al-'Abidin dalam negeri\textsuperscript{3} Banten berkirim sahifat al-ikhlas\textsuperscript{4} yang diiring\textsuperscript{5} dengan tabi banyak\textsuperscript{6} tebawa\textsuperscript{7} oleh Ngabehi Jagadi Sari[?] datang kepada Tuan direktur jenral Johan van Hoorn\textsuperscript{8} dalam negeri Batawih dan segala negeri yang takluk dibawahnya.

\textsuperscript{1}Note the nun of sultan positioned above the \text{ta}.
\textsuperscript{2}Note the sin elegantly bisecting the upright strokes of \text{alif} and \text{lam}.
\textsuperscript{3}Here and elsewhere, \text{ga} is written with three dots underneath.
\textsuperscript{4}Final \text{sad} is positioned above the line.
\textsuperscript{5}d.y.a.y.r.ng
\textsuperscript{6}The \text{ba} of banyak is positioned above the \text{ya} of tabi.
\textsuperscript{7}t.b.a.w
\textsuperscript{8}y.w.n p.n h.w.r.w.n

I.R. Katkova
11 BANTEN, c.1704

Poem by Hamzah Fansuri

This composite MS consists of the works in prose and verse by the prominent Malay Sufi poet Hamzah Fansuri (active in the second half of the 16th century); poems by his disciple Hasan Fansuri and a disciple of the latter, Abdul Jamal; the poem Ikat-ikatan ilm al-nisa, ‘Science of the women in verse’; and a few anonymous Sufi works. The MS originally belonged to the sultan of Banten, Abu al-Mahasin Muhammad Zainal Abidin (r.1690–1733) (see No. 10). It also includes a copy of Hamzah’s treatise Syarab al-asyikin, ‘Drink of the lovers’, finished on 9 Rajab 1116/7 (7 November 1704). The above mentioned poems seem to be written in the same hand, and therefore it is likely the bulk, if not the whole, of this MS was copied in the early 18th century. 64 ff.; Dutch paper, with watermarks fleur-de-lis and coat of arms of Amsterdam (both consistent with a dating of c.1700); 27 x 20 cm; Banten-style binding (Plomp 1993: 579). MS described by Juynboll (1899: 271–3); Wieringa (1998: 230–3); Iskandar (1999, I: 73–4). On the basis of this MS, Naguib al-Attas (1970: 297–328, 416–47) edited and translated Syarab al-asyikin, and J. Doorenbos (1933: 33–117) published poems by Hamzah Fansuri, Hasan Fansuri and Abdul Jamal as well as Ikat-ikatan ilm al-nisa. Text in MCP.

Leiden University Library, Cod.Or. 2016, f. 50r.

Shown on the facing page is poem XXXII according to Drewes’s numbering (Drewes and Brakel 1986: 140-43). The text on ff. 6v-54r of this MS is written in fine calligraphic hand and completely vocalised. Lines of verses are separated by small red circles. Doorenbos (1933: 3–4) discusses a number of the MS’s archaic features: the vocalisation of the text; the Sanskrit form of certain words (sadya, not sedia; syawarga, not sorga; sanitenasa, not sanentiasa; manusyya, not manusia); and the use of tashdid to indicate the presence of ē (pēpēt) in the preceding syllable (e.g. tengngah) (cf. Shellabear 1901: 85). Another feature considered archaic by van Ronkel (1926) is the occurrence in the MS of the letter dal with three dots underneath. Yet Jones (2005: 287) mentions the use of this kind of tashdid as late as 1885, while dal with three dots, a typical feature of Javanese Pégon script (see No. 33), can be found in MSS of the 19th century (Wieringa 2003: 513). Therefore, the so-called archaic features need revision, since some of them may be explained better by the Banten provenance of and Javanese influences on, the MS at hand. The designation of pēpēt by a fatha above the letter and a hamza below is an even more striking Bantenese characteristic of the MS (Wieringa 2003: 505–11, 514).

Transcription (lines 13–17):

Tar / tahuken anpan | jangan sanget angkau baralah |
| dunia nin saparti parih | manaken / dapat kekel kau
kasih. | Satuken hanget dan dingin | ringgalen loba dan / ingin | hancur handak saparti ilin |
mangkanya dapat karjamu licin. || Gajahmina | tarlalu wasil |
dengan laut | tiada barsahil | gila mancari saparti jahil |...

1This date was supported inter alia by Drewes & Brakel (1986: 2–3) and the present author. Yet Guillot and Kalus (2000) believe that Hamzah died in 1527. For the polemic on this issue, see Braginsky (2001), Guillot and Kalus (2001).
2Of the various ways of designating pēpēt in the MS, only a small tilde above the letter is used in this excerpt. Frequently (especially in prefixes) the fatha replaces the sign for pēpēt. As Javanese is rich in prefixes ending with a, this and the use of Javanese suffix -a[̣]ken instead of Malay -kan further ‘Javanises’ the quoted text.
3Pa is written with three dots above. Drewes & Brakel (1986: 142) provide a better reading: Beri tahu akan anak pathi.
4Drewes and Brakel (1986: 142) provide a better reading: beralih.
5Dal is written with three dots underneath.
6Ga is written with three dots underneath.
7Ra and ta marbata are joined in a ligature.
8Ga is written without a dot.
9Wau and ta marbata are joined in a ligature.

Vladimir Braginsky
FIGURE 11. Poem by Hamzah Fansuri, Banten, c.1704. Leiden University Library, Cod.Or. 2016, f. 50r.
12 AMBON, BETWEEN 1707 AND 1710

Syair perang Mengkasar

This *syair* (poem) is contained in the first of three MSS, originally separate but bound together not later than 1728, which once belonged to the Dutch missionary François Valentijn (1666–1727) (Braginsky 2010: 422). The name of the copyist and the date of copying of the MS are unknown. However, as the MS was most probably copied for Valentijn during his stay in Ambon between 1707 and 1712, and as Valentijn’s wife Cornelia copied an excerpt from it around 1710 (Skinner 1963: 49–50, Braginsky 2010: 430), the MS may be dated between 1707 and 1710. 19 pp.; paper; 23.7 x 18.3 cm. [Jones] (1974: 38–9); a facsimile edition of the MS was published in 1994 (*Syair perang et al.* 1994). Other MSS of *Syair perang Mengkasar* include two short fragments, LUB Cod.Or. 1626 and SOAS 12902, and the much longer SOAS MS 40324 from the Marsden collection (see Skinner 1963: 47–50; Jones 1975; Brakel 1976; Wieringa 1998: 26–7; Braginsky 2010: 425–31). Skinner (1963) edited the poem on the basis of LUB Cod.Or. 1626 and SOAS 40324, and translated it into English.

Kuala Lumpur, Muzium Seni Asia, MS UM 81.63 (1), p. 3.

The version of the poem found in this MS narrates the story of the conquest of Makassar, at the time ruled by Sultan Hasanuddin, by forces of the VOC led by Speelman, from the beginning of the campaign in December 1666 to the signing of the Bungaya Treaty in November 1667. The poem was composed by Hasanuddin’s scribe Ence’ Amin between this date – or, as Skinner (1963: 42–3) believes, July 1669, when the war ended – and 1670, when Hasanuddin died.

Characteristic for this MS is its regular and legible, yet hardly calligraphic hand, with relatively small letters written tightly. Numerous cursive elements include the ample use of ligatures (e.g. ra, dal + ha or ta marbuta), and the letter sin presented as a long stroke without ‘teeth’. Idiosyncratic for this hand is also ga with one or no dot above it, pa with one dot like fa, and especially the nga in the final position, the ‘tail’ of which makes an ‘s’-shaped turn inside the ‘bowl’ of the letter. Suprisingly, poetical lines in the MS are not separated from each other. These are marked below by a vertical line |, with ends of stanzas marked ||.

Transcription (p. 3, lines 5–8):

Tamatlah sudah memuji sultan | tersebutlah 1 / perkataan Welanda kufar 2 | Kornilis Sipalman penghulu kapitan 3 | tatkala ke Buton membawa angkatan | Demikianlah asal mula pertama | Welanda dan Bugis 4 / bersama-sama | Kornilis Sipalman Welanda ternama | Raja Palaka 5 kelak jadi panglima | Berkampunglah Welanda 6 yang najis | berkatalah jenral kapitan yang bengis | jikalau / alah Mengkasar itu 7 habis | Tenderuqlah kelak raja di Bugis.

1 *Tesebuth* is written with *sin* without ‘teeth’, in a very cursive manner.
2 Here *nasrani* is crossed out and replaced with *kufar*. As neither *nasrani* nor *kufar* fits the rhyme, this should be either *nasran* (a poetic licence?) or the misread word *syaitan* as in SOAS MS 40324.
3 The words *penghulu kapitan* (p.ng.h.w.l k.p.y.t.n), with *wau*, *lam* and *kaf* touching each other, show the tendency to write letters very close to each other.
4 *Ga* in the word *Bugis* is written with one dot above it.
5 *p* (with one dot), l.q.a.
6 ‘Welanda’ is inserted on the left margin, while a sign in the text like the numeral ‘2’ indicates its correct position.
7 *Itu* written as *a.t.w* can be also read as *atau*.

Vladimir Braginsky
13 BENGKULU, 1718

Letter from Sultan Kecil of Anak Sungai

Letter from Datuk Raja Kuasa (Sultan Kecil) to the British commander of Bengkulu, at that time Richard Farmer, Deputy Governor; undated but received on 14 January 1718. 2 ff.; English paper, watermarked ‘GR’; 31 x 20 cm. Ricklefs & Voorhoeve 1977: 107.

In this letter, the writer assures the British of his good will and acknowledges that the glue of the relationship between Malays and British is a shared interest in trade, but also refers to slanderous rumours swirling round on all sides.

The letter is written swiftly in a brisk cursive hand, without undue care — two words have been accidentally abbreviated while two other words are erroneously repeated — but individual letters are carefully formed and all dots above and below are present. The curved line above the first word bahwa may be an ornamental addition.

Transcription (lines 1–4):
Qawluh al-haqq / Bahwa ini alamat surat1 tulus dan fi[ad]2 ikhlas serta3 putih hati / selagi4 ada peridar cakrawala bulan dan matahari akan menerangi malam dan siang {dan / siang}5 tiada berubah kepada Kompeni, iaitu dari pada Datu’ Raja Kuasa, barang5 / sampailah kiranya kepada Orang Kaya Komandar Bengkahulu.

1 In the words surat and serta on the same line, the scribe has joined the final letters ra and ta. This is a very common occurrence in Malay manuscripts.
2 The scribe has omitted the final letter(s) of fiad.
3 The scribe has omitted the final letter(s) of selagi. In this and in fn.2 above, the intended words can easily be conjectured due to the formulaic nature of phrases in the opening compliments (puji-pujian) of Malay letters.
4 An example of dittography, where the scribe has accidentally repeated the two words dan siang.
5 After this word, the scribe has inserted a dash as a ‘filler’ to fill up the end of the line.

Annabel Teh Gallop
14 TAMONTAKA, MINDANAO, 1719

Letter from Sultan Ja‘far Sadik Syah

Letter from Sultan Ja‘far Sadik Syah of Maguindanao to General Gregorio Padilla y Escalante; dated 6 Syawal 1131 (22 August 1719). 1 f.; Spanish paper, watermark of three concentric circles, surmounted with a crowned cross over a bird and number; 42 x 33 cm; no seal or letter heading. Seville, Archivo General de Indias, Escribanı´a 423B, f. 178r.

Sultan Ja‘far Sadik Syah (Manamir), Sultan Jalaluddin’s younger brother, is writing to General Gregorio de Padilla y Escalante regarding the capitulacio´n (surrender) of Zamboanga. Don Gregorio was sent by Governor-General Fernando de Bustillo Bustamante y Rueda to re-establish the Spanish garrison there and at the time was reconstructing the fort.

The letter is written in a consistent and graceful cursive hand in the naskh style. Dots are written without lifting the pen from the paper, so that in letters with two dots a chevron is normally used, while those with three dots usually have a mark resembling a dotless question mark. An ornate yet roughly written colophon in a monumental hand concludes the letter, written along the bottom. Full vocalisation is not used for Spanish words. Linguistic features of a Bornean Malay variety may be an indication of a scribe who spoke Brunei Malay (e.g., bajalan).

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Bahwa ini surat\(^1\) yang menyatakan hati yang putih serta \(^1\) tulus dan i(k)hlas\(^2\) dengan tabi banyak2 yang dikirimkan oleh Paduka Maulana Ja‘far Sadik Syah ibn al-Sultan Muhammad Syah / Sultan Magindana\(\text{\(a\)}}\)\(^3\) datang kepada sahabat kami senyor gobernador di Sambuangan yang dipeliharakan Dios\(^4\) dan diberi umur panjang serta \(^1\) untung banyak selama-lamanya karena budiman lagi bijaksana / pada melakukan kekuasaan perintah dari Enperador Gran Leon de Espanya\(^5\) syahdan kemudian dari itu yang suruhan kami mastre kampo\(^6\) Mahmud akan memeriksa pada sahabat kami serta memberitahu ... Final line:

Tersurat(s)\(^7\) di dalam ‘alam Tamontaka pada enam hari bulan S(y)awal pada hari Ahad\(^8\) wa hijrat al-Nabi sal-lalahu alayhi wasallam sanat 1131 ha\(^9\)

\(^1\)In the words surat and serta, the scribe has joined the final letters ra and ta.
\(^2\)Kha is undotted (as in line 22, (k)hat cara Kastila).
\(^3\)An alif follows Maguindanao (and Melayu in the penultimate line).
\(^4\)Typical of Jawi letters from the Philippines, many loanwords from Spanish appear. The word for ‘God’ is Dios, which is used for the Catholic recipient of the letter.
\(^5\)The name ‘el gran león’ is used to refer to the Castilian king, mimicking the usage by Spanish missionaries in exaltation of Spain’s monarch, connected to the millenarian belief that Islam would be defeated by a ‘lion king of Spain’ and emperor of the Last Days.
\(^6\)Maestre de campo in Spanish, lit. ‘master of camp’ roughly equivalent to the rank of colonel.
\(^7\)The ta is undotted and the sin and wau are clearly detached.
\(^8\)S(y)awal is written over S(y)a’ban, while the first syllable of bulan can be read from combining the dot from pada with the nun and mim from enam.
\(^9\)ha, second fusal in the traditional 8-year cycle. The year is in reverse order, from right to left.

Roderick Orlina
15  BANJARMASIN, 1746

Edict from Sultan Tamjidullah

Edict issued by Sultan Tamjidullah of Banjar to Mr Butler, Mr Steward and Captain Kent of the East India Company ship Dragon, regarding the right to trade in Banjar, with contemporary transcription and English translation. Annotated: ‘Sultan’s chop for ship Dragon received 24 October 1746 at Tattas, from Mr. Mordan.’ 2 ff., European paper, 32 x 21 cm. Red wax seal of the sultan. London, British Library, IOR: L/Mar/C/324, f. 65r.

This royal edict (titah) is written in brown-black ink in an impressive, stylish hand, with bold pen strokes, with all dots above and below clearly indicated. Most striking are the long straight diagonal strokes, particularly the top stroke of kaf and the tails of pa and ra. In the two occurrences of the word ‘mister’ in the first line the letters mim-sin-ta-ra are written more or less as a single straight line with a head for the mim and two dots above for the ta.

The sultan is identified not in the document but by his seal, which is inscribed in three lines Sultan / Tamjid / Allah, designed to be read from the bottom upwards so that the word Allah is positioned at the top of the seal as a mark of honour.

Figure 15a. Detail of line 1 showing the word mister.

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Bahwa ini titah kami kepada Mister Butel dan Mister Asdut serta Kapitan Kin jikalau ada perahu masuk atau perahu keluar tiada kami berikan diperiksa yang jenis perahu dagang dan lagi pula kalau raja atau orang besar hendak bermain ke kapal jangan dinaikkan atau /

1b.t.l, i.e. Butler. Fortunately, this and the following two names have been identified from the accompanying contemporary English translation.
2a.s.du.t, i.e. Stewart.
3k.y.n, i.e. Kent.
4Note the unusual kink in the shape of the dal, also noted in the name Asdut.

Annabel Teh Gallop
Treaty with the East India Company


The Malay text of the Treaty is written in an accomplished hand with a marked slant to the right, evidently by a professional scribe. Two different aspects can be discerned: the first five lines which give the date and the ‘title’ of the document are indented to accommodate the seal and are in a slightly larger hand; the rest of the document, in a smaller hand, contains the body of the treaty.

Transcription (lines 1–6):

Bi-hijrat¹ seribu seratus tujuh² puluh empat tahun / pada tahun zai pada dua likur hari bulan Jumadilakhir / pada hari Khamis pada ketika pukul sepuluh dewasa itulah Paduka Seri Sultan berteguh-teguhan³ janji dengan s.r.b.d.w.r⁴ di kompanniyyih⁵ Aliksandah Dalfinfili⁶ maka // inilah perjanjian Paduka Seri Sultan Muhammad Muizzuddin ibn⁷ al-Sultan Muhammad Badruddin dengan s.r.b.d.w.r . . .

¹This conjoined word is written with a great calligraphic flourish, with an elongated ligature between the ba and ha, and the jim, ra and ta marbuta all in a single pen stroke which spirals upwards.
²The scribe appears to have corrected an erroneous stroke before the ta of tujuh.
³This reduplicated word is written out in full.
⁴The reading of this word is unclear. One possibility is the English word ‘servant’, referring to Dalrymple’s status as a servant of the East India Company; another might be a Malay honorific, seri baiduri.
⁵With two tashdid.
⁶I.e. Alexander Dalrymple.
⁷Note the super-stylish single stroke functioning for both ba and nun of ibn.

Annabel Teh Gallop
17 ACEH, 1764

Mirat al-tullab

Mir’at al-tullab fi tashil ma’rifat al-ahkām al-shar’iyya lil-mālik al-wahhāb, by Abdul Rauf of Singkel (1615–1693), was composed in 1074/1663. According to the colophon on f. 224r, this MS was copied on 14 Muharam 1178 (14 July 1764) in Aceh. 224 ff., various watermarked European papers (blueish with horse; yellowish with shield above ‘G M’); 30 x 21 cm.
London, British Library, Or. 16035, f. 4r.

Mirat al-tullab, composed for Sultanah Tajul Alam of Aceh (r.1641-1675), is Abdul Rauf’s major work on fiqh. It is a substantial work covering many topics, not only fiqh but also political, social, economic and religious life. Its main source was the Fath al-Wahha¯b of Zakariyya al-Ansari.

Transcription (lines 16–22, Malay text only):

... artinya¹ bermula segala² kadi itu / tiga kaum dua kaum daripadanya dalam naraka dan suatu kaum daripadanya dalam syurga³ adapun / kadi yang dua⁴ kaum dalam naraka itu maka yaitu suatu kaum daripadanya kadi yang mengetahui hukum yang / sebenarnya maka tiada ia mau menghukumkan⁵ antara segala manusia seperti ilmunya kedua kaum daripadanya kadi / yang menghukumkan⁶ antara segala manusia dengan jahilnya adapun kadi yang suatu kaum / dalam syurga itu maka yaitu kadi yang mengetahui akan hukum yang sebenarnya maka dihukumkannya akan segala / manusia dengan hukum yang sebenarnya.

¹In this MS, two dots are connected and look like a short line, while three dots look like one dot and a short line.
²Note the unusual appearance of segala, here and elsewhere in this MS, as the ga-lam resembles a capital ‘B’.
³Ga is written without a dot and thus resembles kaf.
⁴yang and dua are connected.
⁵The prefix meng is written separately from hukumkan.

Yumi Sugahara
A JAWI SOURCEBOOK

FIGURE 17. Mirat al-tullab, Aceh, 1764. British Library, Or. 16035, f. 4r.
18 SEMARANG, 1775

Hikayat Raja Babi

In the colophon (f. 3r), the writer makes himself known as Usup ibn Abdul Kadir, a merchant from Semarang of Indian descent from Cooch in West Bengal (peranakan Kuj). One day he went to Palembang to trade, but having no success, he anchored in Sungai Lawang, where he consoled himself by writing this story, which took him 20 days to finish. It was completed on 10 Zulkaidah 1188 (12 January 1775). He begs his readers not to mock or scorn his letters because his ‘pen had run amok’ (tetapi jangan ditertawakan dan disunguti daripada hal hurufnya karena kalamnya mengamuk). The final page (f. 106v) contains the beginning of the Syair Ikan, but only ten double lines; cf. lines 5–6: Ajaib handai heranlah beta | mendengar ikan pandai berkata | sekalian ikan bercerita | sekalian ikan menjawab rata ||. 106 ff.; European paper; 18.5 x 13.5 cm. Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 109).

The Hikayat Raja Babi tells of the adventures of a prince who was born into the world in the form of a pig. The story begins with the sultan of the realm of Gunung Berapi Rantau Panjang Tebing Berukir who has difficulties having offspring, which makes him very sad. He marries many princesses, but to no avail. One day, however, one of his wives, the beautiful Puteri Indera Suri gets pregnant, and thereupon the Sultan sends his other wives back to their parents. These women, forty in all, curse him for that, wishing that he may get a pig for a son. And so it comes to pass: a big pig is born. The Sultan, who is very ashamed that he has fathered an accursed animal, banishes his son from court, and the royal pig is brought to a forest. Here he meets many other pigs, and soon he has a ferocious fight with the King of the Forest Pigs (Raja Babi Hutan). A long series of adventures ensues, but hitherto the Hikayat Raja Babi has never been studied or published. Another MS of this text is RAS Raffles Malay 52, dated 1229 AH (1813 AD), which is also of Javanese provenance. Javanese influence is undeniable (see also the transcription below), but catalogues of Javanese literature do not seem to contain a possible prototype.

On this folio the text has an omission of content between identical words (saut du même au même), which has been corrected in the margin. This correction is marked by a signe-de-renvoi or reference mark, using a small ‘v’ (cf. Wieringa 2009: 113).

Transcription (lines 11–13):

Syahdan maka Tuan Puteri / pun segera mengambil daun pudding¹ itu sehelai diperbuatnya tamba² lalu dici-
dukkannya air kolam itu / lalu [di]mandikannya Raja Babi dengan air mawar dan dilulutnya dengan ambar dan kesturi. /

¹p.w.d.ng. According to Heyne (1950: 1379) the leaves of the pudding (Graptophyllum pictum Griff. or G. hortense Nees) are well known in Java as a medicine against bumps and pimples.
²t.m.b.a. Javanese tamba ‘medicine, remedy’.

E.P. Wieringa
**19 ACEH, 1783**

**Hidayat al-salikin**

Hidayat al-sālikin fī suluk maslak al-muttaqīn, by Abdul Samad bin Abdullah al-Jawi al-Falimbani (1704–1789?) (see also No. 20), was completed in Mecca in 1192/1778, and printed at various times in Mecca, Singapore, Bombay and other places. According to the colophon on the last page, this manuscript was copied by Teungku Haji Hasyim ibn Ahmad al-Rahimin on 4 Rabiulawal 1197 (7 February 1783) at Le Masin, Aceh. London, British Library, Or. 16604, f. 2r.

Hidayat al-salikin deals with syariah in a mystical way. Its main source is the Arabic work Bidayat al-Hidaya by al-Ghazālī.

![Figure 19a. Detail of line 4, showing ga in segala written without a dot.](image)

**Transcription (lines 2–15, Malay text only, in black ink):**

Adapun kemudian daripada itu maka lagi akan berkata fakir yang berkehendak / kepada tuhannya yang amat kaya yaitu Abdul Samad Jawi Palembang khadim / segala fukara` di dalam negeri Mekah yang musyarafat ... [Arabic text, in red ink] / ... mudah-mudahan mengpunī3 Allah ta’ala / baginya dan bagi ibu bapanya dan segala muslimin akan beberapa hampunnya4 / dan rahmatnya ... [Arabic text] /// ... ketahui olehmu hai saudara kami yang / menuntut bagi negeri akhirat bahwasanya kitab Bidayat al-Hidayah bagi Imam / Hujjah al-Islam al-Ghazali itu yaitu yang mehimpunī5 bagi ilmu yang membawa / takut akan Allah ta’ala yang disebutkan di dalam firman Allah ta’ala6 dan / ambil oleh kami akan bekal akhirat maka yang terlebih baik bekal akhirat itu / yaitu takut akan Allah ta’ala.

---

1In this MS, pā is written with one dot and is hence indistinguishable from fā.
2In this MS, gā is usually written without a dot, and so looks the same as kāf.
3There is no letter mim, but it is assumed that this is a scribal error, and the word should be read as mengpunī.
4This word could alternatively be read as himpunī. The printed version gives ampunī.
5i.e. menghimpunī.
6In both examples, the final alif maqṣūra is written with two dots, resembling ja.

Yumi Sugahara
20 MECCA, 1790

Al-‘Urwat al-wuthqa

Al-‘Urwat al-wuthqā and Ratib Jum’at (Risāla fī kāfiyat al-ratib lailat al-Jum’ah), by Syaikh Abdul Samad al-Falimbani, copied by Haji Ma’ruf bin Hasanuddin in Mecca, Thursday, 6 Muharram 1205 (15 September 1790). Although this MS is not described in the catalogue of Palembang manuscripts, two other MSS containing the same text are recorded (Ikram 2004: 145, 180). 52 ff.; Italian paper, ‘Three crescents’ watermark; 21 x 15.5 cm.
Palembang, Private collection of Kemas Andi Syarifuddin.

The two religious texts in this manuscript were composed by Abdul Samad al-Falimbani in Mecca (see also No. 19). The manuscript is written in black ink, with rubrication for portions of the text in Arabic. From beginning to end the handwriting is consistent, neat and of a good standard, and is evidently the product of a trained and professional scribe. The main characteristic of this hand is a pronounced slant to the left, although Jawi script is more usually slanted to the right.

Transcription (lines 2–13, Malay text in black ink only):

Kumulai risalah ini dengan nama Allah yang amat murah¹ lagi mengasihani / akan hambanya ... Segala puji tertentu bagi Allah yang / sebenar-benaranya pujinya ... / Dan rahmat Allah dan salam-Nya² atas penghulu / kita Nabi Muhammad Nabi-Nya dan hamba-Nya ... / dan atas keluarganya dan sahabatnya dan yang mengikut akan dia ... / adapun kemudian daripada itu maka lagi akan berkata faqir / ila Allahi ta’ala Abdul Samad al-Jawi Palembang mudah-mudahan / diampuni Allah ta’ala baginya dan bagi / sekalian muslimin.

¹Note the ra joined to the left to final ha. According to standard rules for the writing of Arabic, the letter ra should not be joined to the following letter. However, the frequency of occurrence of this ligature in the Malay world – particularly in the word ‘surah’ as found in surah headings in Qur’an manuscripts from Southeast Asia – makes it a characteristic feature of Jawi.

²In accordance with the stipulations of Pedoman Umum Ejaan Bahasa Indonesia yang Disempurnakan, III Pemakaian Tanda Baca, E. Tanda Hubung (.) (No.46, 2009), the hyphen is used before the upper case Nya.

Ali Akbar
21 SEMARANG, 1797

Hikayat Raja Pasai

According to the colophon of the first text in this MS, Hikayat Raja Handik, (f. 45r), the copy was made by Encik Usman, son of the Malay scribe in Makassar, in the house of Encik Johar, in the Kampung Melayu of Semarang, at the request of Encik Usep (a.w.s.p.) of Kampung Belikang in Makassar, from an original manuscript owned by Abdullah, Kapitan Melayu of Semarang, dated 8 Syaaban 1211 (6 February 1797). The copying of the Hikayat Raja Pasai was probably not too long after this date. 83 ff.; Dutch paper, watermarked ‘C & I Honig’; 19.5 x 17 cm. Kratz (1989: 1-10); Gallop and Arps (1991: 60); Ricklefs, Voorhoeve and Gallop (2014: 303). Jones (2013) is the most recent (and annotated) translation of the text, and also contains references to earlier scholarly literature. Text in MCP.

London, British Library, Or. 14350, f. 78r.

Although this is the earliest of the two known copies of the Hikayat Raja Pasai (ff. 45v-83v), it lacks the final part of the text. Thought to have been composed in the 15th century, it narrates the coming of Islam as a state religion in the kingdom of Pasai on the north coast of Sumatra.

The script is small and neat, and appears to have been written by a professional scribe. The initial sin is in the form of a flowing stroke. In order to preserve a straight left edge, the copyist varies extended and close strokes, resulting e.g. in a relatively long tail of the wau in the pre-final line or in a rather ‘crammed’ way of writing the last words in the final line. The letters of senyum in the word tersenyum (last word of line 9) have been piled up, hence taking up only little space, but this is quite common and not necessarily due to its place in the line. The final dal in the word baginda has an upward-pointing curled ending, rather resembling the curved final letters r.h of the word disuruh (see lines 12 and 13). This can also be observed in other texts; although the dictionaries only include baginda, perhaps copyists wished to even elevate this honorific word further by rendering it as bagindah.

Transcription (lines 9–15):


1 In fact, there is a third MS, kept in the National Library in Paris as Malais.Javanais no. 50, but this is a copy of the RAS MS by the French scholar Dulaurier and merely of antiquarian significance.
2 t.r.s.n.ny.m.
3 a.p.
4 m.y.d.a.n. Based upon RAS Raffles Malay 67, p. 103, Jones (1987: 53; 2013: 83) renders this name as ‘Medana Pantai’.

E.P. Wieringa
22  TERNATE, 1802

Letter from Sultan Muhammad Yasin

Letter from Sultan Kaicil Patra Muhammad Yasin of Ternate to the British Commissioner in Ambon, 26 Zulhijah 1216 (19 April 1802). In the letter, probably intended for Robert Townsend Farquhar, the Sultan informs the Commissioner that a joint British-Ternatan force had been despatched to Halmahera to settle a disturbance in Sahu provoked by Jailolo. 1 f., English paper: ‘Curteis & Sons 1798’; 40.5 x 25.5 cm; lampblack seal. Gallop and Arps (1991: 39, 131); Ricklefs, Voorhoeve and Gallop (2014: 301). Text in MCP.

London, British Library, Add. 18141, f. 2r.

The letter is written in superb calligraphy, confident and stylish, by a master of the craft who makes good use of the thick and thin edges of the nib of the pen, as is particularly evident in the opening words of the first line.

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Bahwa ¹ paduka² seri³ yang⁴ maha⁵ tuan sultan⁶ Ternate al-buldan taj al-‘ala al-mukarram Amir Iskandar⁷ Jauhar Azimuddin Syah / Kaicil Putera Muhammad Yasin ialah⁸ raja yang memegang taibir perintah di atas tahta kerajaan bandar negeri Ternate sehingga daerah / takluknya dan wazir menteri babato2 berkirim warkat al-ikhlas ini . . . .

¹The scribe has used a thick edge of his nib for ba-ha followed by a thin edge for wau.
²The tail of the pa rises up and is extended backwards over the head of the letter. Dal is written with pronounced dots at beginning and end of the very thin wavy stroke representing the letter with curlicues at each end.
³Seri is spelt with a syin. Note also the distinctive and unusual shape of final ya.
⁴Yang and maha are conjoined.
⁵Note the stylised form of the word maha.
⁶Sin is represented by the thick stroke just below the seal, and lam the thin stroke resembling kaf underneath the sin.
⁷Note the exceptionally long, straight and thin — almost as if ruled — top stroke of the kaf.
⁸Final ha has the same distinctive shape as the ya in seri in the first line.

Annabel Teh Gallop
FIGURE 22. Letter from Ternate, 1802. British Library, Add. 18141, f. 2r.
Letter from Sultan Nuku

Letter from Sultan Muhammad Amiruddin Syah (Sultan Nuku) of Tidore to the Board of the East India Company in London, 7 Ramadan 1217 (1 January 1803). With a contemporary English translation. Annotated: Recd. from Marchioness at Exeter, 22 August 1803. 2 ff., European paper, 36 x 22 cm. Lampblack seal.

Unusually for a Malay letter, this is written on both sides of the sheet of the paper, in a wispy and spidery hand which gets even more hasty towards the end. Although there appears to be a distinct slope to the right, the upright strokes are generally straight. There are a number of striking similarities with the hand of the royal Ternate letter shown previously, in particular the sweeping, cursive ductus which greatly exaggerates the tails of letters. One of the most characteristic letter forms is ya or medial/final ha, which is usually written as two convex arcs joined at the lower tip, like an elongated curved v tipped towards the right. Also notable are the deep bowl of nun, and the pyramidal (or mountain-like?) presentation of the sultan’s name in the first line, all hinting at a common ‘Maluku chancery hand’. Reproductions of similar letters from Tidore are published in Katoppo (1984: 102–5); Wieringa (1998: 364); and Gallop and Arps (1991: 39).

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Qawluh al-haqq / Bahwa paduka sayyid yang multa seri¹ maha tuan Sultan Sayyid al-Jihad Muhammad al-Mab’us Amiruddin Syah, kaicil² peperangan, raja yang memegang perintah di atas gunung / Tidore di dalam kota³ s.l.y.r.yng mengirimkan warkat al-musharraf⁴ itu dipesertakan dengan beberapa hormat dan tabi banyak2 datang ke hadapan hadrat⁵ / paduka tuan2 yang memegang perintah di atas kompeni Inggils punya bangsawan yang tertinggal di pulau Inggling di negeri Landang. Maka / . . .

¹Note the deep oblique bowl of ya.
²A Maluku title of nobility.
³Wau is joined to the left to final ta.
⁴With final ha?
⁵Ra is joined to the left to ta marbuta.

Annabel Teh Gallop
Hikayat Pandawa Jaya

The colophon (f. 90r) states that the MS was copied on Saturday, 10 Rabiulawal 1220 (8 June 1805) in the reign of Sultan Ahmad Tajuddin in Kota Setar Dar al-Aman, i.e. Kedah. The Hikayat Pandawa Jaya or ‘Story of the victorious Pandawa’ is a shortened prose version of the Old Javanese narrative poem Bhāratayuddha (ff. 2v-90r). In the beginning it is stated that the story was originally in Old Javanese, but had been translated into Javanese which thereupon served as the basis for the Malay version (see below). The initial and end pages contain various notes and dates from the same year 1220/1805. 99 ff.; Chinese paper (note the brushstrokes in f.2v); 23 x 14.5 cm. Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 123).

London, British Library, MSS Malay B.4, f. 2v.

Boelo Johannes Bijleveld (1919–2003) made a provisional transcription of this MS, which is kept in Leiden University Library as Cod. Or. 25.404, while more photocopies of manuscripts, transcriptions and notes by Bijleveld, all related to Malay wayang stories, are held as KITLV Or. 774. At the beginning of the text (f. 2v), in the third line we encounter the word Keling (k.lng), and the technical term for the joined ka¯f is mashku¯la ‘shackled’ or dāliya because it is derived from the letter dāl (Mansour 2011: 226). Apparently, the ‘pear shape’ of the ka¯f dāliya (Mansour 2011: 226) induced Bijleveld to read dalang here. However, K(e)ling, denoting South India, and usually a derogatory term for someone from that area, seems here to be used in the sense of ‘Indian Javanese’, i.e. Old Javanese, which is indeed strongly influenced by ancient India, viz. Sanskrit.

Transcription (f.2v, lines 1–7):


At the end (f. 90r) there are two syair stanzas plus two pantuns which reads:

Inslah Hikayat Pandawa Jaya | siapa membaca jangan percaya |/ bohongnya banyak tiada berdaya |/ dunia kayangan sangatlah mulia 3 ||/ Siapa meminjam sair rencana | hadahnya sirih pinang secerana 4 |/ bawalah bunga serana5 (?) arwana6 (?) |/ supaya lepas papa dan karma ||/ Batara Kesna raja yang sakti | ialah penjelmaan Batara Bisma |/ a.y.h.y.n7 tuan yang baik pekerti |/ sigeralah tuan kakok8 (?) di peti ||/ Ialah penjelmaan Mahabisnu | saktnya bukan alang kepaling ||/ sigeralah tuan kakok (?) di peti /

1It seems that the scribe initially wanted to continue with sekali (s.k.l), probably because of the common phrase sekali peristiwa.
2m.s.h.w.r with suspended alif following ra.
3m.l.y.a. followed by a dash functioning as a line-filler. However, Bijleveld, in his provisional transliteration (mentioned above), reads mulia raya,
4s.c.r.a.n. Cerana or carana is explained by Wilkinson (1959: 216) as ‘sireh-tazza’, i.e. a ‘metal pedestal-bowl in which are placed the articles required for betel-chewing’.
5s.r.a.n. Bijleveld reads setra.
6a.r.w.a.n. Bijleveld reads arwana.
7Unclear: Bijleveld reads yakin.
8k.k.w . ‘Idem in the final line. Bijleveld reads kekep. Perhaps kakok ‘to hold, seize; to do, perform, carry out, work’

E.P. Wieringa
25 PENANG, 1806

Syair surat kirim kepada perempuan

Although this text has no colophon, it follows directly on from Syair Silambari, signed by Ibrahim on 18 Syawal 1220 (9 January 1806), and appears to be in an identical hand. The scribe, Ibrahim bin Fakir Kandu, was born in Kedah in 1780, the younger brother to Ahmad Rijaluddin (see No. 27) and ‘an excellent poet in his own right’ (Teeuw et al. 2004: 18). Ibrahim was in the service of Leyden and Raffles, and a number of other surviving manuscripts were copied by him (see Gallop 1994: 189 fn. 75). For a biography of Ibrahim and a reproduction of his portrait, see Gallop (1994: 155–9). It seems likely that Ibrahim was also the author of Syair surat kirim. 10 ff.; English paper, f. 34 watermarked ‘1796’ and ‘GR’, the remainder unwatermarked paper of flax and hemp; 20 x 14.5 cm. Leyden (1808: 182–4); van der Tuuk (1849: 389); Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 123); Gallop (1991: 175); Teeuw et al. (2004: 15–20).

London, British Library, MSS Malay B.3, f. 40 r.

Ibrahim does indeed possess ‘characteristic handwriting’ (Teeuw et al. 2004: 16): very upright, inscribed confidently and with considerable brio. The letter forms are very distinct, though he is occasionally somewhat cavalier about the dotting. There are no dots to distinguish ga and kaf.

Transcription (lines 2–7):

Kain cindai\(^1\) akan basahan | Pakaian raja anak bangsawan ||
Jika mau\(^2\) tuan berbinttuan | Tuan ditaruh\(^3\) di dalam pangkuan |||
Burung mepati\(^4\) terbang ke tanjung | Bijj nangka di dalam puan ||
Buah hati setangkai jantung | Bijj mata hanyalah\(^5\) tuan |||
Parasya indah tuan adinda | Di tanah kayangan bandingan tiada ||
Sangatlah berahi hati kakanda | Hendak bertemu dengan adinda.|||

\(^1\)The cramped ya appears to have been added as an afterthought.
\(^2\)Spelt with hamzah kursi wau, ‘hamzah sitting on wau’, though elsewhere (i.e. line 10: jikalau) there is no hamzah on the wau.
\(^3\)Consistent use of ha in such forms, rather than the hamzah that is often found.
\(^4\)The pa lacks dot(s).
\(^5\)A left-leaning exception to Ibrahim’s usual very upright letters.

Mulaika Hijjas
26 LINGGA, RIAU, 1811

Letter from Sultan Mahmud Syah


This royal Malay letter has often been published on account of its beautiful illumination, but in this case the surrounding decoration has been deliberately cropped in order to focus attention on the writing, which is one of the finest examples of calligraphy in a Malay epistle. The scribe has expertly organised the text to fit exactly into the planned space, commencing and ending at almost exactly the same spot. When measured, the text block — the area of the paper occupied by the writing, in two columns — is a perfect square. The hand is small and neat with a slight slope to the right, and perfectly controlled with a gentle rhythm regularly imparted by the tails of letters such as sin, ya, nun and lam which are all elegantly elongated and gently cup the words following to the left.

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Bahwa ini surat tulis dan ikhlas\(^1\) serta suci hati yang tiada\(^2\) berhingga\(^3\) dan kesudahan selagi ada / peridaran cakrawala matahari dan bulan daripada beta Seri Paduka Sultan Mahmud Syah yang mempunyai tahta / kerajaan negeri Johor dan Pahang serta daerah\(^4\) takluknya sekalian, maka barang disampaikan Tuhan seru alam sekalian . . . .

\(^1\)The lam-alif ligature has a loop extending from the alif.
\(^2\)These two words are conjoined.
\(^3\)Ga is undotted.
\(^4\)Ra is joined to the left to ta marbuta.

Annabel Teh Gallop
27 PENANG, 1811

Hikayat perintah negeri Benggala

The Hikayat perintah negeri Benggala or ‘Account of the state of Bengal’ was written by Ahmad Rijaluddin (ibn Hakim Long Fakir Kandu). It is in the form of a travel-diary, relating his journey from Penang to Bengal, which he made in the company of Robert Scott in 1810. The MS is an autograph, dated (on f. 2r) Ramadan 1226 (September 1811). It has been made accessible through an excellent text edition with annotated English translation and commentary by Skinner (1982). 51 ff.; European paper; 31 x 19 cm. Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 108; 1982: 319). Text in MCP. London, British Library, Add. 12386, f. 16v.

In one humorous episode a sailor and a whore exchange pantuns, and Skinner (1982: 165) wondered about their originality as they were not included in the standard collections. The selected fragment (below), also to be found in Skinner (1982: 64), contains a pantun alluding to the story of Rama (discussed in Wieringa 2011: 40–1). Almost exactly the same pantun is used (in a completely different context) in another MS, viz. British Library, Malay B.3, Syair surat kirim kepada perempuan, ff. 43v–44r, which was written by Ibrahim Kandu, Ahmad’s younger brother (No. 25, see also Wieringa 2011: 41).

Immediately noticeable are the long sweeping ‘tails’ of final letters, mostly of nun and ya, but also of e.g. qaf (see e.g. line 5). The individual ba and ta, too, are generally in their ‘extended’ forms. This predilection for extension can also be observed in the elongated form of the initial sin. Skinner (1982: 11) has described the handwriting as ‘bold but not particularly elegant, far removed from the graceful calligraphy of a Munshi Abdullah or his colleague Husain bin Ismail’. Skinner (1982: 11) also notes that ‘the only difficulties encountered in reading it arise from the scribe’s occasional attempts to squeeze too many words onto a page’. Furthermore, Skinner (1982: 12–15) makes some interesting remarks about the spelling which, in his opinion, reflects the Kedah dialect.

Transcription (lines 9–12):

... Maka dibalas oleh jalang / itu: ‘Kuda te´ji pandai berteji, kuda kenaikan Seri Rama; abang mari / kita berjanji, maukah mia  mati bersama?’ Maka dibalas oleh khelasi / itu: ‘Segan saya berpadi2, tanam halia tiada tumbuh; segan saya bermati2, setia tuan tiada akan sunkguh.’

1Derived from Urdu miyā, ‘master, Sir’ (Skinner 1982: 166, n.124).

E.P. Wieringa
This manuscript contains cures for various ailments and thus belongs to the genre known as kitab tib, ‘medical book’. Many of the prescriptions found in kitab tib consist of herbal remedies, although they may also involve magical rites such as the use of incantations and talismans.

The handwriting in this manuscript is neat and clear with a faint slant towards the left. Occasionally letters that follow an alif are raised upwards to link to the top of that alif (e.g. the nga in ‘jangan’ in line 3). The letter kaf is sometimes written in an elongated form (e.g. ‘manteraku’ in line 4).

Although the hand is legible, the spelling is erratic and inconsistent, making it difficult to determine the ingredients and spells used in the treatments. Therefore a comparison with similar texts found in other manuscripts is necessary to determine the correct reading. For example two prescriptions for treating intestinal worms also appear in a kitab tib dated 1288 AH (1871–2 AD) that was once owned by the ‘Raja Besar’ of Kelantan (most likely referring to Sultan Muhammad II, r.1838–1886). The Kelantan text is more detailed and is thus used here to help with the transcription below.

Transcription (lines 10–13):

Sebagai lagi / ubat \(^2\) cacing: Ambil akar mambu, \(^3\) maka tutuk \(^4\) pecah-pecah, / maka r.n.d.w \(^5\) pada air, maka beri air itu diminumnya; jika d.a.s.h \(^6\) / pun baik. \(^7\)

\(^1\) Kuala Lumpur, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, MS 33, p. 381. This manuscript has been partially transliterated in A. Samad 2005.

\(^2\) Spelt a.w.w.b.t, with the first three letters in red ink and the last two in black ink.

\(^3\) Akar mambu is a species of liana, L. Millettia sericea.

\(^4\) Spelt t.w.t.q.a.

\(^5\) I.e. rendam.

\(^6\) I.e. dibasahi.

\(^7\) The text in the Kelantan manuscript reads: Bab ubat cacing: Ambil akar mambu, maka tutuk beri pecah-pecah, maka rendamkan pada air, sudah itu maka ambil beri ia minum; jika dibasahi pun baik, afiat (DBP, MS 33, p. 381).
29 BATAVIA, 1815

Syair perang Inggeris di Betawi

*Syair perang Inggeris di Betawi*. Anonymous, written by an *orang dagang yang hina*, in Kampung Ketip, [Batavia], and completed on 12 Muharam 1231 (14 December 1815). On f. 34v it is recorded that Lady Raffles donated the manuscript to the RAS on 16 January 1830. 34 ff.; English paper, ‘C Wilmott’, ‘1812’; 19 x 15 cm. Van der Tuuk (1866: 125); Van der Linden (1937: 133–47); Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 143); Zubir (1996); Murtagh (2002).

London, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, Raffles Malay 78, f. 19r.

*Syair perang Inggeris di Betawi* is an anonymous Malay rhymed epic (*syair*) in which the author records his interpretation of events surrounding the British attack on Batavia in 1811 and the subsequent British rule over the city. In particular, the latter part of the text is notable for a long description of a market and the various goods sold there, including numerous types of fruits, vegetable and spices. A number of Dutch and English names occur in the text, as well as various locations in Batavia.

The manuscript is written in a neat Jawi hand in black ink, though with a notable diagonal slant. There is rubrication of the first word or words of almost every quatrain. The scribe has used impressed vertical and horizontal lines to guide his hand. On the first page of the manuscript there are only two quatrains, which are possibly written in the same hand as the rest of the manuscript, but certainly it seems that a different pen was used, the strokes being much thicker.

**Transcription (lines 5–8):**

1. Hamba berkata *dengan*¹ sungguhnya | *Jenderal*² Raflis³ banyak budinya /
2. Bicaranya *lembut*⁴ dengan *betulnya* | *Menghukumkan*⁶ rakyat serta adilnya ||/
3. Hamba pohonkan kepada Tuannya | supaya baginda memerintah selama-lamanya ||/
4. serta⁷ sehat panjang umurnya | bertambah daulat dengan darjatnya. ||/

¹In this MS, three dots are written in various different ways; compare *nga* in *dengan* with its occurrence in the same word in the preceding line. Note also the dots above *nga* and *nya* in the next word, *sungguhnya*. Sometimes the dots are formed by one mark of the pen, and at other times by two separate marks, but the two lower dots of the three are almost never differentiated.

²Spelt j.n.d.r.a.l.

³Spelt r.f.l.y.s.

⁴The final position *ha* generally curves round and downwards throughout the MS (see also *ha* in *bertambah* in the last line of the transliteration.

⁵The final position *ta* also curves round and downwards, though on other occasions the end of the *ta* curves upwards.

⁶The prefix *meng* is written separately from *hukumkan* (see also No. 17).

⁷Note that the final letters *ra* and *ta* are joined.

Ben Murtagh
30 SUMENEP, MADURA, 1815

Letter from Pangeran Nata Negara


In this letter the Pangeran states that he is sending Clark presents of a Malay-style kris and a brazier or incense-burner belonging to his late father, the Panembahan. Written in a swift, competent and cursive hand, and in an intimate tone, the letter was probably written by the Pangeran himself for the signature is written in the same ductus and with the same brownish ink. Here, as in all other written communications in Malay from Madura of this period, the place name is always written as Sumeneb with a ba rather than the present-day spelling Sumenep.

Figure 30a. Detail of the signature.

Transcription (heading and lines 1–3):

Qawluh al-Haqq\(^1\) / Bahwa warkat al-ikhlas yang termaktub di dalamnya beberapa tabik dan hormat yang beserta selamat al-khayr / selama-lamanya datang mengadap ke hadapan majlis sahadara saya Tuan Kapten Jims Klarq Resident / di dalam negeri Sumeneb adanya.

Signature:

\(\text{Talib al-da’i al-Pangeran Nata Negara al-amir} \) (‘Student of The Summoner, the Pangeran Nata Negara, the prince’)

\(^1\)Written diagonally upside down.

Annabel Teh Gallop
31 PONTIANAK, 1816

Hikayat Banjar

Hikayat Raja-raja Banjar dan Kotaringin, called in this MS Hikayat Lambu Mangkurat, dated 5 Rejab 1231 (1 June 1816). According to a note on f.1r, this manuscript was copied from an original in the possession of the ruler of Kota Ringin, and was sent by the Sultan of Pontianak (then Sultan Syarif Kasim, r.1808-1819) via Captain William Scott to John Crawfurd, Resident of Yogyakarta, with the intention that it be handed by Crawfurd to Thomas Stamford Raffles. Although the MS does not state precisely where it was written – whether in Kota Ringin or Pontianak – as it was commissioned by the Sultan of Pontianak, it was most likely copied by a Pontianak scribe. Employed by Ras (1968) in his study of Hikayat Banjar as MS ‘E’. 68 ff.; Chinese paper; 31 x 20.5 cm. Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 109). Text in MCP.

London, British Library, Add. 12392, f. 68r.

This text is a dynastic chronicle of the kingdom of Banjarmasin in south Borneo, spanning the 15th to the 17th centuries, relating the founding of the kingdom, the rise of the ruling house, and its later conversion to Islam.

Transcription (lines 3–6):

Adapun yang laki2 itu Pangeran Iman anak Uwan Ratu Ayu adapun / yang perempuan 1 dua orang itu itu anak Ratu Mangkurat tamatlah sudah / surat Melayu tamat kepada hari Sabtu pada jam pukul sembilan siang / pada lima hari bulan Rajab pada hijrah 2 al nabi / salla Allah ‘alayhi wa-sallam seribu dua ratus / tiga puluh asa 3 tamat / al-kalam

1Two kinds of letters are used for the ‘p’ sound in this manuscript. The letter fa, with one dot, can also be read as ‘p’. Sometimes both fa and pa (with three dots) are used in a single word, but both have to be read as ‘p’. Thus this word, perempuan, is spelled ferempuan, f.r.p.w.n.

2There seems to be an extraneous dot above the ha of hijrah.

3Asa means ‘one’; thus tiga puluh asa is ‘31’.

Yumi Sugahara
Belonging to the genre of ‘Mirrors for Princes’, the Taj al-salatin is a compendium of ethics and state-craft, setting out standards of ideal behaviour for rulers and court officials, drawing on a wide repertoire of didactic Islamic works. In an episode quoted from Hikayat Iskandar Zulkarnain, one word in an envoy’s reply from Raja Dara raises Iskandar’s suspicions. Iskandar sends a written report back to Raja Dara, who returns it with the offending word cut out, because it was not his word, adding that if the envoy himself had been present he would have had his tongue cut out in the same way.

In this finely illuminated manuscript, the hand is of the same high standard as the decoration, written with great care and with nicely rounded bowls of nun and nya.

Transcription (lines 1–4):

In this MS, three dots – such as in ca in membaca – are written as a vertical stack of two dots, that nearer the base line being slightly larger, to imply the presence of two dots.

2Ga is written without dots.

3The scribe has erased a mistake by scraping the paper, and writing the word aku on top.

Annabel Teh Gallop
33 CENTRAL JAVA, 1830

Letter in Javanese from Prince Diponegoro

Letter from Prince Diponegoro in Javanese in Pégon script to Colonel J.B. Cleerens and Major H.F. Buschkens, area commanders of the Dutch army during the Java War; dated 17 Syaaban 1245 (12 February 1830). 2 ff. (i.e. one sheet of paper, folded), text on ff. 1r and 1v; Dutch paper, watermarked ‘Van Gelder’; 23 x 19.75 cm. Discussed in [Brood and Delen n.d.:] 213; Carey (2007: 670–3, with a full transcription and translation); Gallop and Porter (2012: 50–1). All three show the first page of the letter; here the second page is presented. The Hague, Nationaal Archief, Collection H.M. de Kock, 2.21.005.33, inv. nr. 208, f.1v.

In this letter in Javanese, Prince Diponegoro instructs Colonel Cleerens and Major Buschkens about the necessary preparations for peace negotiations. The ‘jenderal’ is the Dutch supreme commander, H.M. de Kock. The letter is written in Pégon, the Arabic script as adapted for Javanese, which includes some special devices not found in Jawi.

Transcription (lines 5–9):

\[\text{isun}^1 \text{ mirsa khabar yèn jèndèra}<1>^2 \text{ saiki}^3 \text{ ora ana dadi}^4 \text{ isun angantèn}^5 \text{ saktekaning}^6 / \text{jènderal yèn upama jènderal wis teka sun perih jèderal}^7 \text{ kirima}^8 \text{ layang marang isun} / \text{ isun mundhut}^9 \text{ pesanggerahan ana Kalireca}^{10} \text{ ing kono muqa}^{11} \text{ isun ketemua}^{12} \text{ lan jènderal / kaserat}^{13} \text{ ing dinten Jum’ah wulan Sya’ban tanggal kaping pitulas ing tahun}^{14} \text{ Jimawwal ha}^{15} \text{ hijrat / al-nabi s.m.}^{16} \text{ min Makati ila al-madiniati al-sharifati \<h.m.r.g\>}^{17}\]

1As a rule, Javanese texts in Pégon are fully vocalised. However, initial vowels — written with the alif as their ‘chair’ — do not take the hamza’.
2The lam, inserted above the ra, may have been omitted due to similarity in form with the ra (haplography).
3The text has sahiki, with a ha, reminiscent of the spelling in Javanese characters.
4Spelt dadiy, with a sukun over the ya.
5Spelt angantèyni, with a sukun over the ya.
6Spelt as two separate words sak and tekaning. The k of sak is used in the same way that a glottal stop in this position is rendered in Javanese script.
7Instead of jènderal.
8Spelt kirima, with a sukun over the ya.
9Note the use of the letter dha (dal with 3 dots undeneath), one of the extra letters which distinguishes Pégon from Jawi, but which can also be seen in Malay texts, perhaps under Javanese influence (see Nos. 4, 5, 11).
10Instead of Kalireca. The ca is written with two vertical connected dots.
11Spelt mwpqa, with a sukun over the wau.
12Spelt ketemwaba, with a sukun over the wau. The h is redundant (but would have been normal in Javanese script).
13From here on the writing is gundhil ‘hairless’, i.e. without vocalisation.
14Instead of taun (but the normal spelling in Javanese script).
15Erroneous ha, not erased, duplicating the following initial ha of hijrat.
16An unusual abbreviation formed of the first and last letters of salla Allîh ‘alayhi wa-sallam (cf. Gacek 2012: 6)
17i.e. 1245. The date is given not in numerals but in letters with numerical value, which are written together as one word (‘gh’ stands for the letter ghain). The reader is alerted to this usage by certain marks before and after the formula (as seen in the image). Special marks are also used for a similar purpose in Javanese script.

Willem van der Molen
34 MECCA, 1832

Sabil al-Muhtadin


Sabil al-Muhtadin is a monumental work on Islamic law by Muhammad Arsyad al-Banjari (1710–1812), who was born in Banjar in south Kalimantan. Judging from the handwriting, this thick manuscript was written by a single scribe from beginning to end. The small neat hand can hardly be called artistic, but can be deemed to display many of the typical features of Jawi hands, of which the most prominent is the elongated letter initial sin without ‘teeth’ in the words seperti and sembahyang in the second line. This hand is closer in style to the classical Arabic naskh than to the nasta’liq-type script which is more common in Jawi hands.

Transcription (lines 1–4):

... puasanya yang ditinggalkannya pada masa kufur. Bermula dikehendak dengan tiada wajib atas / kafir puasa dan barangsebagainya1 seperti sembahyang dan zakat2 yakni tiada dituntut dengan dia / dan tiada disyiksa ia dengan dia di dalam dunia. Tetapi dituntut dan disyiksa ia di dalam / akhirat sebab meninggalkan dia.

1Conjoined words.
2Spelt z.k.w.t, in accordance with the standard orthography (rasm ‘Uthmani) of the Qur’an (see e.g. Qur’an 2: 43).

Ali Akbar
Sejarah Melayu

Entitled here *Hikayat Melayu* (f. 301r), this MS of the work commonly known as *Sejarah Melayu* or *Sulalat al-Salatin* was completed on ‘Saturday 16 Rajab’. Although no year is given in the colophon on f. 301r, the fact that 16 Rajab falls on a Saturday, combined with the years in the watermark, and the provenance of the manuscript, points to 1248 AH, in which case 16 Rajab [1248] = 8 December 1832. (The closest other years when 16 Rajab is a Saturday are 1825 and 1840.) The colophon further states that copying was done by Husin bin Ismail in the village of Tanah Merah in Singapore. Husin bin Ismail was of Bugis origin and was one of the most prolific scribes of Malay (and Bugis) manuscripts, active in Singapore between c.1830–1865 (see Tol 2001: 301 ff.; lightish blue English paper, three types, all watermarked with a shield containing ‘V E I C’ and ‘J Whatman 1832’ (quires 1–13,16 –19), ‘J Whatman / Balaston & Co’ (q.14-15, 20-24); ‘E Wise 1830’ (q.25-27); 22.5 x 18 cm. Text in MCP.

London, British Library, Or. 16214, f. 2r.

The text is only found on the recto sides, which possibly indicates that this manuscript was commissioned for educational purposes. Arabic text is written in red ink. The writing is neat and regular which is typical of Husin bin Ismail. In contrast to Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munshi (No. 37), despite having an easily recognisable hand Husin has no evidently distinct features in his writing. A characteristic which he shares with other scribes is often writing *kaf* for *ga* (Tol 2001: 125). Another distinctive feature is his consistent use of the regular *lam-alif* shape instead of the V-shaped *lam-alif* (as often used by Abdullah; Tol 2001: 123). Interestingly, in our fragment he writes *orang besar* differently on both occurrences, first conjoined and then separated. Remarkable is the spelling of *cucu*, using the number ‘2’ (c.w.2).

Transcription (lines 8–12):

Dan pada suatu masa bahwa fakir duduk pada suatu majlis dengan orangbesar1 bersenda gurau.2 Pada / antara itu ada seorang besar3 terlebih mulihnya dan terlebih besar martabatnya daripada yang lain.4 Maka berkata ia / kepada fakir, ‘hamba dengar hikayat Melayu5 dibawa oleh orang dari Goa6. Barang kita perbaiki kiranya dengan / istiadatnya supaya diketahui oleh segala7 anak cucu8 kita yang kemudian daripada kita dan boleh diingatkannya / oleh segala9 mereka itu syahdan adalah beroleh faidah ia daripadanya.’

1*orang* and *besar* conjoined.
2*gurau*; k.w.r.w.
3*seorang* and *besar* separated.
4Regular *lam-alif* shape.
5Regular *lam-alif* shape.
6*Goa*; k.w.h.
7*segala*; s.g.l, *ga* with one dot underneath.
8*cucu*; c.w.2
9*segala*; s.g.l, *ga* with one dot underneath.

Roger Tol
JAMBI, 1837

Hikayat negeri Jambi

This anonymous piece of historical (or rather, quasi-historical) literature was copied/composed in a week between 20 Rabiulawal and 27 Rabiulakhir 1253 (24 June–31 July 1837) in Muara Kampai, Jambi. 12 ff.; thin wove paper; 33 x 20.5 cm. Juynboll (1899: 244–5); Wieringa (1998: 229); Iskandar (1999, I: 72). Two other Leiden MSS of this text, LUB Cod.Or.12.189 and KITLV Or. 72 (in Roman characters) (see Iskandar 1999, I: 638; II: 760–2), do not show significant differences between each other and Cod.Or. 2013. Hikayat negeri Jambi has never yet been published or translated (for recent summaries, see Iskandar 1999, II: 761–2; Kukushkin 2004). Leiden University Library, Cod.Or. 2013, f. 2r.

Beginning with legends about pre-Islamic Jambi, Hikayat negeri Jambi continues with a narrative of the foundation of the new Jambi dynasty by Datuk Paduka Berhala (allegedly from Turkey), the ensuing Islamisation of the state, its liberation from Mataram suzerainty and further half-legendary history until the reign of Sultan Muhammad Fakhruddin (1833–1841).

The MS is written in a neat fairly thin hand slightly tilted to the right. It shows pronounced elements of cursive script, for instance in long sloping strokes of kaf and ra, and long strokes of sin (without ‘teeth’) and nun in their final positions. The ligatures of ra with ha or ta marbuta merely produce a small loop on the tail of the ra, while the ligature of ‘saucer’- or ‘bowl’-like letters and ha or ta marbuta resemble an elongated tilde.

Transcription (lines 16–20):


1 Berkatah finishes with a ha.
2 Adindah finishes with a ha.
3 Ca in mencari is written with the three dots in a single stroke.
4 Ba and ta marbuta are joined in a ligature similar to a tilde.
5 Pa and ta marbuta are joined in a ligature similar to a tilde.
6 Ga is written with one dot above.
7 Berkawal = berkaul, ‘give an oath’, ‘say a special kind of prayer’.
8 In the text this maka is erroneously followed by another one at the start of the next line (a case of dittography).
9 Ga is written with one dot below.

Vladimir Braginsky
37 SINGAPORE, 1849

Hikayat Abdullah

*Hikayat Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi*. Lithograph published by the ‘Bukit Zion’ Mission Press in Singapore in 1849. [5], 441, [6]; thin yellowish wove paper, no watermark; 17.5 x 11.5 cm. For a discussion and annotated edition of this lithograph, see Sweeney (2008). Text in MCP.


This lithographed book was published in 1849 from an autograph manuscript written by Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi himself. The page shown here displays the characteristics of Abdullah’s handwriting: the use of v-shaped lam-alif alongside its regular shape; the consistent use of a dot with ga (thus distinguishing it from kaf); the use of so-called super-ya, i.e. an isolated ya written above the line; and danlagi always spelled conjoined (Tol 2001: 121–5).

**Figure 37a.** Detail to show the regular lam-alif in ‘Melayu’ and v-shaped lam-alif in ‘lain’ in line 6.

**Transcription (lines 3–6):**

Syahdan maka hendaklah pula engkau mengetahui bahwasanya bahasa orang Eropa itu pada tiap2 hari1 dari / dahulu sampai sekarang ini pun diperbaikinya2 dan terangkannya jalannya dan ditebasnya semak samunnya dan disapunya / sampah2nya, maka lorong2nya itu pun telah diaturkannya serta diletakkannya pula masing2 perkataan itu dengan hukum2nya; / danlagi3 pula ia pun seperti hal Melayu4 juga5 meminjam perkataan bahasa lain6 bangsa dijadikannya bahasanya sendiri.7

1 hari: h.a.r.super-ya.
2 diperbaikinya: d.p.r.b.a.y.q.k.y.ny.
3 danlagi: conjoined.
4 Regular lam-alif.
5 juga: j.w.g.
6 V-shaped lam-alif.
7 Super-ya.

Roger Tol
38 BIMA, MID 19TH CENTURY

Bo’ Sangaji Kai

The Bo’ Sangaji Kai is the archive book of the palace of Bima in Sumbawa (Chambert-Loir 2000, 2014). The sample below contains a document copied from an earlier ‘Major Bo’ (Bo’ Besar) on 1 Rabiulawal 1163 (8 February 1750) by order of a dignitary, Bumi Ngoco Bolo, into a now missing MS, and then copied again into our MS at an unknown date. 66 ff.; Dutch paper. ‘D & C Blauw’; 57 x 34 cm. Chambert-Loir and Salahuddin (1999). Text in MCP.

Bima, Yayasan Museum Samparaja.

The MS is exceptionally large in format, with up to 39 lines per page in a tiny, very tight hand; the page shown opposite contains up to 1,603 words. The handwriting is professional and elegant, evidently that of one of the secretaries of the palace, but is so small that some letters are reduced to a shapeless mass. The script slightly slants to the right and is characterised by long oblique lines upwards on the initial sin and downwards on the ra, which combine with the relatively long alif and kaf to give the impression of a script stretched vertically and diagonally and compressed horizontally. Some long curves ‘cup’ the following words, while ra is usually convex. Final ya has two different shapes as seen in the last word, memberi, of lines 2 and 3, and as often in Jawi, the alif maqṣūra is written as a ya with two dots (e.g. salla in line 1, hatta in line 22). As a rule, but with exceptions, ka / ga and sin / syin are differentiated. Dots of letters are written in a single stroke, with three dots looking like an inverted comma, which sometimes seem to be attached to the body of the letter (e.g. the pa ofberapa in line 2, and the ba of bernama in line 3). The copyist fills up each line by stretching the last letter (line 4) or compressing the last words (lines 5, 10), or by adding one short dash (lines 13, 14, 18) or two (line 35). Four groups of words are underlined which are people’s names.

Transcription (lines 1–3):

Hijrat al-nabi salla’lhu alaihi wa sallama sanat¹ 1163² tahun Alif sehari bulan Rabiulawal pada hari Ahad waktu zuhur, tatalka itulah Bumi Ngoco Bolo bernama Ismail Daeng Mangalai Loe membaharui lagi perkataan daripada asal mula raja yang kedua pihak / yang di dalam bo’ besar akan mengatakan daripada Rumata Mawa’a Bilmama³ yang turun-temu[ru]n sampai kepada segala anak cucunya. Pada zaman itu Mawa’a Bilmama naik di atas⁴ tahta kerajaan dalam tanah Bima. Antara berapa lamanya di atas kerajaan itu, maka Mawa’a Bilmana itu pun adalah pikirkan hal yang memberi / manfaat kepada segala anak cucunya. Mawa’a Bilmama mufakat dengan saudaranya yang bernama Rumata Nggampo Donggo hendaknya diserahkan kerajaannya kepada saudaranya serta menghi[m]pankan segala raja-raja dan segala rakyat dalam Tanah Bima.

¹There seems to be a letter after sanat, perhaps a wau for wa; it should then read: sanat 1163 wa tahun alif.
²The year is written in Arabic numerals from right to left, and again above the line, for clarity, in the more usual left to right.
³m.w’.b.l.m.a.n The Bo’ is practically illegible for anyone not familiar with Bima’s titles of nobility and main historical characters.
⁴Di and atas written separately would be d.a.t.s, but di atas as one word is written d.y.a.t.s.

Henri Chambert-Loir
SRI LANKA, MID 19TH CENTURY

Adab raja-raja

This manuscript is on Malay and Islamic ethics and policies, offering guidance particularly to Malay rulers in administering their states fairly in line with the teachings of Islam. It has 18 fasl or chapters. The content has a close relationship with a similar Malay text, Taj al-salatin, composed in Aceh in 1603. In fact in the 11th fasl, it is clearly stated that the fasl concerned was taken from Taj al-salatin. 78 ff.; Italian wove paper; watermark ‘Almasso’; 21.3 x 15 cm.; 19 lines per page; unbound. Although undated, Asma (1994: 120) has noted another Malay MS dated 1830 with the same watermark, while Russell Jones (pers. comm., 18 October 2014) has suggested a date range of between 1830–1871. The MS was acquired in 1985. Asma (1994); Mohd. Taib (2006). Kuala Lumpur, Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia, MSS 432, p. [1].

The text is mostly in Malay with selected verses in Arabic, mainly from the Qur’an and Hadith, written in red ink. It is written very cursively in a quick hand with a moderately thick nib. The style is closely related to riqa’ or ‘secretary style’ of handwriting. The letters are written rather low, especially the letter alif. In many cases the letters are connected to one another because of the speed of the handwriting. In some cases dal is written with one dot beneath, for example in adapun and adakah on p. 1. The dammah sign is placed over the letter wau to help reading certain sounds, for example in mau (m.a.w) and peroleh (p.r.w.l.h), both on p. 3. Certain words are spelled with the addition of alif where none might be expected, perhaps reflecting local pronunciation, for example dangan on pp. 3 and 4. We frequently find the addition of the letter ha to certain words, for example adah on p.4 and tuha on p.1. The incipit starts with the Basmallah, but on the last page there is no colophon and the text ends abruptly. This raises the possibility that the work was left uncompleted by the writer.

Transcription¹ (lines 1–7, Malay text only):

Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim. Fasal yang pertama peri mengatakan Allah Ta’ala menjadikan nabi / Allah Adam seperti firman Allah Ta’ala [Arabic text]. Ertinya: bahawasanya / Allah Ta’ala menjadikan Adam rupa yang maha tinggi murah; maka nyatalah kejadian daripada / segala manusia amat mulia dan terlebih besar daripada segala yang dijadikan, seperti firman-Nya / Allah Ta’ala. [Arabic text]. Ertinya: bahawasanya Allah menyuruhkan / berbuat adil dan kebajikan dan lagi seperti hadith qudsii . [Arabic text]. Ertinya: hai anak Adam, perbuatlah olehmu yang adil seperti barang /

¹See also Mohd. Taib (2006: 80).

Wan Ali Wan Mamat
40  MELAKA, 1850

Sullam al-mubtadi

Leiden University Library; Kl. 22 (folio unidentified).

Manuscript copy of a well known manual on fiqh, originally written by Dawud ibn Abdullah ibn Idris al-Fatani in Mecca in 1252/1836; many printed editions are known, right up until the present day (Heer 2012: 33). The chosen fragment was also used in Klinkert’s publication of facsimiles of Malay manuscripts (Klinkert 1885: 3). The Arabic loanword asi (line 11), i.e. ‘disobedient’ (Arabic ‘āṣī), is included in Klinkert’s dictionary (1930: 649), referring to his 1885 publication of facsimiles shown here.

Transcription (lines 1-7):

Ini suatu fasal maka wajiblah atas wali kanak-kanak laki-laki dan perempuan / yang mumayiz\(^1\) keduaanya bahwa menyuruh akan keduaanya dengan sembahyang lima waktu / dan mengajar akan keduaanya hukumnya daripada rukunnya dan syaratnya dan yang membatalkan / dia jika ada umur keduaanya tujuh tahun dan dipukul akan keduaanya atas / meninggalkan dia. Kemudian daripada sepuluh tahun seperti disuruh puasa apabila / kuasa ia akan dia dan wajib atas wali al-amr\(^2\) yakni orang yang {m.m.r}\(^3\) / memerintahkan pekerjaan Muslimin membunuh akan orang yang meninggalkan sembahyang sebab /...

\(^1\)Ar. mumayyiz, ‘the age of discretion (7 years) (Isl.)’ (Jones 2007: 211).
\(^2\)Ar., male legal guardian, usually the father.
\(^3\)As the following line makes clear, the word memerintahkan should have been written here, but the copyist lacked space.

E.P. Wieringa
FIGURE 40. *Sullam al-mubtadi*, Melaka, 1850. Leiden University Library, Kl. 22 (cropped; reproduced from Klinkert 1885: 3).
Regulations on the lending of land

Entitled Peraturan dari meminjam tanah, ‘Regulations on the the lending of land’, this manuscript is in fact a copy made by or for the Secretary of the Resident (sekertaris residin) D. van Sekreeven, on 9 December 1851, of the original agreement dated 5 July 1779 between the Dutch East India Company during the tenure of Governor-General Reinier de Klerk (1777–1780) and the first Sultan of Pontianak, Pangeran Syarif Abdul Rahman (r.1772–1808, as Sultan from 1779). 6 ff.; lined ledger book paper, watermarked with a circle containing the letter ‘K’ and ‘Original’ above the circle and ‘Superfine’ below; 30 x 19.5 cm. Black ink seal in the top right corner of the first page. Acquired by Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia from Tuan Syarif Hud of Pontianak, Kalimatan Barat, on 12 September 2008. Katalog (2011: 157).


The manuscript is written in Jawi script in beautiful naskhi style of calligraphy (khat). The writing is very clear and neat with no smudges or cancellations. In the document, some of the names of the Dutch officials were also written in romanised script beside the Jawi script.

Transcription (lines 1-11):

Peraturan dari meminjam tanah /
Bahawa peraturan tersebut di bawah ini diperbuat dengan nama / dan perintah gupernur jenral Rejnir Deklerk¹ / beserta tuan-tuan / Raad van India,² maka yang dijadikan wakil bestur³ yang paling / tinggi dalam ini negeri, akan mengurus hal mengangkat Sultan / yakni saya rasidin Wilem Adrian Palm⁴ rasidin dari Rembang / saitu akan menguruskan hal mengangkat Sultan dari Sesangau dan / Pontianak Pangeran Syarif Abdul Rahman ibn Habib Husain / al-Qadri yang mana Sultan menerima pemerintahan dari ini negeri / serta negeri-negeri yang mendekan dan negeri-negeri yang dikasi pinjam oleh / Ost India Kompani⁵ . . .

¹r.j.n.y.r d.k.l.r.k, i.e. Reynier de Klerk.
²r.a.d p.n a.y.n.d.y (here an elsewhere final ya written without dots), i.e. Raad van Indie.
³b.s.t.w.r, i.e. bestoor.
⁴w.y.l.m a.d.r.y.a.n p.l.m, i.e. Willem Adriaan Palm.
⁵a.w.s.t a.y.n.d.y k.w.m.p.a.n.y, i.e. Oost Indische Compagnie.

Hashim bin Musa
42 PENYENGAT, RIAU, 1856

Syair Siti Dhawiyyah

Syair Siti Dhawiyyah (also known as Syair Haris Fadhilah). 21 Zulkaidah 1269 (26 August 1853) is given as the date copying was begun by Iskandar (1999: 738); 1273 AH (1856/7 AD) is in fact the date of the note on the flyleaf. 102 pp.; British white laid and blue wove paper, watermark Britannia with ‘J Whatman’; 20 x 15.5. Iskandar (1999: 738); van Ronkel (1909: 341; 1921: 67–8); Mulaika Hijjas (2011: 142–69).

Leiden University Library, Kl. 157, p. [1] (text is not numbered).

This is an interesting example of a non-professional and female hand. According to Klinkert’s note, the MS was copied by a Malay woman from Penyengat, with what Iskandar (1999: 738) describes as ‘bad writing’. Klinkert also provides the name of the author, Tuan Bilal Abu, who by 1864 had been dead for 30 years. In spite of Iskandar’s judgement (cf. that of Raja Ali Haji on the ‘very defective’ writing and spelling in an MS copied by a woman which he was sending to Von de Wall, see van der Putten and Al Azhar 1995: 40), the writing is legible and competent. Although perhaps inelegant, the hand is consistent throughout the MS. Spelling, particularly of Arabic-derived words, is somewhat erratic, but probably not much more so than in other Jawi MSS. The writer was evidently familiar with the conventions, such as the neat division into two columns, with the letters stretched or dashes inserted to fill up the allotted space. Judging by the note on the flyleaf asking borrowers to return the MS promptly, MSS produced by non-professional scribes did circulate.

Transcription (lines 13–16):

Malam Ahad mula disurat¹ | Syair² dikarang fakir yang larat | Daripada hati sangat gelorat³ | Dikarangkan syair tamsil⁴ ‘ibarat || | Syair dikarang dagang yang fakir | Diambit⁵ ‘ibarat di sinilah fikir || | Dari dahulu sampai ke akhir | Perkataan⁶ jangan diberi mungkir ||

¹Ta marbuta is joined to the preceding ra.
²Three dots erroneously placed aboved the ‘ayn, an error which is repeated but corrected in line 15.
³Although this hand usually places three dots over ga to distinguish it from kaf, here they are omitted.
⁴Here and elsewhere lam alif is used for final lam.
⁵Spelt d.’m.b.l.
⁶In both ‘akhir’ and ‘perkataan’ there is a redundant alif, a fairly common feature of this hand.

Mulaika Hijjas
FIGURE 42. Syair Siti Dhawiyyah, Riau, 1856. Leiden University Library, Kl. 157, p. [1] (cropped).
Kitab 'atiyat al-rahman

Palembang, Private collection of Kemas Andi Syarifuddin.

Kitab 'atiyat al-rahman was composed by Syekh Muhammad Azhari bin Abdullah al-Falimbani, and like Kitab sittin is a bilingual religious text in Arabic and Malay. The Arabic text is written in red ink and is in a naskhi hand, while the translation into Malay, written in black ink with a slight slant to the right, is closer to nasta’liq in style. The margin contains a commentary on the main text. As the style of handwriting, nib size and colour of ink all differ, it can be presumed that the marginal commentary was added later by a different writer.

Transcription (lines 1–6, Malay text in black ink only):


Ali Akbar
44  PENYENGAT, RIAU, 1864

Syair Sultan Yahya

*Syair Sultan Yahya*, dated 29 Rabiulakhir 1281 (1 October 1864). Copied by Klinkert’s scribe, called ‘mijn schrijver’ by Klinkert in his note on the flyleaf but unfortunately no name is given. Klinkert’s note also states the *syair* was probably composed by Daeng Wuh, who was born in Penyengat and who had died in Pahang 13 years previously. She was from a member of the royal family and was married to one Said Moehasin Atas. 140 pp.; Dutch paper, watermark ‘Eendracht’ with ‘Van Gelder’; 20 x 16 cm. Iskandar (1999: 731); Mulaika Hijjas (2011: 75–108); van Ronkel (1921: 65).

Leiden University Library, Kl. 139, p. [1].

The text opens with praise for Muhammad, before proceeding to the romantic *syair* relating the trials and tribulations of Siti Jauhar Manikam and her siblings. Orphaned and at risk of forced marriage, Siti Jauhar Manikam disguises herself as a man and goes to sea in search of her brother. Her travels bring her to Sultan Yahya, whose amorous advances she evades through various magical means, eventually becoming his official wife. The *syair* apparently draws on both Panji stories and south Sumatran oral tales such as Anggun Che Tunggal.

The manuscript is a clean copy made for Klinkert and, judging by the very neat, consistent and confident hand throughout, was written by a professional scribe. A summary and notes by Klinkert appear in the beginning, with further marginal notes by him throughout the text.

Lines are elongated to fit the text box (for example line 3, *la ilaha* . . . ). Little concession is made to spaces between words. Three dots above letters are made without lifting the pen, so that they appear more like an apostrophe or the number 2. *Ga* is consistently distinguished from *kaft* with a dot. Initial *sin* usually starts high above the line. When a ‘bowl’ or a ‘saucer’ letter (to use the terminology of Lewis 1954) appears at the end of a line, the final upwards curve is often truncated.

Transcription (lines 1–6):

```
Bismillah itu puji yang mulia | memuji Allah Tuhan yang kaya | Berkat Nabi segala ambiya¹ | Hendaklah kita sekalian percaya || | / La ilaha illa Allah | Tiada Tuhan melainkan Allah | / Sifatnya dua puluh yang terjumlah | Tiadalah boleh² kita menyalah || | / Sifat dua puluh dibahagi empat | Itulah ditilik dengan ma’rifat | / Hendaklah dikenal dhat dan sifat | Teguhkan³ iman jadi hakikat. ||
```

¹The use of *ambiya* rather than *anbiya* may suggest the scribe was not proficient in Arabic, as also the use of spelling of *hadit* for *hadith* below (l. 12).
²Final *ha* usually lacks the complete loop, appearing more like a *dal* or *ra*.
³Spelt t.k.w.t.k.n.

*Mulaika Hijjas*
FIGURE 44. *Syair Sultan Yahya*, Riau, 1864. Leiden University Library, Kl. 139, p. [1].
45  PENANG, 1868

*Mawahib rabb al-falaq*

Lithograph of a work composed by Ismail bin Abdullāh al-Shafī’i al-Shadhīlī al-Naqṣbandī al-Khalīdī in Tēluk Belanga (Singapore) on 8 Zulhijjah 1268 (23 September 1852), and printed at the Muhammadiyah press of Hāji Muḥammad Sāliḥ Hāji Yāmīmī in Palembang in Penang on 24 Ramadan 1284 (19 January 1868), and thus probably written in the hand of a Penang scribe employed at the lithographic printing press. 116 ff; paper; 20.5 x 15 cm.

Agam, Kutubkhanah Surau Simpang, Matur Katik. (Digitised: EAP352_EMWSPJCSB_SS_01)

The text deals with the doctrines and ritual practices of the Naqṣbandīyah brotherhood. This copy of the lithographed text derives from the collection of Syaikh Dr Hāji Abdul Karīm Amrullah (1879–1945), now preserved by his granddaughter Halimah in the library of Surau Simpang in Matur Katik, Agam in West Sumatra.

Transcription (lines 1–4):

*Mereka yang sampai dan ketika itu engkau kenallah di sana itu akan barang yang engkau / bebalkandia dan engkau dapatlah daripada segala rahasia akan barang yang lemah daripada / mengetahui dia tiap siapa2 yang menggali akan dia dan puaslah / engkau ketika itu daripada minuman kesukaan akan yang terlebih hening . . .

I.R. Katkova
FIGURE 45. Mawahib rabb al-falaq, Penang, 1868. Kutubkhanah Surau Simpang, EAP352_EMWSPJCSB_SS_01.
The genealogies of the kings of Luwu and Soppeng

Turunan raja Luwu dan raja Soppeng (The genealogies of the kings of Luwu and Soppeng), copied c.1870 in Makassar, south Sulawesi. The annotations in roman script on f. 1v and f. 2v appear to be in the hand of Professor G.K. Niemann (1823–1905), a scholar of South Sulawesi and editor of the Geschiedenis van Tanete (1883). The simple genealogies it contains suggest that the MS was commissioned by a European scholar who wished to access such information in Malay. The MS contains a number of eighteenth and nineteenth-century dates, of which the most recent is 1861 (f. 1v). The scribe is unknown but was almost certainly literate in the Bugis-Makasar script. 9 ff.; European paper; 21 cm x 35 cm. Van Ronkel (1908: 219); Iskandar (1999: 767–8).

The text comprises royal genealogies of four Bugis-speaking kingdoms of South Sulawesi: Luwu, Soppeng, Tanete and Sidenreng. It is unclear why the MS is written in the Jawi script in the Malay language as the Bugis-Makasar script (and the Bugis language) was more widely understood by those likely to be interested in the subject. The script is neatly written in a fine hand suggesting the work of a professional copyist. The most striking feature of the script is its frequent use of the letter ra written as a long, straight diagonal ending with an almost vertical ‘uptick’. Occasionally a more typical, shorter, more curved character is employed, notably for the word raja, though the unusual ‘long’ ra is also employed for this word. This uncharacteristic ra appears to reflect an influence from the Bugis-Makasar script, which is angular and linear in character, at least in its 19th-century form. This linearity can be detected also in the Arabic numbers, which are angled at approximately 45 degrees from the vertical, reminiscent of many Bugis-Makasar characters.

Transcription (lines 1–4):

Bahwa inilah menyatakan turunan¹ raja Luwu² dan raja Soppeng kaum / keluarga berlaki isteri turun-menurun adanya. / Adapun raja Luwu’ daripada orang menurun kedua laki isteri pada nomor 1 sampai / kepada nomor 18 sekalian itu masing-masing anaknya juga menggantikan kerajaanya.

¹All instances of ra in this passage are ‘long, linear’ ra.
²The modern spelling and pronunciation is Luwu.

Ian Caldwell
FIGURE 46. Genealogies of the kings of Luwu and Soppeng, Makassar, c.1870. KITLV, Or. 84, f. 1r.
47 RIAU, 1872

Letter from Raja Ali Haji

Letter from Raja Ali Haji to Hermann von de Wall, 30 Zulkaidah 1288 (10 February 1872). The author was at the time of writing on the island of Pengujan as he states in the letter. Large volume of letters; this letter on pp.125-128. 2 ff.; European paper; 17.5 x 10 cm. Van Ronkel (1909); van der Putten and Azhar (1995: 104). Jakarta, Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, Ml. 174, p. 125.

This letter from Raja Ali Haji deals concisely with the following points: he encloses lexicographic notes in reply to Von de Wall’s queries, and promises to work on new queries to the best of his abilities, for he is working on his own dictionary and will be back from Pengujan on Sunday to visit Von de Wall on Monday, God willing.

The handwriting is brisk and idiosyncratic, unadorned but highly experienced, as we – unsurprisingly – find hardly any errors. The initial letter sin in Salam is typical for Raja Ali Haji’s later letters, and so is the form of the lam-ha (-lah) in many instances where the concluding ha is hardly discernible. Another characteristic in his letters is the use of kita to refer to himself, instead of saya or sahaya.

Transcription:

Jan van der Putten
FIGURE 47. Letter from Raja Ali Haji, Riau, 1872. Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, Ml. 174, p. 125.
Wallace’s visit to Aru


This document was written in 1872 by the man who had piloted Alfred Russel Wallace up the Wanumbai river in Aru in 1857. It was given by its author to an Australian naturalist, J.T. Cockerell, who visited Aru in 1872, to be forwarded to Wallace in England. Although evidently written with care, the document is extremely hard to decipher and to interpret, and exercised the minds of both the Malay scholars C.O. Blagden and W.W. Skeat, to whom Wallace sent it in 1909 for reading. The text is given below in full, with a suggested translation.

Transcription:


‘This is a record based on memories of the past, from the Malays whose forefathers have possessed the land of Aru up to the land of Wasir. The English came here to meet us Malays. Wallace, who was the English chief, established a bond of friendship with all the elders of the house, and their children and grandchildren, their children and grandchildren. Kampong Walai; the imam who teaches students, the end.’

¹Note the truncated medial form of nga.
²Here and elsewhere, ‘xxx’ represents crossings-out by the scribe.
³Henri Chambert-Loir (pers. comm., 13 March 2013), suggested that this symbol might represent the manifold descendants of the house.

Annabel Teh Gallop
49  SINGAPORE, 1881

Kitab Buncang Tigun berdua nabi-nabi Taibi Sian Gun

The colophon (pp. 33–4) states that the copying was finished on the 24th of the eight month of the (Chinese) year Sin Ci; Sunday, 25 Zulkaidah 1298 or 16 October 1881, at four o’clock in the afternoon in Kampung Empat Ulu, Palembang. The title page mentions 1299 (November 1881 – November 1882) as the year of printing, while the publisher was Haji Termidi of Daerah Kampung Haji Lane in Singapore (p. 34). Proudfoot (1993: 553) reads the name of the editor (yang menahukannya ini kitab, p. 34) as Ooi Guan Yee, but Oi Guan Aik seems to be more likely. The correct transcription of the name of the author (mentioned on p. 34) is also unclear. His name has been spelled as ‘Baba Kwa Tiki Taka’ (Salmon 1981: 199) and also tentatively as ‘Baba Kwa Tek Yee, Taka Laut’ (Proudfoot 1993: 553). The Jawi spelling supports Salmon’s (1981: 21; 197; 199) suggestion that presumably he was the same person as (Baba) Ko Tek ie. The title page reads Kitab Buncang Tigun berdua nabi-nabi Taibi Sian Gun adanya 1299. However, in the colophon (p. 33) the book is called Kitab King Sin Liwuk. 34 pp.; European paper; 21 x 16 cm. Salmon (1981: 199); Proudfoot (1993: 553–4). Jakarta, Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, XXXII 907, p. 2.

Written in Palembang, the book was published the following month as a lithograph in Singapore. The hand is probably that of a Malay scribe in Singapore employed by the publisher Haji Termidi. This text belongs to so-called Baba literature, intended for Chinese whose mother tongue was Malay. Also known as (Kitab) Boen Tsiang Ti Koen (Salmon 1981:199), it is a Malay translation of a Chinese religious work dealing with Wenchang Dijun, the Taoist god of literature.

Transcription (lines 1–7):

Bahwa ini kitab menuruni surah daripada / nabi Bun Cang ² Tigun ³ berdua nabi-nabi Taibi Sian Gun ⁴ / mene-

tapkan sekalian obat di dalam dunia ⁵ ini membuat kebajikan / pahala dan dosa. Maka adalah tersebut di
dalam ini suranya ⁶ / Hai sekalian orang yang suka ⁷ membacanya dan suka menengarnya / serta dengan

ikhlas bersungguh2 di dalam hatinya, apakah kiranya / jika diterima olehmu hidayat yang dipersembahkan

atasnya hamba padamu / . . .

¹Proudfoot (1993: 553) provides the titles ‘Bun Chang Ti Kun Berdua Nabi-Nabi Tai Bi Sian Kun’ and
‘Kitab King Sin Liwuk.’
²In contrast to the title page bun and cang are divided.
³Ga written with dot above.
⁴cf. the title of a contemporaneous publication, published in Batavia 1884, probably by the same
author: Ini kitab dari Nabi-nabi Boen Tjiong Tekoen dan Taij Sian Koen, aken di tjeritaken dari oemat di
doenia jak berboeat kedosan (Salmon 1981: 197). In the margin a former owner has added a transli-
teration of the first ‘prophet’ (nabi), viz. ‘Boen-ts’iang Ti-koen’, also providing the Chinese charac-
ters and a Dutch explanation (‘God van de letterkunde’). On some pages of this booklet there are also
some marginal question marks, perhaps also by its erstwhile (Dutch) owner.
⁵d.n.ny.a.
⁶Spelt s.w.r.a.ny, i.e. surahnya (cf. line 1). As the text deals with the heritage of Taoist nabi-nabi (pro-
phets), its author uses the term surah (Arabic sūra), just as in the Qur’an.
⁷Here and in the next occurrence too, spelt s.w.q.a.

E.P. Wieringa
FIGURE 49. *Kitab Bunchang Tigun,* Singapore, 1881. Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, XXXII 907, (top) p. 2; (bottom) detail of p. 34 giving the names of the author and editor (reproduced from a photocopy; both pages cropped).
50 MELAKA, 1882

Hikayat Hang Tuah


This is a two-volume copy of the Hikayat Hang Tuah. Each volume has a leather binding with gold tooling and is illuminated on the first two pages. The handwriting is neat and clear. The letters are angular (e.g. the lam in ‘segala’ in line 3) and slant markedly towards the left, both of which are common features in Southeast Asian calligraphy (Blair 2008: 563). The initial sin is elongated and stretches upwards above the top level of the alif, while the tails of ra, final lam and final kaf are long and stretch under the following letters.

Transcription (lines 1–5):

Wa-bihi nastaʾin billâhi ‘alâ. Ini hikayat Hang Tuah yang amat setiawan / pada tuannya. Sekali persetua 1 adalah seorang raja di keinderaan. 2 Maka / raja itu terlalu amat besar kerajaannya; daripada segala raja indera / seorang pun tiada menyamai dia, sekalian menurut titahnya / baginda itu.

1Spelt with a ya’ at the end rather than an alif.
2The hamzah is often erratically used. For instance here the alif between kaf and nun is missing a hamzah above it, nor is there one at the end on the alif before the nun.

Farouk Yahya
51 TAIPING, PERAK, 1882

**Treatise on divination**


London, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland; Maxwell 15, f. 88r.

The text contains 53 chapters, most of which deal with various divinatory techniques such as lot-casting, bibliomancy, auspicious and inauspicious times (for example the rejang calendar depicted here), omens and dream interpretation. There are 44 pages of illustrations as well as 12 pages of diagrams. The handwriting is neat and clear. The letter ga is written with an additional bar instead of a dot (as in the Persian gaf); an exception is the word ‘gajah’ (‘elephant’) where the ga is written with neither a bar nor a dot. The final kaf in the word ‘jika’ (‘if’) often tends to be fairly flat and shaped almost like a straight line, although in other words it is usually more well formed. The tails of the final nun and nya are long and stretch under the following letters.

Transcription (lines 1–5):


1In this manuscript Sri is often (but not always) spelt with an initial ba, i.e. b.s.r.y.
2The jakni is a type of spirit that moves along the cardinal and intercardinal directions, and it is unlucky to face it when travelling, during warfare, etc.
3Here the bar of the initial kaf is missing.
4Spelt as kh.l.d.a.y.
5The word ‘atau’ (‘or’) is consistently spelt as a.t.w.a, atawa. For other examples of this archaic form, see No. 6.

Farouk Yahya
52 LOHONG, ACEH, 1889

Letter from the Teuku of Lohong

Letter from Seri Setia Lingga, the Teuku of Lohong on the east coast of Aceh, to the Dutch Resident of Aceh Besar, 26 Ramadan 1306 (26 May 1889). Annotated at the bottom in roman script: mintak kapal datang di negri Soeing, berdjoeal lada, mintak dia poenja gadji. In December 1880 the French traveller Xavier Brau de Saint-Pol Lias visited Lohong and stayed with the Teuku, and published an account of his experiences and some sketches of Lohong and the Teuku’s fort (benteng) (Brau de Saint-Pol Lias 1884). 1 f.; paper and dimensions unknown; with a lampblack seal impression.

Amsterdam, Koninklijk Instituut voor Tropen, 1016/10a.

This letter is an exceptionally ingenious example of Malay calligraphy. At first glance it appears to have been written with a double-nibbed pen, but in fact the scribe, writing with an ordinary pen, has doubled over the strokes of most letters to produce this unusual effect.

The seal is carved in relief and is inscribed in both Jawi and Roman script: Khadam Sultan Aceh Kejuruen Slung¹ Seri Setia Lingga 1274 // TOEKOEO KEDJOEROEAN LOHONG / SERI STIA LINGGA (Gallop 2002: 2.52, #455). It is dated 1274 AH (1856/7 AD), and was probably made for the Teuku’s accession to the title of Kejuruen of Lohong. The original brass seal matrix is today held in the Museum Aceh (no. 2129).

Transcription (lines 1–6):

Qawluh al-haqq / Bahwa inilah alamat surat tulus² dan dengan ikhlas daripada perhamba Seri Paduka Teuku Kejuruan³ Lohong Seri / Setia Lingga hulubalang yang memerintahkan kuasa dalam negeri tiga mukim Lohong yang a(da)⁴ terhenti pada masa sekarang / ini dalam kota Lohong jua adanya. Mudah-mudahan barang diwasilkan oleh Tuhan seru sekalian alam apalah jua kiranya / datang mengadapkan ka bawah kadam yang maha mulia dan pangkat yang tera’la wa-fadla dan iaitu nama yang termasyhur / Seri Paduka Tuan Residin yang telah meme-gangkan kuasa dalam negeri Aceh Besar . . .

¹The seal engraver seems to have misread the toponym Lohong (l.h.w ng) as s.l.w ng.
²Erroneously spelt t.w.l.y.s, tulis.
³The Acehnese title keujrueun, but spelt here the Malay way as k.j.r.w.a.n, kejuruan.
⁴The scribe probably intended to write ada, a.d, but missed out the dal.

Annabel Teh Gallop
FIGURE 52. Letter from Lohong, Aceh, 1889. Koninklijk Instituut voor Tropen, 1016/10a (cropped).
53 MERBOK, KEDAH, 1893

Undang-undang Kedah

Undang-undang adat negeri Kedah, ‘Code of laws and customs of Kedah’. According to the colophon the MS was copied on Wednesday 22 Rabiulawal 1311 (3 October 1893), at Bukit Batu Hampar, Merbok, Kedah, by Haji Muhammad Said bin Nasir for the owner, Ku Din Ku Me, head of Kedah prison and headman of Merbok (Ku Din bin Ku Meh ketuha penjara di dalam negeri Kedah dan ketuha di Merbok yang empunya kitab ini. Tamat surat di Bukit Batu Hampar, Merbok. Tam. Wa-katubuhu Haji Muhammad Said bin Nasir). Ku Din’s full name was Tengku Baharudin bin Tengku Meh (1848-1932). 195 ff.; European paper, without watermarks; 27.6 x 18.2 cm. A photocopy of this manuscript is in the National Archives of Malaysia (ANM, ref.n. 2007/0002643). (The kind assistance of Siti Fairus binti Kamarudin is acknowledged in the writing of this entry; cf. Siti Fairus 2014.) Penang, Private collection of the family Ku Din Ku Meh, p. 13.

Other known manuscripts of the Undang-undang Kedah are RAS Raffles Malay 77, SOAS MS 40329, Bibliotheque nationale Mal.-Pol. 39, and Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, W 57, which bears the title Undang-undang perbuatan Datuk Besar Dahulu. The Ku Din Ku Meh manuscript contains 40 chapters (bab/fasal) of Undang-undang Kedah occupying ff. 1-151, written in black ink with rubrication, and is orderly and tidy. There are a few different styles of handwriting in this MS, which may have been copied by different writers/copyist. The MS also contains extra chapters on ff. 152-165 on the Undang-undang laut (Code of maritime law), as well as further sections on ff. 165-195 on enthronement ceremonies, a didactic story about Satan (iblis), and a copy of a letter regarding a license for tin mining and regulations for tin trade.

Transcription (lines 1–6):

Tiada tunduk ku kerat kepalanya terlalu dahsyat hati segala menengar dan melihat perintah itu datu’ / bendahara mengangkat pedang yang sudah terhunus, dan kiri kanan bendahara itu temenggung dan maharajalela / keduanya sudah menyembah itu, sebelah tangannya memegang hulu keris dan sebelah tangan juga ia bert-1-kan di lutut ia rukuk itu, takkala habis ragam itu berhenti nobat berbunyi suara nafiri / mengatakan daulat diturut oleh bentara kata daulat sambil mengangkat kepala berdiri betul ditu/rut sekaliannya demikian itu, berhenti sekati, berbunyi pula nobat, rukuk pula bentara dan sekaliannya / sehingga datu’ bendahara seorang juga terdiri. Berhenti nobat, berbunyi nafiri, panggung bentara, di/turut sekaliannya.

1 Ga is written without a line or dots.
2 Nga has three clear dots.
3 Yang sudah is written conjoined.
4 Maharajalela is written without spaces.
5 Ga is written with a double line.
6 Not clear, may be bertolak[k]han.
7 Berbunyi: nya is written with three clear dots.
8 Diturut: the second part of the word is moved to the next line.

Tatiana Denisova
FIGURE 53. Undang-undang Kedah, Kedah, 1893. Penang, Private Collection (reproduced from a photocopy of the original MS).
54 BATAVIA, 1894

Hikayat Indra Bangsawan

Copied on 4 September 1894 by Muhammad Bakir who owned and managed a lending library in Gang Pecenongan, at Langgar Tinggi in Batavia (Jakarta) in the closing decades of the 19th century. In the 14 years he was active, this author wrote and copied at least 6,000 pages, which makes him the most prolific writer of the 19th century known to us. 96 ff.; European paper; 32 x 19.5 cm; the first and last page have come loose and are torn. Chambert-Loir and Kramadibrata (2014). Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, MI. 245, f. 95r.

This adventure story was copied by Muhammad Bakir for renting out to readers in the centre of Batavia in the late 19th century (for another example of a Pecenongan MS see No. 59). The handwriting is clear and simple with some elongated strokes below the line. The example shown is taken from a concluding syair, in which the copyist gives details about the copying, the rental price and a concise summary of the story. Dates in the margins of a few pages indicate that he copied the story in about one month. Some of the punctuation words are in bold or embellished.

Transcription (lines 5–10):

Menulis di dalam kampung Pecenongan | selesai pada 4 September dalam bilangan \ |
1894 tahun dalam hitungan | tahun Belandah juga garangan || |
3 Maulud itu masanya | 1312 itulah hijrahnya || |
Yaum al-Thelatha itulah harinya | tahunnya\ Ba itu naqthunya\ |
Habisnya hikayat syair terganti | akan buat tamba senangin \ hati || |
Indra Bangsawan raja yang sakti | masyhur ceritanya sudah pasti || |

\ The nya is here written with three dots below the letter. Here and elsewhere, possessive nya is always written as a separate character.

\ This is an erroneous spelling of noqta, which may refer to the number of dots to indicate the numerical value of the letters in the octaval calendar (Proudfoot 2006: 20).

\ Frequently the spelling in the Pecenongan collection seems to indicate a more or less Batavian colloquial orthography and morphology in words such as suda for sudah, tamba instead of tambah and senangin for menyenangkan.

Jan van der Putten
FIGURE 54. *Hikayat Indra Bangsawan*, Batavia, 1894. Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, Ml. 245, f. 95r.
**55  JAMBI, 1897**

**Tambo Minangkabau**

Untitled manuscript, containing *Tambo Minangkabau*, copied by Khatib Muhammad Zainudin bin Abdul Kadir, at Dusun Terusan negeri Jambi on 27 Rajab 1315 (22 December 1897). In the colophon the scribe also mentions that he has two remaining sons named Abdullah and Muhammad Yunus. 37 ff.; of unknown paper and dimensions. Edwar Djamaris (1991); Drakard (1999); Zuriati (2007).

Private collection of Dato’ Seri Deris bin Hj. Yunus and Encik Muhammed Nazri bin Dato’ Seri Deris (courtesy Muhammad Ridhwan bin Ibrahim), f. 16v.

An example of the legendary history relating the settlement of the Minangkabau highlands (Djamaris 1991), which is often combined with a list of *adat* regulations (Zuriati 2007) and letters stating the authority of the Minangkabau ruler. The handwriting is clear and simple with some elongated strokes below the line and regular long strokes of *kaf*, *ga*, and *lam*. The spelling is regular with the peculiarity of sometimes omitting the voiced occlusives from a (prenazalised) consonant cluster, which is not uncommon in Malay writing. So we find for instance *menengarkan*, *memunuh*, *memuat* instead of *mendengarkan*, *membunuh* and *membuat* respectively. Other quite common features are *sangat* for *saat* and writing a *syin* for *sin* in words like *bes(y)ar*. In this version Iskandar Zulkarnain’s fourth [sic] son was killed by a falling *semawang* tree which comes to ask for forgiveness.

**Transcription (lines 1–9):**


*Jan van der Putten*
FIGURE 55. Tambo Minangkabau, Jambi, 1897. Private collection, f. 16v (reproduced from a photocopy of the original MS).
Syair Baginda

An untitled syair which could be named Syair Baginda after its chief protagonist, Sultan Abdul Mumin of Brunei (r. 1852–1885), referred to in the text as Baginda. Recounts a voyage made to Labuan, with the emphasis on the ritual preparations beforehand. Undated, but on the basis of the watermark can be dated to c.1900. 26 ff., English paper: ‘Superfine’ 1895’, 21 x 17 cm.

British Library, Or. 14549, f. 3r.

This manuscript, which is in poor condition, with damaged folios and with the end missing, is nonetheless of great interest as the only witness so far known to this text. The extract below recounts the grief of Sultan Mumin and his wife at their childlessness, and his decision to make a journey to Sabah.

The syair is written in black ink in two columns, in a characteristic Brunei literary hand familiar from hikayat and syair manuscripts, notable for its extreme horizontal aspect, and very different from the chancery hands evident in royal Brunei letters over the centuries (Nos. 1 and 5). The orthography too reflects Brunei phonetic norms such as the preference for medial a rather than ê pêpê.

Transcription:

ada sedikit menaru duka | tiada beroleh putera mareka |
berapa peranda[?] sudah dibuka | balumlah juga mendapat suka || |
berapa banyak gendati1 isteri | akan berputera rasa sendiri || |
Allah ta’ala balum membari | kesukaan ayang2 lain apa dicari || |
adapun isteri dari Baginda | puteranya marhum sultannya muda || |
kesukaan ayang lain semuanya ada d3 | berolelah putera seorang pun tiada || |
setelah berapa getika4 masa | Baginda pikir di dalam desa5 || |
‘Baiklah aku berbuat jasa | menyelasaikan pikir keluar desa || |
dari Burunai aku Isnin angkat | sebalah ke Saba negeri yang dakan || |
barang bicara yang barsaluk6 | sekalian perbantahan ak- ... || |
menentukan rantau dan taluk | sana kemari ... || |
pasal Marumnu7 disambil Suluk | baik ... || |
mesyuarat Baginda di dalam negeri | ... || |

1i.e. kendati.
2The three dots of nga are written without lifting the pen from the paper. In this MS yang is frequently written ayang with an alif in front.
3This dal is probably a mistake.
4i.e. ketika; see also No. 60 for similar spelling with ga.
5d.y.a.s, i.e. desa with interpolated /a/.
6A Brunei word for speech heavily veiled with metaphors and similes (pertuturan yang kurang jelas dan penuh tamsil ibarat).
7i.e. probably Marudu.

Ampuan Haji Brahim Haji Tengah & Annabel Teh Gallop
FIGURE 56. *Syair Baginda*, Brunei, c.1900. British Library, Or. 14549, f. 3r.
57 BONJOL, WEST SUMATRA, 1902

Tarekat Naqsybandiyah

The colophon of this manuscript is dated 19 Jumadilakhir 1320 (23 September 1902). Originally from the collection of Surau Sheikh Muhammad Said Bonjol of the Naqsybandiyah brotherhood, Kabupaten Pasaman Timur, Kecamatan Bonjol, Nagari Gangga Hilir, Jorong Padang Baru, West Sumatra, the collection now belongs to Haji Mansur Hasan Herbalis. 76 ff.; Dutch paper, watermarked ‘Pro Patria’; 25 x 18 cm.

Surau Sheikh Haji Muhammad Said Bonjol, EAP352_EMWSPJCSB_SSSB_02 (manuscript digitised through the Endangered Archive Programme EAP352).

This text deals with the doctrine and ritual practice of the Naqsybandiyah brotherhood. The manuscript comes from the collection of the famous surau (prayer house) of Sheikh Haji Muhammad Said Bonjol, in the region of Pasaman Timur, in West Sumatra. It is written by a Naqsybandiyah syaikh of this surau, whose name is not mentioned in the manuscript.

Transcription (lines 1–4):

Keduanya dengan dihimpunkan sekalian pengenalan ke dalam hati s.f\(^1\) / beri maka kita taubat kepada Allah ta’ala daripada sekalian maksiat / dosanya yang telah lalu serta kita baca Astaghfirullah lima belas kali / atau dua puluh lima kali dan sekurang2nya lima kali kemudian /

\(^1\)i.e. safi, ‘pure’?

I.R. Katkova
FIGURE 57. Tarekat Naqsyabandiyah, West Sumatra, 1902. EAP352_EMWSPJCSB_SSSB_02.
58  DAIK, LINGGA, 1905

Lingga court verdict

A verdict dated 25 September 1905 concerning a case between Senyor Gurnilis and Muhammad Said Lanjut. From a volume of verdicts and official resolutions taken by the court of justice in Daik, Lingga (Mahkamah Kerajaan Lingga), dating from 8 Muharam 1323 (14 March 1905) to 13 Zulkaedah 1327 (5 September 1909). 350 ff. (numbered 5-350); European paper with watermark ‘Superfine’ with image of a crown; various sizes, maximum 32.5 x 20 cm.

Museum Linggam Cabaya, Daik, Lingga; 01:083; EAP 153_DAIK_MUSEUM_01, 900 (A 39) (Digital copy created in 2008 by Aswandi Shahri for Endangered Archives project EAP153, ‘Riau Manuscripts: the gateway to the Malay intellectual world’).

This volume contains handwritten documents in black ink and some instances black, blue or orange pencil for rejected cases. The documents, which are in good condition and clearly legible, are in different hands in Jawi; some documents include Chinese characters.

The official juridical verdicts and resolutions in this volume follow a fixed format, with the names of the participants (top right corner); the number of the case (next line below); the preamble with the full title and name of the sultan of Riau Lingga (in the middle); the place of the court and date (next line below); the main contents of the document in a series of indented paragraphs; and the final part with the signatures of the participants and court assistants and witnesses (in separate blocks on the right and on the left part of the document at the bottom of the paper).

Transcription (lines 1–14):

Senyor Gurnilis — Muhammad Said Lanjut
Nombor 42.
Dengan nama ke bawah duli yang maha mulia seri paduka baginda yang dipertuan besar / al-Sultan Abdurrahman Muazzam Syah kerajaan Riau Lingga serta daerah takluknya.
Mahkamah negeri Lingga pada 25 Rajab 1323
Maka waktu itulah dibuat muafakat perkara Senyor Gurnilis mendakwa Muhammad Said / Lanjut Pulau Singkep ada berhutang fasal perniagaan yang tersebut di dalam bukunya banyaknya / $75.75, jawab Muhammad Said ianya sudah bayar kepada Tuan Besar di Singapura $50. / baki hutangnya $25.75.

1g.w.r.n.y.l.y.s. Ga is written with a double line on the top stroke.
2yang maha is written conjoined, overlapping with the word mulia.
3Sultan Abdurrahman II Muazzam Shah (r.1883–1911).
4The year is written in ‘European’ figures (from left to right): 25 Rajab 1323 (25 September 1905).
5Here the name of the first participant is written as g.w.n.y.l.y.s (Gunilis), without ra.
6i.e. resit, receipt.

Tatiana Denisova
FIGURE 58. Lingga court verdict, 1905. Museum Linggam Cahaya, 01:083; EAP 153_DAIK_-_MUSEUM_01, 900.
59  BATAVIA, 1909–12

Sair Tamba Sia Betawi

This manuscript contains 15 syair, with graphic vignettes in the form of tree branches with flowers, birds and butterflies at the beginning of each syair. 771 pp.; European paper; 20.5 x 16.5 cm. Braginsky and Boldyrev (1990: 159–62).
St Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences; B 2508, p. 1 (Collection of Dr Frank, 1912).

The opening syair narrates events which took place in Batavia between 1851 and 1856, and at the end the name of copyist is given as Ahmad Beramka1 of Kampung Pecenongan, in Batavia (for another example of a Pecenongan MS see No. 54). The titles and contents of the other syair in the volume are all listed in the catalogue entry mentioned above. Although there is no date in the volume, on the basis of the presence of the date 1909 in syair no.13, and the date of 1912 of the Dr Frank collection, it can be assumed that the manuscript was copied between 1909 and 1912 (Braginsky and Boldyrev 1990: 162).

Transcription (title and line 1–2):

Ini sair Tamba Sia Betawi / yang suda kejadian di Betawi pada tahun 1851-1856 /
Al-kisah tersebut2 suatu cerita | Dikarang sair sudahlah nyata |
Yang suda3 kejadian di Betawi kota | Di tahun 1851 dan 1856 adanya serta ||/

1Ahmad Beramka was the first cousin of another prolific Batavian scribe and author, Muhammad Bakir (see No. 54 in this issue) (Chambert-Loir and Kramadibrata 2014: 18–19).
2The two dots above of ta are written together in single stroke.
3Without final ha.

I.R. Katkova
60 BRUNEI, 1938

Syair keberangkatan Sultan Muhammad Jamalul Alam

According to a handwritten note on the front cover of the book, this MS was copied by hamba Hid 'Aman (h.y.d ‘.a.m.n) Tambangar (the short form of Temburung Bangar), although on the first page of the text shown here the copyist names himself as Abdul Wahid peranak Brunei, and gives the date as 15 Rabiulawal 1357 (=15 May 1938) and 5 [sic] Mai 1938. 105 ff.; lined exercise book paper; 16.2 x 21.1 cm. Bandar Seri Begawan, Pusat Penyelidikan Borneo, PS/A/MS/12/2008, p. 1.

This manuscript tells about the circumstances of Brunei and its people during the reign of Sultan Muhammad Jamalul Alam, the 26th sultan of Brunei (r.1906–1924). It was written in syair form, in black ink in a consistent and neat hand throughout the manuscript. There are black text frames that present the syair in two vertical columns on each page. Most of the text is legible even though certain phrases are quite difficult to interpret. It is interesting to find the English loanword mengopi for ‘copy’ in line 8, followed by dikopikan (lines 9, 17 and 20) and the noun kopian (line 13); in each case the word has been retraced in ink, indicating perhaps some uncertainty over spelling.

Transcription (lines 1–8):

Hajarat nabi rasul junjungan | seribu tiga ratus pada bilangan ||
Lima puluh tujuh lagi garangan | ilmu pendita punya hitungan ||
Bersamaan hajarat nabi Isa | seribu sembilan ratus kepada masa ||
Tiga puluh lapan lagi dipaksa | hitungan padri orang biasa ||
Rabialawal lima belas hafis|bulan | yaumal Jumaati yang berbetulan ||
Lima Mai sudah berjalan | gutika Bisnu4 dalam simpulan ||
Pukul lima jam berlari | waktu petang masuk matahari.||
Masa itulah kalam berlari berpari | mengopi syair waktu malam hari||

1Transcribed according to the Brunei pronunciation.
2The scribe has a distinctive way of writing final ha, with a full ha written above the final form.
3Ra is omitted.
4For another example of the calendrical Bisnu see No. 51.
5The scribe has written berlari, perhaps a case of dittography from the line above, but has realised his error and crossed it out.

Ampuan Haji Brahim Haji Tengah
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