

TAWARIKH

International Journal for Historical Studies

IKHWAN

The Typology of *Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times) Discourse in the Perspective of Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin

ABSTRACT: Nusantara or Indonesian archipelago's ancient manuscript is a precious cultural inheritance of the past. Apart from the content, that includes various topics concerning the life of society in the past, it also becomes a part of the tradition that constructs the recent society of Nusantara. One of the witnesses to the struggle of Nusantara's past Islamic society, in spreading Islam, is "Babad Zaman" (BZ) or Chronicle of Times' manuscript. Observing from the content aspect, the manuscript is regarded distinctive. If generally Islamic manuscripts are taken from Arab, either copies or adaptations, BZ manuscript is an original work of the people in Nusantara. The author tried to contextualize the Islamic basic teaching concerning faith to the local context of Cirebon in West Java. Its tradition is a combination of three different traditions: Islam, Hindu, and Javanese beliefs. The paper specifically studies the form of discourse in the manuscript. The method employed is a discourse typology approach in the perspective of Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin. The result of the research shows that BZ manuscript does not only contain either a single-voiced discourse or a double-voiced discourse, but it also contains a plural-voiced discourse. The discourse is differentiated into two types: linear discourse and parallel discourse. The linear discourse consists of vertical transmissive speech and horizontal transmissive speech, while the parallel discourse consists of contaminative speech and deflecting speech. The findings of the research complement the previous studies on Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin's double-voiced discourse in his work entitled "Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics" (1984).

KEY WORDS: Chronicle of Times, Nusantara's Islamic manuscripts, Bakhtinian discourse analysis, double-voiced discourse, and polyphony.

INTRODUCTION

The BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times)'s manuscript is a religious manuscript (Islam) that is obtained from the followers of *Syatjatiyah tariqah* (one of the mysticisms in Islam) in *Keprabonan* (palace) living in the village of Cisawu, Pesawah District, Kuningan

Regency, West Java, Indonesia. The manuscript is estimated more than 250 years old, or even much older than that. BZ manuscript was passed down to the leaders of *Syatjatiyah tariqah* in that area. The text was copied from the master text in *Keprabonan* Cirebon palace, which no longer exists because of the age.

About the Author: Ikhwan, M.Hum. is a Doctoral Student at the Graduate Program, Faculty of Humanities UNPAD (Padjadjaran University) Bandung, Jalan Raya Jatinangor-Sumedang Km.21, West Java, Indonesia. For academic interests, the author is able to be contacted via e-mail at: ikhwanikhwan08@yahoo.com

How to cite this article? Ikhwan. (2015). "The Typology of *Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times) Discourse in the Perspective of Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin" in *TAWARIKH: International Journal for Historical Studies*, Vol.7(1) October, pp.15-32. Bandung, Indonesia: Minda Masagi Press, ISSN 2085-0980.

Chronicle of the article: Accepted (January 2, 2015); Revised (May 20, 2015); and Published (October 28, 2015).

BZ manuscript was written in the form of *pupuh* (cantos) using Cirebon Javanese with *Pegon* (Arabic) characters started from page 183, which could be saved. The paper used was European paper in "Dutch Lion" (Pro Patria) watermark produced in the Netherlands around the year of 1687/1688. Although the first and the last few pages of the manuscript are missing, it does not give a significant impact to the entire understanding of the text.

The systematics of BZ text content is basically divided into three parts: the first is the introduction, in which contains important matters concerning creed, faith, and Islam that are expressed in an expository text embedded in cantos (*pupuh*).

The second is the initiation of discourse, which functions to introduce the readers to the discourse of the significance of knowledge about the chronicle of times (*babad zaman*). In this part, it is explained that the first beings created by God is the Light of Muhammad from the blend of the God natures, such as *Jalal* (Supreme), *Jamal* (Beauty), *Kamal* (Perfect), and *Qahar* (Powerful). In addition to this, it also explains about the creation of the universe that was created from the four basic elements of the universe (water, wind, fire, earth), the creation of Adam, the story of the devil vanity, and a brief description of the lifetimes of *ulul 'azmi* (extraordinary men) apostles, such as Nuh AS (*Alaihi Salam*), Ibrahim AS, Musa AS, Isa AS, and Muhammad SAW (*Salallahu Alaihi Wassalam* or peace be upon him).

The third is the core part of the discourse of the chronicle of times. In this section, it is mentioned that there are eight phases of the age of human life, namely: (1) the Age of *Tirta* or Water; (2) the Age of *Karta* or Prosperous; (3) the Age of *Dopara* or Strange; (4) the Age of *Kali* or Currently; (5) the Age of *Sengara* or Cycle of Eight Years in Java; (6) the Age *Dahuru* or Hurricane; (7) the Age of *Kiamat* or Judgement Day; and (8) the Age of *Akhirat* or Hereafter. Each of the age has its own particular characters describing the events occurred in the related age.

Observing from the aspect of the discourse, BZ text is incredibly interesting to be discussed, because it represents ideas about

knowledge constituted from three different cultures: Arab (Islam), India (Hindu) and Java, with a great concern to the local elements where BZ text was arranged, that is around the area of Cirebon. To describe the aspect of BZ discourse, the paper employs Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin's theory of the discourse typology focusing on the subject voices embedded in the related discourse.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN BAKHTINIAN PERSPECTIVE

Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin was born in Oryol on November 1895. He studied classical literature and philology at the Odessa University (Ukraine), then at Petrograd University in 1918. In 1929, Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin was arrested for allegedly involved in an underground movement together with Russian Orthodox Church and exiled in Kazakhstan for six years. Due to political reasons, he moved to a little city named Mordovia and taught there from 1936 to 1961 (Lechte, 2011:23).

Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin is one of the best literary theorists in the 20th century (Holquist ed., 1981:xv; and Lechte, 2011:23). His name has been well known since he and his friends initiated the Bakhtin Circle of which the members are not scholars in literary theory, but also artists from various branches of arts. Some of the members of the circle, who are also famous, are P.N. Medvedev who had been always with him since 1920; Lev Pumpianskij, a professor of philology from Leningrad University; V.N. Voloshinov, a linguist who also studied musicology and poetic symbols; M.V. Judina, a great Russian pianist; and B.M. Zubakin, an archaeologist interested in music (Holquist ed., 1981:xxii). Their focus of studies is philosophy, religious, and mainly literature in Marxism contexts.

Many of Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin's works were published in pseudonyms or the names of his friends, instead of his own names. For example, his work entitled *Freudianism and Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* was published in the name of V.N. Volosinov and *The Formal Method in Literary Studies* was published in the name of P.N. Medvedev (Lechte, 2011:23).

Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin is a post-structuralist. He rejects Saussurean structuralism, which assume that language is a static, monologic, and isolated object of study (cited in Ratna, 2008:262). According to Raman Selden (1993), Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin regards language as a social phenomenon. Words are social signs that are active and dynamic and, thus, present various meanings and connotations for many different classes. Consequently, language is always dialogic (Selden, 1993:13-14).

One of the most famous works of Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin is "Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics" (1984). Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin reveals the distinctive characteristics of Dostoevsky from other literary works flourished in Russia at the time, particularly the works of Tolstoy. Based on his research, he shows and identifies at once the specificity of dialogic discourse in the works of Dostoevsky. If in the works of Tolstoy, different voices are subordinated to support the voice of the author, and thus there is only single homogenous logic, in the works of Dostoevsky, the author does not try to unify various voices into the consciousness of a character, and the characters maintain their own integrity instead. The words in Dostoevsky's works do not only present meanings, but also the relationship of the texts with other texts or even their dialogically social reality (*cf* Bakhtin, 1981:56; and Bakhtin, 1984).

The dialogic concept is the key word to recognize the model of Bakhtinian discourse analysis closely related to the science of humanities. According to Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin, as stated by Tzvetan Todorov (1984), reading a text in the science of humanities is dialogic, because the object is speech of others instead of a thing. The reading is basically a transposition of two kinds of consciousness that cannot be unified. Therefore, the reading is intertextuality instead of metatextuality (Todorov, 1984:17-61). In this case, meanings or topics of speech are not only determined by linguistic elements, but also by situational aspects embedded in the number of interaction between speakers and hearers.

Thus, it makes speech inseparable from the nature of intertextuality (dialogic relation)

– called as *intertextuality* "the relation of discourse", a terminology used by Fairclough and Wodak (cited in Titscher *et al.*, 2009) – because behind all the interaction (which is never neutral), there is meaning as an answer to questions. The intertextuality levels of a speech, however, vary and thus based on different types of discourse, either monologic or dialogic speech can be determined. A speech is considered monologic if it does not contain other voices, but the voice of the speaker (author); whereas a speech is considered dialogic if it contains the voice of the author and the voice of others as well, or the combination of voices (Titscher *et al.*, 2009).

The Dialogic Relationship in Discourse.

The dialogic and polyphonic relationships are generally regarded as Bakhtinian controversial and original perspectives at once (Ratna, 2008:176). The works of Dostoevsky, according to Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin, reflect the idea of carnival structure in which there are diverse voices mingled into one voice, so that the discourse may reveal other points of view rather than what is represented in the text (Bakhtin, 1984).

Parody, irony, and satire are a primary example for the model of polyphony. The polyphony also includes the idea about interpenetration of voices and thus its nature is double and dialogic. Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin claims that discourse in novel style should not be regarded as a common language of communication like in the study of linguistics (Bakhtin, 1984). On the contrary, it should be regarded as a dynamic situation where a dialogue between a text and other texts or other social situations occurs (*cf* Bakhtin, 1984; and Lechte, 2011:23-27).

The theory of intertextuality is considered in debt to the dialogic principles of Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin (cited in Ratna, 2008:176); and so is the interdiscursive principle of Fairclough's discourse analysis. Like the principle of intertextuality proposed by Julia Kristeva, the dialogic concept of a text assumes that every text is a part of other texts, which interact each other (cited in Titscher *et al.*, 2009:238). The dialogic concept also investigates how historical and social bases are combined and modified by texts and how

discourse and genre mingle (Titscher *et al.*, 2009:245-246).

In certain few things, Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin does not distinguish between the terms of dialogic and polyphonic, particularly in describing double voices in the structure and the construction of narrative. Through the concepts, Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin relates the creator subjectivity with the created characters and events. The subject of creator does not create only grounded on psychological consciousness, but also on his motivation to be out of himself (Bakhtin, 1984). The work of arts does not reflect a biography only, but also a dialogic manifestation (*cf* Bakhtin, 1984; and Ratna, 2008:176-177).

Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin (1984) claims that dialogue is a life of language in which the voices of an author can be heard simultaneously. In this sense, the dialogic concept has the same meaning with polyphonic concept, that is a discourse containing different kinds of double or plural voices. A simple example illustrated by Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin is as follows:

/1/ "Life is good". "Life is not good".
/2/ "Life is good". "Life is good"
(Bakhtin, 1984:183-184).

In example /1/, there are two evaluative judgements: one regards that "life is good", while the other regards "life is not good". Each of the evaluative judgements has a certain logical form and specific meaning that orientate to a semantically referential object of philosophical consideration about the value of life. In between the two evaluative judgements, there is a logical relationship (one is the negation of the other), but it does not necessarily mean that there is dialogic relationship because the two elements are not arguing with each other, in anyway, that show each of the argument.

To produce dialogic relationship, both of the evaluations should be realized by involving extra linguistic aspects, so that each other can be positioned as a thesis and antithesis in a dialectic relationship. Both cannot be merged into a single-voiced discourse. In other words, such cases do not have dialogic

relationship unless both of them are separated into two different speeches with two different intentions.

Unlike the example /1/, the example /2/ explicitly expresses two identically evaluative judgements. Both of them are a single consideration written or spoken twice. The word "twice" here, however, only refers to its oral or written realization, instead of the evaluation itself. In this case, it can be ascertained that there is logical relationship in between the two evaluations. It can be clearly seen if the extra linguistic aspects prove that both of the decisions are expressed in two different utterances with two different intentions, so that the dialogic relationship arises by itself, namely that one confirms the other or in between them there is an agreement relationship.

Based on such cases, Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin draws a conclusion that a dialogic relationship is completely impossible without a logical relationship or a relationship that orientates to a referential object. Therefore, Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin (1984) states that:

As we have already said, logical and semantically referential relationships, in order to become dialogic, must be embodied, that is they must enter another sphere of existence: they must become discourse, that is an utterance, and receive an author, that is a creator of the given utterance whose position it expresses (Bakhtin, 1984:183).

The logical and semantically referential relationship is embedded in discourse in order to become dialogic. A text should also be placed in a speech event in relation to the contexts of speakers. Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin, as cited also by Tzvetan Todorov (1984:43) and Simon Dentith (1995:127), defines an utterance as follows:

Utterance, as we know, is constructed between two socially organized persons, and in the absence of a real addressee, an addressee is presupposed in the person, so to speak, of a normal representative of the social group to which the speaker belongs (Bakhtin, 1984:184).

Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin's definition of "utterance" is different from the definition

proposed by the conventional linguistics. In conventional linguistics, utterance is considered as an abstract rule of language that is stable, standard, and objective, which is separable from outer aspects of language. Utterance in this sense is signified by the relationship between speakers and hearers (its addressivity). The essential meaning of an utterance is agreed by speakers and its interlocutors. The utterance is given "into the eyes of another or with the eyes of another" (Bakhtin, 1984). And it also always in a social process, because every utterance is principally a process of dialogue between the addresser and the addressee within a real situation or through an intertextual process.

Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin (1986) also distinguishes the two types of audiences: real audience and abstract audience. The real audience is a concrete hearer or the second party at the time the utterance is delivered (addressee); whereas the abstract audience is the third party with a higher quality, whose absolutely just responsive understanding is presumed, either in metaphysical distance or in distant historical time. The third party is called "superaddressee". It is embedded in various ages or various understandings of the world formulated as an "ideological expression". It includes God, absolute truth, the judgement of dispassionate human conscience, the people, the court of history, science, and so forth related to the discourse (Bakhtin, 1986:126).

Each of the audience has their own beliefs and assumptions that should be considered by addresser in urging them to rely on a certain reason, which finally direct them to a certain conclusion or position. Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin (1986), as cited also in Tzvetan Todorov (1984), claims that "each speaker-authors an utterance not only with an audience-addressee, but a superaddressee in mind" (Bakhtin, 1986; and Todorov, 1984). In this sense, each of the speaker or writer principally does not speak or write with the addressee, but also with superaddressee in mind.

The existence of the third party or *superaddressee* is a primary feature to understand Bakhtinian dialogic discourse analysis. The *superaddressee* is not assumed

to be outside of a text, due to its existence that gives a great influence to an utterance. The *superaddressee* should also be perceived as a party that has an essential relationship with the second party and the place where an utterance is addressed, and thus it is "co-authoring" the utterance itself.

Christopher W. Tindale (2004) describes that: "there can be an unlimited number of participants in a dialogue, so this is not simply a third member" (Tindale, 2004:125). In other words, the number of *superaddressees* is many, such as a community where people or a group of people are part of, God that individual or a group of people believe, and historical links that individual or a group of people in a certain area have, as Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin (1986)'s explanation.

The Discourse Typology in Bakhtinian Perspective. The dialogic relationship is extra linguistic or beyond language. Nevertheless, the existence is inseparable from language and becomes a part of discourse nature. In this perspective, discourse is regarded as a concrete phenomenon and integral part of a language. Language is considered alive in a dialogic interaction among the subjects of users in any discourse genres. The dialogic relationship lies in the realm of discourse and the discourse occurs with the dialogic natures (Bakhtin, 1984:183).

The dialogic relationship of an utterance results the emergence of a polyphonic discourse. In this concept, a discourse is considered significant not only because of logical and semantically referential relationships, but also because of its existence in relation to other discourses, either involved intertextually or extratextually. On the basis of this concept, Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin, in "Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics" (1984), differentiates three types of discourse:

Type I: the direct, unmediated discourse. It is a discourse that refers to its object directly or exclusively. In this type of discourse, a speaker is regarded as the only one who has semantic authority and thus it is monologic. It can only defined in relation to the referential object, other discourses with the same contexts or the same utterances.

Basically, all kinds of discourse and

lexicology can be classified into this type of discourse, because of the monologic referential semantic nature unless are related to other discourses or a second context. The most obvious example of this type of discourse is archaic or regional words. Such words, in a narrow sense, cannot be defined except with the personal characters of speakers.

Type II: the objectified discourse. It is a discourse that is assumed to inform, express, or represent the discourse type I, for instance utterances of a main character. The characters' utterance basically has direct referential meaning, but it may be assumed to represent the utterance of the author. The utterances of both the author and characters do not lie in the same ground, so that the characters' utterance only represents the author's utterance. This type of discourse is divided into two categories: a discourse representing social types and a discourse representing individual characteristics.

Type III: double-voiced discourse. It is a discourse that refers to other discourses. There are three kinds of double-voiced discourse:

Firstly, *unidirectional double-voiced discourse* is a double-voiced discourse referring to the same object. This kind of discourse is constituted in a discourse in which two voices are merged to form the discourse type I, for example in stylization, narrative of the narrator, objectified discourse representing the character of an author, and the use of "I" in narrative. In stylization, other discourse styles, other people's utterances and/or other artistic-referential status are used to serve its own purpose with new intention.

The same case occurs in the narrative of the narrator. Words are used by the narrator in a story, either in the form of the characters' utterances or utterances separated from the characters, because the existence of other points of view and its function to replace the author are a part of this kind of discourse. Similarly, the use of the narrative "I" has the same position, representing its author.

Secondly, *vari-directional double-voiced discourse* is a double-voiced discourse referring to a different object. This kind of

discourse is constituted when there is an objectified discourse and other discourses included are active, so that two discourses can be seen, because there is an internal dialogue within the discourse. The examples are parody and its different kinds of nuance, parodistic narration, parodistic narration of "I", objectified discourse representing characters parodically and the transmission of words, utterances or discourse of other people with the use of certain accents. In a parody, we can identify not only the main discourse presented directionally to the object, but also the existence of other discourses appointed actively by and inside the discourse.

Thirdly, *the active type or reflected discourse of another* is a discourse reflecting other discourses. This type of discourse is constituted when other discourses develop from the outside of the discourse. Various relationships among discourses may occur here. The example of the discourse is hidden polemics. In the hidden polemics, other discourse is not explicitly stated. The discourse of speakers seems to be directed only to the object.

However, each of the statement about the object is constructed in such a way, so that it directed not only to the object, but also to other discourses about the same object. The presence of other discourses is clearly perceived as a form of disapproval or an attempt to refrain from undesirable utterances with obvious indications. In other words, the construction of discourse is at once influenced by other discourse confronted from the outside of the text. The examples of this kind of discourse are plea or polemic autobiography, counter-discourse, the answer to the polemics, and hidden dialogues.

Dialogue may express polemics, either explicitly or implicitly. The answers to the dialogue show different discourses. In an implicit way, a dialogue is hidden in a form of utterance, which seems to be a monologue; in fact, the discourse is constructed in relation to the discourse of another as its counter-discourse. In this kind of discourse, the other discourse, which is included, is no longer in the form of the actual condition, but it is deformed instead.

Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin classifies skaz (the mode of spoken utterance) into this kind discourse. An author uses a typical utterance, usually in the form of everyday spoken language for a particular purpose. In the most real circumstances, there is often a gap between, for example, the character's utterance and the character of the utterance, the gap occurs because the character does not only speak in his own name, but also represents knowledge, idea and even the author's ideology. It can be revealed through the genre and the type of the utterance (Bakhtin, 1984).

The above classification of discourse types, admitted by Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin (1984), is very abstract and open. A discourse might be classified into several different types of discourse. The linear discourse (uni-directional) can be turned into pictorial discourse (vari-directional), the internal polemics can be stronger or weaker, passive can be turned into active, and so forth. Similarly, a single-voiced discourse can be turned into a double-voiced discourse, or vice versa, depending on the point of view (Bakhtin, 1984:184).

Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin refers the above three types of discourse as a double-voiced discourse or polyphony because every discourse always includes other discourses, either consciously, because the other discourses are actively involved or unconsciously, because the discourse is passive and helpless confronted with the discourse of speaker or author as in the linear discourse, focusing directly to the object (Bakhtin, 1984).

The double-voiced discourse is predominantly the most significant finding of Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin. The finding is an answer for many Russian linguists and literary scholars, particularly Boris Eikhenbaum, who failed to consider the fact that in most cases, skaz (spoken utterances) can always be positioned as the second voice in the context of discourse, because linguistics does not acknowledge the presence of double-voiced discourse (in Bakhtin, 1984).

In this case, Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin claims that there are a number of utterance

phenomena, which have been long attracted the interest of literary scholars and linguists, beyond the limit of language: stylization, parody skaz, and dialogue. All these phenomena have the one common feature: the inside discourse has double directions, whether in relation to the referential object of the utterance or other people's discourse or utterance. The presence of these two discourses cannot be perceived if we simply regard the utterance as a common phenomenon referring to a referential object. In this matter, stylization might only be evaluated as a style, whereas parody is simply nothing more than a bad work of art (Bakhtin, 1984:185).

The presence of double-voices in a discourse will be easily identified by literary historians and qualified readers (Bakhtin, 1984:187). Nevertheless, its presence might also be able to recognize through the sensitivity of an ordinary sense, because parodistic discourse is common in daily life and can be easily recognized by the existence of the stresses of sound or accents, the expressions of doubt, anger, irony, mockery, ridicule, etc. (Bakhtin, 1984:194).

THE DISCOURSE OF *BABAD ZAMAN* IN BAKHTINIAN "DIALOGIC DISCOURSE" PERSPECTIVE

Linear Discourse. It is a discourse representing other discourses. For example, in *Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume 1, pp.16-17, is stated as follows:

Pêrkara syahadat iki
(In terms of creed)
wontên sapêrkara ika
(there is one requirement legitimating the creed)
syarat êsahe ta mangko
(there is one requirement legitimating the creed)
wong iku amaca syahadat
(that is a person reading the creed)
anênggih patang pêrkara
(must fulfil four things)
ing kang dihin iku 'ilmu
(firstly knowing or acknowledging its meaning)
lan kapindo angucapêna.
(secondly pronouncing it)

Anênggih kaping tiganeki
(Thirdly)
yaiku pangestunira
(believing in)

ngestokakên Pangerane
(God)
lan kaping pat den-lampahana
(fourthly realizing)
kalimah syahadat ika
(the lines of creed)
ing siyang kalawan dalu
(either in daytime or at night)
utamane syahadat ira.
(that is the primacy of the creed)

The fragment of the text above can be identified as monologic and directly refers to the object relating to the legitimate requirement of the creed. In dialogic contexts, other discourses are not present except only in an outline of clearly external boundaries by minimizing the internal individuality. Here, the depersonalization of discourse occurs, in a sense that what is revealed is only from what is said, instead of from how to say it. The expressions of *ilmu* (acknowledging), *angucapena* (pronouncing), *angestokaken* (believing), and *denlampahi* (realizing) have lost their individuality or particular interiority.

In the discourse of Islamic science, each of the activity actually has its own terminology and extensive scope of understanding. Firstly, in terms of the activity of acknowledging, knowledge viewed from the aspect of sources is divided into *dharuri* knowledge (precise: grounded on the legal basic of *syara'*) and *nazhari* knowledge (speculative: grounded on mind). Meantime, in terms of how to acquire knowledge, the process of "acknowledging" is divided into *bayani* or "through textual tradition", *burhani* or "through rational tradition", and *irfani* or "through spiritual tradition" (al-Jabiri, 2003).

Secondly is the activity of "uttering". Pronouncing a sentence or certain expressions have the typical rules based on the appropriateness to the sound of *lafaz* as studied in *tajwid* and *qirā'ah*, to the arrangement of *lafaz* as studied in *nahwu*, to the sound or the arrangement of pronunciation with meaning resulted from the study of *sharf* and *balaghah* (*badi'*, *ma'ani*, and *bayan*), etc.

Thirdly is the activity of "believing". In a simple sense, it means there is no doubt. Nevertheless, there are levels of believing depending on how to find things that raises

belief. The Sufis classify belief into three different levels, those are *ilmul-yaqin*, *'ainul-yaqin*, and *haqqul-yaqin* (as-Sarraji, 1960:102-104).

Fourthly is the activity of "realizing". In Islamic teaching, the activity does not only involve the dimension of movement, but also the dimension of silence, as stated in the *Hadith* of the Prophet Muhammad SAW (*Salallahu 'Alaihi Wassalam* or peace be upon him) in which silence may indicate faith, the sleeping of a fasting person is worship, etc.

BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times) text, as already explained above, is categorized as linear discourse. It is the discourse about belief, pronunciation, knowledge, and the act of doing including the range of broad meaning in the Islamic repertoire that is personalized into the limits of "the legitimate requirement of the creed". Dialogically, the discourse relating to the valid requirement of the creed represents other discourses stated by Junaid al-Baghdadi (cited in al-Jami, 1989:145) about *tauhid al-'awam* (the tawheed of laypeople), *tauhid ahlil-haqaiq bi'ilmiz-zhahir* (the tawheed of *haqiqah* experts mastering *bayani* and *burhani* knowledge) or also called as *tauhidul-khash* (the tawheed of particular people) and *tauhidal-khash min ahlil-ma'rifat* (the tawheed of particular people from *marifat* expert) or also called as *tauhidu khawashil-khawash* (the tawheed of very *tauhidnya* the most particular people).

The discourse is also related to the levels of tawheed proposed by Abu Hamid al-Ghazali (2008), which consist of: (1) *lubb* or content, people pronouncing the phrase of *la ilaha illallah*, but they forget or disbelieve in God, and this kind of tawheed is the tawheed of hypocritical people; (2) *lubb al-lubb* or content of content, that is the tawheed of people who justify or *tashdiq* the *lafziyyah* meaning of the phrase in their hearts, as embracing in majority of the Muslims, and this level is named *i'tiqadul-'awam* or the faith of laypeople Muslim; (3) *Qasyr* or surface, that is the testimony or *musyahadah* of the tawheed intuitively *kasyf*, "inner openness" through *nur al-Haqq* or the light of al-Haqq, Allah, and this level is *maqam al-muqarrabin*; and (4) *Qasyr al-qasyr* or surface of surface, that is the tawheed of *marifat* experts fully drowned

in the tawheed of those who have achieved the spiritual level of *al-fana'* (al-Ghazali, 2008:256).

The dimension of meaning that is highly rich – in Bakhtin's terminology, containing many voices – in the discourse of the creed requirement taken from *Babad Zaman* manuscript is summarized, so that it loses its interiority. Various kinds of voices inside the discourse are represented in outlines, confined to the edges of the contents. Even though, different voices with many perspectives are found, in general the discourse has a clear boundary namely the requirement of the creed according to the author of *Babad Zaman* manuscript, instead of the versions of Sufism concept described in a complex way by al-Junaid and al-Ghazali or other Islamic discourses.

Stylization. For example, in *Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume IV, pp.14-29, is stated as follows:

Ing kang putri matur nêmbah
(The daughter bowed and said)
maring ramaneki:
(to her father)
"Rama kula gusti
(O Father)
boten ajêng alaki besuk
(I am not going to get married)
ajêng angawula datêng Rama
(I will always serve Father)
ing dunya akherat benjing
(either in the world or in the hereafter)
nunut mulya datêng Rama, boten liyan".
(obedient to Father, not the others)

Kanjêng Nabi angandika
(King of the Prophet said)
wahu datêng putrineki:
(to the daughter)
"Anakkisun nyi Fatimah
(My daughter Fatimah)
yen nora gêlêm alaki
(if you don't want to get married)
iku dadi parawan sunti
(you will be a spinster)
tan duwe panutan ing besuk.
(one day will have no role model)
Ana jangjine Allah
(God has commanded)
wong pawestri kudu laki
(girls should be married)
iya iku pangeran dunya akherat".
(he will be the role model in the world and the hereafter)

Lamon lakinira adahar
(If your husband eats)

aja milu sira gusti
(you should not follow to eat)
ange(n)tenana (a)tutus
(wait until he finishes)
kalayan kudu sumanding.
(to accompany him)

Layan aja wani-wani
(Nor should you dare)
maring laki sira iku
(to your husband)
amukul atawa anye(n)tak
(hit or yell)
doraka sira ing benjing
(you will be considered disobedient)
doraka maring laki ora ingapura.
(disobedient to your husband is not forgiven)

Lawan kudu anêmbah
(In addition, you must respect)
maring laki.
(to your husband)

Ta sira bénjang iya
(Later you should ask for)
jaluken apuranéki
(an apology from him)
aja kongsi da'um.
(don't be late)
Lamon ora sira iku
(If you)
dén-apura lakinira
(do not get forgiveness from your husband)
dadi reregeding bénjing
(it would be a sin in the future)
ing akherat mêlewang-mêlewung dosanira.
(the enormous sin in the hereafter)

Aja angumpet-umpet dosa
(Do not pile up sins)
iku dadi babayani
(because it will harm you)
dén-adang dening nêraka
(awaited in the hell)
nora kêna dén-bêlani.
(will not be defended)

Kudu ati-ati
(Should be careful)
tasira nini ing bésuk
(later, girl)
aja ana salah dursila
(not to err)
lamon duwé laki ing bénjing
(if one day you get married)
wong melérok ing bénjang ta dosanira
(women who look at another men, in return)
mata molér tumêkang dhadha.
(their eyes will stick out until their chests)

Mulané ta sira nini
(Therefore, girl)
poma aja wani-wani
(do not ever dare)

lamon lakinira lungguh
(if your husband sits)
kudu aja mélu sira
(you do not follow to sit)
lamon lungguh aja amapaki
(if you sit, do not be disrespectful)
wong pawéstri kudu anéng sahandapnya.
(women should sit modestly)

In the stanzas of BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times) text above, the author uses the voice of other to express his ideas about the attitude of a woman toward her husband. The author quotes the words of the Prophet of Muhammad SAW (*Salallahu 'Alaihi Wassalam* or peace be upon him), or *Hadith*, to his daughter, Fatimah. The truth of the expression as taken from the *Hadith* of the Prophet Muhammad SAW can be in doubt. The voice of the Prophet Muhammad SAW (as an authorized party) used by the author of BZ to convey his intention is called *stylization*. The expression of "Therefore, Girl!" is the narration of the author that is stylized by taking the Prophet's point of view.

Parallel Discourse. For example, in *Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume IX, pp.1-29, is stated as follows:

Sédaya samnya ngawêruhi
(Know all)
punika babading zaman
(the chronicles of the times)
wolung pêrkara katahe:
(there are eight kinds of times)
ing kang dimin Zaman Tirta
(the first is the Age of Water)
salaksa tahun lawase
(ten thousand years old)
lan ing zaman puniku
(at that time)
anênggih ngumure titiyang.
(the human lifespan)

Duk alame Zaman Tirta
(In the Age of Water)
ngumure titiyang ika
(the human lifespan)
wolung ewu ta_hun lawase
(was eight thousand years old)
wondene pamangane ika
(as for his food)
duk alam Zaman Tirta
(in the Age of Water)
kang den-pangan iku kukus
(the thing that was edible was smoke)
duk alame Zaman Tirta.
(in the Age of Water)

Duk alame Tirta dingin
(In the Age of Water formerly)

/71| iku sawulan sapisan
(|71| once a month)
ing dalêm pangane
(the period of their eating)
kang den-pangan kukus ika.
(it was the smoke that they eat)

Duk alam Zaman Tirta
(In the Age of Water)
wong iku tur ora nginum
(people did not drink)
tur ora laki rabiya.
(did not get married either)

Duk alame Tirta dingin
(In the Age of Water formerly)
apa kang den-êsiri ika
(what caused passionate)
nuli mêtêng iku dadine
(immediately afterward got pregnant)
lan sukune lêmbo ika
(and bull's feet)
maksi jêjêg sakawan.
(were still even four)

Sang Yang Parmana iku
(Sang Hyang Parmana)
lungguhe ana ing Nala
(was domiciled in Nala)
duk alame zaman dingin
(in that age)
luhure kayu punika
(the height of wood)
iya tunggal satus dèpa
(was a hundred fathoms)
lan jêrone kédung punika
(and the depth of abyss)
iya tunggal satus dèpa
(was a hundred fathoms too)
lan luhure mênusa iku
(and the height of a man)
antara limalas dèpa.
(was about fifteen fathoms tall)

Nulya salin zaman maning
(Then the time changed)
ing kang aran Zaman Karta
(called the Age of Prosperous)
selaksa tahun lawase
(ten thousand years old)
lan umure wong punika
(and the human lifespan)
sewu tahun kang kaprah
(generally a thousand years old)
ing kang den-pangan puniku
(the food)
ingkang aran rizki ika.
(was called sustenance)

Anênggih pamangane iki
(The period of eating)
sajêmu'ah sapisan
(was every Friday)

lawan malih gagamane
(and the weapon)
ing waktu Zaman Karta
(in the Age of Prosperous)
ginawe sarampang
(was made haphazardly)
lan |72| malih wasta puniku
(and |72| at that time)
ana ing kang aran dewa.
(there were so-called gods)

The BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times) text explains about the existence of eight phases of times experience by human, those are: the Age of *Tirta* (Water); the Age of *Karta* (Prosperous); the Age of *Dopara* (Strange); the Age of *Kali* (Currently); the Age of *Sengara* (Cycle of Eight Years in Java); the Age of *Dahuru* (Hurricane); the Age of *Kiamat* (Judgement Day); and the Age of *Akhirat* (Hereafter), with its own particular characters. The text above is categorized as parallel discourse: one direction refers to the object, which is the age and the characters; and another direction refers to other discourses, that are the discourse of *catur-yuga* (four *yugas*) in Hindu and *jangka jaman* (period of time) in Javanese mysticism.

The author of BZ text breaks through the discourses of Hinduism and Javanese mysticism, and then the entire meanings are shifted and objectified for his interest to explain the existence of the age of doom and hereafter in the Islamic perspective. The cycle of *catur yuga* motion is turned by the author into a linear motion with the idea that the era must come to an end in the doomsday and human start the new chapter of life in the hereafter.

The Active Type of Double-Voiced Discourse. This is consisted of two matters: *skaz* and the *hidden polemic*. The term of *skaz* is initially introduced by a Russian formalist, Boris Eikhenbaum, at the end of 1910s to signify a literary phenomenon about the form of improvised oral speech (in Bakhtin, 1994). Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin (1994) enhances also the concept by regarding it as a stylistic device. He puts *skaz* in a specific theory, larger than narration, by defining it as one of the types of double-voiced discourse (Bakhtin, 1994).

For example, in *Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume XIII, pp.19-22, is stated as follows:

Wus kocap ing dalem Qur'an
(It is mentioned in the *Al-Qur'an*)
wong kang nêmu ganjaran ika
(people get reward)
duk lagi ning dunyaneki
(when his life in the world)
iku dêmên kakêbonan
(they love gardening)
dêmên weh-weh maring wong miskin
(and love to give to the poor)
lan wêlasan maring santêri
(and love the pupils)
tur wêlas maring wong sêpuh
(also love their parents)
den-sidkohakên pisan
(also like charity)
kabeh nane maring wong alim
(to the pious)
iya iku katêmune wawalêsira:
(so, they will get in return)
ana ing kang nêmu danas
(some get the pineapples)
ana nêmu ya balingbing
(some get the starfruits)
ana nêmu jêruk manis
(some get the sweet oranges)
[...]
ana nêmu ...
(some get ...)
ana nêmu manggis kuning
(some get the yellow mangos teens)
ana maning wong iku nêmu widara
(some also get the lotes)
ana kang nêmu kuwista
(some get the limonias)
ana nêmu buwah wuni
(some get the *wuni* mango)
ana nêmu bonteng catang
(some get the *catang* cucumbers)
ana nêmu waluh kênçi
(some get the *kenti* pumpkins)
anêmu uwi kumbilih
(some get the *kumbilih* yam)
ana nêmu talês bêtul
(some get the oval taro)
anêmu boled abang
(some get the red sweet potatoes)
ana nêmu talês kutil
(some get the little taro)
ana maning anêmu sêmangka Cina
(also some get the Chinese watermelons)
iku wong kang pađa sidqah
(those are the rewards for people who love charity)
duk lagi nang |120| dunya neki.
(when they live |120| in the world)
[...]
tur wêlas maring santêri
(and love the pupils)
lan têtangga patut aruntut
(live with their neighbours in harmony)
besuk wawalêsira
(later the return is)

kang bécik tinêmu bécik
 (the good will gain kindness)
iya kang ala langkung saking alanira.
 (the bad will gain worse things in return)

On the above text, the speech of the author is included into the speech of *Al-Qur'an*. In the context of the use of *Al-Qur'an* authority by the author, the expression is categorized as *stylization*; but in the context of interdiscursiveness, it is categorized as *skaz*. The fruits, tubers, etc. mentioned in the text of BZ (*Babad Zaman* Chronicle of Times) are not the typical character of the speech of *Al-Qur'an* revealed in the *jazirah* (peninsula) Arab, but represent the typical speech of the author within his socio-cultural contexts. Other discourse possessed by the author about the image of heaven is active, weakening the limits of the Al-Quranic discourse about gardens filled with fairies and rivers flowing underneath.

According to Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin (1994), the use of *skaz* is not only for the purpose of narrative technique (stylization), but also for the purpose of approaching the world, the typical point of view toward the world. The point of view employed by the author of BZ manuscript is nothing, but the point of view of the community of farmers and agriculturalists, which are free to use many different forms of formal rules, not only the formal rule of language, but also the formal rules of religion and ethics (cf Bakhtin, 1994; Dentith, 1995; and al-Jabiri, 2003).

About the *hidden polemic*, in addition to *skaz*, it is also the active type of double-voiced discourse found in the BZ text. For example, in *Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume IV, p.16, is stated as follows:

Kanjêng Nabi angandika
 (King of the Prophet said)
wahu datêng putrineki:
 (to the daughter)
"Anakkisun nyi Fatimah,
 (My daughter, Fatimah)
yen nora gêlêm alaki
 (if you don not want to get married)
iku dadi perawan sunti".
 (you will be a spinster)

The above verses can be classified into *stylization* and include other types of

discourse. The titles of *nyi* and *perawan sunti*, even though textually uttered by the Prophet Muhammad SAW (*Salallahu 'Alaihi Wassalam* or peace be upon him), are actually not a typical speech of the Prophet. "Nyi" or "nyai" is the typical title of honour in Javanese culture although in the period of colonialism, the meaning of the title had a bad association.

In Cirebon, the title of *nyai* have been used to call a woman who is highly respected from the past to the present, generally the wives of religious leaders (clerics) or public figures (cf Sulendraningrat, 1975; Noorduyn, 2006; and Tjandrasmita, 2011). It means that when it is mentioned "*anakkisun nyi Fatimah*" in BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times) manuscript, it actually not the voice of the Prophet Muhammad SAW, but the typical speech of the author (*skaz*) who highly respects the position of Fatimah as the daughter of the Prophet.

Likewise, the title of *perawan sunti* in the expression of "*yen nora gelem alaki iku dadi perawan sunti*" (if you do not get married, you will be a spinster) is categorized as *skaz* and includes a hidden polemic. It is in accordance with the myth of the sculpture of spinster located in the cave area of Sunyaragi Cirebon. It is a counter-discourse of the discourse of Cirebon-Islam toward the discourse of Hinduism about *Brahmacarya* and the *Kania* (cf Sunardjo, 1983; Pandit, 2000; and Sukarma, 2015).

The Plural-Voiced Discourse: The Typical Discourse of Islamic Manuscripts. In addition to the types of the discourse in the Bakhtinian perspective as explained above, there are other particular types of discourse in BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times) text. In BZ manuscript – and other Islamic ancient manuscripts in general – the linear double-voiced discourse may consist of more than two voices. It is because the sources used by Islamic texts are derived from other texts, which can be from more than one source. The sources are related to the laws of Islam. The most outstanding plural-voiced discourse in the tradition of Islam is the narration of the Prophet's *Hadith*.

The *Hadith* of the Prophet Muhammad SAW (*Salallahu 'Alaihi Wassalam* or peace be upon

him) is communicated gradually from one transmitter (*sanad*) to other next transmitters and the validity of the utterance is determined by the validity of the utterance delivered by each of the transmitter. The nature of the discourse type is vertical transmissive, because the truth of the utterance depends on the validity of the previous utterance. The characters of the plural voices can be seen clearly from the controversial and/or fake the *Hadith*. The science of *Hadith* discusses such things in a very detailed way (cf Ismail, 1992; and Mustaqim, 2002).

In BZ, Volume IV, pp.13-36, the existence of plural-voiced can be seen from the following examples:

Kocapa Nabi panutan
(It is told that the Prophet of the role model)
tetkala amuruk singgih
(when teaching)
wahu datêng putrane estri
(to his daughter)
satunggal puniku,
(the one and only)
Nyi Fatimah,
(that is Fatimah)
dawuh datêng putraneki:
(said to the daughter)
"Anakkisun piharsanên!"
(My daughter, listen!)

[...]

lamon nora duwé sira
(if you do not have)
papanganan kanggo anyuguhi
(food to be served)
kang dén-manis sabdanira
(sweeten your words)
dén-agancang anakoni.
(always make a conversation with them)

Ing kang aran sêmbah iki
(What is called as honour)
iku mohal tambuh laku
(will not be realized)
lamon nora nana karya
(if it is never done)
teka apa gawénéki
(so, it depends on your deed)
wong kang akeh semah akeh rizqinira.
(people who receive more guests, they will receive more fortunes)

[...]

Lamon ana semah teka
(If a guest comes)
anggawa emas picis
(bringing gold and money)
sira anuju nora amêmgangan
(while you are lack of food)

maka nuli dén-asongi
(then you are offered)
dening sira ugi,
(or given something)
nanging semah kang tutulung
(by the guest who wants to help you)
kang duwe rizki sira,
(that is your fortune)
semah kang anggawa rizki,
(it is the guest that brings luck)
iya iku mangkono ujaring Kitab.
(that is stated in the Book)

Mulané wong sugih semah
(Therefore, people who have many guests)
winastanan sugih rizki,
(is called as people who have lots of luck)
mangkono ujaré Kitab
(that is what the Book says)
pangandhikaning Yang Widi
(the words of God)
lan sakéhé wong alim
(and the words of the pious)
pan anut ujaring ilmu,
(who runs his knowledge)
anglampahakên ing Kitab
(executes the commands in the Book)
sarta manut maring mami
(and follows my call)
satemené iku pangandikaning Allah.
(indeed, it is the words of God)

The word *kocapa* (told) at the end of the text is the utterance of the narrator, the author of BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times), that is stylized with the utterance of the Prophet Muhammad SAW (*Salallahu 'Alaihi Wassalam* or peace be upon him); the expression of "*Anakkisun piharsanên!*" (My daughter, listen!) until the end of the text is assumed the word of the Prophet.

In the last stanza, there are two expressions: "*mangkono ujaré Kitab*" (that is what the Book says) and "*satemené iku pangandikaning Allah*" (indeed, it is the words of God). Both of the expressions show that there is other voice in the discourse, that is the words of God. Furthermore, in the last stanza, the author writes "*lan sakéhé wong alim*" (and the words of the pious) and "*pan anut ujaring ilmu*" (who runs his knowledge) showing that there is another voice in the text, that is the voice of priests. The author stylizes his discourse about "the significance of respecting guests" by presenting three different voices from others to enhance

the pragmatic effect for the readers. All the voices in the discourse are linear, within the same line with the object of the last speaker.

Other example taken from BZ text, Volume IX, pp.63-65, is as follows:

Sawêneh ana kang manjing,
(Some were running into houses)
ana ing kang umpêt-umpêtan,
(some were hiding)
wong kañah saking gerise,
(because of severe fear)
ana ing kang amanek anda,
(some were climbing stairs)
ana kang pintu lawang,
(some were behind the doors)
miðangêt Dajal tumurun
(hearing the arrival of Dajal or Devil)
akeh ibur bêbêtusan.
(all was rowdy and noisy because of fear)

Anulya pinaranan aglis
(Then immediately came)
sang Dajal lanatullah
(a Dajal or damn Devil)
anulya ngucap ta mangko
(then he said)
maring wong akeh ika:
(to the human)
"He urang manusa sira
(O men)
pada dêlêngên isun iku,
(look at me)
pangeranira ing kang nyata,
(your real god)
iya pangeran sajati".
(true god)

Nulya aglis pinaranan,
(Then immediately approaching)
anggêrêm-gêrêm suwarane:
(his voice is growling)
"Age pada mareneya
(Hurry up, come here)
iki suwarga ênggonira,
(this is heaven, your place)
yen ta nora sira nurut
(if you refuse)
iya ana nêraka sira,
(hell is your place)
[lan sun pateni]".
(and I will kill you)

In the text above, there are three voices, those are: firstly, the voice of the narrator or author; secondly, the voice of other text used as a source because the character shows the existence of other text. If it assumed that the other text is the hadith of the Prophet

Muhammad SAW (*Salallahu 'Alaihi Wassalam* or peace be upon him) by saying, as cited in HR (*Hadith Riwayat* or Story *Hadith*) of Muslim, "Dajjal is the one whose left eye is blind, curly hair, and who brings heaven and hell. His heaven is hell"; so, all the utterances other than those relating to the *Hadith* is the "original" (Ismail, 1994). The author of BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times) text breaks through the *Hadith*, weakening the limits, and thus it seems his own discourse. Beside the voices of the author and the Prophet (*Hadith*), in the type of linear utterance, thirdly, there is also the voice of copyist, which in certain circumstances can be in the form of parallel utterance.

In the ancient manuscript, the copyists sometimes – in certain limit – "think" that they have authority over the texts they copy and thus justify themselves to repair, add, delete, or even replace the text (*cf* Baried *et al.*, 1983; and Djamaris, 2002). In the text above, the expression "*lan sun pateni*" (and I will kill you) in the last line of the stanza is the voice of the copyist. The copyist added the text in the purpose to strengthen the pragmatic aspect of the text. The presence of the copyist's voice can be revealed through the pattern of canto. In the canto of *Asmarandana*, each stanza consists of seven lines patterning of *guru lagu* or tune master | i-a-e/o-a-a-u-a |, whereas in the last stanza of the quoted text consists of eight lines with *guru lagu* | i |, so it clearly shows an addition done by the copyist.

The copyist is not successful to eliminate the boundaries of his utterance from the utterance of the text he copied, because of the strong pattern of the poem used here, so that his utterance can still be clearly identified, not in accordance with the formation of the original text he copied. In addition to the text above, the voice of the copyist can also be seen in the stanza employing *Pupuh Asmarandana*, in BZ, Volume XII, p.1, as the following text:

Sigiting manusa sami
(The end of the human life)
karsane Sukma Kang Mulya
(is because of the will of the God the Exalted)
anglêbur maring makhluke
(destroying His creatures)
sakehe toya samya asat
(a lot of water become dry)

gunung-gunung samya rata
 (mountains turn into flat)
[kasêrang dening barat]
 (blown by the west wind)
iwak-iwak pating galuntung
 (fish are all dead)
ya pinangan dening garuḍa.
 (eaten by eagles)

The text in the brackets “[...]” is an addition from the copyist as well as his voice (utterance) attached in the discourse of BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times). Beside its function to add the pragmatic effect, the addition done by the copyist is to provide an argumentative basis particularly regarding the drain of the water at the time of doomsday.

Similarly in the parallel discourse, in BZ, Volume VII, p.48, as follows:

Sinigêg caritanipun
 (The story is interrupted here)
kang tinurun burak-barik
 (the copied sources is dishevelled)
ginêntos[an] sejen cerita
 (changed by another story)
tuladane ana kang angênṭit
 (some reference sources are stolen)
cêritane amung satêngah
 (so, the story is not complete)
mulane ginêntos[an] malih.
 (consequently changed by other stories again)

The text above has three voices: (1) the voice of the previous writer; (2) the voice of the first copyist; and (3) the voice of the next copyist. The first copyist has a great contribution to the creation of the BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times) text received by us now, especially in making canto. The first copyist admits the limitation of the text he copied, but it does not stop him, he makes the utterance of the previous text become his own voice instead, so that the deflection of direction occurs here, it is more than just the shift of meaning in the terms of Bakhtinian parallel discourse.

It can be seen from the loyalty of the copyist to the pattern of canto desired by the previous author, which is *Kinanti* canto (pattern: u, i, a, i, a, and i) or the one who made canto could be the first copyist. The next copyist seems to give contribution in “destroying” the strong pattern of the canto by doing additions, either intentionally or not, so

that it is contaminated. The third derivations is parallel, the boundaries can still be identified clearly.

CONCLUSION

Based on the explanation above, through this research, it is found that beside the two types of discourse proposed by Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin – a single-voiced and double-voiced discourses – we can also identify another type of discourse, namely a plural-voiced discourse. The plural-voiced discourse is a discourse containing more than one voice. It includes the type of double-voiced discourse, proposed by Mikhail Mikhailovic Bakhtin. The difference is that the plural-voiced discourse does not limit the subject of speakers involved in the text.

Generally, this type of discourse can be classified into linear discourse and parallel discourse. The linear discourse occurs if the utterances inside the discourse are in the same line with the object uttered by the last speaker, so that it is transmissive, in this sense the last speaker transmits the previous utterances. This type of discourse consists of vertical transmissive utterance, an utterance that maintains the original one, and horizontal transmissive utterance, a transmissive utterance which object of transmission is fully controlled by the last speaker. The last speaker uses the previous utterances in the context of his own interest, but it does not accompanied by eliminating the role of the previous utterances.

Parallel utterance is an utterance which boundaries of purpose between the last utterance and the previous one cannot be compromised into a single linear utterance. This kind of utterance is basically transmissive utterance, but because the last utterance cannot successfully compromise his utterance with the previous one, it makes the purpose of the communication seem to be more than one. The types of the utterance consist of contaminative utterance, an utterance caused by the strong influence of the first utterance and thus the presence of last utterance seems to be something alien for the first utterance, and deflection utterance, an utterance caused by the strength of the last utterance and thus the previous utterance is drowned under the

communication purpose of the last speaker.

Based on the various types of discourse found in BZ (*Babad Zaman* or Chronicle of Times) text, there are at least three speakers that give a great contribution in the creation of BZ text: *firstly* is the author, the first person who initially create the discourse and write it as a text. The significant role of the author is in expressing ideas, selecting and contextualizing sources of reading, and structuring the discourse; *secondly* is the first copyist, a person initially copying the archetype text. The first copyist is not passive when copying the text, he participates in the effort of restructuring the text, that has been scattered and incomplete, including also restructuring the canto, or possibly the cantos of BZ are the creation of the first copyist instead; and *thirdly* is the second copyists (and so on), copyists who contribute in transmitting the existing text in the new form of writing. It is predicted that these copyists do not maintain the pattern of canto strictly in producing the copied texts, or perhaps they do not understand the convention of canto at all instead.

Therefore, the cantos in the text tend to be destroyed by the additions of elements aimed to give explanation – although it's not much – that is relevant in terms of meaning, but not relevant in terms of the context of canton, in fact it gives contribution to the loss of text unintentionally [look at the sign of "(...)" in the example]. The existing BZ text now is predicted a product of the second copyist or perhaps the later copyist.¹

References

- al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid. (2008). *Ihya' Ulum ad-Din, Volume IV*. Bairut: Dar al-Fikr.
- al-Jabiri, Muhammad Abid. (2003). *Formasi Nalar Arab*. Yogyakarta: Ircisod, translated by Imam Khoiri from the original text entitled *Takwin al-'Aql al-'Arabi* (Bairut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wahdah al-Arabiyyah, first published in 1989 and tenth edition in 2009).
- al-Jami, Abu al-Barakat Abdurrahman. (1989). *Nafahāt*

¹**Statement:** I, hereby, certify that this paper is my own work. It is not product of plagiarism. Due acknowledgment is made in the text for materials written by other authors and researchers. I also declare that this paper has not been submitted to other publishers and not been published by other scholarly journals.

- al-Uns min Hadlarāt al-Quds*. Al-Azhar as-Syarif: Dar at-Turats al-'Arabi.
- as-Sarraj, Abu Nashr. (1960). *Al-Luma'*. Mesir: Dar al-Kutub al-Haditsah, edited and annotated by Abdul Halim Mahmud & Thaha Abdul Baqi Surur.
- Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume I. Bandung: The Copied Manuscript Owned by the Author.
- Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume IV. Bandung: The Copied Manuscript Owned by the Author.
- Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume VII. Bandung: The Copied Manuscript Owned by the Author.
- Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume IX. Bandung: The Copied Manuscript Owned by the Author.
- Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume XII. Bandung: The Copied Manuscript Owned by the Author.
- Babad Zaman* (Chronicle of Times), Volume XIII. Bandung: The Copied Manuscript Owned by the Author.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovic. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press, translated by Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovic. (1984). "Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics" dalam *Theory and History of Literature*, Vol.VIII. London: University of Minnesota Press, edited and translated by Caryl Emerson.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovic. (1986). *Quotations from Bakhtin: Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovic. (1994). *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writing of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Volosinov*. London: Arnold Ltd., edited by Pam Morris.
- Baried, Siti Baroroh et al. (1983). *Pengantar Teori Filologi*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Dentith, Simon. (1995). *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Djamaris, Edwar. (2002). *Metodologi Penelitian Filologi*. Jakarta: CV Monasco.
- Holquist, M. [ed]. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press, translated by Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist.
- Ismail, Syuhudi. (1992). *Metodologi Penelitian Hadis Nabi*. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- Ismail, M. Syuhudi. (1994). *Hadits Nabi yang Tekstual dan Kontekstual: Telaah Ma'ani al-Hadist tentang Ajaran Islam yang Universal, Temporal, dan Lokal*. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- Lechte, John. (2011). *50 Filsuf Kontemporer: Dari Strukturalisme sampai Postmodernitas*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Mustaqim, Abdul. (2002). "Teori Sistem Isnād Otentitas Hadis Menurut Perspektif M.M Azami" dalam Hamim Ilyas & Suryadi [eds]. *Wacana Studi Hadis Kontemporer*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Noorduyn, J. (2006). *Three Old Sundanese Poems*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Pandit, Bansi. (2000). *Pemikiran Hindu*. Surabaya: Penerbit Paramita.

- Ratna, Nyoman Kutha. (2008). *Teori, Metode, dan Teknik Penelitian Sastra dari Strukturalisme hingga Postrukturalisme: Perspektif Wacana Naratif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Selden, Raman. (1993). *Panduan Pembaca Teori Sastra Masa Kini*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Sukarma, I Wayan. (2015). "Filsafat Hindu: Antara Berpikir dan Percaya (Sepenuhnya)". Available online also at: <http://www.cakrawayu.org/artikel/8-i-wayan-sukarma/55-filsafat-hindu-antara-berpikir-dan-percaya-sepenuhnya.html> [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: August 15, 2015].
- Sulendraningrat, P.S. (1975). *Sejarah Cirebon dan Silsilah Sunan Gunung Jati Maulana Syarif Hidayatullah*. Cirebon: Lembaga Kebudayaan Wilayah III Cirebon.
- Sunardjo, Unang R.H. (1983). *Kerajaan Carbon, 1479-1809*. Bandung: PT Tarsito.
- Tindale, Christopher W. (2004). *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Titscher, Stefan *et al.* (2009). *Metode Analisis Teks & Wacana*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, Translation.
- Tjandrasasmita, Uka. (2011). "Kesultanan Cirebon: Tinjauan Historis dan Kultural". Available online also at: <https://miftah19.wordpress.com/2011/02/18/kesultanan-cirebon-tinjauan-historis-dan-kultural/> [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: August 15, 2015].
- Todorov, Tzvetan. (1984). "Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle" dalam *Theory and History of Literature*, Vol.13. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.



One of the Old Manuscripts in West Java, Indonesia
(Source: <http://www.republika.co.id>, 15/8/2015)

The BZ (*Babad Zaman* or *Chronicle of Times*) manuscript was written in the form of *pupuh* (cantos) using Cirebon Javanese with *Pegon* (Arabic) characters started from page 183, which could be saved. The paper used was European paper in "Dutch Lion" (Pro Patria) watermark produced in the Netherlands around the year of 1687/1688. Although the first and the last few pages of the manuscript are missing, it does not give a significant impact to the entire understanding of the text.