

STUDIA ISLAMIKA

INDONESIAN JOURNAL FOR ISLAMIC STUDIES

Volume 5, Number 1, 1998



CHRISTIAN-MUSLIM RELATIONS IN INDONESIA:
THE CHALLENGES OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY
Ibrahim Abu Rabi'

THE MYSTICAL FIGURE OF HAJI AHMAD MUTAMAKIN
FROM THE VILLAGE OF CABOLÈK (JAVA)
Edwin Wieringa

K.H. HASYIM ASY'ARI'S CONTRIBUTION
TO INDONESIAN INDEPENDENCE
Latiful Khuluq

STUDIA ISLAMIKA

Indonesian Journal for Islamic Studies

Vol. v, no. 1, 1998

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Harun Nasution
Mastuhu
M. Quraish Shihab
A. Aziz Dahlan
M. Satria Effendi
Nabilah Lubis
M. Yunan Yusuf
Komaruddin Hidayat
M. Din Syamsuddin
Muslim Nasution
Wahib Mu'thi

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Azyumardi Azra

EDITORS:

Saiful Mujani
Hendro Prasetyo
Johan H. Meuleman
Didin Syafruddin
Ali Munhanif

ASSISTANTS TO THE EDITOR:

Arief Subhan
Oman Fathurrahman
Heni Nuroni

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ADVISOR:

Donald Potter

ARABIC LANGUAGE ADVISOR:

Nursamad

COVER DESIGNER:

S. Prinka

STUDIA ISLAMIKA (ISSN 0215-0492) is a journal published quarterly by the Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN, The State Institute for Islamic Studies) Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta. (STT DEPPEN No. 129/SK/DITJEN/PPG/STT/1976) and sponsored by the Department of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia. It specializes in Indonesian Islamic studies, and is intended to communicate original researches and current issues on the subject. This journal warmly welcomes contributions from scholars of related disciplines.

All articles published do not necessarily represent the views of the journal, or other institutions to which it is affiliated. They are solely the views of the authors. The articles contained in this journal have been refereed by the Board of Editors.

The Mystical Figure of Haji Ahmad Mutamakin from the Village of Cabolèk (Java)

Abstraksi: Sejarah proses pengislaman masyarakat di pedesaan Jawa telah melahirkan seorang tokoh mistik bernama Haji Mutamakin dari desa Cebolek; sebuah desa di wilayah pantai utara, Pati, Jawa Tengah. Tokoh ini diperkirakan hidup di sekitar awal abad kedelapan belas. Ia dikenal luas oleh masyarakat—khususnya kalangan santri—Jawa lewat sebuah kitab yang ditulis oleh Yasadipura I (1729-1803), seorang pujangga kraton Sultan Pakubuwana IV (m. 1788-1820), yang berjudul Serat Cebolek.

Dalam kitab tersebut digambarkan, Haji Mutamakin adalah seorang sufi—atau lebih tepatnya mistikus Jawa—yang sesat, berperilaku buruk, membuat ajaran bid'ah, dan mengabaikan aturan-aturan pokok syari'ah Islam. Bahkan, lebih jauh dari itu, Mutamakin dianggap menghina golongan ortodoks Islam dengan memberi nama kedua anjing piarannya dengan nama yang menyerupai seorang penghulu (petugas agama) dan ketib (juru khotbah di masjid) Tuban. Karena dianggap sudah terlalu jauh menyimpang, para ulama di pantai utara yang dipimpin Ketib Anom Kudus lalu melaporkan Mutamakin kepada Sunan Mangkurat IV (m. 1719-1926), agar diadili. Sebuah dewan yang melibatkan ulama dan pejabat istana Surakarta kemudian dibentuk untuk menyelidiki, apakah Haji Mutamakin telah menyimpang dari ajaran Islam atau tidak?

Proses penyelidikan itu berjalan alot dan Sunan Mangkurat IV sendiri meninggal pada 20 April 1726. Akhirnya sebuah pengadilan agama digelar, di bawah pimpinan sultan yang baru, Sultan Pakubuwono II (m. 1726-1749). Barangkali karena tidak adanya bukti yang kuat, atau juga karena kecocokan pandangan keagamaan Sultan dengan ajaran Haji Mutamakin, Sultan Pakubuwana II akhirnya menolak tuduhan para ulama itu. Pengadilan menerima keputusan itu dan membebaskan Mutamakin dari tuduhan telah menyimpang dari ajaran Islam. Hanya Ketib Anom Kudus yang terus mempermasalahkan ajaran Mutamakin, sembari mengingatkan Sultan agar menjadi pelindung bagi penganut ajaran Islam yang benar.

Persoalan yang barangkali masih harus diteliti adalah: siapakah sebenarnya tokoh yang bernama Haji Mutamakin? Apakah ia benar-benar ada dalam sejarah Islamisasi Jawa, atau hanya figur rekaan penulis Serat Cebolek? Peristiwa pengadilan di istana itu, misalnya, belum pernah bisa ditentukan secara pasti kebenarannya historisnya. Hal ini disebabkan oleh kenyataan bahwa kisah berlangsungnya pengadilan itu sendiri hanya terdapat dalam satu naskah, tidak ditemukan dalam naskah-naskah yang lain. Peristiwa itu juga tidak terdapat dalam laporan-laporan yang ditulis istana; termasuk arsip-arsip pemerintah Hindia-Belanda sekalipun. Para sarjana hanya mengambil kesimpulan samar yang didasarkan pada perkiraan masa pemerintahan Pakubuwana II, yakni bahwa, pengadilan atas Haji Mutamakin itu terjadi antara 1730 dan 1732.

Persoalan historisitas kisah itu semakin pelik bila dihadapkan pada kisah-kisah Haji Mutamakin yang bersumber pada oral tradisi masyarakat Jawa. Menurut cerita masyarakat yang tinggal di sekitar pantai utara itu, Haji Mutamakin dipercayai sebagai seorang Muslim saleh, guru sufi, yang menyebarkan Islam di daerah pedalaman utara Jawa pada abad kedelapan belas. Ia adalah keturunan Raden Patah, raja pertama dari Kerajaan Demak. Setelah pergi menuntut ilmu di Mekkah selama beberapa tahun, ia kembali dan menyebarkan Islam di Jawa. Di akhir hayatnya, ia harus menghadapi pengadilan istana di Surakarta lantaran dituduh berbuat bid'ah, menghina para ulama, dan menyebarkan Islam tanpa mengindahkan syari'ah. Namun demikian, versi oral tentang kisah pengadilannya itu mengisyaratkan kedudukan Mutamakin yang terhormat; sebagai sufi sederhana yang mengetahui kedalaman mistik Islam, sesuai dengan tradisi Jawa.

Dua versi tentang Haji Mutamakin itu mengisyaratkan akan adanya dua kepribadian sang tokoh. Pada satu sisi ia ditempatkan sebagai tokoh yang berperilaku buruk, di sisi lain ia dijunjung tinggi. Oleh karenanya, ketokohan Haji Mutamakin itu tampaknya hanya mungkin bisa dijelaskan melalui pertentangan identitas kultural "kraton" (pusat kekuasaan Islam) dan "desa" (pemeluk Islam pinggiran). Boleh jadi Haji Mutamakin adalah tokoh yang hidup dalam sejarah. Tetapi, ketokohnya dalam Serat Cebolek merupakan kisah ciptaan yang mewakili kepentingan dan ideologi kraton untuk mendiskreditkan segala bentuk pemahaman Islam yang berbeda darinya. Sedangkan ketokohnya yang bersumber pada oral tradisi merupakan kecenderungan masyarakat Muslim di Jawa untuk mengatakan bahwa, "masih ada Islam yang lain di luar tembok-tembok kraton." Ini mengingatkan kepada kita bahwa selalu ada ketegangan ideologis antara tradisi agung (great tradition) dengan tradisi kecil (little tradition) yang berlaku dalam suatu masyarakat.

الطوره الصوفية للحاج أحمد متمكن

من قرية شيبوليك (Cebolek)

خلاصة: لقد ظهر في تاريخ نشر الاسلام بأرياف جاوه شخصية صوفية يدعى الحاج متمكن من قرية شيبوليك الواقعة شمالي باتي (Pati) بجاوه الوسطى؛ ويقال إنه كان يعيش في أوائل القرن الثامن عشر الميلادي، وكان يتمتع بالشهرة الواسعة لدى العامة - وخاصة جمهور المعاهد التراثية- بجاوه من خلال كتاب ألفه أحد شعراء قصر السلطان ياكوبوانا (Pakubuwana) الرابع (١٧٨٨-١٨٢٠م) هو ياساديورا (Yasadipura) (١٧٢٩-١٨٠٣م) تحت عنوان رسالة شيبوليك (Serat Cebolek).

ويصور الكتاب الحاج أحمد متمكن بأنه صوفى - أو بعبارة أدق حاوى متنسك- ضل الطريق، سبي الخلق، متدخ يطل قواعد الشريعة الاسلامية، بل يقال فوق ذلك إن الحاج متمكن أهان أهل السنة بأن قام بتسمية كلبه بأسماء تشبه إمام المسجد واسم خطيبه بقرية توبان (Tuban)؛ ونظرا لما يعتقد من انحرافه الدينى قام علماء المنطقة الشمالية بقيادة الخطيب آنوم (Ketib Anom) بقدس برفع الدعوى إلى السلطان مانجكورات (Sunan

Mangkurat الرابع (١٧١٩-١٩٢٦م) لتتم محاكمته، وتم تكوين مجلس قضاء يضم علماء وكبار القصر بسوراكرتا (Surakarta) للتحقيق فيما إذا كان الحاج متمكن قد انحرف فعلا عن التعاليم الاسلامية أم لا؟ ولم يسر التحقيق سيرا حسنا حيث توفي السلطان مانجكورات نفسه في ٢٠ ابريل ١٧٢٦م؛ وفي النهاية عقدت محكمة شرعية بقيادة السلطان الجديد هو السلطان باكوبونو (Pakubuwono) الثاني (١٧٢٦-١٧٤٩م)، وربما لم تكن هناك أدلة كافية أو أن السلطان نفسه كان على مذهب الحاج متمكن حتى رفض السلطان دعوى العلماء، واضطرت المحكمة لقبول القرار بعدم إدانته وبالتالي تحرره من جميع الاتهام الموجه إليه، ولم يبق من العلماء من يتساءل في مذهب الحاج متمكن إلا الخطيب آنوم مذكرا السلطان بضرورة رعاية التعاليم الاسلامية الصحيحة.

والقضية التي يتحتم التحقيق فيها هي : من هذا الشخص المسمى بالحاج متمكن؟ وهل كان له وجود فعلا في تاريخ نشر الاسلام بجاواه أم أنه كان شخصية خيالية ابتكرها مؤلف رسالة شيبوليك؟ فالمحكمة الشرعية المشار إليها مثلا، لم تكن ليستطاع لها إثبات من الناحية التاريخية، وذلك لأن القصة التي تكشف عن سرعان المحكمة كانت واردة في نسخة وحيدة، وليس هناك مصادر غيرها تشير إليها، لا في الحكايات الأخرى ولا في التقارير الخاصة بالقصر، ولا حتى في ملقات الارشيف للحكومة الهند الهولندية، ولم يتوصل الدارسون إلا إلى نتيجة غير واضحة في ذلك، واضعين في اعتبارهم ما يحدث في فترة حكم باكوبوانا الثاني، وهو أن المحكمة قد تعقد في الفترة ما بين سنة ١٧٣٠م و١٧٣٢م.

ويزيد هذا الحدث التاريخي أكثر تعقيدا عندما وضع إزاء القصص الشعبية عن الحاج متمكن لدى عامة المجتمع الجاوي الذي يقطن المناطق

الشمالية، فقد اعتقد طبقاً لتلك القصص أن الحاج متكن كان مسلماً صالحاً يتولى نشر الإسلام في أرياف جاوه الشمالية في القرن الثامن عشر الميلادي، ويتصل نسبه - فيما يعتقد - بالملك فتاح (Raden Farah) أول ملوك مملكة ديمق الإسلامية، وبعد أن أتم دراسته بمكة المكرمة لبضع سنين رجع إلى جاوه ليقوم بنشر الإسلام، وتعرض لمحاكمة في القصر سواراكرتا (Surakarta) آخر أيام عمره نتيجة اتهامه بالبدعة وإهانة العلماء وإبطال الشريعة الإسلامية، ومع ذلك فإن القضية التي تكشف عنها القصة تعطي للحاج متمكن مكانة مرموقة، كما تليق بصوفي بسيط يتمتع بعمق المعرفة الصوفية وفقاً للتقاليد الجاوية.

وإذن فهناك صورتان للحاج متمكن تشيران إلى شخصيتين، فقد وضع الرجل من ناحية في موضع سئ الخلق، ومن ناحية أخرى في مكانة سامية، ولذلك يبدو أن شخصية الحاج متمكن يمكن تبيينه وتوضيحه من خلال المواجهة بين الهوية الثقافية لكراتون أي القصر الملكي (مركز السلطة) وبين الهوية الثقافية للقرية (للمسلمين الواقعيين على هامش السلطة)، ولربما كان الحاج متمكن موجوداً فعلاً من الناحية التاريخية، إنما شخصيته التي أوردتها رسالة شيبوليك كانت من نسيج الخيال الذي يعبر عن مصالح كراتون أي القصر وايدولوجيته، في محاولة لتجاهل جميع صور المذاهب الفكرية المخالفة له؛ وأما ما تصوره القصص الشعبية فإنه يمثل نزعة المجتمع الإسلامي بجاوه إلى الكشف عن "أن هناك إسلاماً آخر خارج أسوار القصر"، وهذا يذكرنا بوجود صراع ايدولوجي دائماً بين المستوى الأعلى من التقاليد وبين المستوى الأدنى منها في المجتمع.

Who is Haji Ahmad Mutamakin?¹ In the *Serat Cabolèk* he is described as a teacher of mysticism who disregarded the *shari'ah* (Islamic law). He lived in the village of Cabolèk on the northern coast of Java. As he deliberately violated the Islamic law, his behavior caused a scandal among pious Muslims. He even went so far as to name his dogs after the *penghulu* and *ketib* of Tuban. Finally, the coastal '*ulamâ*' decided to report his outrageous behavior to the king of Kartasura. Led by Ketib Anom Kudus they went to the capital to present their charges against Mutamakin to the king. The king, Sunan Mangkurat IV (1719-1726), however suddenly fell ill and died. Investigations into the affair, therefore, had to be postponed until after the installation of his son Pakubuwana II (1726-1749). At a council it was decided that Mutamakin should be burnt at the stake. Mutamakin remained steadfast in his position and was only too willing to face the sentence. Perhaps, in this way he hoped, the smoke from his roasted flesh could be smelt as far as Arabia where he had studied.

The newly-enthroned king did not approve of the council's decision. The king argued that Mutamakin's mystical knowledge was only an individual conviction and that he had not attempted to make converts throughout Java. When Demang Urawan, the nephew and brother-in-law of the king, who served as royal envoy, conveyed this royal decision to the council, all present quaked in fear at the news of the king's displeasure. Only Ketib Anom Kudus was courageous enough to oppose the king. Skillfully he argued that Mutamakin's improper actions posed a threat to the king's dignity. The king had to be the defender of the true faith: he should take active measures lest Mutamakin's faulty teachings led the people astray.

Demang Urawan returned to the palace to report what Ketib Anom Kudus had said. He was profuse in superlatives in describing Ketib Anom Kudus, whereas Mutamakin, according to him, was as small, ugly, miserable and cowardly man: "If he had not made the pilgrimage [to Mecca], he would have been well-fitted for selling paddy-stems or dealing in chickens."² The king acknowledged that Mutamakin had indeed sinned and had come close to treason. He expressed his gratitude to the '*ulamâ*' for protecting their ruler from the threat of heresy. Nevertheless, he pardoned Mutamakin provided that he promised not to repeat his improper conduct.

Ketib Anom Kudus told of men in the past who had done as Mutamakin had, i.e. Shaykh Siti Jenar in the time of Giri, Pangéran Panggung during the Demak era, Ki Bebeluk in the Pajang era and Shaykh Among Raga during the reign of Sultan Agung. All had been executed because of their heterodox mysticism. He mocked Mutamakin's attempts to imitate Sunan Panggung. When the gathering closed, at the house of Demang

Urawan, Mutamakin revealed that he had learned his mystical knowledge in Yemen from a teacher called Shaykh Zain. The doctrine was similar to that of the book *Bima Suci* or *Dewa Ruci*. Ketib Anom Kudus recited this story and afterwards asked his audience to explain its mystical teachings. Nobody dared do so. Haji Mutamakin was also unable to do so, and simply bowed his head to beg pardon.

Ketib Anom Kudus mocked Haji Mutamakin. Apparently he only recited Pangéran Panggung without really knowing what mysticism was about. Ketib Anom Kudus told him that man is forbidden to repudiate *sharī'ah* and may not oppose the king and bring ruin to the country, because the king is the representative of the Prophet, who in his turn represents God. Then he gave his interpretation of the story he had just read. He stressed that man's actions should be consonant with the Islamic law. After that, he continued with a recitation of the *Suluk Malang Sumirang*, the work Pangéran Panggung composed when he was burned at the stake. After reading the story, all returned home.

A True Story?

This, then, is a brief outline of the *Serat Cabolèk* as edited by Soebardi.³ The problems which this text raises are many. The first question, which immediately comes to mind, is whether the story is historically true. The events are placed at about the time of the death of Sunan Mangkurat IV, which took place on 20 April 1726, and the succession of his teenage son Pakubuwana II. According to Ricklefs, if the events actually happened, they must have taken place in the period 1730-1732.⁴ The problem is that until now the trial of Haji Mutamakin is not known from other texts. This does not necessarily mean that the story is untrue, for no one has yet begun to investigate the matter from existing Javanese and Dutch sources.

Soebardi was not interested in the issue of the historicity of the tale, and therefore he did not wonder whether the acclaimed authorship of the text could be correct. Soebardi believed that Yasadipura I (1729-1803), the renowned court poet during the reigns of Pakubuwana III (1749-1788) and Pakubuwana IV (1788-11920), composed the *Serat Cabolèk*. His name, however, is not mentioned in the manuscripts, and Soebardi could only deduce two very weak pieces of 'evidence'.⁵ A more likely author of the original text, as Ricklefs suggests, would possibly be Carik Bajra, the chief court poet and senior adviser to Pakubuwana II.⁶ Actually, we cannot speak of the *Serat Cabolèk* as if there were only one text. There is a *Cabolèk* corpus, which is divisible into at least eight distinct recensions, or versions of the poem.⁷ Soebardi made an additional text composed of two different recen-

sions, thereby creating a whole new version.

Soebardi focussed on the religious contents of the poem, hence the subtitle of his book: "A contribution to the study of the Javanese mystical tradition." However, it seems that the political overtones of the work are of greater importance than its poetic content. According to Day, its central theme is the need for a certain kind of strong king:

The story of the poem, then, deals with a new king who must learn to regulate the religious affairs of his kingdom as his first order of business. The center of the realm, good kingship and Islamic orthodoxy are set in opposition to the peripheries of the kingdom, where heterodoxy and a certain amount of disorder is tolerated.⁸

Day suggests that the poem could have served to instruct a young and inexperienced king like Pakubuwana IV (r. 1788-1820). This would place the date of the *Serat Cabolèk* considerably later, namely at the end of the eighteenth, or beginning of the nineteenth century.⁹

In a version written at the end of the nineteenth century, the political ramifications of this seemingly religious poem is even clearer. Printed in 1885 by Van Dorp. On the title-page it is stated that the poem was written by an unnamed *abdi dalem pujangga kraton ing nagari Surakarta* ('a royal poet of the court of Surakarta') in the reign of Pakubuwana IV. In the 1886 edition, Van Dorp excluded this statement and merely said that the edition was based on a copy by Radèn Adipati Panji Suryakusuma, a pensioned *bupati* (regent) of Semarang, which then had been corrected by Radèn Panji Jayasubrata, a *camat* (district head) of Magetan.¹⁰

Based on the story of Haji Mutamakin, in the Van Dorp version, a similar story is told about Haji Ahmad Rifai, a religious teacher in the village of Kalisalak, Pekalongan. Haji Rifai was born in 1786 in Kendal, and had spent eight years in Mecca studying religion. When he returned home, he refused to recognize the religious authority of the *penghulu*, whom he accused of being servants of the 'infidel king' (*raja kafir*). Furthermore, he was also reportedly taught the 'holy war' ideology. The local authorities considered him a danger to public order, and he had to face a public debate and trial by the religious and the indigenous civil authorities of Pekalongan. This resulted in his exile to Ambon in 1856.¹¹

The description of Haji Rifai's trial is very similar to Haji Mutamakin's. His adversary, Haji Pinang, the *penghulu* of Batang, who plays the same heroic role as Ketib Anom Kudus, called Haji Rifai

angkara murka and *delap* (both meaning: greedy), *candala* (of low character), *deksuna* (impolite), *dirinya* (egoistic), *takabur* and *kibir* (both meaning arrogant), *saen* (willing to act shamefully), *nyrengungus* (obsessed with details, forgetting the essen-

tials). He continued: "It's a pity that you are a Haji. If you weren't, you'd be fit only for begging from shop to shop, or you'd become a wanted criminal, or a pickpocket." The list went on: *dengki* (filled with hatred), *iri* (egoistic, *dusta* (liar), *mamak* (rough), *cidreng bumi* (devious), *khianat* (traitor), *nekad* (stubborn), confused preacher, twisted teacher, collaborator of Satan, someone with demonic intension.¹²

Kuntowijoyo rightly concludes that *Serat Cabolek* "clearly reflects the *priyayi* ideology with regard to religious observance and the maintenance of law and order."¹³ In both stories the *priyayi* are the defenders of *shari'ah* and state.

A Literary Archetype

Perhaps Haji Mutamakkin was only a literary figure. Soebardi speaks of the "Haji Ahmad Mutamakkin motif in the *Serat Cabolek*".¹⁴ In the story he is likened to other mystics, i.e. Shaykh Siti Jenar, Sunan Panggung, Ki Bebeluk and Shaykh Among Raga who propagated the 'Science of Reality' to the uninitiated public. In another story, quoted by Soebardi, a sage named Wisrawa from the Hindu period is mentioned, who likewise dared 'to lift the veil', and claimed to be God.¹⁵ It seems that every era had to have its own heretic: Resi Wisrawa in the Hindu period, Shaykh Siti Jenar during the kingdom of Giri, Sunan Panggung in the kingdom of Demak, Ki Bebeluk during the kingdom of Pajang, and Shaykh Among Raga during the reign of Sultan Agung (Mataram). The big difference is that Haji Mutamakkin was a complete failure: he was portrayed as a miserable would-be al-Hallaj. Whereas Shaykh Siti Jenar and Sunan Panggung are doubles of al-Hallaj, becoming true martyrs, Haji Mutamakkin was described as a ridiculous person, "a mystic without personality, without a deep knowledge of religion, and without any authority."¹⁶

The Genealogy of Haji Mutamakkin

Perhaps Haji Mutamakkin was a historical figure. At least that is what the people in Kajèn believe, who claim that he is buried there. The village of Kajèn is situated in the *kecamatan* Margoyoso, *kabupaten* Pati, on the main road from Pati to Tayu. Because of its many Muslim schools, it is also popularly known as 'Kedhungsantri', i.e. 'centre of Islamic students'.

According to local oral tradition, which has been recorded by M.I. Sanusi A.H., Haji Mutamakkin's ancestor was Radèn Patah.¹⁷ Radèn Patah's son was Sultan Trenggana. Sultan Trenggana's son-in-law was Sultan Adiwijaya, alias Jaka Tingkir. Sultan Adiwijaya's son was Candradiningrat (Sumahadiningrat), alias Pangéran Benawa. This man begot Candradiningrat, alias Sumahadinegara, who was the father of Ahmad Mutamakkin. On his moth-

er's side he was from *sayyid* from Tuban (see appendix for the genealogy resulting from this information).¹⁸

Of course the historical accuracy of his genealogy is very much open to question. However, what is important is that the pedigree of Ahmad Mutamakin serves to underline his (Javanese) noble and (Arab) holy descent. On his father's side he is directly linked with Radèn Patah, who is said to have been the first Muslim king of Java. Ahmad Mutamakin is associated with the kingdoms of Demak (Radèn Patah was the first and his son Sultan Trenggana was the third king of Demak) and Pajang through Jaka Tingkir and Pangéran Benawa.¹⁹ Befitting a saint in Java, he was also of Arab descent, as is shown by the *sayyid* on his mother's side.

A Local Version of the Events

Again according to the local oral tradition in Kajèn, Haji Mutamakin studied for some years in Arabia with a teacher called Shaykh Zain al-Yamani who taught him mysticism. He returned to Java riding a *mladang*-fish. The fish brought him to a place, which henceforth was called Cabolèk, because he 'arrived and thereupon opened his eyes' (*jebul terus melèk*).²⁰ He then went alone to Kajèn (said to be derived from *ijèn*, alone, by oneself).²¹ There he began to propagate the faith in the area.

The episode about the fish is very interesting in connection with other Indonesian Islamization myths. In the dictionary of Gericke and Roorda *meladhang* is explained as the name of a seafish, otherwise known as *sumladhang*.²² As in other Indonesian conversion myths, Haji Mutamakin is presented as a saint who miraculously came from a country overseas.²³ He may be compared to Tuan Tunggang Parangan (also known as Tuan Tunggang, Tuan Haji di Parangan, and Tuan di Parangan), who derived his name ('the Gentlemen astride a swordfish'), because he came to Kutai riding a swordfish (*parangan*). According to the *Salasilah Kutai*, it was he who converted the people of Kutai to Islam.²⁴

Haji Mutamakin was an ascetic, who once upon a time swore not eat and drink for forty days. Thereupon he asked his wife to prepare a delicious meal. Before she served this meal, she had to tie him to a pillar in the house. Then his base instincts came out of his body in the form of two dogs. They ate the meal, and when they wanted to enter Mutamakin's body again, he refused. He called the dogs Abdul Kahar and Kamaruddin, as it happens also the names of the *penghulu* and *khatib* of Tuban. The names symbolized that the servants of God Most High could struggle against their base instincts.²⁵

This story about the purification of a mystic, and the *nafs* in the form of

a dog who wants food, is well-known in Sufi literature.²⁶ In Java the story is best known through Sunan Panggung who kept two dogs, which actually were his *luamah* (i.e. *nafs al-lawwâmah*, the blaming soul) and his *amarah* (i.e. the *nafs al-ammârah*, the soul that inspires evil), which accompanied him every time he entered the mosque.²⁷ Interestingly, in the *Serat Cabolèk* Haji Mutamakin is depicted as an impostor: he only bred dogs, twelve in number. The biggest of them he named Abdul Kahar, whereas the leader of the pups was called Kamaruddin.²⁸

One day Haji Mutamakin was visited by a traveler, whom he gave rice and dried fish. The guest ate it all, even the head of the fish. Smilingly, Haji Mutamakin remarked that his dogs did not like the fish's head, eaten with great relish by the guest. His guest was insulted and left immediately. Thereupon the guest disclosed secrets about Haji Mutamakin in public. It was told that Haji Mutamakin did not follow the Islamic law, because he kept dogs with human names, and liked to watch the *wayang* play of Bima Suci or Déwa Ruci.²⁹

Because of the allegations, Haji Mutamakin was summoned to come to Kartasura to face trial around 1725-1726. During the trial Haji Mutamakin was calm and patient, whereas his opponents were unable to control their emotions. Some accused him and others defended him, and no decision could be reached. The king decided to adjourn the meeting, and to speak with Haji Mutamakin himself. Before Haji Mutamakin paid his respect to the king, one of his pupils told him that he had dream that the king owned a rice field, which at the time of the harvest consisted of a part where the rice had started to become yellow, and of another part where the rice had just been planted. Haji Mutamakin explained that this dream meant that he was not to be convicted.

In a private conversation, in which Haji Mutamakin sat next to the king, the king wanted to know about Haji Mutamakin's teachings. The king became his pupil and had to swear obedience to his *guru*. At the end the king said: "If I do not follow Kyai Haji Ahmad Mutamakin's teachings, I will certainly die like an infidel." The following day, at eight o' clock in the morning, it was announced that Haji Mutamakin was cleared of the charges. Only Ketib Anom Kudus did not agree, but the envoy of the king, Radèn Demang Irawan (sic) urged all those present to safeguard the unity of the *ummah*. Both Haji Mutamakin and Ketib Anom Kudus had dinner with the king and were given royal presents.

One evening Radèn Demang Irawan organized a reading of the *Serat Bima Suci*. Ketib Anom Kudus recited the story, but at the point where Bima met Déwa Ruci, he had difficulties. Thereupon Haji Mutamakin,

who was the *guru ahli*, explained its deeper mystical meaning. The meeting ended brotherly. Therefore, so Sanusi concludes, Haji Mutamakin did not lose the debate with Ketib Anom Kudus and did not have to bow his head, as some commentators suggest.³⁰ In an interview, which I had with Sanusi in 1995, he stressed that the Central Javanese *Serat Cabolèk* was 'kraton-sentris' and that its author (whom he believed to have been Yasadipura) was a 'birokrat'. He claimed that the historical events had been distorted to suit court ideology.

Regional Cultural Identity

Reading the *Serat Cabolèk*, we can discern a 'court vs village' opposition. For example, when Ketib Anom Kudus and Haji Mutamakin at the end of the trial were presented with gifts, both stepped forward. Ketib Anom Kudus received the gift with decorum and then withdrew crouching (*laku dhodhok*), so gracefully that it looked like dancing. The spectators smiled approvingly, and praised him increasingly. When it was his turn, Haji Mutamakin wished to copy Ketib Anom Kudus's behavior, but was awkward because he did not have the skill. Almost falling, he resorted to crawling like a lizard (*akekadhalan*), which caused all officials to laugh and cheer.³¹ In the Kajèn version of the events, however, Haji Mutamakin is depicted as a wise, patient and calm man. Here it is his opponent, Ketib Anom Kudus, who cannot control his emotions and who initially stubbornly refuses to accept the king's verdict. Finally, he is put in his place by Haji Mutamakin.

The figure of Haji Mutamakin lends lustre to the small village of Kajèn. All over Java we nowadays find tombs of Islamic saints with a general name like Shaykh Abdul Rahman or Abdul Rahim, who are said to have come from Arabia and who have converted the area to Islam.³² Haji Mutamakin is one of those local village saints. He personifies a specific cultural region on Java's North Coast, which proudly wants to distinguish itself from "kraton-ridden" Central Java. *Kraton*-centered as most Javanologists are, he reminds us that there are "other Javas away from the *kraton*".³³

His regional importance emerges every year, when, on the date of 10 Muharam, the anniversary of his death is commemorated (Jav. *k(h)ol*, Indon. *haul*). On this day, Kajèn is full of people from kilometers away who on this occasion make a pilgrimage to Haji Mutamakin's grave. A spectacular high point is when the clothes which cover his tomb are replaced. Thereupon the old cloths are sold at a public action. Depending on their former places on the tomb, the prices of the clothes can go up to millions of rupiahs. The festivities are brought to a close on 11 Muharam by a recitation of the story of Sèh Abdulkadir Jaélani, but most guest have already left after

the auction of the clothes, which, so it seems, is regarded as the most important event. Sanusi explained to me that Abdulkadir Jaélani was the “king of all saints”, and a recitation of his biography was a good deed, from which one had to take *hikmat*, i.e. to learn how to do the right thing in the right way.³⁴

Conclusion

Hüsken writes that since the end of the eighteenth century Kajèn has been a so-called *perdikan désa*, i.e. a free village, not liable to taxes, land rent or corvée labor. The reason for this exemption is that in Kajèn there are the tombs of the Muslim saints Kyai Mutamakin and his pupil Kyai Rangakusuma. Both were followers of Sunan Muria (one of the famous *wali sanga*, the ‘nine saints’, who are said have brought Islam to Java), and are considered as the main propagators of Islam in the Northern part of Pati. “If this story is true”, Hüsken concludes, “Kajèn’s special status must date back as far as the fifteenth or sixteenth century.”³⁵ However, in the colonial archives, Hüsken only found that the *perdikan* status of the village was acquired in the years of the British interregnum (1811-1816), when the regent of Juana had granted the privilege to Kajèn in exchange for “taking care of the regent’s family graves.”³⁶

There seem to be at least two persons who were called Kyai Cabolèk: (1) a pupil of Sunan Muria in the fifteenth century, and (2) Haji Mutamakin who lived centuries later. In a Javanese folk tale it is told that a certain Kyai Cabolèk was a pupil of Sunan Muria. One day Sunan Muria wanted to give his daughter Radèn Ayu Nawangsih to him in marriage. However, as his name Cebolèk already indicates—interpreted as a contraction of *cébol* (‘dwarf’) and *èlèk* (‘ugly’)—he was anything but a desirable match, and Sunan Muria’s daughter therefore rejected him. According to the story, Kyai Cebolèk came from the village of Kajèn. Umar Hasyim, who recorded this story from oral tradition, notes that this Kyai Cebolèk cannot possibly be identical with the Kyai Cebolèk, alias Haji Ahmad Mutamakin, who is buried nowadays in Kajèn, because the two are separated by three centuries.³⁷

After we have thereby safely established who Kyai Cabolèk/Haji Mutamakin was not, the question of his identity still remains unsolved. The scientific study of Javanese hagiography and heresiography has scarcely begun yet. For one thing, we do not even know whether the saints and sinners who inhabit many a manuscript only existed on paper or in real life.

Endnotes

1. Material for this article was collected during a fieldtrip to Kajèn in July 1995, which was financed by the International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS) in Leiden. My heartfelt thanks go to my brother-in-law Susila Sihnuagraha who kindly accompanied me at the time. I also express my gratitude to M.I. Sanusi AH as well as several (anonymous) inhabitants of Kajèn, who were willing to share their insights with me. A research fellowship of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung in Bonn enabled me to work up my notes at the Institute of Ethnology, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster.
2. The Javanese Text read: *Yèn sampuna minggah kaji / pantes tiyang kilak merang / utawi dagang pipitik //*. S. Soebardi, *The Book of Cabolèk. A critical edition with introduction, translation and notes. A contribution to the study of the Javanese mystical tradition* (The Hague, 1975), p. 91.
3. See note 2.
4. M.C. Ricklefs, "Book review of Soebardi, *The Book Of Cabolèk*", in: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39 (1976), p. 485.
5. See for details, Ricklefs, "Book review", p. 486.
6. *Ibidem*, p. 486.
7. See T.E. Bernhard, *Katalog Induk Naskah-naskah Nusantara. Jilid 1. Museum Sonobudoyo Yogyakarta* (Jakarta, 1990), pp. 259-261.
8. A Day, "Islam and Literature in South-East Asia. Some pre-Modern, Mainly Javanese Perspectives", M.B. Hooker (ed.), *Islam in Southeast Asia* (Leiden, 1983), p. 145.
9. Day, "Islam and Literature", p. 146; about a late 19th century 'satire' on Pakubuwana IV, cf. Edwin Wieringa, "Another document from the funeral pyre: The *Suluk Aspiya* or *Suluk Éndracatur* by Radèn Mas Atmasutirta", Paul van der Velde (ed.), *IIAS Yearbook 1996* (forthcoming).
10. Soebardi, *Cabolèk*, pp. 5-6, 14. A translation can be found in Sudibjo Z. Hadisutjipto and T.W.K. Hadisuprpta, *Serat Cabolek* (Jakarta, 1981).
11. I base myself on Kuntowijoyo, "The Villian and Sage: the Book of Cabolek or the myth of Islamic Dissent" (unpubl. paper presented at the Fifth Dutch-Indonesian Historian's Conference held in The Netherlands from 23-27 June, 1986). An Indonesian version of this paper has appeared in *Ulumul Quran* 2 (1990), pp. 63-72 under the title of "Serat Cabolek dan Mitos tentang Pembangkangan Islam".
12. Kuntowijoyo, "The Villian and the Sage", pp. 9-10.
13. *Ibidem*, p. 2, 11.
14. Soebardi, *Cabolèk*, p. 40.
15. *Ibidem*, p. 38.
16. *Ibidem*, pp. 40-41.
17. M.I. Sanusi AH., *Mengenang Perjuangan Syaikh HK. Ahmad Mutamakin dari Masa ke Masa* (Kajèn, n.d.), p. 10-11.
18. Based on Sanusi, *Mengenang Perjuangan*, p. 35. *Sayyid's* are descendants of Husain, the grandson of Muhammad.
19. Concerning these personalities I refer to the index in Theodore G. Th. Pigeaud and H.J. de Graaf, *Islamic States in Java 1500-1700* (The Hague, 1976).
20. Personal communication of one inhabitant of Kajèn, 7 July 1995. Cf. Sanusi, *Mengenang Perjuangan*, p. 7.
21. Personal communication of one inhabitant of Kajèn, 7 July 1995. To my sur-

- prise the association with *kaji* was not made.
22. J.F.C. Gericke and T. Roorda, *Javaansch-Nederlandsch Handwoordenboek*. Vol. II (Amsterdam, Leiden, 1901), p. 137 s.v. *ladhang*.
 23. Cf. Russell Jones, "Ten Conversion Myth from Indonesia", Nehemia Levtzion (ed.), *Conversion to Islam* (New York and London, 1979), pp. 129-158.
 24. See C.A. Mees, *De Kroniek van Koetai. Tektuutgave met Toelichting* (Santpoort, 1935), pp. 240-244 (summary in Dutch, pp. 99-101); cf. W. Kern, *Commentaar op de Salasilah van Koetai* ('s-Gravenhage, 1956), pp. 142-144.
 25. Sanusi, *Mengenang Perjuangan*, p. 13.
 26. Cf. Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill, 1883; 5th printing), p. 112-113.
 27. Cf. D.A. Rinke, "Pangéran Panggoeng, Zijne Honden en het Wajangspel", *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde* 54 (1912), pp. 135-207 and G.W.J. Drewes, "Het Document uit den Brandstapel", *Djāwā* 7 (1927), pp. 97-109.
 28. Soebardi, *Cabolèk*, p. 68.
 29. Soebardi, *Mengenang Perjuangan*, pp. 13-14
 30. Soebardi, *Mengenang Perjuangan*, pp. 15-20. The local version of the events as described by Sanusi is also summarized in Pradjarta Dirjosanjoto, *Memelihara Umat: Kyai di antara Usaha Pembangunan dan Mempertahankan Identitas Lokal di Daerah Muria* (Amsterdam, 1994), pp. 45-49.
 31. Soebardi, *Cabolèk*, p. 109; cf. Kuntowijoyo, "The Villian", p. 6.
 32. Claude Guillot & Henri Chambert-Loir, "Indonésie", Henri Chambert-Loir & Claude Guillot (eds.), *Le Culte des Saints dans le Monde Musulman* (Paris, 1995), p. 244.
 33. This expression is from Ron Hatley et alii, *Other Javas away from the Kraton* (Melbourne, 1984).
 34. Unfortunately I was not able to witness the recitation. See about the penetration of Abdulkadir Jaélani on Java. G.J.W. Drewes and R.Ng. Poerbatjaraka, *De Mirakelen van Abdoelkadir Djaelani* (Bandoeng, 1938). For a description of a present-day recitation in a West Javanese village, see Muhammad Hamidi, "Tradisi Pembacaan Naskah Hikayat Abdul Qadir Jaelani di Kampung Suka Asih", S.W.R. Mulyadi (ed.), *Naskah dan Kita: Special Issue of Lembaran Sastra* 12 (1991), pp. 94-101.
 35. Frans Hüsken, "Islam and Collective Action: Rural Violence in North Central Java in 1942", Dick Kooiman, Otto van den Muijzenberg and Peter van der Veer (eds.), *Conversion, Competition and Conflict. Essays on the Role of Religion in Asia* (Amsterdam, 1984), p. 135.
 36. *Ibidem*.
 37. Umar Hasyim, *Sunan Muria; antara Fakta dan Legenda* (Kudus, 1984), p. 80.

Edwin Wieringa is Von Humboldt Research Fellow at the Institute of Ethnology, University of Münster, Germany.

Appendix
 Genealogy of Haji Ahmad Mutamakin
 (based on Sanusi, *Mengenang Perjuangan*, p. 35)

