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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).
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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.
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 Mikhailovich Bakhtin was born in Oryol on November 1895. He studied classical literature and philology at the Odessa University (Ukraine), then at Petrogard University in 1918. In 1929, Mikhail Mikhailovich 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 Mikhailovich 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 Mikhailovich 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 Langugewas 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' 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 Bahtinian 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 addresivity). 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 addressee 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 “supperaddressee”. 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 (1984), as cited also in Tzvetan Todorov (1984), claims that “each speaker-authors an utterance not only with an audience-addresssee, but a supperaddresse 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 supperaddresse in mind.

The existence of the third party or supperaddresse is a primary feature to understand Bakhtinian dialogic discourse analysis. The supperaddresse is not assumed to be outside of a text, due to its existence that gives a great influence to an utterance. The supperaddresse 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 supperaddressees 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 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 pictoral 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)
wohtên sapêrkara ika
there is one requirement legitimating the creed
syarat êsahe ta mangko
there is one requirement legitimating the creed
wong iku amaco 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)
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-Sarraj, 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 Wasallah 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-’ahwal-bihimiz-zahir (the tawheed of haqiqat experts mastering bayani and burhani knowledge) or also called as tauhidul-khash (the tawheed of particular people) and tauhidal-khash min ahil-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, butthey 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 tashdīq 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 musyhadah of the tawheed intuitively kasyf, “inner openness” through nur al-Haqq or the light of al-Haqq, Allah, and this level is maqam al-mugarrabin; 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)
*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)

*aqa milu sira gusti* (you should not follow to eat)
*ange(n)tenu na (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)
*amukal 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 bênjang iya* (Later you should ask for)
*jaluk en apuraneki* (an apology from him)
*aqa kongsi da’um.* (don’t be late)
*Lamon ora sira iku* (If you)
*dên-apura lakinira* (do not get forgiveness from your husband)
*dadi reregding bênjing* (it would be a sin in the future)
*ing akherat mélewang-mélewang dosanira.* (the enormous sin in the hereafter)

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

*Kudu ati-ati* (Should be careful)
*tasira nini ing bêsuk* (later; girl)
*aqa ana salah dursila* (not to err)
*lamon dûwê laki ing bênjing* (if one day you get married)
*wong melêrok ing bênjang ta dosanira* (women who look at another men, in return)
*mata molêr tumêkang dhadha.* (their eyes will stick out until their chests)

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

Sêdaya samnya ngawêruhi
(Know all)
punika babading zaman
(the chronicles of the times)
wulong pêrkara katahe:
(there are eight kinds of times)
ing kang dimin Zaman Tirta
(the first is the Age of Water)
sglaksâ tahan lawasê
(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)
wulong ewu taqun lawase
(was eight thousand years old)
wendene pggangane ika
(as for his food)
duk alam Zaman Tirta
(in the Age of Water)
kang den-pangan ika 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
(once a month)
ing dalêm pangane
(the period of their eating)
kang den-pangan kukus ika.
(it was the smoke that they eat)

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

Sang Yang Parmana iku
(Sing 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 ëpê
(was a hundred fathoms)
lan êrone këdêng punika
(and the depth of abyss)
iya tunggal satus ëpê
(was a hundred fathoms too)
lan luhure mëñusa ika
(and the height of a man)
antara limalas ëpê.
(was about fifteen fathoms tall)

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

Anênggih pgmangane iki
(The period of eating)
sajêmu’ah sapisan
(was every Friday)
lawan malih gaqamane
(and the weapon)
ing waktu Zaman Karta
(in the Age of Prosperous)
ginawe sragampang
(was made haphazardly)
lan [72] malih wasta puniku
(and [72] at that time)
anā 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 démên kakêbonan
(they love gardening)
dêmên weh-weh maring wong miskin
(and love to give to the poor)
lan wêlasan maring sêpuh
(also love their parents)
den-sidhokakên pisan
(also like charity)
kabeh nane maring wong alim
(to the pious)
iya iku katêmune wgwâldésira:
(so, they will get in return)
anā ing kang nêmu danas
(some get the pineapples)
anā nêmu ya balîngbing
(some get the starfruits)
anā nêmu jûrûk manis
(some get the sweet oranges)
[...]
anā nêmu...
(some get …)
anā nêmu manggis kuning
(some get the yellow mangoes teens)
anā maning iku nêmu widara
(some also get the lotes)
anā kang nêmu kuwista
(some get the limonias)
anā nêmu buwah wuni
(some get the wuni mango)
anā nêmu bonteng catang
(some get the catang cucumbers)
anā nêmu wálûh kêtûji
(some get the kêtûji pumpkins)
anêmu wéi kumbilih
(some get the kumbilih yam)
anā nêmu talês bêntul
(some get the oval taro)
anêmu boled abang
(some get the red sweet potatoes)
anā nêmu talês kutil
(some get the little taro)
anā maning anêmu sêmangka Cina
(also some get the Chinese watermelons)
iku wong kang pada sidqah
(when they live [120] in the world)
[...]
tur wêlas maring sêtêrî
(and love the pupils)
lan têntangga patut gruntut
(live with their neighbours in harmony)
besuk wawalêsira
(later the return is)
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kang bêcik tinêmu bêcik  
(the good will gain kindness)
iva kang aha langkung saking alanimu.  
(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 do 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 tittles 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 tittle of honour in Javanese culture although in the period of colonialism, the meaning of the tittle had a bad association.

In Cirebon, the tittle 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 Tjandrasasmita, 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 tittle 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)

waha datêng putrane estri

(to his daughter)

satunggal punika,

(the one and only)

**Nyi Fatimah,**

(that is Fatimah)

dawuh datêng putraneki:

(said to the daughter)

"Anakkisun piharsanên!"

(My daughter, listen!)

[...]

**lamon nora dwé sira**

(if you do not have)

**papanganan kanggo anyuguhi**

(food to be served)

**kang dén-manis sabadanira**

(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 gawéneki**

(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 amêmangan**

(while you are lack of food)

**maka nuli dên-asongi**

(then you are offered)

**dening sira ugi,**

(or given something)

**nanging semah kang tutulung**

(by the guest who wants to help you)

**kang dwê rizki sira,**

(that is your fortune)

**semah kang anggawa rizki,**

(it is the guest that brings luck)

**iya iku mangkono ujarine 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 ujarine 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 ujarine ilmu,**

(who runs his knowledge)

**anglampahakén ing Kitab**

(executes the commands in the Book)

**sarta manut maring mami**

(and follows my call)

**satenene iku pangandhikaning 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 ujarine Kitab” (that is what the Book says) and "satenene iku pangandhikaning 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 ujarine 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-umpétan,
(some were hiding)
wong katâh saking gerise,
(because of severe fear)
ana ing kang amanek anda,
(some were climbing stairs)
ana kang pintu lawang,
(some were behind the doors)
midangêt Dajal tumurun
(hearing the arrival of Dajal or Devil)
akêh ibar bêbêtusan.
(all was rowdy and noisy because of fear)

Anulya pinaranan aglis
(Then immediately came)
sang Dajal lanatullah
(a Dajal or damn Devil)
aniyona ngucap ta mangko
(then he said)
maring wong akeh ika:
(to the human)
"He urang manusa sira
(O men)
pada délêngên 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 énggonira,
(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)
karšane Sukma Kang Mulya
(is because of the will of the God the Exalted)
anglêbur maring makhluke
(destroying His creatures)
sakehe toya sainya asat
(a lot of water become dry)
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:

Sinîgêg caritanipun
(The story is interrupted here)
kang tinurun burak-barik
(the copied sources is dishevelled)
ginêntos[an] sejen cerita
(changed by another story)

tu ladane ana kang gûnênîrit
(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
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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 who 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 fist 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.\(^1\)
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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.