

Sĕrat Darmasarana as The Reception of Ādiparwa, Mosalaparwa and Prasthānikaparwa

Anung Tedjowirawan

Javanese Literatures Study Program, Languages And Literatures Department,
Faculty Of Cultural Sciences, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract - *Sĕrat Pustakaraja* is tops poet R. Ng. Ranggawarsita of Keraton Surakarta XIX Century AD. Said "Pustakaraja" for being the book guidelines for a king, or even be interpreted as "The King of Books", as it became the leading book as well as being the leading of story book Javanese. *Sĕrat Pustakaraja* is considered as a book of Mahābhārata version of Java. *Sĕrat Darmasarana* and *Sĕrat Yudayana* is part of the *Sĕrat Pustakaraja*. The second this *sĕrat* can be seen as an entry point that connects the tradition of Mahābhārata (India) with Javanese tradition (Kediri king's and soon). To understand *Sĕrat Darmasarana*, than the understanding of the texts on it as well as *Sĕrat Karimataya* latter texts such as *Sĕrat Yudayana* closely *Sĕrat Budhayana* (*Sĕrat Prabu Gĕndrayana*), *Sĕrat Sariwahana*, *Sĕrat Purusangka*, *Sĕrat Partakaraja*, *Sĕrat Ajidarma*, *Sĕrat Ajipamasa* is very important. Research on *Sĕrat Darmasarana* will also discuss about the reseption to the Mahābhārata parts of which *Ādiparwa*, *Mosalaparwa* and *Prasthānikaparwa* which includes the causes of death emperor Parīkṣit, Satyaki, and Baladewa, procession Sarpayajña emperor Janamejaya and its comparison on which Sarpayajña in the *Sĕrat Yudayana*.

Keywords - *Sĕrat Pustakaraja*; *Sĕrat Darmasarana*; *Analysis Reseption*; *Ādiparwa*, *Mosalaparwa*, *Prasthānikaparwa*.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the ancient Javanese literature, Parikesit (Parīkṣit) is the son of Raden Abimanyu (Abhimanyu) with Dewi Utari (Uttarī), the daughter of Wirata (Wirāṭa) and the granddaughter of Arjuna. In reality, Parikesit died of the arrow of Brahmaśirah owned by Aswatama (Aśwatthāmā) when he was still being conceived by Utari. Yet because Kresna (Kṛṣṇa) loved her, he was resurrected and predicted to inherit the family of Pandawa (Zoetmulder, 1983: 332; Sutjipto Wirjosupart, 1968: 355). Before Pandawa (Pāṇḍawa) resigned to leave Ngastina (Hāstina) in his preparation to heaven, Parikesit was assigned and crowned as the king of Ngastina to replace Maharaja Yudhistira (Yudhiṣṭhira) (Zoetmulder, 1995: 157; Ketut Nila, 1979: 27). The description of a brief characterization of Parikesit in the narrative of ancient Javanese literature is tremendously different compared to his appearance in the classic Javanese literature both in the variation of his name and his narrative structure.

In the classic Javanese literature, Prabu Parikesit has other titles, such as Prabu Dipayana, Prabu Yudhiswara, Prabu Mahabrata, dan Prabu Darmasarana. Aside from the classic Javanese literature, another narrative that describes Parikesit is in *Sĕrat Darmasarana* and also appear in *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Madya Jilid I* Nomor 138 Na, *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Madya Jilid II* number 168 Na, *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Madya Jilid III* number 170 Na, *Sĕrat Karimataya I* number 151 Na, *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Madya Kasĕkarakĕn* (*Sĕrat Karimataya II*) number 151 Na-B, dan *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Madya* (*Sĕrat Karimataya III*) number 151 Na-C. These manuscripts are stored at the Sanapustaka Library, Kasunanan Surakarta (Nancy Vol. 1, 1981: 261-296). The manuscripts stored at Reksapustaka Library, Pura Mangkunegaran, Surakarta are: *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Madya: Wirabartana* Nomor D 130, *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Wĕdha* (*Pustakaraja Parikĕsit*) number D 106, *Sĕrat Karimataya* number D 24 (Nancy Vol. II, 1981: 121-130), *Sĕrat Parikĕsit Grogol* number D 103 dan *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Parikĕsit* number D 108 (Nancy Vol. III, 1981: 493-495). Other similar manuscripts stored at Radya Pustaka Library in Surakarta are: *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Madya* (No. XV) Nomor 202 N, *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Puwara* (*Sĕrat Danĕswara II*) number 154 B, dan *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Puwara* number 206 (Nancy Vol. IV, 1981: 159-169), also at Sonobudoyo Library in Yogyakarta namely *Prabu Parikĕsit* number PB A 55 (Behrend Jilid IV B, 1989: 268).

The selection of *Sĕrat Darmasarana* number 152 A owned by Radya Pustaka Surakarta Library as the main material in this analysis is due to considerations based on its relative completeness, evident derivative, and its old age. Furthermore, *Sĕrat Darmasarana* is based on text construction that is included in *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Purwa*, particularly in the part of *Sĕrat Mahadarma* (R. Ng. Ranggawarsita, 1939; Sri Mulyono, 1989: 195-197). In its relation to *Sĕrat Darmasarana*, the selected texts *Pustakaraja Purwa* and *Pustakaraja Puwara* (from *Wayang Madya*) is *Sĕrat Yudayana* (*Sĕrat Pustakaraja Puwara: Sĕrat Yudayana*) by Radya Pustaka Library Surakarta number 153 (Nancy Vol. IV, 1981: 162), that has versions such as *Sĕrat Purwa, Angka 12, Sĕrat Yudayana* (*Pustakaraja Madya*) number D 102 d, *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Purwa*, number 12, *Sĕrat Yudayana* (*Pustakaraja Madya*) number D 124, and *Prabu Yudayana* (*Pustakaraja Puwara*) number D 98. These manuscripts are owned by Reksapustaka Pura Library, Mangkunegaran Surakarta (Nancy Vol. II, 1981: 11-126).

In the early part of *Sĕrat Darmasarana*, it is explained that Prabu Satyaki (the king of Lesanpura) who was slain by Prabu Kismaka (Tarajutiksna) along with Bagawan Baladewa who met the same fate at the battle against Prabu Niradhakawaca of Ima-Imantaka. Whereas in *Mosalaparwa*, part *Mahābhārata*, Satyaki died on the hands of Bhoja, with Andhakasa and Baladewa ascended to heaven after a deep Yoga. Thus, the question is how was the poet of *Sĕrat Darmasarana* in conceiving *Ādiparwa*, *Mosalaparwa* and *Prasthānikaparwa*.

II. THEORETICAL APPROACH

This discussion will apply the reception theory. In order to know that a literary text is a reception or the continuation from its predecessor, it is necessary to conduct an intertext between the hypotext and the derivative. According to Teeuw, intertextuality, in principle, is that every literary text is read and ought to be read along with other texts as a background. There is no independent text without other texts that serves as examples in its creation (Teeuw, 1984: 145). By definition, the existence of example, model and framework are necessary to be followed faithfully in the the creation of new text without deviation. This is because deviation and transformation of the existing model text play an important role. The deviation or rebellion presuppose something and the comprehension of the new text needs ground knowledge about the predecessor texts (Teeuw, 1984: 146). Julia Kristeva states that the essence of intertextuality is the existence or the presence of a text in another text (Umar Junus, 1985: 87). Here, the presence of a text needs the processes of understanding and giving meaning along with several interpretation attached to it (Umar Junus, 1985: 88). The presence of a text in another text gives slightly variation to a particular text.

According to Teeuw, a text is a “language document” that is available to be read by the readers (Teeuw, 1986: 16). In a literary theory, particularly structuralism, there is a viewpoint that a literary text is something constant and fixed that has an intact and integrated structure (Teeuw, 1988: 250-252; Wiryamartana, 1990: 9). In the history of text, it appears that every text has a propensity to change and its appearance seems unstable. Text, indeed, has a certain fixation and the need to be read and interpreted based on its intact structure and the integrated intrinsic meaning. However, due to the characteristic and potent of openness of a text, it is prone to change because of reading and interpretation from the readers. On the occasion of reception from the readers, the change in text can be observed in various forms, particularly in copy, adaptation and translation (Teeuw, 1988: 214; Wiryamartana, 1990: 9-10). In the transformation of text, the response from its creator can be identified based on the earlier text that they read. Thus, in this studies that is centered at a text, the readers are not actual readers, as in experimental reception, but the readers behind the text that they create (Teeuw, 1988: 208-210; Wiryamartana, 1990: 10). In this studies oriented towards literary reception, copy and adaptation can be seen as creative readers due to their responses as well as the creator of the text. That is where the transformation of text happens. A text is read, understood, and interpreted. The result of reading, comprehension, interpretation is a form of new text, whether it is similar, or differ in language, type and function (Teeuw, 1988: 266-274; Wiryamartana, 1990: 10).

Thus, it cannot be denied that in an observation, there is an involvement of the role of researcher as the reader and interpreter of the text. In the literary reception, the researcher is the last chain in the chain of history, that partake in the process of valuing as the reader.

III. METHOD OF RESEARCH

A method is a means for the research to prove a speculation over the assumptions that appeared in the mind of a researcher. The literature-based research utilizes several catalogs, both by Nancy K. Florida (1981), Nikolaus Girarded (1983), and Behrend (1989) for guidelines in research material. Based on those catalogs, *Sĕrat Darmasarana*, *Sĕrat Yudayana* and parts of text from *Sĕrat Pustakaraja* that can complete, strenghten this research are finally able to be identified in several libraries such as at Radya Pustaka, Reksapustaka, Pura Mangkunegaran and Sanapustaka, Karaton Surakarta.

The manuscripts of *Sĕrat Darmasarana* and *Sĕrat Yudayana* found at Radya Pustaka Library in Surakarta are transliterated into latin alphabets and translated into Indonesian. The reception theory then being applied in *Sĕrat Darmasarana* and *Sĕrat Yudayana* because intertextually, there is a finding regarding a linkage between those texts with the part of narrative in *Ādiparwa*, *Mosalaparwa* and *Prasthānikaparwa*.

IV. SĒRAT DARMASARANA AS THE RECEPTION OF ĀDIPARWA, MOSALAPARWA AND PRASTHĀNIKAPARWA

In the theoretical approach above, it is expressed that according to Teeuw, a text is a “language document” that is available for the readers to be read (Teeuw, 1986: 16). In a literary theory, particularly structuralism, there is a viewpoint that a literary text is something constant and fixed that has an intact and integrated structure (Teeuw, 1988: 250-252; Wiryamartana, 1990: 9). In the history of text, it appears that every text has a propensity to change and its appearance seems unstable. Text, indeed, has a certain fixation and the need to be read and interpreted based on its intact structure and the integrated intrinsic meaning. However, due to the characteristic and potent of openness of a text, it is prone to change because of reading and interpretation from the readers. On the occasion of reception from the readers, the change in text can be observed in various forms, particularly in copy, adaptation and

translation (Teeuw, 1988: 214; Wiryamartana, 1990: 9-10). In the transformation of text, the response from its creator can be identified based on the earlier text that they read. Thus, in this studies that is centered at a text, the readers are not actual readers, as in experimental reception, but the readers behind the text that they create (Teeuw, 1988: 208-210; Wiryamartana, 1990: 10). Thus, in this research, the response of readers are understood as another side of the change or creation of a text. It is undeniable that in an observation, the researcher is involved in reading and interpreting the text. The researcher is the last chain in the chain of history, that partake in the process of valuing as the reader (Teeuw, 1988: 200).

If being observed carefully in the Sanskrit Mahabharata or the Javanese Mahabharata with their parwa parts and compared with *Sĕrat Pustakaraja* and its text construction, it can be understood that Sri Mulyana stated that *Sĕrat Pustakaraja* is the Indonesian version (Javanese) of Mahabharata. It is certain that in adapting, innovating or transforming the ancient Javanese *Mahābhārata*, the author of *Sĕrat Pustakaraja*, R. Ng. Ranggawarsita, purportedly adjusting with the Javanese state of mind and the intention of writing it.

In *Ādiparwa* itself, besides the existence of *Sarpayajña* that Mahārāja Janamejaya did, the content of the story within is significantly complex, more or less 32 topics as stated by Padija in the thesis *Perbandingan Cerita Wayang Yang Bersumberkan Kitab Adiparwa Dalam Kesusastraan Jawa* (Padija, 1973: 42-116; Tedjowirawan, 2014: 377-380). From those 32 topics above, then in *Sĕrat Pustakaraja* by R. Ng. Ranggawarsita responded (recepting) in 21 topics which later known in the puppetry as 21 lakon (play) that took *Ādiparwa* as its source. These plays are: 1) Lakon *Angruna-Angruni*; 2) Lakon *Sakri Lair*; 3) Lakon *Sakri Rabi*; 4) Lakon *Palasara Lair*; 5) Lakon *Palasara Rabi*; 6) Lakon *Abiyasa Madĕg Ratu*; 7) Lakon *Pandhu Lair*; 8) Lakon *Narasoma*; 9) Lakon *Bima Bungkus*; 10) Lakon *Bambang Sucitra*; 11) Lakon *Pandhu Mékrat*; 12) Lakon *Kumbayana*; 13) Lakon *Balé Sagala-gala*; 14) Lakon *Pandhawa Babad*; 15) Lakon *Karna Maling*; 16) Lakon *Jayadrata Rabi*; 17) Lakon *Sayĕmbara Gandamana*; 18) Lakon *Parta Krama*; 19) Lakon *Gathukaca Lair*; 20) Lakon *Angkawijaya Lair*; 21) Lakon *Parikĕsit Grogol* (Padija, 1973: 118-137). These narrative texts from the name of characters in *Ādiparwa* are elaborated briefly whereas in the classic Javanese are being recepted into a rather long text and later became the source of *wayang* play as stated above. In *Sĕrat Darmasarana*, the *wayang* play is very obvious that it can traced back to the play *Parikĕsit Grogol*.

If observed carefully in the sub-chapters of the narrative of *Ādiparwa*, it appears that *Sĕrat Darmasarana* was part of the reception, acknowledgment and response by the author R. Ng. Ranggawarsita in regards to *Ādiparwa*, *Mosalaparwa* and continued the narrative to *Prasthānikaparwa*. The evidences are: In *Ādiparwa*, the narrative structure of Mahārāja Parikĕsit being bitten by Takṣaka and the procession of *Sarpayajña* by Mahārāja Janamejaya can be described in brevity in *Sĕrat Darmasarana* whereas *Sĕrat Yudayana* is elaborated extensively by R. Ng. Ranggawarsita. If in the narratives of the Mahārāja Parikĕsit and the procession of *Sarpayajña* Mahārāja Janamejaya, only several characters being featured, then in *Sĕrat Darmasarana*, 435 characters are being featurd. In terms of the quantity of the text, both *Sĕrat Darmasarana* and *Sĕrat Darmasarana II* are no longer than 367 pages, significantly longer than *Ādiparwa*.

In being observed in the comparison of the death of Mahārāja Parikĕsit due to the bite of Takṣaka as explained in the book of *Ādiparwa*, then the responses of readers R. Ng. Ranggawarsita is the ascension of Prabu Parikesit was not due to the bite caused by Taksaka, but rather his tip of the toe being licked by Taksaka Raja, that facilitated the ascension. If in *Ādiparwa*, the death of Mahārāja Parikĕsit was alone, *Sĕrat Darmasarana* explained that his ascension is to accompany his mother, Dewi Utari, who wish be reunited with her husband Arya Abimanyu. If in *Ādiparwa*, a moment in the death of Mahārāja Parikĕsit, Janamejaya was still a child. Thus, in *Sĕrat Darmasarana*, by the time Prabu Parikesit ascended, Prabu Yudayana was already an adult and has ruled the throne by replacing his father.

If in *Ādiparwa* the procession of *Sarpayajña*, which was conducted by Mahārāja Janamejaya, received a response from R. Ng. Ranggawarsita by describing *Sarpayajña* being conducted by Prabu Yudayana as stated in *Sĕrat Yudayana*. His response regarding the event is based on the background and difference in manner when comparing the content of *Ādiparwa*. This is because in *Ādiparwa*, *Sarpayajña* was conducted by making furnace for the victim, whereas in *Sĕrat Darmasarana II* and *Sĕrat Yudayana*, *Sarpayajña* was conducted by raiding the places in which suspected as the dwelling of the serpents. The end of *Sarpayajña* in both texts are stated differently. In *Ādiparwa*, Mahārāja Janamejaya stopped *Sarpayajña* for his respect and affection to Brahmana Āstika, whereas in *Sĕrat Darmasarana II* and *Sĕrat Yudayana*, Prabu Yudayana stopped *Sarpayajña* because of the enticing beauty of Dewi Sarini and his incapability to oppose his in-law, Naga Raja Sarana. Another difference in *Ādiparwa* lies in Āstika as a male Brahmana (*mijil ta raré laki-laki paripūrñawayawa. Inaranan ta sang Āstika, āpan "asti" ling sang bapa ngūni*), whereas Dewi Sarini is clearly the daughter of a serpent. Despite of this, both appear as the family of serpent.

In the perspective of characterization, *Sĕrat Darmasarana* feature supporting characters that have imporant role such as Bagawan Baladewa and Satyaki. The reception and acknowledgment of those characters by R. Ng. Ranggawarsita apparently demonstrate a

significant difference if being compared with their appearance in *Mahābhārata*, particularly in *Mosalaparwa* (the 16th Parwa in *Mahābhārata*).

The response from R. Ng. Ranggawarsita over Bagawan Baladewa is at that time, he is an elderly yet still have a variety of power. In addition, Bagawan Baladewa exhibits a responsible figure and is willing to sacrifice for the sake of Ngastina. It is emphasized when Ngastina was being attacked by Prabu Niradhakawaca of Ima-imantaka, Bagawan Baladewa assisted the kingdom. With his powerful weapon Nanggal, Prabu Niradhakawaca was defeated. Later, he tricked Bagawan Baladewa in disguise of Arya Dyastara (his grandson) into giving him the weapon. Having realized that he was being deceived by the enemy, he struggled to take back what was his. Prabu Niradhakawaca was later described as creating a foggy hurrican. Bagawan Baladewa who was very old could not take it and later froze to death and ascended. The event caused chaos, roaring thunder. Above the sky, gods poured the rain of fragrant flowers. The event suggested a high-level and the superiority of Bagawan Baladewa.

The death of Bagawan Baladewa in *Sērat Darmasarana* is significantly different compared with the return of Baladewa (Rama) in *Mosalaparwa* as suggested below:

“Katon ta sang Baladewa sumandeng wit ning kayu magawe yogadhāraṇā. Umijil tang nāga sake tutuk nira, aputih warnanya abāng tutuknya, sinungsung de ning nāga kabeh, Takṣaka Kumuda Suṇḍarīka Hrāda Durmukha prawṛddhi (?) makādi sang Baruṇa, manungsung ring pādyaṛghācamānīya, wēkasan lunghā mulih ring pātāla. An mangkana lwir sang Baladewa, hārohara tāmbēk bhaṭāra Kṛṣṇa (Zoetmulder, 1958: 116).”

From the quote above, it is suggested that the families Wrishni and Andhaka (Andhakasa in the Balinese tradition) both succumb to annihilation by killing each other, Rama (Baladewa) and Kresna (Wasudewa, Kesawa) prepared themselves to return to heaven. However, Kresna (Krishna) first bowed before his father to let his wives (16.000 of them) under his care temporarily before Dhananjaya (Arjuna) came to assume the care. Once returning to where Baladewa is, Kreshna still witnessing Baladewa as he sat back in a deep Yoga. From his mouth, a serpent came out with its glossy white skin, thousand of heads, a body as huge as a mountain, and glaring red eyes. As it moves towards the sea, the sea god, serpents and river gods welcome the serpent. They, who welcome the holy spirit of Baladewa are Karkotaka, Wasuki, Takshaka, Prithusrawa, Waruna, Kunjara, Misri, Sankha, Kumuda, Pundarika, the holy spirit of Dhristarashtra, Hrada, Kratha, Sitikantha, Chakramanda, Atishanda, sprimary serpents with titles Durmukha dan Amwarisha. They offer Arghya, water to wash feet and other ceremonies and worship the great serpent (Nila, 1979: 13-14; Zoetmulder, 1958: 116).

The spectacular event of death for Baladewa in *Mosalaparwa* demonstrates his importance in position and the virtue of Baladewa as the incarnation of holy spirit of the great serpent. Whereas in *Sērat Darmasarana*, the death of Baladewa and the return of his holy spirit were not extravagantly depicted as in *Mosalaparwa*. However, in the latter there are sufficient proofs to infer the involvement of Baladewa in the Parīkṣit administration. In in *Mosalaparwa*, it is explained that Baladewa ascended first before Kresna and the Pandhawas, then it is the opposite case in *Sērat Darmasarana*.

In *Mahābhārata*, the death of Satyaki lies in *Mosalaparwa* as well. Within the text that Samba, Sarana, and Wrishni knights (Wresni) are demonstrated as trying to trick the Brahmana with a condescending question. They drag Samba who imposed as a pregnant woman in front of the Brahmanas and ask him to rightly guess what will be born through the pregnancy. The Brahmanas became angry and put an extreme curse that Samba will bear a steel rod (bomb) that will destroy the Wrishnis and Andhakasa (Nila, 1979: 7-8; Zoetmulder; 1958: 112). Before their demise, the Wrishnis became wild and controlled by lust. They dared to drink liquor in front of Kresna (Kṛṣṇa). In the state of intoxication, Yuyudhana laughed and mocked Kritawarman (Kartamarma) for his scurvy actions by killing the sons of Draupadi and both Dhristadyumna and Sikhandin (Srikandi) when they were asleep. Kritawarman retaliated with a disgrace of the action by Satyaki as he killed Bhurisrawa when the latter was weaponless, left the battle to sit and recover. It incited his anger and later attacked and beheaded the head of Kritawarman in front of Kresna. Upon seeing that, the Bhojas and Andhakasa became angry and attacked Satyaki in return from all directions. The son of Rukmini soon helped Satyaki. They bravely fought together against their attackers until they both died in front of Kresna (Nila, 1979: 11-12; Zoetmulder, 1958: 115-116). in *Mosalaparwa*, the dispute between Yuyudhāna and Sang Kṛṭawarmā as the cause of their own demise thus led to the death of Satyaki can be seen from this quote:

“An mangkana wuwus sang Yuyudhāna, agirang ta sang Pradyumna wācapala, atēhēr manudingi sang Kṛṭawarmā. Umalēs ta sang Kṛṭawarmā tumudingi sang Yuyudhāna: "Ai kong anak ning Satyaka, wruh tāku ri tattwanyu ngūni. Ardha sor polahta (n) tugēl bāhu sang Bhūriśrawā de sang Arjuna ring yuddhakāla, apan so milu lumūda sarika. Hana pwa wīra matī wwang huwus mati sarika.”

Mangkana wuwus sang Kṛtawarmā rinēngö de sang Kṛṣṇa, krodha sira ardhārēngu tinghal nira. Umasö ta sang Sātyaki, nēhër mojar i dewī Satyabhāmā mwah umatuturakēn artha nikang Syamantaka, an sang Kṛtawarmā mülanya kälap de sang Śatadhanya. Manangis ta sang Satyabhāmā kapituturēn ri pati nira ng bapa sang Satrājīṭ pinaribhawa de sang Śatadhanya ri kulēm. Ya ta matang nyan(?) ri bhaṭāra Kṛṣṇa. Tumon pwa ri galaka sang Kṛtawarmā, mangadēg ta sang Sātyaki mojar i dewī Satyabhāmā: "Harah dewi Satyabhāmā, t ahuwusan kita dīnāsālarānangis. Haywa ta kita kapituturēn ri pati ni bapanta Satrājīṭ pinaribhawa ring kulēm de ning pāpāsawatthāmā. Tan raka rahadyan sanghulun, nghulun juga matyana ng duṣṭa sahāya ning Aśwatthāmā. Bho bhoh panglampwa ta ko doṣanyu mējahi sang Pañcakumāra Śikhaṇḍī Dhṛṣṭadyumna sēḍēng irāturū kāla ning kulēm. Panglampu ta ko wēkas ning uripmu ike yuh hara."

Mangkana ling sang Sātyaki, inuhutan ta sira de bhaṭāra Kṛṣṇa mwang sang Babhru, tan anggā sira. Sāhasa tinugēl ta gulū sang Kṛtawarmā, pēgat tan pasāra. Krodha ta sang Wṛṣṇyandhaka kabeh, mapulihakēn sang Kṛtawarmā, lāghawa n parēng umasö mangambuli sang Sātyaki. Sang Yuyudhāna ta sira pinugutan uniṣṭabhojana mwang sang Satyaka. Sakrodha ta sang Pradyumna sāhasānulunga ndatan wēnang kinabehan de sang Wṛṣṇyandhakabhoja. Ri wēkas pējah sang Yuyudhāna mwang sang bapa sang Satyaka i samīpbhaṭāra Kṛṣṇa. Krodha ta sang Pradyumna, sang Sāmba, sang Ania ruddha Cārudeṣṇadi śūra pramukha, parēng mapulihakēn sang Sātyaki. Tar kawēnang sinapihan de bhaṭāra Kṛṣṇa, apan sēḍēng kapasukan ing kālabahnisanghāra ... (Zoetmulder, 1958: 115-116)."

(Upon hearing the words of Yuyudhāna, Pradyumna the mighty chariot hero clapped his hand to suggest his agreement. Yet, Kṛtawarmā felt insulted and regardless of the great name of Satyaki, he rose and pointed with his left hand and shouted: "you consider yourself as a magnificent knight yet you cruelly killed Bhūriśrawā who was weaponless, to leave the battlefield just to sit and recover". Kesawa (Kṛṣṇa) who heard this sharply stared at and cursed Kṛtawarmā out of anger. At that time, Sātyaki also reported to Kṛṣṇa that Kṛtawarmā has robbed the pearl of Syamantaka from the hands of Satrājīṭ. Upon hearing this, Satyabhāmā sobbed at Kṛṣṇa while he burst his heart out about Kṛtawarmā. Sātyaki stood tall and said: "I swear in the name of truth, that I will send this villain to reunite with the sons of Draupadi (Pañcakumāra) who he has killed and make him responsible of his action in front of Dhṛṣṭadyumna and Śikhaṇḍī. They were all killed by this evil in their sleep. The murder happened with the help of Aśwatthāmā, the son of Mahaguru Drona. Very well, O Queen Mother, Kṛtawarmā will soon meet his demise." After finishing those words, Satyaki then attacked and beheaded Kṛtawarmā. It initiated the anger of the Wṛṣṇyandhaka. Every one was on the side of Kṛtawarmā. Every one stepped up attacking Sātyaki. The Yuyudhāna continued his attacks to help Sātyaki. The Pradyumna were in anger to help Sātyaki who was under the attack of the Wṛṣṇyandhaka. At last, the Yuyudhāna died and his father Sang Sātyaki in front of Kṛṣṇa. The anger flooded Sang Pradyumna, Sang Sāmba, the brave Sang Ania ruddha Cārudeṣṇadi, everybody who was on the side of Sātyaki. Bhaṭāra Kṛṣṇa had no power to intervene for everyone has been possessed by lust (Nila, 1979: 11-12).

There is significant difference on the account of the death of Satyaki in the book of *Mosalaparwa* and *Sērat Darmasarana*. In *Sērat Darmasarana*, it is stated that Prabu Satyaki (the king of Lesanpura) came to Dwarawati to help Prabu Satyaka who was being attacked by Prabu Kismaka, the son of the late Prabu Bomanarakaswara, the king of Tarajutiksna. In a fierce battle against Prabu Kismaka, Prabu Satyaki died together along with him in Dwarawati (Sērat Darmasarana). Thus, Prabu Satyaki died not because of the strike by the Bhoja and Andhakasa in Prabasa (Mosalaparwa). Moreover, in *Mosalaparwa*, the death of Satyaki preceded Kresna and the Pandhawa yet in *Sērat Darmasarana*, Satyaki died after Kresna and the Pandhawa.

An important interest in the reception and acknowledgment by R. Ng. Ranggawarsita is regarding the Prasthānikaparwa. It is stated in Prasthānikaparwa that upon ascension, the Pandhawa conduct preparations such as visiting sacred places to do Yoga. In *Sērat Darmasarana*, this inspires Patih Dwara to suggest Prabu Dipayana (Parikesit) to respect his ancestor (the Pandhawa) before ascension as well. It is done so by wandering out from his kingdom to discuss matters on the knowledge of perfection to ensure his precise ascension to heaven. This is clearly stated in a dialog between Patih Dwara and Prabu Dipayana at the end of *Sērat Darmasarana*. Thus, it can suggested that *Sērat Darmasarana* is intended to be the sequel of Prasthānikaparwa.

In addition, the appearance of Prabu Niradhakawaca of Ima-imantaka is said to be the grandson of Prabu Niwatakawaca. The character of Prabu Niradhakawaca reminds us of Kakawin Arjunawiwāha by Mpu Kanwa during the reign of Airlangga. The hostility

between Arjuna against Niwatakacawa in Kakawin Arjunawiwāha continues with their grandchildren, who are Prabu Niradhakawaca and Prabu Dipayana (Parikesit). The most powerful force of Prabu Niradhakawaca is the Bēsi Aji on the base of his tongue that is similar with that Prabu Niwatakawaca had. Prabu Niradhakawaca is purportedly featured to ensure the powerful remark of Prabu Dipayana as the ruler of Ngastina.

Thus, it can be concluded in the depiction above that *Sērat Darmasarana* is the reception of part of *Ādiparwa*, *Mosalaparwa* and *Prasthānikaparwa*.

V. CONCLUSION

Since the research and publication of parts of *Mahābhārata* in the Javanese literature by A.A. Fokker, H.H. Juynboll, G.A.J. Hazeu, H. Kern, J.G.H. Gunning, J. Gonda, R.M. Ng. Poerbatjaraka as well as P.J. Zoetmulder, it shrinks the ancient Javanese version of *Mahābhārata* in terms of research. It goes the same with *Sērat Pustakaraja* since the research by R.M. Ng. Poerbatjaraka, C.C. Berg, Th. G. Pigeaud, J. Kats and Slamet Mulyono. Hence, the catalog by Nancy K. Florida entitled *Javanese Language Manuscripts of Surakarta, Central Java : A Preliminary Descriptive Catalogue Vol I-IV* (1981) became a huge significant in describing *Sērat Pustakaraja* and its part (Tedjowirawan, 2014: 460).

The research or study regarding both *Mahābhārata* in Sanskrit and ancient Javanese literature along with its trace to the *Sērat Pustakaraja* can be suggested as non-existent as stated by Ign. Kuntara Wiryamartana, S.J. *Sērat Pustakaraja* is able to give a wide array of potential for Javanese scholars to research fields such as religion, mythology, pedagogy, psychology, law, leadership, environment, agriculture and the like (Tedjowirawan, 2014: 460-461).

Both *Sērat Darmasarana* and *Sērat Yudayana* and the late part of *Sērat Pustakaraja Purwa* can function as a gateway to the genealogy of the kings of Mataram. These texts position the kings of Java as the descendants of main characters in *Mahābhārata* such as *Kṛṣṇa Dwaipayana Vyāsa*, *Pāṇḍu*, *Arjuna*, *Abhimanyu*, *Parīkṣit* or *Janamejaya* (*Yudayana* in the Javanese tradition). In its relation to *Mahābhārata*, *Sērat Darmasarana* is the reception of *Ādiparwa*, *Mosalaparwa*, and *Prasthānikaparwa*.

References

- Behrend, T.E., dkk. 1989. *Katalogus Naskah-naskah Museum Sonobudoyo*. Yogyakarta: The Ford Foundation.
- Berg, C.C. 1974. *Penulisan Sejarah Jawa*. Jakarta: Bharata.
- Florida, Nancy K. 1981. *Javanese Language Manuscripts of Surakarta, Central Java: A Preliminary Descriptive Catalogue Vol. I-IV*. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University.
- Girardet, Nikolaus. 1983. *Descriptive Catalogue of The Javanese Manuscripts and Printed Books in the Main Libraries of Surakarta and Yogyakarta*. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.
- Juynboll, H.H. 1906. *Ādiparwa Oudjavaansch Prozageschrijf Uitgegeven 'S Gravenhage*, Martinus Nijhoff.
- Mulyono, Sri. 1989. *Wayang: Asal-usul, Filsafat dan Masa Depan*, Cetakan III. Jakarta: Haji Masagung.
- Nila, Ketut. 1979. *Mausala, Mahaprasthanika, Swargarohanika Parwa*. Denpasar: Dharma Bhakti.
- Padija, M. 1973. *Perkembangan Cerita Wayang yang Bersumberkan Kitab Adiparwa Dalam Kesusastraan Jawa (Tesis)*. Jogjakarta: Fakultas Sastra dan Kebudayaan Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Poerbatjaraka, R. M. Ng. dan Tardjan Hadidjaja. 1957. *Kepustakaan Djawa*. Kolff Djakarta: Djambatan.
- Ranggawarsita, R. Ng. 1939. *Sērat Pustakaraja Purwa Jilid I – IX*, Cetakan Keempat. Djokdja: Boekhandel En Drukerij Kolf Buning.

- Simuh. 1988. *Mistik Islam Kejawen Raden Ngabehi Ranggawarsita, Suatu Studi Terhadap Serat Wirid Hidayatjati*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- Tedjowirawan, Anung. 2014. *Sĕrat Pustakaraja Purwa: Sĕrat Darmasarana Karya Pujangga R. Ng. Ranggawarsita Di Abad XIX: Analisis Struktur-Resepsi-Genealogi*. Tesis. Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Gadjah Mada. Yogyakarta: Tidak Diterbitkan.
- Teeuw, A. 1988. *Sastra dan Ilmu Sastra, Pengantar Teori Sastra* Cetakan II. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Umar, Junus. 1985. *Resepsi Sastra (Sebuah Pengantar)*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Widyatmanta, Siman. 1968. *Ādiparwa I-II*. Yogyakarta: Spring.
- Wiryamartana S.J.; I. Kuntara. 1980. "Bebuka Serat Pustaka Raja Sebagai Dasar Pemahaman Seluruh Kitab" (*Makalah Seminar dan Diskusi Memperingati Pujangga Besar Ronggowarsito pada 3 Januari 1980*). Jakarta: Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.
- _____. 1990. *Arjunawiwāha: Transformasi Teks Jawa Kuna Lewat Tanggapan dan Penciptaan di Lingkungan Sastra Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Zoetmulder, P. J. 1958. *Sĕkar Sĕmawur, Bunga Rampai Bahasa Jawa Kuna I*. Djakarta: Obor.
- _____. 1983. *Kalangwan, Sastra Jawa Kuna Selayang Pandang*, terjemahan Dick Hartaka. Jakarta: Djambatan.

NASKAH

Sĕrat Darmasarana

Naskah 152 A. Surakarta: Museum Radyapustaka.

Sĕrat Yudayana

Naskah 153. Surakarta: Museum Radyapustaka.

Naskah Hs. Th. P. NR. 268. Jakarta: Biro Naskah Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.