

The Malay Historiography: A Study of Raja Ali Haji's *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*

Alimuddin Hassan

Institute for Southeast Asian Islamic Studies (ISAIS) UIN Suska Riau

| KEYWORD | ABSTRACT |
|--|---|
| <i>Tuhfat al-Nafs</i> Raja Ali Haji Melayu | The <i>Tuhfat al-Nafs</i> book is one of the historical works on Malay history to this day. This book was written by Raja Ali Haji in 1282 H on the 5th of Rabi'al-Akhir. According to Raja Ali Haji, this book was written when he obtained the book from Sayyid Al-Sharif 'Abd Al-Rahman ibn Sayyid Al-Syarif Kasim Sultan of Pontianak ibn Sayyid Al-Syarif' Abd Al-Rahman Al-Kadri. |

Alamat Korespondensi:

Alimuddin Hassan,
Director Institute for Southeast Asian Islamic Studies (ISAIS)
University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Indonesia
E-mail: alimuddin@uin-suska.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

The discussion of intellectual aspect of Raja Ali Haji in the field of history was represented by, using Matheson's term, two his sibling books (Matheson, 1971). The first book, the sister, was written from 7 September 1865 to 15 January 1866. The second book, the brother, had been written before his first book was finished (Moy, 1975) on 22 December 1865 and was finished in 1867 (Haji, 1982). It means that *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* had been written in five or six years before he died in 1873 (Haji, 1982).

It is different from "its brother", *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis dan Sekalian Raja-Rajanya* has not been paid a great attention by most scholars and researchers. Perhaps, this is because it has been under the shadow of "its brother's" popularity, *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*. In fact, the first part of *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* had been duplicated from *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis dan Sekalian Raja-Rajanya*. However, it can be tolerated since both of them were written in the same time and by the same writer (Haji, 1982; Moy, 1975; Winstedt, 1932). In the beginning, *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*, even more than half a century after Raja Ali Haji's death, was not known as famous as other manuscripts such as *Sejarah Melayu (Sulalatus Salatin)* (Lanang, 1979), *Hikayat Hang Tuah* (Ahmad, 1991) and *Kisah Pelayan Abdullah* (Ahmad, 1991).

In a Malay historical discourse, *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*, for the first time, was mentioned by Maxwell when he wrote about Raja Ali Haji in 1890. In his writing entitled 'Raja Ali Haji', he mentioned *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*: " ... and besides the English and Dutch accounts I found a long description of Raja Ali Haji's invasion of Malaka in a Malay historical work called "Tuhfat Al-Nafis", which treats of the Malay Rajas of Bugis extraction in the straits of Malaka" (Maxwell, 1980). Then, in 1899, C.O Blanden read Maxwell's (1980) manuscript and gave a comment, " *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* is a historical work discussing Malay history until modern era including the explanation of Selangor's kingdom family written by Raja Ali Riau" (Winstedt, 1932).

Tuhfat Al-Nafis's Manuscripts

In his writing, Winstedt (1932) mentioned that "*Tuhfat Al-Nafis* is an interesting and priceless account. I know that it only has two copies". Later, Virginia Matheson completed Winstedt's idea when he found four copies of *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* (Matheson, 1971) during his research for his dissertation in 1973. However, in his

following research, he said that there was one more manuscript. Therefore, there were five manuscripts of *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* (Hooker, 1982).

In fact, according to Dr. Shaharil Talib from *Malaya University*, as it was mentioned by Matheson (1982), there was one more manuscript from Trengganu copied in the end of 19th century. This manuscript, according to Dr. Shaharil Talib, has not been examined yet. Therefore, the most recent finding shows that there are six manuscripts of *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*.

The first manuscript is a manuscript belonging to A.L. Hasselt (Hooker, 1982), the resident of Riau 1893-1896. This manuscript is kept in *Koninklijk Instituut voor Taa-, Land -ed Volken Kunde*, KITLV Or.69 (previously, it was mentioned as HS 630). This manuscript was copied based on a manuscript belonging to YDM Riau Raja Muhammad Yusuf Ahmadi in 1896 in Pulau Penyengat. This manuscript was copied as a gift for A.L Hasselt who had finished his duty as Resident of Riau. This manuscript and other manuscripts including a poem composed for him were given to KITLV Leiden on 13 September 1903 (Hooker, 1982).

The second manuscript is a manuscript belonging to W.E Maxwell, the resident of Selangor (1889-1892). According to his note, when he was on duty as resident, he got the manuscript. This manuscript is kept in Royal Asiatic Society London Maxwell 2. This manuscript was copied by Syamsuddin bin Imam Musa in Perak in 1890 to be given to Sir William Maxwell. Later, this manuscript and other Maxwell's manuscripts were given to the library of Royal Asiatic Society in London (Hooker, 1982).

The third manuscript is a manuscript belonging to Tengku Fatimah binti Sultan Abu Bakar, Johor. This manuscript was borrowed by Sir Richard Winstedt when he became the general advisor of Johor's kingdom in 1930. A year later, Winstedt wrote a *Jawi* manuscript and it was published in JMBRAS in 1932. Matheson Hooker (1992) said that this manuscript was not known certainly in which it was kept. However, it is possible that it is kept in the library of *Sultan Johor*.

The fourth manuscript is a manuscript belonging to Raja Aziz bin raja Kasim. But, later, it was bought by *Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka* and is kept in its library, MS 87. This old manuscript (1877) entitled *Sejarah Raja-Raja Melayu dan Bugis* was reviewed in *Dewan Bahasa* (1971) and was confirmed by Mohd. Khalid Saidin as *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* (Hooker, 1998). This manuscript is similar with Maxwell's manuscript. However, according to Saidin, this manuscript is easier to read (Hooker, 1998).

The fifth manuscript is a manuscript belonging to Dr. A. Ringkes, the head of *Balai Pustaka*(1917-1927). This manuscript is kept in Leiden University's library, Cod. Or. 8554. According to Matheson, the background of getting this manuscript is obscure. However, it is possible that he got this manuscript when he became the head of *Balai Pustaka* in Batavia. Since he had great interest in Malay text, he, perhaps, bought this manuscript from somebody. In 1927, he finished his duty and he went back to the Netherlands and gave this manuscript to Leiden University's library (Hooker, 1998).

The sixth manuscript is a manuscript found by Y.M Tengku Ismail bin Tengku Su in Trengganu. This manuscript, according to Matheson, was copied by Haji Abdul Rahman bin Encik Long in 1901 based on another *Tuhfat Al-Nafis'* manuscript which had been copied by Alwi in Pulau Karimun in 1886. This manuscript is kept in a king's palace in Trengganu and has become a legacy inherited by Sultan Zainal to his son, Sultan Muhammad (Hooker, 1998).

The above six manuscripts can be classified into two versions, short and long manuscripts. A short manuscript consists of, approximately, 88.000 words, while a long manuscript contains at least 126.000 words. Although those two types have the same historical accounts but they are not similar in writing's style. The former is simpler in explaining the points than that of the latter. Hooker (1998) says that, previously, the short manuscript had been written by Raja Ali Haji's father, Raja Haji Ahmad. Then, the long manuscripts were written by Raja Ali Haji as the correction of his father's manuscript. There is only a manuscript classified as the short manuscript, namely a Hasselt's manuscript. The other manuscripts are categorized as the long manuscripts.

From these six manuscripts, there is not a manuscript found or taken in which the writer, Raja Ali Haji, wrote the manuscript, namely Pulau Penyengat. In fact, some sources or data mentioned that in the end of 19th century there was a manuscript in Pulau Penyengat. According to Matheson, the manuscript is lost because the

fire burnt the house of Raja Haji Abdullah, Raja Ali Haji's grandson, including his manuscripts in 1924 (Hooker, 1998).

The Appreciation of *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*

Tuhfat Al-Nafis, for the first time, was published in Jawi letter and summarized in English by Winstedt (1932), "A Malay History of Riau Johor" in JMBRAS in 1932. R. Winstedt (1963), in his *magnum opus* A History of Classical Malay Literature, appreciated *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* as "the most important book in Malay history after *Sejarah Melayu* written by Tun Sri Lanang. After the publication of this book, the popularity of *Tuhfat Al Nafis* has grown among scholars such as P.L. Amin Sweeny (1967). Therefore, *Tuhfat Al nafis*, then, was published in Latin letter in 1965 in Singapore (Haji, 1965). Consequently, *Tuhfat Al Nafis* got appreciation and acknowledgment from scholars as an important book in describing Malay culture and its society. It can be seen from Zainal Abidin bin A. Wahid (1965) in "introduction" of *Tuhfat Al Nafis*:

Oleh itu, tidaklah rasanya terlalu, kalau *Tuhfat Al Nafis* ini dianggap sebagai sa-buah sejarah yang sangat penting dalam pengkajian Alam Melayu di-kurun yang ke-18 hingga ka-pertengahan kurun ke-19. rasa-rasanya tidaklah sempurna bagi seorang itu penulis sejarah negeri2 Melayu, terutama Johor, Riau dan Selangor kalau buku ini tidak digunakan karena bukan saja pengarang-nya telah dapat mengkaji yang bahan2 yang tiada lagi pada masa ini tetapi Raja Ali haji ialah seorang Melayu dengan artikata Melayu umum. Tambah lagi, beliau juga hidup hamper sa-masa dengan sa-bahagian besar daripada sejarah yang ditulisnya.

(Therefore, it is normal that *Tuhfat Al Nafis* is considered as an appreciable history book in the study of Malay world from the 18th century to the middle of the 19th century. It is not rewarding for the author of the Malay lands, particularly, Johor, Riau and Selangor if this book will not be used. This is because the writer was able to study scarce materials and he is a Malay, namely a general Malay. Furthermore, he wrote most of the history in his book almost during the period of his life).

However, the attention and research of *Tuhfat Al Nafis* got its incredible achievement when Virginia Matheson Hooker did his fieldwork for his dissertation entitled "Tuhfat al-Nafis (The Precious Gift) : A Nineteenth Century Malay History, Critically Examined." (1973). Later, Virginia Matheson Hooker published *Tuhfat Al Nafis* in many versions, and, in this case, he is the most authoritative and productive scholar in analyzing *Tuhfat Al Nafis* specifically, and Malay-Riau intellectuals generally.

Hooker (1998) appreciated Raja Ali Haji's *magnum opus*, *Tuhfat Al Nafis* which have been in touch with him for many years as follows:

Karya Agung *Tuhfat Al Nafis* ini ialah karya sejarah Melayu yang paling komplek dan canggih antara semua karya Melayu yang dikarang sebelum abad kedua puluh. Walaupun begitu, *Tuhfat Al Nafis* kurang diketahui dan dikaji pada abad ini, barangkali karena pada zaman penjajahan Inggris, teks ini tidak digunakan di sekolah sebagai teks wajib. Sebelum kemerdekaan, anak Melayu membaca naskah pilihan daripada karya sejarah Melayu yang lain misalnya *sejarah Melayu*, *Hikayat Abdullah*, *Hikayat Hang Tua*. Penerbitan *Tuhfat Al Nafis* ini dan dengan kesadaran bahwa karya ini merupakan kemuncak yang gemilang dalam pernyataan pemikiran dan kebudayaan Melayu, akan membangkitkan lagi kebanggaan terhadap kejayaan penulisnya, Raja Ali Haji.

(This great work of *Tuhfat al-Nafis* is a history of Malay account which is the most complex and sophisticated work among all Malay books written before the 20th century. However, *Tuhfat Al Nafis* is less known in this century, perhaps, because, during English colonialism, this text was not used as standard text in the schools. Before the independence, Malay children prefer reading optional texts to Malay history texts such as *Sejarah Melayu*, *Hikayat Abdullah*, *Hikayat Hang Tua*. The publication of *Tuhfat Al Nafis* and the consciousness of this text as the ultimate achievement in thought and Malay culture will support more proud to the fame of the writer, Raja Ali Haji.)

There are some argumentations, according to Virginia Matheson, proposed that *Tuhfat Al Nafis* is a great work and has some characteristics making it different from other texts.

Firstly, the historical conception of this text is wider and deeper than other Malay history texts. From chronological perspective, *Tuhfat Al Nafis*, covers the events from the period of the early 17th century to the middle of 19th century (Hooker, 1975) (or to modern era) (Winstedt, 1932); and as the background, he stated

some events during the Sriwijaya and Malaka kingdom. Based on geographical perspective, *Tuhfat Al-Nafis* not only describes the relationship between Malay and Bugis people in the Malay kingdom of Johor-Riau-Lingga located in *Kepulauan Riau* and Malay strait, but also covers other regions, such as Kalimantan Barat, Siak (mainland and coastal area of East Sumatera), Kedah and Trengganu (Hooker, 1975), and Selangor (kingdom) (Winstedt, 1932) as well; there are even some references to the events in Batavia (Hooker, 1975).

Secondly, since the scope of space and time was too wide, Raja Ali Haji designed a good, systematic, and precise technique in delivering his narration. Raja Ali Haji divided his book into two chapters. The first chapter explains a complete description of the following chapter to his readers via a complete genealogy of the profiles which will be discussed in the chapter two. Even though there are many characters included in this history and their complicated interaction in chapter two, but they are not confusing because preliminary information is provided in the first chapter. Therefore, precise technique and systematic approach in writing *Tuhfat al-Nafis* is the superiority of this book (Hooker, 1975).

Thirdly, from the perspective of historiography, Raja Ali Haji developed a new principle in describing the past events of history. This principle was that he was extremely critical when he wanted to examine the truth and the legality of the references which he used. When there was a myth in his sources for instance, he always said “*entah sacan kaul percatan itu, entah tidak*” (it can be trusted or not). He also believed that reliable sources are those which have or mention the date or the year when the event happen. Moreover, in writing *Tuhfat al-Nafis*, he used a principle of multi-locus chronology, i.e. he did not describe an event only in a location or region from the beginning to the end. In this case, he also explained other events which happened in Riau, Siak, and Pontianak in the same time simultaneously by referring the local sources such as *Siarah Siak* or *Siarah Pontianak*. It means that Raja Ali Haji mentioned clearly his references or sources which he used (Hooker, 1975).

Fourthly, based on its language, philosophy, and historiography, Raja Ali Haji synthesized his writing between Islam and Malay tradition. Its language is original Malay with addition to Arabic. Furthermore, he followed the principle of Islamic historiography stating that history should be based on the fact. Therefore, it is normal when he did not use historical sources which were not reliable in *Tuhfat al-Nafis*. It can not be avoided that the principle of Islamic historiography influenced Raja Ali Haji strongly. As a result, in applying this principle, he produced not only historical epic but also theology and ethic reasons, particularly in describing the story of the Malay and Bugis kings (Hooker, 1975).

Fifthly, *Tuhfat al-Nafis* is regarded as a great work since its style and content is easier to read and fascinating to follow its narration. In *Tuhfat al-Nafis*, for instance, there are a story about interesting women such as Tengku Tengan and Engku Putri; a story about the heroic struggle of Raja Ali Haji with the Dutch in Malaka, and the struggle of Raja Kecik with Bugis in the sea. Also, it is interesting to follow the story of his journey to the Middle East to make the pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina; the story of the journey of Raja Ahmad and his groups to Java (Batavia and Semarang); the description about the daily life in Pulau Penyengat as the centre of civilization and government of YDM in the 19th century; or the story of Sultan Mahmud who preferred living extravagantly in Singapore to running his government in Lingga. By reading *Tuhfat al-Nafis*, as if the readers are involved in the events of the story, although these events happened half a century ago. Therefore, Virginia Matheson is right when he says that *Tuhfat al-Nafis* is a priceless gift for the following generations (Hooker, 1975).

The positive appreciation to Raja Ali Haji and his work, *Tuhfat al-Nafis*, was given by a historian from Malaysia, Muhammad Yusoff Hashim (1985), through his authoritative and comprehensive writing in depicting the Malay world, *Pensejarahan Melayu : Kajian Tentang Tradisi Sejarah Nusantara*. According to Hashim, Raja Ali Haji did some progressive steps in breaking the tradition of Malay historiography writing.

Firstly, his explicitness to use “AKU” or “I” in his narration indicates that he is an independent writer, “...*dan bangkitlah hatiku bahwa memperkuat kitab ini yang sempurna*. (and I had a strong motivation to write a perfect book)”. His motivation was not influenced by the ruler like the previous tradition of Malay historiography (Hashim, 1985). The second is the use of precise historical data. *Tuhfat al-Nafis* has solid historical data starting from, approximately, 196 years before the writer’s life (Hashim, 1985). The third is the use of critical sources. These sources were explained explicitly, then, he analyzed and examined whether they are correct data or not (Hashim, 1985). This way of writing, according to Muhammad Yusoff Hashim, was not

used formerly in writing of Malay history. *Fourthly*, Raja Ali Haji did not only use written sources but also spoken sources based on his observation, his involvement, and his personal experience. The integration of these three sources had not been employed by the writers of Malay historiography before (Hashim, 1985).

Another appreciation to *Tuhfat al-Nafis* was proposed by UU. Hamidy who said that Raja Ali Haji had written history without screen or written honestly, and even he had criticized it. Although he came from a noble family, he was not proud of it. In fact, he criticized the officials who did not have responsibility to his jobs. For Hooykas, as quoted by UU. Hamidy, *Tuhfat al-Nafis* could not be given a comment due to its perfectness.

It seems that UU. Hamidi and Hooykas are not precise enough and copious in giving opinion to this Raja Ali Haji's work. It is not suitable enough because, as it will be explained later, Raja Ali Haji was fond of praising his Bugis descendants. Moreover, it is too copious since *Tuhfat al-Nafis* has some shortcomings. These shortcomings can be seen, for instance, when Raja Ali Haji still believed and included some myths in his writing such as a myth about the genealogy of kings who came from Ratu Balkis in Saba; about the dream of Opu Daeng Manambung who saw his brother's, Daeng Celak, penis sticking to be a dragon facing to Johor; about Raja Ali Haji's coffin which spouted out fire when it was moved from Malaka to Riau.

The Sources of *Tuhfat al-Nafis* : Raja Ali Haji's Attitude and View

In writing history, Raja Ali Haji used some previous historical sources. To write *Tuhfat al-Nafis*, for instance, Raja Ali Haji referred to some references such as *Siarah Pontianak (Hikayat Opu Daeng Menambung)*, *Siarah Selangor (Hikayat Negeri Johor)*, *Sejarah Pihak Trengganu (Aturan Seia Bugis dengan Melayu)*, and *Siarah Siak* which he had gotten from the descents of those kingdoms (Hooker, 1987). Moreover, according to Al Azhar, Raja Ali Haji also used personal sources such as *Siarah Haji Kudi* and *Tawarikh Tok Ngah*. He also used spoken sources by mentioning a term such as "kata orag tua" or unreliable collective memory by writing a word "konon".

According to Andaya (1998), those references, except *Siarah Siak*, are texts identified as pro-Bugis view. Perhaps, it was normal for him to use those references since there was similarity between the view of those references and *Tuhfat al-Nafis*. In historical writing, Raja Ali Haji sometimes explained two or more different versions about the events, as if he wanted to give the chance for his readers to judge his honesty and the main point of the episodes described. However, those sources were chosen precisely to emphasize the view of his writing (Andaya, 1998). Even, when there were two texts which one did not like the Bugis but another text was fond of praising the Bugis, he chose the latter as his source (Hashim, 1985).

In another part, he described different sources for an event but he sometimes could not or did not want to decide the most correct one. He, for instance, would say, "Syahadan, adalah dua kaul itu pula, wallahu'alam, entahkah mana yang terlebih sah?" (Haji, 1965) (there were two sources but, only God knows, I did not know the reliable one). This Raja Ali Haji's attitude was likely not found in the previous historical writing. Therefore, according to Hashim, it was one of the reasons why he was categorized as a modern historian (Hashim, 1985).

In Virginia Matheson's (1971) view, the peculiarity of *Tuhfat al-Nafis* compared to other historical books was that Raja Ali Haji had mentioned the sources he referred to. However, when there was a text different from his perspective he did not follow it word by word or even he skipped it. The view and attitude of Raja Ali Haji indicated that, according to Virginia Matheson, he worked as a scholar. This is because his opinion was made for his aim. It means that he was not a writer who did not think or just copied from the sources found.

The view and attitude of Raja Ali Haji to his sources were different when he used *Siarah Siak* as his reference in writing *Tuhfat al-Nafis*. According to Matheson, sometimes Raja Ali Haji did not use the data from *Siarah Siak* though they had relevance with his writing. This was because *Siarah Siak* had anti-Bugis view (Hooker, 1983). Although he, to some extent, referred to *Siarah Siak*, but its data were manipulated or changed to make them same as his perspective in writing *Tuhfat al-Nafis*, particularly related to the hostility between the descendants of the Bugis and *Raja Kecil* (Hashim, 1985).

His treatment was very critical to *Siarah Siak* text. It is different from his treatment to other texts which were pro-Bugis view. Even, sometimes, he -Raja Ali Haji is the first indigenous writer using *Siarah Siak* as his source judged it negatively (Hashim, 1985). He (1985), for instance, stated that *Siarah Siak* did not have

historical data and was not easy enough to read. Raja Ali Haji's (1965) critique to *Siarah Siak* can be seen as follows:

Syahdan, akan tetapi aku terjumpa dengan siarah Siak; akan tetapi sejarah dan siarah siak itu daripada awal hingga akhirnya tiada bertahun dan tiada bertarikh, apalagi bualn dan harinya, tiada sekali-kali aku bertemu. Dan suratnya pun terlalu kopi. Dan karangannya pun banyak kurang sedap dibaca, sebab banyak berpindah-pindah agaknya daripada tangan seorang ke tangan seorang, serta yang menyurat pun kurang selidik pada mengisahnkannya. Demikianlah sangkaku.

(so it happened that I found *Siarah Siak*; however, from the beginning to the end, it did not have the chronicles, the year, or even the month and the date. I never found those historical data. There were many copied texts and difficult to read since, perhaps, it often was brought from one person to another. And the writer was not careful enough in explaining the points. Those were my opinion.)

In the field of history, according to Nur Dzai (1972), Raja Ali Haji was considered as the first recorder of *Nusantara* history. He was more careful in recording the historical data than that of Abdullah Munsyi. The carefulness of recording the time is one of the requirements in writing modern history. In line with this, Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Atas (1990) acknowledges that Raja Ali Haji is a modern historian. However, he does not acknowledge this as an apology to the Western scholars' opinion stating that Raja Ali Haji is the first history writer in modern Malay language (Al-Atas, 1990). In fact, Hashim (1985) still views that *Tuhfat al-Nafis* has traditional characteristics in its writing.

The critical attitude of Raja Ali Haji to *Siarah Siak* was obscure whether he wanted to show the weakness of its writing or he had biased attitude to *Siarah Siak*. In fact, according to Hashim (1985), Raja Ali Haji mentioned comparatively by using an objective and systematic principle in writing *Tuhfat al-Nafis*. While the attitude of Raja Ali Haji in changing and manipulating some parts of *Siarah Siak* has become a problem in writing history, it can be assumed that the background of this attitude is due to the past subjective sentiment and his moral responsibility to legalize the existence and the authority of the Bugis and their descendants (Hashim, 1985).

However, it was unfortunate that his attitude and view turned to be hatred to Raja Kecil and the Minangkabau, as it can be seen from his *Syair in Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis dan Sekalian Raja-Rajanya*. In this *Syair*, Raja Ali Haji used some harsh words with full of hatred, for example "Raja Kecil sebagai Raja yang garang dan pemberang" (Raja Kecil as a cruel and bad-tempered king) and called the Minangkabau "Hei, anak heivan" (Hi, animal's son).

The writing of history which aims at legalizing and praising the rulers and their descendants had been employed by Malay writers before Raja Ali Haji wrote *Tuhfat al-Nafis* and *Silsilah Melayu dan Bugis*, such as Tun Sri Lanang who had written *Sejarah Melayu* during the period of Sultan Alauddin Ri'ayat Syah (1597-1613) in Johor's kingdom; Nurdin al-Raniri had written *Bustaitten al-Salatin* under Sultan Iskandar Thani (1637-1641) in the Sultanete of Aceh; and *Misa Melayu* had been written by Raja Chulan during the period of Sultan Iskandar Zulkarnain (1752-1765) in Perak's kingdom (Hashim, 1985). However, according to Kratz (2001), Raja Ali Haji was different from those Malay writers because he was more capable in changing and adapting his writing explicitly and implicitly. Furthermore, the legalization of the existence and activity of political administration of the Bugis, in historical context of Malay and Riau, was given "label and package" of religion and knowledge, so the aim of the historical writing could be accomplished clearly.

It is true that, as it was mentioned before, Raja Ali Haji had the aim at legalizing the existence and authority of the Bugis in Malay world. According to Al Azhar, it is normal character of Raja Ali Haji (1965). Related to his fond of praising the Bugis descendants, according to Siti Hawa, it is natural since his descendants had succeeded in running the administration in the ocean of Western Nusantara. Furthermore, Raja Ali Haji (1965) achieved his great existence in Malay intellectualism.

Therefore, according to Al Azhar, Raja Ali Haji was placed in the high rank of traditional Malay historiography. Even Siti Hawa Salleh conferred, as quoted by Al Azhar, a title "Pengarang agoeng" (the great writer) to Raja Ali Haji, together with Raja Chulan and Abdullah bin Abdul Kadi Munsyi (Haji, 1965).

The above appreciation of Siti Hawa Salleh was not too profuse since during his life, Raja Ali Haji (1965) was an expert of history, constitutions, and the kingdom's rule. He had a great interest and attention to

history, not only Malay history but also the history of other world's part, even his understanding of classical Islamic history was great. His great interest and preference to history can be traced from his collection consisting of multi-discipline texts including historical books or manuscripts kept in his house. According to the delegates of Tumenggong Abu Bakar, they read some manuscripts taken from Raja Ali Haji's (1983) collection. Even, when he went back to Johor, Raja Ali Haji lent them some manuscripts including a historical text of the kingdom's fame of Johor-Riau. One of them was, perhaps, *Tuhfat al-Nafis*.

In a daily note of the delegates of Tumenggong Abu Bakar, Raja Ali Haji suggested Abu Bakar to read, "*Sejarah dan siarah karangan aku dari awalnya hingga akhirnya dan perhatikan baik-baik*" (Hooker, 1983) (the history was written by me, read carefully from the beginning to the end).

This suggestion indicated that he considered that his text was a precious gift, as it can be seen from its title, for the following generations. Finally, Raja Ali Haji (1965) hoped that his generations also will give another precious gift to the following generations as it can be read in his *Tuhfat al-Nafis*: "*Syahadan di-belakang ini kelak siapa2 daripada anak chucoku hendak menghubungkan-nya siarah ini maka patutlah, akan tetapi dengan jalan patut dan dengan 'ibarat perkataan yang wadha' dan sah serta atoran yang patut serta benar supaya terpakai....*" (as it happened, in future, it will be suitable that my generations will continue this writing but it should be in a good and legal way in order to be useful)

Using a boiled-down version of the notion of the "total institution", we saw that, unsurprisingly, Goffman's theory encourages the consideration of the ways the *pesantren* is structured as a discrete institutional sub-culture: the ways space is contained and borders patrolled, the way time is structured and daily routines dense, the way rules and values enforce the single, top-down authority.

Using Foucault's theory, the resulting ethnography might be felt to portray the *pesantren* in a rather cynical fashion: religion can be reduced to discourse; belief and faith can be represented merely as tools of power. The objective of creating *santri* who are pious and sincere, full of Islamic knowledge and well equipped for this life and the next, might be seen as the exercise of the powerful on the powerless, and to be wielding symbolic violence to the motives and ethos of Islamic education. It is this theoretical approach which results in an ethnography which is furthest from the ideals and practice of Islamic education. This approach displays that tension that I mentioned at the beginning, that tension in ethnography between description, that is true to the ethos of practice, and analysis, which is quite happy to abstract, critique and perhaps distort the intentions of practitioners.

Using the concept of agency and approaches such as the anthropology of experience and "practice theory" allows a depiction of *pesantren* as a moral and religious institution, which provides an education that is highly valued by students and parents. This sort of theory encourages an ethnography of *pesantren* that is more in accord with the ethos, objectives and nature of the *pesantren*.

REFERENCES

- Al-Atas, Syed M. Naquib, 1990, *Islam Dalam Sejarah Kebudayaan Melayu*, (Bandung :Mizan, 1990), p.6
- Andaya, Leonard Y., 1975, *The Kingdom of Johore 1641-1728 : Economic and Politica Developments*, Kuala Lumpur : Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 9 ;
- Haji, Raja Ali, 1982, *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*, (Virginia Matheson, ed.), Kuala Lumpur : Fajar Bakti, 1982, p.370.
- Haji, Raja Ali, 1982, *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*, (Virginia Matheson, ed.), Kuala Lumpur : Fajar Bakti, 1982, p.81;
- Hashim, Muhammad Yusoff., 1994, " Hikayat Siak atau Sejarah Raja-Raja Melayu : Status Penampilan Teks dan Persepsi Sejarah", in *Jurnal Filologi Melayu*, Jilid 3, Kuala Lumpur : Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia, 1994, p. 42
- Hashim, Muhammad Yusoff (ed.), 1985, *Hikayat Siak*, (Kuala Lumpur : Dewan bahasa dan Pustaka Kementerian Pelajar Malaysia, 1985), p. 63 and pp. 124-125
- Hooker, Virginia Matheson., 1973, *Tuhfat Al-Nafis (The Precious Gift) : A Nineteenth Century Malay History, Critically Examined*. Monash University, Melbourne, 1973.

- Hooker, Virginia Matheson, 1982, "Introduction" in Raja Haji Ahmad and Raja Ali Haji, *Tuhfat Al-Nafis*, (ed. Virginia Matheson), Kuala Lumpur : Fajar Bakti, 1982, p.xx;
- Hooker, Virginia Matheson, 1975, "Concepts of State in the Tuhfat al-Nafis (The Precious Gift)" in Anthony Reid and Lance Castle (ed.), *Pre-Colonial State Systems in Southeast Asia* (Kuala Lumpur:JMBRAS, 1975), No.6. p.12
- Hooker., Virginia Matheson, 1971, *Tuhafa al-Nafis : Structure and Sources*, *Bijdragen tot de taal Land en Volkunde (BKI)*, Deel 127, 1971, p. 381
- Moy, Timothy J., 1975, " The 'Sejarah Melayu' Tradition of Power and Political Structure : An Assesment of Relevant Sections of the 'Tuhfat al-Nafis' ", in JMBRAS, Vol. 48, part 2, 1975, p. 65.
- Winstedt, R. O. 1932, " A Malay History of Riau Johor" in JMBRAS, Vol.X, Part II, August 1932, p.320
- Winstedt, R.O. 1963, "A History of Classical Malay Literature ", JMBRAS, Vol.31, Part 3, No. 183, 1963, pp.164-165;
- Winstedt, R.O. 1963, "Malay Chronicles from Sumatra and Malay", in D.G.E. Hall (ed), *Historians of Southeast Asia*, London : O.U.P., 1963, p.27