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VERS NUMBERING SYSTEM AND ARABIC REFERENCES IN BAGUS NGARPAH’S EARLY 20TH-CENTURY JAVANESE QUR’AN

Ervan Nurtawab and R. Adi Deswijaya

ABSTRACT
This article examines the exegetical activity in the composition of Kuran Jawi, a Qur’anic translation from the turn of the 20th-century. Its focus is on the examination of the three-volume manuscript that contains the Qur’anic translation in Javanese script and language that is now held in the library collection of the Radyapustaka Museum in Surakarta, Central Java. This Javanese Qur’anic translation, Kuran Jawi, was carried out by Bagus Ngarpah, a royal servant (abdi dalem) and Islamic scholar in the early 20th-century Javanese keraton of Surakarta. The authors examine aspects of the verse numbering system and Arabic references that Ngarpah used for the arrangement of his work. An examination of the applied verse counts reveals that Kuran Jawi is accommodative to multiple numbering systems, and also contains idiosyncrasies. This study also reveals a complexity in the use of Arabic references that include non-Arabic commentary works. In the broader context, the study of Ngarpah’s Kuran Jawi confirms the emergence of awareness among the Javanese priyayi of Islamic modernism through their attempts at having a direct approach to the study of the Qur’an.
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Introduction

The Javanese priyayi have long been engaged with the study of Islam, especially of the Qur’an but their approach to the Qur’an has been understudied. The manifestation of their reflected Islam has been typically pictured as following syncretism and relativism (Geertz 1976: 337). Previous studies on Islamic education in Java show that Islamic education with the use of Arabic and pegon texts had been common pedagogical practices in the pesantren in rural areas (Bruinessen 1999; Ricklefs 2007), or in the Javanese Islamic kingdoms in coastal settlements such as those in Banten (Bruinessen 1995; Nurtawab 2020) and Cirebon (Muhaimin 2001). However, Javanese knowledge and literature in Javanese script are said to have had a limited circulation among the Javanese priyayi milieu. Ricklefs (2007: 52), for example, states that there was a gap that widened after the survey of education by the colonial government in 1831 between the educational development in the countryside and that of Javanese aristocrats. The former had developed the pedagogical practice of traditional Islamic texts, while the latter had preserved the Javanese language and culture.
In addition to related works mentioned above, a number of other scholars have shown an interest in the study of Qur’anic interpretation and translation activities in Java. Keijzer (1863) is the first scholar who studied the Qur’an in Javanese. He examined the first printed Qur’an in Javanese script and language published by Lange & Co of Batavia in 1858. Uhlenbeck (1964) provided a critical bibliography of publications on the languages of Java and Madura, with a particular focus on Sundanese, Javanese and Madurese. Here, he included five sub-sections, one of them being biblical readers and bible translations. For this section, he did not find difficulty in tracing the Javanese translations of the bible. However, Uhlenbeck (1964: 54) states that the data on Javanese translations of the Qur’an is not available except for some works he listed, which included the translation made by Bagus Ngarpah. Johns (1988) recognised the importance of Javanese as one of the major languages in the Malay world, but his attempt at tracing the profile of Qur’anic exegesis in the region did not include works written in that language. In the following decade, Feener (1998) then enriched the profile to include Qur’anic exegesis written in other languages and scripts, especially those found in Javanese literature.

More attempts at profiling the Qur’anic exegetical activities in Javanese have appeared in the last two decades. Nurtawab (2009, 2016) listed more works on Javanese Qur’anic interpretation and translation in both handwritten and printed forms from the colonial period and then classified them based on their social and pedagogical functions in the Javanese communities. Gusmian (2015) provided a historical picture of Javanese Qur’anic exegesis from the 19th and 20th centuries. Some scholars tried to look at Javanese Qur’anic commentaries more closely. Umam (2013) and Mustaqim (2017), for example, examine a well known Qur’anic exegesis in Javanese and pegon script by Salih Darat from late 19th-century Java. Meanwhile, others looked at works produced in the modern period. One example is Wahidi’s work (2015) that examines the *Tafsir al-Ibriz* of Bishri Mustafá (d.1977). More currently, Pink (2020) focuses on practices of Javanese exegetical activities in Javanese Qur’anic translations produced in the Indonesian post-independence period where Indonesian is the official language of the country, and its use is dominant as the language of instruction and administration. Our knowledge about the Qur’an in Javanese literature, however, is still limited. This is the case with the study of Javanese exegetical activities in the colonial period, especially of the role played by Bagus Ngarpah and his attempts at introducing the meaning of the Qur’anic text to the Javanese-speaking communities.

This article examines the three-volume manuscript titled *Kuran Jawi* (Javanese Qur’an) written by Bagus Ngarpah, the early 20th-century royal servant (*abdi dalem*) in the Javanese *keraton* of Surakarta. The manuscript is now kept as part of the library collection of the Radyapustaka Museum in Surakarta, Central Java. Initiated by B.P.H Hadiwijaya, this museum was built in 1890 and opened for public access in 1913. Given that this museum has existed since Ngarpah’s lifetime at the turn of the 20th-century, it is likely that since the beginning the manuscript has been safely kept in this building. Our examination of this work owes much to the romanised transliteration prepared by the Yayasan Sastra Lestari based on their transliteration project of this work that started in July 2004 and ended in August 2005. Our focus here is on the applied verse numbering system and Arabic references used for presenting interpretive additions to the translation text.
Each volume of this manuscript measures 21.5 × 34 cms. According to the front cover, this Qur’anic translation project received assistance from Ngabehi Wirapustaka (Padmasusstra) (1843–1926) as the Javanese editor and Ki Ranasubaya as the Javanese copier. Contained in three large volumes, this work has 1,559 pages in total based on the last number found in the end section of the third volume. The entire text is written in Javanese language and script, while the original text of the Arabic Qur’an is not included. The first volume (387 pages) contains the Javanese translation of Sūrat al-Fātiḥah until Sūrat al-Tawbah verse 94. The second volume (577 pages) contains the Javanese translation of Sūrat al-Tawbah verse 95 up to Sūrat al-‘Ankabūt verse 44. The last volume (594 pages) contains the Javanese translation of Sūrat al-‘Ankabūt verse 45 to the last chapter of the Qur’an. The front cover bears the year of completion both in the Javanese and Gregorian calendars; 1835 and 1905 respectively (nalika taun 1835–1905).1

Black and red inks were used for different purposes. The former was used for the main text (i.e. the translation text) and the chapter headings, and the latter for the interpretive additions placed within parentheses ‘()’. These additions usually end by listing a short title of one or more Arabic works in Javanese spelling, confirming its use as a source of reference. The analysis of Arabic references used in this work will be mainly based on the mentioned Arabic works. A prototype for the three volumes of the manuscript had previously been prepared by a different copier, named Suwanda. Florida (2012: 247–248) notes that the manuscript of Ngarpah’s Kuran Jawi scribed by Suwanda constitutes the prototype of the Javanese Qur’an that is our case study here.

It is worth mentioning that scholars have identified a number of different versions of Ngarpah’s Kuran Jawi, sometimes where the original the Arabic is attached. Uhlenbeck (1964: 54, 91), identifies a Javanese translation of the Qur’an made by Ngarpah. He notes that the first eight sections were printed with the original text (Arabic Qur’an) in 1884. This work was made for pedagogical purposes by members of the Waradarma circle. The second identification comes from Kaptein (2014: 197–201). He notes that Ngarpah began the Javanese translation from about late 1907. The original Arabic Qur’an and its translation were laid out in columns, the former on the right side of the page and the latter on the left side. It was printed in Semarang in late 1908 under the sponsorship of the Waradarma literary circle.

We also find another Javanese Qur’anic translation that Uhlenbeck (1964: 54) identified as the first printed Qur’anic translation in Javanese script and language. The identification of this work by Keijzer (1863) reveals that it was originally written in pegon script by an Arab descendant living in Cirebon. This work came to the printing company in Batavia, Lange & Co. The printed edition finally appeared in Javanese script in 1858. Any possible relationship between Ngarpah’s Kuran Jawi used in this study, its prototype, and Ngarpah’s works described by Uhlenbeck and Kaptein above, as well as with the 1858 Lange & Company printed edition, is not our present focus, though it is important to investigate and would warrant further research.

---

1Based on the second author’s experience in the study of Javanese literature, it is common for the texts produced in the Javanese keraton milieu to have both Javanese and Gregorian calendar systems, confirming the reception of the Western calendar in modern Javanese literature. Another example can be found in the Serat Pustaka Raja of Ranggawarsita that was reprinted by Ki Padmasusstra and published by Boedi Oetama of Surakarta in the years 1842–1912. In this connection, the former year refers to the Javanese calendar and the latter to the Gregorian calendar. This is also the case with the years found in the front cover of the Kuran Jawi (i.e. nalika taun 1835 –1905). See also Riyadi (2002: 124–156) for the Javanese textual tradition in the Javanese keraton of Yogyakarta.
The examination of the Qur’anic exegetical activities among the Javanese priyayi and how their Islamic knowledge had been linked with trends in the development of Islamic discourses in the Muslim world reveals a number of significant points. Our study shows that the ways in which Ngarpah separated Qur’anic verses in his Javanese translations demonstrates an idiosyncratic, distinctive numbering system. While he seemed to be more accommodative to the Basran and Kufan systems in the sums of verses in most chapters of the Qur’an, two cases confirm that he followed other systems, and one case shows an anomaly, indicating a disagreement with all canonical systems known in the Muslim world. We can also see a number of idiosyncracies with respect to verse separations.

Aside from that, the exegetical activity as seen in the expertise of Bagus Ngarpah shows a complexity in the use of Arabic references for the composition of his Javanese Qur’anic translation and its interpretive additions. There are about 14 Arabic references mentioned in Ngarpah’s *Kuran Jawi* that we have classified here into commentary and non-commentary works. The variety of Arabic works referenced in Ngarpah’s *Kuran Jawi* also corresponds to some scholars’ (Kaptein 2014: 199; Ricklefs 2007: 173–175) findings concerning the emergence of awareness among the late 19th- and the early 20th-century Javanese priyayi. This was particularly the case for those affiliated to the Waradarma literary circle of Surakarta, who demonstrated their openness to modernism and the reform movement through their direct approach to the study of the Qur’an.

**Bagus Ngarpah and his Qur’anic exegetical activity**

The dates of Bagus Ngarpah’s birth and death are unknown. The *Pusaka Jawi* of Pakêmpalan Yapa Insêtitut (Java-Instituut) (#11, November 1931) mentioned that his original name was Iskak Sastra Adirengga. Ngarpah (derived from Arabic, ‘Arafah) was from a religious family of the Javanese aristocracy and must have received an Islamic education and studied Arabic in the late 19th century. These presumptions are based on the fact that he was appointed as a royal servant and Islamic scholar in the Javanese keraton and teacher at the Mambangul Ngulum school (*abdi dalêm ngulama uluming guru pamulangan Mambangul Ngulum*). Ngarpah was versed in Javanese culture and language, as reflected in his social relationship with Javanese colleagues at the Islamic school where he taught, and with the Waradarma literary circle.

Ricklefs (2007: 174) describes the Mambangul Ngulum school as the first modern Islamic school in Java, built by Pakubuwana X in 1905. The idea for its establishment came from the chief religious officer (pangulu) of Surakarta after observing the achievement of the Dutch schools in Java. Local Islamic scholars (kaum), however, strongly opposed its establishment on the grounds that its management and pedagogical form was similar to that of unbelievers, that is, the Dutch. Despite strong opposition, the Mambangul Ngulum school followed patterns of modernised European school management with the adoption of classrooms and fixed periods of learning, and students were granted graduation certificates once they passed the final examination. This is certainly different from the format in traditional Islamic education (cf. Boyle 2004; Steenbrink 1986). Ricklefs did not name the incumbent for the position of pangulu of Surakarta. We might suggest in this regard that Tapsir Anom held this position at that time, and that Bagus Ngarpah as an educated Muslim in the Surakarta keraton milieu must have been part of the group who agreed with the school’s orientation and contributed to its establishment.
The front cover of the first volume of *Kuran Jawi* clearly mentions the translator, other contributors, and the year of completion as presented in Figure 1 (transliterated by Deswijaya):


The Qur’an translated into Javanese by Bagus Ngarpah, royal servant and official Islamic scholar in the Waradarma circle. The one who edited its Javanese words [was] Ngabehi Wirapustaka, the royal servant expert in the Radyapustaka in Surakarta in [the Javanese year] 1835 – [the Gregorian year] 1905. Copied by Ki Ranasubaya, *abdi dalêm jajar nirbaya kaparak têngên*, as released in the Radyapustaka office.

The Javanese periodical, *Pusaka Jawi*, in November 1931 also reported controversy on Ngarpah’s *Kuran Jawi*. His attempt at presenting the meaning of the Qur’an in Javanese aroused strong criticism from groups of Islamic scholars in Surakarta. One forceful criticism came from Raden Mas Suleman. In this connection, there was a story narrated by Haji Muhtar when accompanying Kyai Dahlan, the founder of the Muhammadiyah organisation, on a visit to Ngarpah’s residence.

Mas Haji Muhtar related: One day I followed Kyai Dahlan to Surakarta, visiting the residence of Bagus Ngarpah. The *kyai* was invited by Bagus Ngarpah. The *kyai* is one of Bagus Ngarpah’s nephews. Once they arrived at Bagus Ngarpah’s house, [Ngarpah] then told the following: ‘Le, my work on translating the Qur’an recently caused disagreements. Many Muslim scholars took this as unacceptable. [This matter] will be discussed in a public meeting. The Muslim scholars there will be headed by Raden Mas Suleman. Raden Mas Suleman himself will talk in that meeting, as the representative of the Muslim scholars [who disagreed]. He already raised many points and [the points] were reported in the newspaper. I already responded to all of his comments, nothing is left. What do you think?’ Kyai Dahlan then looked at the list containing responses for the questions, analysed and thought about them for a while. Then he said: ‘Oh Uncle, you will lose if you do it this way.’ Bagus Ngarpah was surprised [hearing the *kyai’s* response], and asked?: ‘How can I be wrong? In all my responses I referred to classical Arabic texts (*kitab-kitab*). I can assure myself, they will be defeated.’ Kyai Dahlan responded: ‘I think not Uncle. You will lose. Why do you serve someone whose intention is to give people more burden?’

*Pusaka Jawi* (1931: 172–173)

The report continued on the debate at the public meeting on Qur’anic translation made by Ngarpah, as reported in *Pusaka Jawi* (1931: 173–174):

On the day of the meeting, Raden Mas Suleman stood on the table so that everyone who wanted to hear his talk could see him. His voice was so loud and clear. After he explained the purpose of this public meeting, Raden Mas Suleman then presented his statement of disagreement < toward the translation made by Ngarpah > . He said: ‘Why was Bagus Ngarpah so brave enough to make the translation of the Qur’an, when it is clearly in the Qur’an that the Qur’an cannot be translated. Muslims who clearly disobey the rule mentioned in the Qur’an can be taken as immoral. More than that, such a wrongdoing might lead other Muslims to heresies.

---

2All English translations of the text from the *Pusaka Jawi* are by Nurtawab and Deswijaya from the original Javanese text transliterated by the Yayasan Sastra Lestari.
Figure 1. Cover page of the first volume of *Kuran Jawi*. Photo: Courtesy of Yayasan Sastra Lestari, 2005.
The above shows that a group of Islamic scholars in Surakarta, headed by Raden Mas Suleman, disagreed with the attempt to translate the Qur’an into Javanese. In their opinion, the Qur’an cannot be translated and any such act would be regarded as immoral. Bagus Ngarpah nevertheless stuck to the principle that it is possible to work on the translation of the Qur’an as it made the meaning of the Qur’an accessible to Javanese speakers. Moreover, he said, his intent was the translation of the Qur’anic commentary into Javanese not the translation of the Qur’an itself. The following is the report on his response.

Bagus Ngarpah then gave a statement as follows: ‘I did not translate the Qur’an. I just provided the meaning of the Qur’an or made the Qur’anic commentary. You might be right that no one can translate the Qur’an. But, all people already knew my work related to this Qur’an, just as Raden Mas Suleman certainly knew and reviewed it. Therefore, I would like to ask: ‘What principles did Raden Mas Suleman use to identify my work as making the Qur’anic translation? Or, from which principles did you get to assume that I worked on the Qur’anic translation?’ Raden Mas Suleman did not give any response, but was silent. He then got off the table. This public meeting then ended at this point.

Pusaka Jawi (1931: 174)

There is also information in the Javanese text Kawruh Ushuluddin (Ngarpah n.d.) on the professional background of Bagus Ngarpah, as a royal servant and the Islamic scholar and principal of the Mambangul Ngulum school in the reign of Pakubuwana X. Bagus Ngarpah’s response to the criticism on the purpose of his translation was also found in the printed Javanese text titled Babad Wedyadiningratan by Raden Mas Ngabehi Duta-dilaga (1938: 37). Ngarpah reiterated his motive was to make the Qur’an accessible to Javanese society so that more people are able to understand the explicit and implicit meanings of the Qur’an.

Ngarpah’s Javanese Qur’anic translation was also objected to by Sayyid ‘Uthmān (d.1913) in Batavia. Kaptein (2014: 197–201) describes how this conflict attracted attention from the Dutch Indies authorities as found in correspondence between the Advisor for Native Affairs, G.A.J. Hazeu, and the Assistant Resident of Solo, Ch.P.J. Blok. Protests by some Islamic scholars and Arab descendants included Sayyid ‘Uthmān who reportedly wrote to the king of the keraton Surakarta (sunan) asking for a ban on its publication. As Kaptein (2014: 198–199) notes, Blok reported that thousands of people attended the public debate much like spectators at a boxing match. But Sayyid ‘Uthmān and one Arab from Singapore reportedly cancelled their attendance at this event. During this debate, Ngarpah again clarified that his work was just the interpretation not a translation. Kaptein stresses Blok’s opinion of Ngarpah’s Javanese Qur’an that it showed the Javanese priyayi in the Waradarma circle accepted Islamic modernism as reflected in their direct approach to the Qur’an in studying Islam.

**The verse numbering system in Kuran Jawi**

In mainstream Qur’anic sciences (ʿulûm al-Qur’ân), Muslims believe that the Prophet Muhammad always did a slow and clear reading of the Qur’an to his companions and compiled a written scripture before his death. The Prophet always separated the verses in his recitation. His companions then wrote down each verse of the Qur’an following
its recitation (al-Suyūṭī n.d. I: 68–69; Rabb 2006: 86). It has been accepted that as early as the first century Hijri, Muslims had paid attention to the separation of the Qur’anic verses. Quoted in Farrin (2019: 4–5), in his examination of the Qur’anic manuscripts from the Umayyad period, Déroche states that those responsible for scribing the Qur’an paid much attention to the ways the Qur’anic verses are separated. As al-Ḥamd (1994: 3–4) notes, since the earliest Islamic period Qur’anic reciters (qurrā’) have read the Qur’an and stopped after each verse. In the first development of the scripture transcription, Muslim scholars introduced some forms of verse separations. They firstly used a cluster of dots at the end of verse. In the following centuries, the use of circles has become commonplace.

The late first century Hijri witnessed canonical verse numbering systems coming to be recognised based on the centres they originated in: Medina, Mecca, Basrah and Syria (al-Suyūṭī n.d., I: 68–69). Medina is home to two systems: Medinan I (al-Madānī al-awwal) and Medinan II (al-Madānī al-akhir). The others are Meccan (al-Makkī), Basran (al-Bāṣrī), Syrian (al-Shāmī), and Kufan (al-Kūfī) (ibid.; al-Dānī 1994: 79–82; al-Shaybānī 1994: viii–ix). Rabb (2006: 90) notes that the Syrian system (al-Shāmī) is usually associated with the Damascene tradition transmitted by Ibn ʿĀmir who was the Imām of Shām in the late 7th and early 8th centuries. The Syrian system may also refer to the Himṣī (al-Himṣī) reading from the city of Himṣ in Syria. Al-Ḥamd (1994: 3–7) notes that this field of study had rapidly developed in the classical Islamic period where Ibn al-Nadīm (d.990) in his Fihrist mentioned around 20 works on this subject. Al-Ḥamd then listed more works published in the following centuries, showing that the study of the verse numbering system still attracted much attention from Muslim scholars across the ages.

The above systems have different sums of the verses: Medinan I/MI (6,217 verses); Medinan II/MII (6,214 verses); Meccan/M (6,219 verses); Basran/B (6,204 verses); Damascus/D (6,226 or 6227 verses); and Kufan/K (6,236 verses) (al-Dānī 1994: 79–82; cf. al-Suyūṭī n.d. I: 68–69). The sum in the Himṣī reading is 6,232 verses (Mūsā 1988: 46–50; al-Shaybānī 1994: iv–v; Farrin 2019: 9). Knowledge about the verse counting traditions is one important field in the study of the Qur’an to consider in our attempts at tracing the pre-modern Qur’an copying tradition developed in different parts of the Muslim world. It is also useful to examine Qur’anic translations where the Arabic Qur’an is not attached. As will be elaborated, the presentation of the translated verses in Kuran Jawi is accommodative to more than one system. In some cases, Kuran Jawi even contains distinctive counts on the number of verses and differences in verse separation. Table 1 presents the list of all Qur’anic chapters with their sums of verses according to Kuran Jawi and the recognised traditions.

Table 1 shows that Kuran Jawi has 6,239 verses that constitutes the highest sum compared to those of the recognised systems. Where the chapters have the same number of verses, Kuran Jawi shows its agreement. Kuran Jawi is generally accommodative to the Basran and Kufan systems in chapters which have different verse totals except for a few chapters that we will elaborate on later. This leads to the understanding that it is likely Ngarpah used the Qur’ans that utilise more than one counting system. As will be shown, such pre-modern Qur’ans with double counting systems are commonplace in the region.
Table 1. Chapters of the Qur'ān with the sums of verses in Kur'an Jawi (KJ) and the recognised verse numbering systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.*</th>
<th>KJ</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>284/5</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85/6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sum of verses in Kur'an Jawi (KJ) 6239

*Chapter numbers

Source: The sums of verses are partly adapted from Farrin (2019:40–58) except for those in grey that we refer to al-Dānī (1994).
We selected clusters of verses taken from different chapters to identify the verse separations in Kuran Jawi. The first case is the Fāṭihah section where the presentation of its verses in Kuran Jawi clearly disagrees with the Kufan and Meccan systems. Here, Ngarpah followed the systems (Basran, Medinan I, Medinan II, and Damascene) that — as al-Dānī (1994: 139) notes — do not count the basmalah verse. Instead, they treat the last verse of this chapter as two separate verses (Figure 2 and Table 2).

The second case comes from Sūrat al-Baqarah. For this study, we selected the first 114 verses of the chapter where four disagreements in the verse separation out of 11 cases
appear in the mainstream systems. Al-Dānī (1994: 140) notes that there are 11 cases in this chapter where the recognisable counting systems diverge, and that the first four cases appear in verses 1–114. The first is in the fawātīḥ (opening letters) where the Kufan system counts the alif-lām-mīm as one verse. But the non-Kufan systems do not and instead, they include the fawātīḥ as part of the next verse. The second is in verse 10 where the words ‘adhābun alīm are counted as one verse in the Damascene system only. The third is the word musliḥūn (verse 11) which the Damascene system does not count, but which other systems do count as a separate verse. The fourth difference is in the the words illā khāʾifīn (verse 114). Here, the Basran system counts the words illā khāʾ ifīn as a separate verse.

Given that Kuran Jawi bears the same sum of verses as the Kufan system, it leads to the assumption that the Kuran Jawi’s verse counting system for the Sūrat al-Baqarah would follow the Kufan system. Nevertheless, our examination reveals discord in several places, and that Kuran Jawi contains idiosyncrasies. Farrin (2019: 30) notes that the Kufan system typically counts the fawātīḥ as separate verses in 19 out of 29 places. Our identification of these 19 cases confirms this. Table 3 shows differences in the ways in which some verses are separated or integrated. Verses 20–21 of Sūrat al-Baqarah are counted as one verse in Kuran Jawi (verse 19). This is also the case with verses 40–41 where

Table 2: Translation of Sūrat al-Fāṭihah in the Kuran Jawi (Transliterated by Deswijaya)

[1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kuran</th>
<th>Surat Phakihah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tinurnake ana nagara Mêkah, pitung ayat</td>
<td>Awit ingkang asma Allah, kang Mahamurah tur kang Maha-asi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sakèhing pêpuji iku konjuk ing Allah kang Mangerani ngalam kabéh.</td>
<td>1. Praise be to God, The Lord of all the universe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kang ngratoni ing dina agama. (Dina agama, têgêse dina wêwalês, iya iku dina kiyamat, awit ing dina iku Allah nindakake wêwalês, angganjar wong makmin sarta niksa wong kaphir. Jamal.).</td>
<td>3. The Owner of the day of religion (the day of religion means the day of judgement, that is the hereafter day, because on that day God will judge, give the reward to the believers and punishments to the unbelievers. Jamal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kawula nêmbah ing Tuwan, saha kawula nyuwun pitulung ing Tuwan.</td>
<td>4. I worship The Lord, and I beg The Lord’s help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tuwan mugi nêdahna wot lêrês (Uwot lêrês, têgêse dalan kang bénêr, iya iku saraking agama Islam. Jamal.) dhumatêng kawula.</td>
<td>5. May The Lord show the straight path (the straight path means the correct path, that is the law of the Islamic religion. Jamal) for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Uwotipun para tiyang ingkang sami Tuwan paringi nikmat. (Nikmat, têgêse sadhengah kang makolèhi marang manungsa, nanging tumrape ana ing akherat, kang makolèhi mau mung iman, iya iku pangandêl marang Allah. Jamal.).</td>
<td>6. The path of those that The Lord gives joys (joys means something that is useful for human, but given in the hereafter. What is useful [on that day] is only belief, that is belief in God. Jamal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dede tiyang ingkang sami kenging bêbêndu, lan dede tiyang ingkang sami kêsasar.</td>
<td>7. Not of those who got wrath, and not of those who have taken the wrong direction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English translation (by Nurtawab)

[1]

In the name of God The All Graceful and The All Merciful

1. Praise be to God, The Lord of all the universe.
2. The All Graceful and The All Merciful.
3. The Owner of the day of religion (the day of religion means the day of judgement, that is the hereafter day, because on that day God will judge, give the reward to the believers and punishments to the unbelievers. Jamal).
4. I worship The Lord, and I beg The Lord’s help.
5. May The Lord show the straight path (the straight path means the correct path, that is the law of the Islamic religion. Jamal) for me.
6. The path of those that The Lord gives joys (joys means something that is useful for human, but given in the hereafter. What is useful [on that day] is only belief, that is belief in God. Jamal).
7. Not of those who got wrath, and not of those who have taken the wrong direction.

3These fawātīḥ are in: Q.2; Q.3; Q. 7; Q.19; Q. 20; Q. 26; Q. 28; Q. 29; Q. 30; Q. 31; Q. 32; Q. 36; Q. 40; Q. 41; Q. 42; Q. 43; Q. 44; Q. 45; Q. 46.
the Kufan and all traditions count them as separate verses. Ngarpah merged them as one verse (verse 38), as he did for verses 64–65 and 67–68 in the Kufan system to become verses 61 and 63, respectively. Lastly, verse 108 of this chapter in Kuran Jawi (treated as verse 114 in the Kufan system) does not agree with the Basran system, but follows the majority.

It is necessary to have more examples to understand how Kuran Jawi has benefited from the existing numbering systems. For the purpose of this examination, we owe the selection of verses to Farrin (2019) where we contextualise these verses in our attempt to look at verse separations in Kuran Jawi.

The first case is of verses 37–41 of Sūrat al-Nāziʿat in accordance with the Damascene, Basran and Kufan traditions, as follows:

37 fa-ammā man taghá
38 wa-āthara ḥayāta ḥ-dunyā
39 fa-inna ḥ-jahīma ḥiyya ḥ-ma ḥ-wā
40 wa-ammā man khāfā maqāmā rabbīhi wa-nahā ḥ-nafsa ’ānī ḥ-hawā
41 fa-inna ḥ-jannata hiyya ḥ-ma ḥ-wā

Farrin (2019: 15) notes that the above verses are counted as verses 37–40 according to the Medinan I, Medinan II and Meccan systems where the verses 37–38 are united as one verse (verse 37), as follows:

37 fa-ammā man taghā wa-āthara ḥ-hayāta ḥ-dunyā
38 fa-inna ḥ-jahīma ḥiyya ḥ-ma ḥ-wā
39 wa-ammā man khāfā maqāmā rabbīhi wa-nahā ḥ-nafsa ’ānī ḥ-hawā
40 fa-inna ḥ-jannata hiyya ḥ-ma ḥ-wā

We then question which system Ngarpah has followed for the above verses. Our identification of relevant verses in Kuran Jawi reveals that he chose the Damascene, Basran and Kufan traditions. The above verses of Sūrat al-Nāziʿat in Ngarpah’s Javanese Qur’an are presented as follow:

37 Ing kono sing sapa kaphir.
38 Lan nguja kabungahan ing dunya kang kharam.
39 Iku panggonane ana ing Naraka Jakhim.
40 Dene sing sapa wédi ènggone bakal seba ana ngarsaning Pangerane, pèlbu dipancasi prakarane, népak awake, aja nganti nglakoni kêkarépane kang ala.
41 Iku panggonane ana ing suwarga.

The second case is the first six verses of Sūrat al-Raḥmān [55] according to the Damascene and Kufan systems, as follow:

1 al-raḥmān
2 ’allama ḥ-qur ān
3 khalaqa ḥ-insān
4 ’allamahu ḥ-bayān
5 al-shamsu wa ḥ-qamaru bi-husbān
6 wa ḥ-najmu wa ḥ-shajaru yasjudān

Farrin (2019: 15–16) notes that the Medinan I and Medinan II systems have merged the above verses 1–2 and the verses 3–4 to become verse 1 and verse 2, respectively. The
first six verses of Sūrat al-Rahmān in the Damascene and Kufan systems are treated as verses 1–4 in the Medinan I and Medinan II systems, as follow:

1 al-rahmānu allama ʾal-qr‘ān
2 khalaqa ʾl-ınsān allamahu ʾl-bayān
3 al-shamsu waʾl-qamaru bi-husbān
4 waʾl-najmu waʾl-shajaru yasjudān

It is worth noting that the mainstream numbering systems have presented different sums of verses for this chapter. The Hijazi counts (Medinan I, Medinan II and Meccan) give 77 verses. Meanwhile, the Damascene and Kufan systems bear the sum of 78 verses. The Basran system present a smaller number (76 verses). In this connection, we see that Kur'an Jawi seemed to have agreed with the Damascene and Kufan systems that bear the sum of 78 verses.

Although the Damascene and Kufan systems as well as Kur'an Jawi have the same number of verses for Sūrat al-Rahmān, the way Ngarpah separated the first six verses of this chapter in his Javanese Qur‘an does not concur with either of the above. Ngarpah’s Kur'an Jawi does not agree with the Medinan I and Medinan II systems that number the above verses as four verses. Our final choice then goes to the Basran and Meccan systems. Al-Dānī (1994: 238) notes that the Basran and Meccan systems have merged verses 1–2 in the Damascene and Kufan systems into one verse. Nevertheless, they agree with the Damascene and Kufan systems for the rest, showing five verses for verses 1–6 in both Damascene and Kufan traditions or verses 1–4 in both Medinan I and Medinan II traditions. In Table 4, the Javanese translations of the above Qur‘anic verses in Kur'an Jawi are presented in accordance with the Basran and Meccan systems.

Another case involves verses 43–47 of Sūrat al-Dukhān [44] in the Kufan system, as follows:

43 inna shajarata ʾl-zaqqúm
44 taʾāmu ʾl-ıthim
45 kaʾl-muḥli yaghfilī ʾl-butūn
46 ka-ghaly ʾl-hamīm
47 khudhūhu fa tilūhu ilā sawāʾi ʾl-jahim

Table 3. Differences in the separation of verses 1–114 in Sūrat al-Baqarah of Kur'an Jawi and the Kufan system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kur'an Jawi</th>
<th>Kufan system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1: alif lām mīm&lt;br&gt;2: dhalika ʾl-kitābū ... li ʾl-muttaqīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20: yakādu ʾl-barqu ... shyān gaddīr&lt;br&gt;21: yā ayyūhā ʾl-nāṣū ... la allakum ttkaṭtūn&lt;br&gt;40: yā bānī Isrāʾīl ... wa-yyāya farhābūn&lt;br&gt;41: wa-ʾāminī ... wa-yyāya fattaqīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>64: thumma tawallaytum ... min ʾl-khāṣīrīn&lt;br&gt;65: wa-qaḍ ʾalīmtum ... kūnā qirādatān khaṣīn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 61 | 62: wa-ʾāyūhī ... ūmāniyya yasī ṭūna ...
Note: number 64 missing, but the text is included in verse 63 |
| 63 | 66: yākūlū lānūr rabbakā ... fī ʾl-humālīn |
| 108 | 114: wa-mān azamū ... ilā khā ʾīfin ... adhābun ʿazīm
Farrin (2019: 16–17) notes that the above verses are numbered as the verses 41–44 according to the Medinan II, Meccan and Hims systems, as follows:

41 inna shajarata ʾl-zaqqūm  taʾāmu ʾl-athīm
42  kaʾl-muhli yaghī fi ʾl-butūn
43  ka-ghaly ʾl-hamīm
44  khudhūhu faʾtīlūhu ilā sawāʾi ʾl-jahīm

Meanwhile, the Medinan I and Damascene traditions have separated the above verses differently although both systems count four verses as well. These verses are as follow:

41 inna shajarata ʾl-zaqqūm
42  taʾāmu ʾl-athīm
43  kaʾl-muhli yaghī fi ʾl-butūn ka-ghaly ʾl-hamīm
44  khudhūhu faʾtīlūhu ilā sawāʾi ʾl-jahīm

Our examination reveals Ngarpah’s presentation of the translation of the above verses follows the Kufan system (verses 43–47). The following is the transcribed Javanese translations of the above verses:

43 Satêmêne wit Jakum.
44 Iku dadi pangane wong duraka.
45 Rupane wohe kaya jêlantah kang irêng, yên dipangan, ana sajroning wêtêng umob.
46 Kayadene umobing wedang.
47 (He naraka) wong kaphir iku sirâ cêkêla, banjur sirâ laraka marang têngahing Naraka Jakhim.

The above comparative studies of the verse numbering systems in Kuran Jawi in contrast to the recognised traditions as reflected in the selected clusters of verses discussed above, guide us to draw some important remarks. The first relates to the Fātiḥah and fawāṭiḥ sections where Ngarpah has clearly considered the non-Kufan system. The second has a connection to the ways in which Ngarpah presented his translation for some selected clusters of verses where he accepted one system in one case, but included other systems for other verses. In his Javanese translation of the verses 37–41 in Sūrat al-Nāziʿ āt, Ngarpah chose the Damascene, Basran and Kufan systems. In presenting the translations of verses 1–6 in Sūrat al-Rahmān according to the Damascene and Kufan systems, Ngarpah followed the Basran and Meccan traditions. In other cases, such as verses 43–47 of Sūrat al-Dakhān, Ngarpah’s translation of these verses was in accordance with the Kufan system.
Considering the sums of the verses in all chapters of the Qur’an in Table 1, it is obvious that Ngarpah’s choices are more in agreement with the Kufan and, if not, the Basran systems or both, except for two chapters (Q. 27 and Q. 91). For Q. 27, Kuran Jawi shows a total of 95 verses as in the Medinan I, Medinan II and Meccan systems. The Kufan and Basran systems, however, have a total of 93 and 94 verses, respectively. For Q. 91, Kuran Jawi aligns with the Medinan I and Medinan II systems, bearing the sum of 16 verses, while, the Kufan and Basran systems list the sum of 15 verses.

Aside from the above variance, it is worth noting that Kuran Jawi contains anomalies with regard to the sum of verse in one chapter and the verse separations. Kuran Jawi contains the unique sum of 228 verses in Q. 26. There is no single recognised tradition used for comparison in this article that bears the same sum. As for verse separations, the presentation of translations in some clusters of the verses in the chapter under study (Table 3) reveals that Kuran Jawi contains idiosyncrasies.

Kuran Jawi contains a mixed use of the verse numbering systems that in some ways witnessed the spread of the Qur’an’s accommodation to double numbering systems. For this reason, the attempt at tracing the indigenous Qur’ans is important, especially those circulated in the Javanese keraton of Surakarta or the Mambangul Ngulum school milieu. The fact that Ngarpah composed his Javanese translations of the Qur’an in Surakarta gives us an idea of how the extant Arabic works and Qur’ans previous to or during his lifetime, in manys ways helped him complete his translation project. One important collection to consider is the Islamic manuscripts and the Qur’ans now kept at the great mosque of Surakarta (Masjid Agung Surakarta) library.

Yahya et. al. (2018: vi) note that the great mosque of Surakarta was established during the ruling period of Pakubuwono IV (1788–1820), and that most of the the Islamic manuscripts and the Qur’ans as part of the mosque library were previously the properties of the Kasunanan palace and the Mambangul Ngulum school (Figure 3). This indicates that it is likely that Ngarpah must have used the collection for Islamic pedagogical purposes and the completion of his Javanese Qur’anic translations. Based on the published catalogue, there are 28 Qur’ans in the collection. Many of them were the properties of the Mambangul Ngulum school donated to the mosque. Although not all the Qur’ans are found complete, we successfully accessed two complete Qur’ans (MAA 060 and 061). As Yahya, et al. (2018: 35) note, the Qur’an MAA 060 became the property of the mosque as soon as the copying of this Qur’an was completed. Qur’an MAA 061 was an endowment from Sri Susuhunan Pakubuwono X who initiated the establishment of the Mambangul Ngulum school in 1905.

Our examination of some parts of these two Qur’ans gives us some important points. The first connects to the verse separation where the copyers of both Qur’ans have used circles to signify Qur’anic verses. The same circles however are also placed in the basmalah sections in the chapter headings other than the Fātihah chapter. We argue that the circles in the basmallah sections in the chapter headings except the Fātihah chapter were not designed to count the basmalah as verse. Rather, those circles were intended to give certain aesthetical purposes. One evidence can be found in the chapter heading of Sūrat al-Qāri’ah that has eight verses. Seven circles, minus one in the basmalah section, were made to separate the verses of this chapter to become eight verses, indicating that the basmalah is not considered as a verse although it has the circle.
The second point connects to the ways in which both Qur’an MAA 060 and 061 appear to have given more space for the Kufan and Basran systems. It is obvious that the presentation of verses in the Fātihah section follows the Kufan system, by including the basmalah as the first verse. Meanwhile, both Qur’ans bear two sums of the verse (286 and 287 respectively) for Sūrat al-Baqarah as indicated in the chapter heading (Sūrat [al-] Baqarah mi’ātān wa-sittu aw sab’u wa-thamānīn āyah Madaniyyah). Both numbers agree with the Kufan and Basran systems. Aside from that, the chapter heading of Sūrat al-Qāri’ah clearly follows the non-Kufan system that bears the sum of eight verses. This sum is listed in the Basran, Medinan I and Damascene traditions. Regarding the fawātih section, the observation of this section in the chapter heading of Sūrat al-Baqarah reveals that both Qur’ans MAA 060 and 061 clearly refer to the non-Kufan traditions. Here, the alif lām mim is not counted as a separate verse.

Observation of the extant indigenous Qur’ans shows that the pre-modern Qur’ans circulating in Surakarta have combined the application of the verse numbering systems known to Muslims throughout the history of the Qur’an. The fact that the practice of a mixed numbering system in the Qur’ans under study was commonplace might be one determinant that made the presentation of Ngarpah’s Javanese Qur’anic translations accommodative to double or even multiple numbering systems. Aside from that, it is clear that the Kuran Jawi also contains idiosyncrasies for the sum of verses in Q. 26 and the verse separations in the chapter under study. The reason why he chose to apply such unusual counts needs to be investigated in future research.

4The Qur’an MAA 061 classifies this chapter as Meccan (Makkiyyah).
**Arabic references mentioned in the Kuran Jawi**

In this section, we examine the complexity in the use of Arabic references in the interpretive additions to the translation text in the *Kuran Jawi*. As has been presented above, Ngarpah put these interpretive additions within parentheses ‘( )’ in red ink and — at the end of the explanation — mentioned briefly one or more Arabic titles as the references (see Figure 2 and Table 2). In our analysis that follows, some of the listed works clearly refer to those known among the Javanese *pesantren* of the countryside. Some works, especially those categorised as non-commentary works, seemed to be uncommon in pedagogical practices in the 19th- to the early 20th-century *pesantren*. This perception is based on the inventory project of Arabic works by van den Berg (1886) used or circulated among the late 19th-century Javanese *pesantren* (see also Steenbrink 1984: 155–157).

Our examination reveals that Ngarpah’s Qur’anic translation used more references than those of known extant Qur’anic commentaries and translations in the Malay-Indonesian world up to the early 20th century. Some Arabic commentaries (i.e. *Tafsir al-Baghwî*, *Tafsîr al-Khâzîn*, *Tafsîr al-Baydâwî*, and especially *Tafsîr al-Jalâlayn*) dominated references in 17th- and early 20th-century Malay Qur’anic commentaries from Aceh (Riddell 1984, 1993 and 2017), Mindanao (Nurtawab 2019) and Banten (Nurtawab 2020) as well as the printed Maranao *tafsir* in 1930 (Kawashima 2016), and the early Javanese translation found in the 18th-century Banten Qur’an A.54 (Nurtawab and Syukroni, forthcoming). Ngarpah’s Javanese Qur’anic translation used different Arabic commentaries, that is, two glosses of the *Jalâlayn*, and non-commentary works (see Table 5).

**The role of Arabic commentaries**

Ngarpah used *Tafsîr al-Jalâlayn*, two glosses of the *Jalâlayn* (shortened in Javanese to *Jamal* and *Sawi*) and *Tafsîr al-Khâzîn* (Jav.: *Khazîn*). *Tafsîr al-Khâzîn* and three Arabic references greatly contributed to the development of the early Malay Qur’anic exegetical activity (Riddell 1993: 64). The works mentioned as *Jamal* and *Sawi* refer to the glosses of the *Jalâlayn* authored, first, by Sulayman ibn ‘Umar al-‘Ujaylî al-Azhari (d.1790), titled *al-Futûhât al-ilâhiyâh bi-tawdîh tafsîr al-Jalâlayn li al-daqîq al-khîfîyâh* — better known as *Hâshiyat al-Jamal* — and, second, by Aḥmîd ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣawî (d.1826) titled *Hâshiyat al-Ṣawî ‘alâ tafsîr al-Jalâlayn*.

Aside from the use of *Tafsîr al-Jalâlayn*, Ngarpah used *Hâshiyat al-Jamal* in many parts of the interpretive additions. One example is his translation of *Sûrat al-Fâtiha* that shows the dominance of this work for providing a definition of keywords: *yawm al-dîn* (the day of judgement), *al-ṣirât al-mustaqîm* (the straight path) and *ni’mah* (joys). The examination of these interpretive additions found in *Sûrat al-Fâtiha* of *Kuran Jawi* will be compared to the commentary of this chapter in the *Hâshiyat al-Jamal*. Our presentation of these interpretive additions will mention the verse number as it appeared in *Kuran Jawi* followed by the verse numbers based on the Kufan system separated by a forward slash ‘/’.

If the title *Jamal* mentioned in the *Kuran Jawi* does refer to the *Hâshiyat al-Jamal*, we find that Ngarpah had read the work carefully. He had selected and quoted some key points, and finally expressed them in his own words. The first example is the explanation of the phrase *yawm al-dîn* (Jav.: *dina agama*; ‘The day of religion’) in the translation of
Sūrat al-Fāṭiḥah [1]: 3/4 as follows: (The day of religion means the day of judgement, that is the hereafter day, because on that day God will judge, give the reward to the believers and punishments to the unbelievers. Jamal.) The presented interpretive addition partly corresponds to a piece of commentary found in the Ḥāshiyat al-Jamal as follows: ‘One opinion on it [is] judgement, that is with the reward for the believers and punishment for the unbelievers.’

The second example is found in the explanation of the words al-ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm (Jav.: uwot ḻeṟēs) in verse 5/6 as follows: (The correct path, that is the straight path, i.e. the law of the Islamic religion. Jamal.) The above additional explanation might be taken from chunks of the commentary of this verse in the Ḥāshiyat al-Jamal (Sulaymān 1885, IV: 666). One piece might come from the quoted definition of the word al-ṣirāṭ (the path) by al-Rāghib al-Īsfahānī (d.1108) as follows: ‘And [the word] al-ṣirāṭ [means] the easy path … and that means the religion of Islam’ (Sulaymān 1885, IV: 671). Another piece might come from the quoted opinion by Abī al-Saʿūd (d.1574) on the word al-mustaqīm as follows: ‘What is meant by the word al-mustaqīm that is the true and tolerant faith (Sulaymān 1885, IV: 672).

The third example comes from the explanation of the word niʿmah (joys) and the groups that God has granted it to [them], as follows: (Joy means something that is useful for human, but given in the hereafter. What is useful [on that day] is only belief, that is belief in God. Jamal.) The author of the Ḥāshiyat al-Jamal compiled scholars’ opinions on the commentary of this verse, stressing one opinion held by the majority. Ngarpah did not choose the majority opinion. Instead, he seemed to have selected the last opinion that understands the group here to be the believers. The related text is as follows: ‘That what is implied with [the pronoun] “them” refers to the group of believers on the grounds that they are blessed with a faith.’ The presented interpretive additions found in the Kuran Jawi are generally found in mainstream Qur’anic commentaries.

Table 5. Arabic references mentioned in the Kuran Jawi (in alphabetical order).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Jawi Short titles as in the Kuran</th>
<th>Complete titles of the (possible) works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inna ngatut talibin/ Ingana</td>
<td>ʿānat al-talibin by Abū Bakr ʿUthmān ibn Muḥammad Shatā al-Dimyātī al-Bakri (d.1893).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Itkan</td>
<td>al-ʾīqān fi ʿulūm al-Qurʾān by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d.1505).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jalālīn</td>
<td>Tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-ʿazīz by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Mahallī (d.1459) and Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d.1505), better known as Tafsīr al-Jalālīn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kasasulambiya</td>
<td>Qasas al-anbiyāʾ by Abū al-Fīdāʾ ibn Kathīr (d.1373).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Khayatulkhewan</td>
<td>Ḥayāt al-hayāwān al-kubrā by Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Mūsā al-Dumayrī (d.1406).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Misbah</td>
<td>Al-Misbāḥ al-munir fī gharīb al-sharīʿ al-kabīr by Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn ʿĀli al-Muṣrī al-Fayyūmī (d.1369).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MizanSakrani</td>
<td>Al-Mizān al-kubrā by ʿAbd al-Wahhāb bīn Ahmad al-Syārānī (d.1565).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Muhtar</td>
<td>Muḥtar al-sīrāḥ by Muḥammad ibn Abī Bākur ibn ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Rāzī (d.1267).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sawī</td>
<td>Ḥāshiyat al-Sawī ‘alā tafsīr al-Jalālīn by Abī Ahmad Muḥammad al-Ṣawī (d.1826).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Takrib</td>
<td>Taqrīb by Ahmad ibn al-Husayn al-shāhīr bi-Abī Shujāʾ (d.1107).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Takrip</td>
<td>Muṣsamā bi-al-tāʾrif by ʿĀli ibn Muḥammad al-Jūrjānī (d.1413).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But, what is found as a resemblance between those presented in the *Kuran Jawi* and the Ḥāshiyyat al-Jamal might confirm that Ngarpah seemed to have referred to this gloss.

It is also worth presenting certain parts of the interpretive additions on a prophet’s story that Ngarpah possibly referred from other Qur’anic commentaries. The interpretive addition in Ngarpah’s translation of *Sūrat al-A’rāf* [7]: 71/73 on the Prophet Sālih with his tribe, Thamūd, provides detailed information on the origin of the Thamūd tribe taken from *Tafsir al-Khāzin*. The related interpretive addition found in the *Kuran Jawi* is as follows: (Thamūd is the son of Ghabir, Ghabir is the son of Sam, and that Sam is the son of the Prophet Noah. So, the Prophet Noah is the great-grand father of Thamūd. Khazin.) Based on the commentary of this part in *Tafsir al-Khāzin*, Ngarpah seemed to have missed one person as the father of Ābir (Jav.: Ghabir), as seen in the following commentary: ‘That is, we sent [The Prophet Sālih] to Thamūd, and he is Thamūd the son of Ābir the son of Iram the son of Sam the son of the Prophet Nūh.’

In some cases, we identified two or more Arabic commentaries that were used to support an interpretive addition in one verse. One example of this is in the way three Arabic commentaries, i.e. the Jalālayn, Ḥāshiyyat al-Jamal and *Tafsir al-Khāzin*, were respectively mentioned to provide the interpretive addition to the translation text in *Sūrat al-Nisāʿ* verses 19–20/15–16. It confirms that Ngarpah’s *Kuran Jawi* sometimes adopted multiple referencing.

### The role of non-Qur’anic commentary works

Ngarpah provided definitions based on Arabic works that he referred to as Muhtar, Misbah, Khayatul khewan and Takripfat. In this regard, the use of non-commentary works shows that Ngarpah appears to have been consumed with presenting various information for his target readers who might need this related detail in their study of the Qur’an. Aside from Arabic dictionaries, Ngarpah also referred to the Islamic works on jurisprudence. However, we are not analysing them in detail here, though there is a call for further research on this topic.

Identifying the use of non-commentary works that appear to draw from Arabic dictionaries has been difficult partly because the listed works were uncommon in the region’s Islamic pedagogy. Two inventory projects, the first conducted by van den Berg (1886) in Ngarpah’s lifetime and the other by van Bruinessen (1995), have been used to determine the types of Islamic works circulating among the Javanese pesantren from the late 19th- to the late 20th-century. This also assumes that Islamic texts (kitab) unlisted in both projects indicate a very limited availability.

If the dictionary works listed in Table 5 are the works that Ngarpah used for the composition of his *Kuran Jawi*, particularly the additional explanatory parts, we suggest that he showed a high level of skill in utilising those references, and paraphrasing selected information to reflect his own understanding and perspective. We will present the use of four Arabic dictionaries that have short titles found in Ngarpah’s work: Muhtar, Misbah, Khayatul khewan and Takripfat. The first title seems to be the work of Muḥammad ibn Abi Bakr ibn ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Rāzī (d.1267) titled *Muḥtār al-ṣīḥāḥ*, and the use of this work as reference is found to define the following words of Qur’anic Arabic: *al-shukr* (al-Baqarah: 153/158), *tashrīq* (al-Baqarah: 199/203), *al-mahīḏ* (al-Baqarah: 222/222), *al-shahr al-ḥarām* (Q.S. al-Māʿidah: 2/2), dan *zaqqūm* (Q.S. al-Isrāʿ: 62/60).
For the word *al-shukr*, Ngarpah provided the following explanation: (Be thankful for God’s giving [is] by being grateful [to him]. Muhtar.) Al-Rāzī’s *Muḥtār al-siḥāḥ*, however, gives a much longer definition. The second example is on the definition of the three days after the ‘Īd al-adḥā. Ngarpah provided this text: (The days of *tashriq* are the date 11th, the date 12th and the date 13th of the month Dhū al-Ḥiǧjah once every year. Muhtar.) In the *Muḥtār al-siḥāḥ* of al-Rāzī (n.d: 141) the text is as follows: ‘It is mentioned the days of *tashriq* and they are three days after the Day of Immolation.’

There is still a certain resemblance, but with some variance, in the definition of the word *al-shahr al-ḥāram*. In the Kuran Jawi, Ngarpah’s definition of *al-shahr al-ḥāram* (Jav.: *sasi kharam*, ‘forbidden months’) is as follows: (Forbidden months means sacred months where battles are forbidden, that is four months as follows: Muḥarram (Sura), Rajab (Rejeb), Dhū al-Qa’ dah (Dulkangidah), Dhū al-Ḥiǧjah (Besar). Muhtar.) Al-Rāzī (ibid.: 56) presented a similar definition, but mentioned the months in a different sequence, i.e. Dhū al-Qa’ dah, Dhū al-Ḥiǧjah, Muḥarram and Rajab in *Muḥtār al-siḥāḥ*.

For the word *zagqīm*, Ngarpah defined it in his translation of *Sūrat al-Isrā* (60/62) as follows: (*Zikkum* is plantation that grows and lives in Hell. Muhtar.) This definition, however, does not agree with the one in the *Muḥtār al-siḥāḥ* that presents a more detailed and longer definition although there is a possibility that Ngarpah might have referred to it with certain significant changes.

The second dictionary work coming out in Kuran Jawi is called *Misbah* that in our identification possibly refers to *al-Miṣbāḥ al-munīr fi gharīb al-sharḥ al-kabīr* by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ali al-Muqrī al-Fayyūmī. The use of this work is seemingly less frequent than the above *Muhtar*. Ngarpah mentioned this work twice in his translation of *Sūrat al-Baqarah* [2]: 99/105 to explain the word *mushrik* and in his translation of the same chapter verse 119/125 to define the word *ṭawwāf*.

In Kuran Jawi, *mushrik* (polytheist) is defined as: (The polytheist is those who take Gods but Allah. Misbah.) Our investigation towards the related text in the *al-Miṣbāḥ al-munīr* of al-Fayyūmī (n.d.) shows that this work does not specifically provide the definition of the word *mushrik*. Rather, the author gives a brief explanation of another noun (i.e. *al-shirk*) as follows: ‘Polytheism is the term for those who did polytheism towards God once they become infidel’ (al-Fayyūmī n.d.: 380). There is also a discord in the definition of the word *ṭawwāf* in the translation of *Sūrat al-Baqarah* [2]: 119/125, between Kuran Jawi and the *al-Miṣbāḥ al-munīr*. In Kuran Jawi, Ngarpah provided the following definition: (Round trip (*ṭawwāf*) is to walk around the Ka’bah [as part of the Islamic pilgrimage]. Misbah.) Our identification of the related word in the work of al-Fayyūmī (n.d.: 380) shows that there is no definition of the word *ṭawwāf* which bears the meaning of walking round the Kaaba as part of the pilgrimage ceremony.

Another dictionary work in Kuran Jawi is what Ngarpah briefly mentioned as Khayatul khewān. We identified that the use of this work is less frequent than the above two dictionaries. Ngarpah made a reference to it once in his attempt at defining the animal *khimār* in his translation of *Sūrat al-Baqarah*: 261/259 as follows: (Khimar is the name of an animal that has four legs in the Arabian Land. [It] was usually used to ride. Khayatul khewān.) It differs from that in the *Hayāt al-ḥayawān* of Mūṣā al-Dumayrī (1992: 40), where he divided types of *khimar* into two: *al-ḥimār al-ahlī* (domestic donkey) and *al-ḥimār al-waḥshī* (wild donkey).
The next dictionary work that appears to be used by Ngarpah is what he referred to as *Takriphat*. It is likely a reference to the work of ʿAlī ibn Muhammad al-Jurjānī, *Muʾjam al-taʿrīfāt*. The use of this work in the *Kuran Jawi* is more frequent than the above dictionary works. Here, we have identified the Qurʾanic Arabic words that attracted Ngarpah to provide the definitions, i.e. *al-dḥāt, al-sīfah,* and *al-lawḥ al-mahfūz* in the translation of *Sūrat ʿAlī ʿImrān* [3]: 6/8; *al-Naḥl* [16]: 62/60; and *al-Anʿām* [6]: 38/38, respectively. Given that they show the same pattern in the way this work was referred, we will just examine the definition of the last word.

Ngarpah’s definition of *al-lawḥ al-mahfūz* (the preserved tablet) does not correspond to his reference. In his translation of *Sūrat al-Anʿām* 38/38, he explains: (Loh [Ar.: *al-lawḥ*] means place (Jav. *papan*), mahphul [Ar.: *al-mahfūz*] means being secured, documented. *Loh mahphul* therefore means the book of God that contains all the destinies of creatures. *Takriphat.*) Our identification of the related definition for this word in the *Muʾjam al-taʿrīfāt* does not show a resemblance to the above definition. It corresponds with his knowledgeable style in using other dictionary works above, and re-presenting to keep his readers well informed of the used references.

As shown in Table 5, Ngarpah was also interested in references in Islamic jurisprudence, revealing that he seemed to have intended to show their practical understandings. Unlike the above non-commentary works, Arabic references in Islamic jurisprudence, for example, *Taqrīb* and its commentary *Fath al-qarib*, are very popular in the pesantren milieu. Ngarpah also mentioned *Mīzān Sakrānī* that possibly refers to the work of ʿAbd al-Wahhāb bin Aḥmad al-Syārīnī (d.1565) titled *al-Mīzān al-kubrā*. One fresh work in the field of Islamic jurisprudence composed in the late 19th century, *Iʿānat al-talibīn* by Abū Bakr ʿUthmān ibn Muḥammad Shatā al-Dīmāṭī al-Bakrī (d.1893), was obviously used in *Kuran Jawi*. We are not going further into the analysis of the presented interpretive additions using these references given that those abbreviated in Javanese *Kuran Jawi* — *Inna ngatut talibin* or *Ingana Tuttalibin*, *Mīzān Sakrānī*, *Phatkhul Karīt*, and *Takrib* — undoubtedly refer to the popular works among Indonesian Muslims. More research, however, is needed on how these non-commentary works came to be listed as references in the Javanese Qurʾanic exegetical activities, and more generally in Islamic pedagogical practices in the Javanese *keraton* milieu. We also need better understanding of how these works contributed to the conception of Islamic thought among the Javanese *priyayi* at the turn of the 20th century.

**Concluding remarks**

We have examined aspects of the Qurʾanic verse numbering system and Arabic references in Ngarpah’s *Kuran Jawi*. Ngarpah was a royal servant and an Islamic scholar in the early 20th-century Javanese *keraton* of Surakarta. His work was presented to the members of the Waradarma literary circle. We assume that the variation in the use of references for the composition of the *Kuran Jawi* reflects the Javanese *priyayi*’s intellectual interests and need to study Islam. We highlight some remarks concerning trends in the study of Islam, especially the Qurʾan, and the Javanese *priyayi*’s reception towards early 20th-century modernisation.

Translation or commentary without its original text is typical of Qurʾanic exegetical activities in late 19th- to early 20th-century Java. It might be connected to the ways in
which the targeted readers wanted to study the Qur’an without being hindered by the language barrier. Or, perhaps the Javanese priyayi had a strong desire to preserve their Javanese identity. In this connection, the hypothesis is that they were unwilling to learn Arabic if it replaced the Javanese language and script. The reception of many Arabic words in Javanese as found in the *Kuran Jawi* shows that Javanese speakers have reflected their Islam in Javanese.

*Kuran Jawi* also shows that Ngarpah’s organising of the number of verses in most chapters of the Qur’an seemed to be closely related to the Basran and Kufan systems. Some exceptions are evident in Q. 27 (*Sūrat al-Naml*) and Q. 91 (*Sūrat al-Shams*) where Ngarpah clearly followed other systems, and Q. 26 (*Sūrat al-Shu’arā*) where the number of verses differs from the recognised counting traditions. We have also highlighted idiosyncrasies where Ngarpah applied a different method of separating some verses in his Javanese translation of *Sūrat al-Baqarah*. In looking at these facts, we negate the possibility of technical errors that Ngarpah and his team might have made during its composition. Given that all the translated verses were well presented in Javanese language and script, we assume that while being accommodative to multiple recognised verse numbering traditions Ngarpah seems to have applied an idiosyncratic counting system in presenting his Javanese translations of the Qur’an.

We have highlighted the complexity in the use of Arabic works as references for the composition of the *Kuran Jawi*. There are about 14 Arabic works that Ngarpah clearly mentioned in his work and we have classified them into works of Qur’anic commentary and non-commentary. In this connection, Ngarpah’s *Kuran Jawi* represents one of the most remarkable works in the field of Qur’anic commentaries ever produced in the early modern Malay-Indonesian world. Ngarpah pioneered the use of various works in an attempt at presenting the meaning of the Qur’an to the non-Arabic speaking communities in Java. It is the general understanding that until the composition period of *Kuran Jawi* the Qur’anic exegetical activities in Southeast Asia had mainly benefited from the use of *Tafsir al-Jalālayn* and three other popular Arabic commentaries, i.e. *Tafsir al-Baghawi*, *Tafsir al-Khāzīn*, and *Tafsir al-Baydāwī*. The *Kuran Jawi* also referred to both *Tafsir al-Jalālayn* and *Tafsir al-Khāzīn*. Ngarpah’s use of Arabic works from various disciplines shows his mastery of Islamic studies and his focus on presenting the meaning of the Qur’an for Muslim needs in a changing world.

*Kuran Jawi* was composed in the period when modernisation began to receive attention from Southeast Asian Muslims. Modernism had encouraged Muslims to approach the Islamic sources more directly. The complexity in the use of both Arabic commentaries and non-commentary works in the *Kuran Jawi* reflects Ngarpah’s interest in providing a direct approach to the Qur’an. It also mirrors the way Islamic education had been conducted in the Javanese keraton milieu that includes some elements from westernised education and Islamic reformism. This is especially the case with the Mambangul Ngulum school where Ngarpah had been headmaster and with the Waradarma literary circle to whom Ngarpah’s Javanese Qur’an was presented.
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