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**ABSTRACT**
The story of *Pandawa Lima* ‘Hikayat Pandawa Lima’ (abbreviated to HPL) written in Malay is a literary work transformed from the Mahabharata Epic ‘Wiracarita Mahabharata,’ especially ‘Kakawin Bharatayuda’ (abbreviated to KBY) written in the Old Javanese language. As a transformational literary work, additions, and reductions could not be avoided. The part that was added and reduced depended on the adapter’s way of thinking and socio-culture values. It was also closely related to the linguistic, literary and cultural conventions inspiring the transformational process. This present study is intended to discuss how the adapter received KBY as the source text (hypogram), what adjustments were made, and how they were made. The problems of the study were analyzed using the theory of literary reception and the qualitative and hermeneutic method. The objective of the study is to reveal the HPL adapter’s reception of its source text (hypogram). The result of the analysis shows that the HPL adapter adapted KBY without degrading the hypogram, meaning that the great values which the hypogram contains are still intact and complete. However, several adjustments were made in HPL; they are the incidents, names of weapons, and characters.
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I. INTRODUCTION
The object of analysis chosen in this present study is one of the Malay texts entitled Hikayat Pandawa Lima (abbreviated to HPL) (the story of Pandawa Lima) for several reasons. First, from the transmission context, HPL is one of the transformational works written in Malay by a Malay writer, meaning that the transformational work describes how the Malay writer revealed what had been read before. In this case, the work had been read before it is referred to as hypogram, namely Kakawin Bharatayudha (abbreviated to KBY). The kakawin (Old Javanese Poetry) narrates that Korawa and Pandawa (the Bharata’s descents) were involved in a tremendous war. It is KBY which was used as the source from which a new literary work referred to as a transformational work, namely HPL, was written. Second, HPL is believed to contain different types of information, knowledge, arts, customs and traditions, and so forth (Faturahman, 2015: Cika, 2006:1) which can be used as guide to the life of society, nation and state. In relation to the transformational process, two questions appear. They are how consistent and creative the HPL adapter in receiving KBY was and what factors inspired the adapter to make adjustments and to link one part with another.

II. RESEARCH METHOD
The theory used to analyze how consistent and creative the adapter in receiving HPL is the theory of literary reception supported by the qualitative and hermeneutic method. The literary reception is the reader’s reaction to a text. Then the reader receives it as a text which is fully comprehended and understood. According to Yunus, literary reception means how a writer transforms the values which any literary work previously was written contains the work which is being written. This shows a clear linkage as what was done by Jauss and Isser which was then known as the definition of the literary reception currently referred to (Yunus, 1985:32). Jauss and Isser were considered having given the theoretical and methodological basis of the development of literary reception (Yunus, 1985:33), although its basis had already been available before World War II (Yunus, 1985:28). The objective of the present study is to explain how consistent and creative the adapter was and the factors inspiring the adapter to transform KBY into HPL.

III. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS
Every episode is analyzed, and in every analysis, the question “why” is raised to examine the logic of the incidents which construct the plot. The different answers to such a question indicate the reception given by the adapter to the source text. Then what caused the responses to be different is interpreted. The socio-cultural things and misreading or the intention of creating a new thing could cause the responses to be different. The episode is divided based on the unity of the story.

The analysis starts with the episode of Krisna Duta to the victory of Pandawa. Finally, Pandawa could govern Undraprasta safely and wisely. This needs to be emphasized as in HPL there are episodes which initiate and end the basic story which KBY does not contain. In this analysis, the writer presents several episodes to exemplify the consistency and creativeness of the HPL’s adapter in receiving KBY.

3.1 The Episode of Krisna Duta
Several questions related to this episode are raised. They are why Krishna was sent as the delegation of Darmawangsa to Astinapura? Why did Darmawangsa ask for a half of the Astina Kingdom? Why did Krishna refuse what was offered by Duryudana? And, why did Duryudana refuse what was requested by Krishna?

In HPL the answer to the first question is related to what was requested by Darmawangsa based on the decision made by Pandawa in the meeting they held. In HPL, Krishna was still treated as the delegation of Darmawangsa who asked for a half of the Astina kingdom. There was a difference with respect to how the delegation was chosen in which it is narrated that the delegation was chosen in accordance with the prevailing ethics, namely through the royal meeting. In KBY it is narrated that it was the responsibility of Krishna for becoming the Darmawangsa’s delegation (HPL, p. 87). In KBY this is not narrated.

The second question; why did Darmawangsa ask for a half of the Astina kingdom? As far as what is narrated in HPL concerning the Baratayuda war is concerned, this incident is not mentioned in KBY. However, in the episode another incident is mentioned, namely King Duryudana was angry that Arjuna had an intimate relation with his consort named Banuwati. Duryudana intended to ask Danghyang Drona to kill Pandawa (HPL, p. 6). The answer to this question was not found in KBY. It was possible that the adapter had ever read and heard the oral tradition which was then inserted in HPL.

After Krishna arrived in Astina, he was welcome with a great ceremony before he explained why he came. Delicious food was offered to Krishna by Duryudana; however, Krishna did not what to consume it. In HPL the answer to why Krishna did not want to consume the food offered by Duryudana can be retraced from the following quotation.

“Lord Krishna was too happy to see that all the kings honor him. Emperor Duryudana comes; he was accompanied by the kings who were carrying dishes for Lord Krishna. However, Lord Krishna did not want to be entertained by Emperor Duryudana. He told Lord Krishna, “Please accept what we are offering. As the guest whom we entertain, you are supposed to feel fine whether you actually feel fine or not”. Lord Krishna answered, “Nothing inspires me not to consume the food, except the tradition which is adhered to by the guest to whom the food is offered. If he has not completed what he is supposed to do, he will not neither to eat nor to drink” (HPL, p. 89).

In HPL, there is a description describing what KBY contains. It is described that Lord Krishna refused what was offered by Duryudana. What was meant was that any delegation
was not to accept what was offered before he completed what he had been supposed to do. In this case, the delegation did not want to break the prevailing ethics. The difference is that the description in HPL is longer; however, the quality is the same. It is possible as HPL is in the form of a story ‘hikayat’ to which things can be freely added, depending on what was desired by the adapter. The following description explains more clearly why Krishna refused what was offered by Duryodana.

“... then the King of Astina came carrying dishes; however, what was served was refused by Krishna who said: “You do not have to serve anything” (KBY, III.3). Therefore, the King of Kaurawa said to king Krishna: “Hi king Krishna, your character is not good. You refuse what I serve. This refusal is not friendly, and should be avoided by someone who is considered good on earth (KBY, III.4).

That was what was said by the king of Astina when he warned king Krishna. King Krishna immediately informed that he came as a delegation as follows: “If the objective has not been achieved, nothing good can be received; if the objective has not been achieved but the good thing has been received that would mean drinking poison” (KBY, III.5).

From the Krishna Dua episode, it can be concluded that Krishna’s responsibility for being a delegation failed; the reason was that Duryodana refused the objective why Krishna was sent as a delegation although Drestarata and the priests agreed with it.

This is the answer to the fourth question which constructs the plot structure. This last incident can be found in the source text, in which it is stated that Krishna sided with Pandawa (KBY, IV.5), and became the main enemy of Kaurawa (KBY, IV.6). Karna, Dursana and Sangkuni also stated that Krishna supported Pandawa; therefore, they should keep on guard against him. Thus, from this episode it can be concluded that the HPL adapter showed fidelity to the source text, meaning that not many creations were found. The lesson which can be acquired from this episode is that we should pay attention to etiquette and moral ethics in whatever we do.

3.2 The Episode in which Bisma as the War Commander

The king Mangaspati’s son, Sang Seta, was killed as the war commander for Pandawa. The commanders Lima and Krishna discussed who would be appointed the commander. Then it was decided to appoint Dasta Jaman the war commander. In HPL that incident can be seen from the following quotation.

Emperor Darmawangsa and Lord Krishna requested that someone should be decided to replace Sang Seta as the war commander. Then Jaman was decided to replace him as the war commander, for which he was requested to change clothes completed with gold (HPL, p. 104).

In KBY it is described in the following couplets.

“Hentikanlah tentang terangkatnya mayat putra-putra raja Wirata. Cerita akan lagi tentang permusyawararatan orang Pandawa yang membicarakan supaya Sang Drestadyumna menggantikan Sweta. Ia akan diangkat (KBY, XXX.5) (Stop talking about the removal of the corpses of Wirata’s sons. Start talking again about what was discussed by Pandawa that Sang Drestadyumna would replace Sweta).

The essence of the quotation above also contains the appointment of Dasta Jaman as the war commander. However, unlike in KBY it was narrated that the decision was made through a meeting, in HPL the appointment was not made through a meeting (magunem).

The following incident shows that the two parties showed war formation to each other. In HPL Lord Krishna and Emperor Darmawangsa showed the war strategy referred to as Baruda Bayu (HPL, p. 104), but in KBY it is referred to as Garuda Wyuha (KBY, XII.6), as can be seen from the following description.

“When the people of the two parties faced each other, Lord Krishna and Emperor Darmawangsa showed the war strategy referred to as ‘Garuda Bayu’ in which Arjuna as the beak, Emperor Derpa as the war commander, Sang Bima as the left wing, Seta Jaman as the right wing, Emperor Darmawangsa and the Pandawa kings became the body, and Sang Setyaki became the tail.

After Begawan Bisma watched the war formation formed by Pandawa, he also did the same thing. Emperor Salya became the beak, Patih Sengkuni became the war commander, Begawan Bisma became the right wing, and Dangyang Drono became the left wing. Emperor Duryodana and all the kings Korawa became the body, and Sang Darseta became the tail. Then...” (HPL, p. 104).

In KBY it can be described in the following couplets.

“... after the time came, Sang Drestadyumna left. He left for the place where a meeting was held to discuss everything related to the endangering and terrifying war strategies. However, the war strategy which was difficult to be defeated by the enemies was Garudawyuha” (KBY, XII.6).

“Drupada was the head, and Arjuna was the beak. The kings led by Yudistira were the back. Drestadyumna and his soldiers became the right wing, and Bima, who was well-known for being brave and strong, became the left wing. Satyaki became the tail” (KBY, XII.7).

“This war strategy was imitated by King Suyodana. Sakuni became the bird’s head, Salya became the beak. Bisma became the left wing and Drono became the right wing. Suyodana became the back, and Dursuana was at the back” (HPL, p. 104)

In this case, the HPL adapter shifted the actors of the incident. From the context which one is right and which one is wrong, the writer tends to justify that the incident described in
KBY is right. The justification can be supported with an argument that Krisna, as the witness, and Emperor Darmawangsa, as the king of Pandawa, had been fully responsible to Drestayumana for doing everything in order to stand up to the enemy. Within certain limitations of time, Krisna and Darmawangsa only supervised. As the kings used as the models, it was impossible for them to interfere with the others’ affairs.

The other thing which importantly needs to be paid attention to is the shift of the name of the character imitating the war strategy implemented by Pandawa. In HPL it is mentioned that Emperor Salya imitated the war formation adopted by Pandawa (HPL, p. 104), but in KBY it is stated that Emperor Suyodana did (KBY, XII.8). Such a shift affected the war formation made by Korawa. In HPI Sengkuni became the mouth whereas in KBY it is mentioned that he became the head. In HPL it was mentioned that Darseta became the tail. Further research needs to be conducted to investigate whether Darseta was wrongly adapted or wrongly written.

The next incident is the tremendous war involving Pandawa and Korawa. The anger shown by Krisna was described to resemble the anger shown by God Kala (HPL, p. 105) who destroyed the universe, and this is in accordance with what is narrated in KBY (XII.11). It was also narrated that Bisma killed many people from the Pandawa kingdom. One of those who ran and was killed by Kala Serenggi was Irawan, Arjuna’s son, as narrated in the following quotation.

The weapon kept coming, Rajuna could not say anything when he saw that many Pandawa kings were killed. Sang Irawan, his son from his marriage to Dewi Partalupi was also killed by a giant named Kala Serenggi. After Lord Krisna saw that Irawan had been dead, Lord Krisna descended bringing his weapon referred to as cakra. It was rotated and shining to expel Begawan Bisma (HPL, p. 106).

What was described above was clearly adopted from one source although many changes had been made with respect to the name of character. In HPL Tartalupi was used but in KBY Ulupuy was used. The following quotation proves that.

“At that time Arjuna seemed to be unhappy and disappointed, after he saw the kings were killed in their carriages. There was Irawan, the Arjuna’s son, whose mother was Dewi Ulupuy, who was killed by Serenggi in a battle, a superior giant (KBY, XII.17).

Lord Krisna with his supernatural cakra intended to oppose Bisma’s attitude; however, Arjuna avoided him from doing that. The question is why Rajuna avoided Lord Krisna from opposing Bisma’s attitude, although nobody could defeat him. That incident was mentioned in HPL (p. 106) and in KBY (XII.19). However, in HPL the weapon (cakra) was supposed to resemble a beautiful girl. In KBY such a simile was not used. It was possible that it was added by the adapter to make the story more interesting and to keep serenity. However, the HPL adapter added something which was not mentioned in the source text, indicating that he was creative.

Finally, the answer to the question mentioned above can be clearly found both in HPL and KBY. In HPL it was mentioned that it was useless for Sri Krisna to release his cakra to kill Bisma, as he would not be killed by any man. Then it is stated that:

Rajuna said: “Do not try to fight against Bisma as he would never be killed by any man, but he could be killed by a woman” (HPL, p. 106).

The following quotation from KBY shows a difference as can be compared from the following part.

…, then Arjuna did not waste any time; he immediately descended and held Krisna’s hands. He avoided Krisna from the attempt made to kill the great Priest. Therefore, he did not move and failed in his attempt to throw his cakra to the great Priest”. (KBY, p. 20).

That answer could not be found in KBY. The reason is that the adapter had ever read another story, which was then inserted in HPL, causing the story more complete to lead the reader to the further incident. The next incident was that Darmawangsa requested Srikandi to face Bisma (HPL, p. 106). However, the word “being requested by Darmawangsa” was not written in KBY. The similarity which could be found was that Bisma became powerless when he saw Srikandi; he wove his hands to king Yudistira to imply that he would die (HPL, p. 106; KBY, XII.3). This was in accordance with the beginning of the war that his death would depend on Emperor Darmawangsa. This can be proved from the following quotation.

“… Begawan Bisma wove his hands to Emperor Darmawangsa, who knew that Begawan Bisma would die as had been stated in the beginning of the war that his death would depend on Emperor Darmawangsa” (HPL, p. 106).

“He only wove his hands to king Yudistira and his eyes implied that there would be something. Yudistira understood what was meant by Krisna who was well-known that the Priest would submit his life to him. Since the beginning of the war he had submitted his life to the kings of Pandawa. It was said that he would be killed by Srikandi with Arjuna’s assistance” (KBY, XIII.2).

Finally, Srikandi shot at Bisma with his bow and arrow and Arjuna did too (HPL, pp. 106—107); HBY, XIII.3—4), causing Bisma to fall down and his body to be destroyed. Pandawa and Korawa respected and cried for him. However, Bisma still stood with his bludgeon as he had not been satisfied with his involvement in the war (HPL, p. 107; KBY, XIII.7). In KBY it was more firmly stated that Bisma would be ready to
replace Yudistira if he still respected Bisma. He said: “... he gave a sign to Yudistira that he would replace him if they all respected Bisma” (KBY, XIII.7).

What was said by Bisma could not be found in HPL, where it was only mentioned that he ran around carrying his bludgeon as he had not been satisfied with his involvement in the war (HPL, p. 107). The two parties offered things in accordance with what had been requested by Bisma; however, Korawa were disappointed as what they had offered was not accepted by Bisma. In this relation, what is important to be paid attention to is the bed used by Bisma at Tegal Kuru which was offered by Pandawa and Korawa. In HPL, the mat offered by Arjuna was referred to as tarkas (in Persian and Hindi it is referred to as “tarkash” or the English word for it is quiver. It is stated as follows.

Bisma asked Emperor Duryudana for a mat. Therefore, the emperor gave him a golden mat. However, Bisma was not interested in the mat. As a result, Bisma asked Arjuna for a mat, which was then offered; the mat which was offered was the arrow tarkas (HPL, p. 107).

In KBY the word Tarkas was not found but the word Saratalpa was, as stated in KBY as follows:

“Ita waktu itu kedua Padjava dan segenap keluarga Korawa damai di medan perang. Karena Bisma tidak mau menggunakan tempat tidur dari rumput, Arjuna menggantikannya dengan anak panah.” (At that time the two parties, Pandawa and Korawa family, were on good terms in the (Saratalpa) ...”

It seems that semantically the word Saratalpa is not different from the word Tarkas. The word Saratalpa or Sarayana Saratela means ‘bed/a thing used for storing arrows’ (Zoetmulder, 1997: 1040), and the word Tarkas means ‘tube’ for storing arrows (Tim Penyusun Kamus, 1993: 1012). The shift made by the adapter for the word Saratalpa (KBY) to the word Tarkas (in HPL) could possibly result from the adjustment to the convention used in the Malay story.

Finally, what is important is the Arjuna’s arrow used to secrete water which was then offered to Bisma. In HPL, the Arjuna’s arrow was referred to as Tersengkala, which was not found in KBY. It is narrated that:

Bisma asked Emperor Duryudana for water. Therefore, he offered water using a gold cup with gems of all kinds. Bisma was not interested in it so Arjuna offered his arrow referred to as Tersengkala (HPL, p. 108).

It seems that this part was directly transformed from KBY as stated in this couplet. “... dengan segera datanglah Arjuna untuk memberikan air yang murni, karena air itu didapat dengan jalan (menembakan panahnya) ke tanah”

(KBY, XIII.9). (“... Arjuna came immediately to offer pure water which was obtained by shooting his arrow at the earth).

That episode was closed with the incident that Pandawa Lima (Five Pandawas) carried Bisma to a place located under a banyan tree (HPL, p. 108; KBY, XIII.11).

3.3 The Initial and Final Parts of HPL Which Were Not Found in KBY

HPL mainly consists of several episodes; they are the episode in which it is narrated that Darmawangsa gambled with Duryudana (pp. 1—17), the episode in which it is narrated that the Bimanyu’s relation with Siti Sundari came to an end when the war involving Gatotgaca—Baladewa took place (pp. 19—52), the episode in which it is narrated that Pandawa returned from Mercunegara and Karna was not successful in carrying the Pandawa’s wife and children (pp. 52—60), the episode in which it is narrated that Bimanyu was married to Dewi Utari (pp. 60—64), and the episode in which it is narrated that king Wurgadewa waged war against Pandawa and Dewi Anggarmayang and Tunjung Tutur ascended to heaven (pp. 64—86).

The final part consists of several episodes as well. They are the episode in which it is narrated Sengkuni was in Indraguna forest where he was finally killed by Sadewa (pp. 163—180), the episode in which it is narrated that Pandawa returned to Mertawangsa (pp. 180—185), the episode in which it is narrated that Rajuna was possessed by the Duryudana’s soul (pp. 186—208), the episode in which the death of Arjuna and the situation when Pandawa played in the Mahadra sea is narrated (pp. 208—238), and the episode in which it is narrated that Parikasthi was appointed king and Pandawa ascended to heaven (pp. 239—249). Such a narration shows that there had been conversions of incidents. It is highly difficult to determine the impact which can be found in HPL. However, it seems that this description is similar to the description of the text stored at Royal Asiatic Society No. 2 (bdk. Fang, 1975:61—62). In this description there were also conversions of incidents. The revival of Sengkuni and the appearance of the character Rajuna Sasrabahu illustrate this. Apart from that, the names of the characters were modified. The character Arjuna was modified into Rajuna and the character Kumba was modified into Tirirah, the character Nakula was modified into Sakula, and the character Aswatama was modified into Bambah Tutur.

III. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the result of analysis above, it can be concluded that HPL was transformed from KBY. As a transformational literary work, HPL cannot be underestimated. The reason is that the adapter creatively made adjustments based on his way of thinking and cultural convention. In spite of the adjustments, the adapter was able to maintain the intactness of the source text. The adapter was able to make minor adjustments, expansions, conversions, modifications, and excerpts automatically and critically. Thus, HPL, as a text, has its own quality and needs to be further investigated in accordance with its existence and specialty.
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