

Negations of the Laweyan Batik Community during the Pajang and Mataram Period

Hieronymus Purwanta, Victor Novianto

¹Universitas Sebelas Maret, ✉hpurwanta@staff.uns.ac.id

²Universitas PGRI Yogyakarta

Article history

Received : 2024-11-29

Accepted : 2026-04-18

Published : 2026-04-23

Keywords

Laweyan;

Batik industry;

Kauman;

Symbolic negation;

Ki Ageng Henis.

Abstract: This study examines the negation of the Laweyan batik community during the Pajang and Mataram periods. It addresses two questions: why the Laweyan batik industry was negated and how such negation was expressed. The research employs the historical method, including source collection, source criticism, interpretation, and historiography, and uses Ernst E. Boesch's symbolic action approach to analyze the intentions, procedures, goals, and situational context of historical actors. The findings show that the negation of the Laweyan batik community was closely related to the inability of Laweyan batik entrepreneurs to maintain harmonious relations with political authorities after the era of Ki Ageng Henis. This negation appeared in two main forms. First, it was expressed in folklore derived from traditional historiography, which portrayed Laweyan as socially improper, unlucky, and morally suspect. Second, it was reflected in rulers' policies, particularly the tomb politics surrounding Ki Ageng Henis in Kotagede and the promotion of Kauman batik as a palace-centered alternative. These policies symbolically distanced royal authority from the commercial batik tradition associated with Laweyan. This study argues that the negation of Laweyan was not merely cultural prejudice, but also a political and symbolic strategy to preserve aristocratic identity and authority. It contributes to the socio-cultural history of batik by showing how power, memory, and symbolism shaped the historical marginalization of a local craft community.

Abstrak: Kajian ini menganalisis penegasian terhadap komunitas batik Laweyan pada masa Pajang dan Mataram. Penelitian ini menjawab dua pertanyaan, yaitu mengapa industri batik Laweyan mengalami penegasian dan bagaimana bentuk-bentuk penegasian tersebut direpresentasikan. Penelitian menggunakan metode sejarah yang meliputi pengumpulan sumber, kritik sumber, interpretasi, dan historiografi. Analisis dilakukan dengan pendekatan tindakan simbolik Ernst E. Boesch untuk mengkaji intensi, prosedur, tujuan, dan keterlekatan situasional para aktor sejarah. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa penegasian terhadap komunitas batik Laweyan berkaitan erat dengan ketidakmampuan para pengusaha batik Laweyan menjalin hubungan harmonis dengan penguasa setelah masa Ki Ageng Henis. Penegasian tersebut hadir dalam dua bentuk utama. Pertama, melalui folklor yang bersumber dari historiografi tradisional dan menggambarkan Laweyan sebagai ruang sosial yang buruk, sial, dan tidak ideal. Kedua, melalui kebijakan penguasa, terutama politik makam terhadap Ki Ageng Henis di Kotagede dan pengembangan batik Kauman sebagai alternatif yang berorientasi istana. Kebijakan-kebijakan tersebut menjadi strategi simbolik untuk mengambil jarak dari tradisi batik komersial yang berkembang di Laweyan. Kajian ini menegaskan bahwa penegasian terhadap Laweyan bukan semata-mata prasangka kultural, melainkan juga strategi politik dan simbolik untuk menjaga identitas serta otoritas aristokrat. Studi ini berkontribusi pada sejarah sosial-budaya batik dengan menunjukkan bagaimana kuasa, memori, dan simbolisme membentuk marginalisasi historis terhadap komunitas perajin lokal.

INTRODUCTION

There have been many studies of the Laweyan Batik community, both from historical, architectural, and tourist perspectives. From a historical perspective, Laweyan has, among other things, created a socio-economic historical narrative. Soedarmono's (2006a) study attempted to map the economic activities of the Laweyan



Available online at
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/paramita>

community at the beginning of its emergence. Based on the Laweyan Chronicle by Mloyodipuro, the research aims to explain the supporting system of Laweyan as a clothing market, including the cultivation of cotton plants, spinning yarn, *gedhog* weaving, and *mori* cloth from Pedan to Bandar Kabanaran. Various clothing industries, from upstream to downstream, are dominated by women, leading to social stratification and the title "mbok mas," which applies only in Laweyan (Wahyono et al., 2014, pp. 19-20). From this point of view, Ki Ageng Henis, who developed batik into one of the merchandise at Laweyan Market, is an innovation that is no less unique. Batik is a craft specifically for women, and the results benefit the family because each motif has a specific meaning within the social class. Therefore, Ki Ageng Henis's ability to master batik skills and his efforts to make batik into an economic commodity were unique. This mixture of uniqueness made Laweyan develop into a strange society, like a foreign country, amid the aristocratic Javanese society of the inland.

Strange things are also found in the Laweyan community's residential architecture, especially among batik craft industry owners, also known as batik traders. Hastuti's study (2011) explains that, in general, Javanese houses are divided into three rooms, namely *senthong*, *dalem*, and *emperan*. The *senthong* section is divided into right, middle, and left *senthongs*. The development was carried out by adding a *pendapa* at the front, a *pringgitan* at the former overhang, a *gandok* around the main house (left, right, and back sides), and a small open space and kitchen at the back. Houses in Javanese society not only serve as places to live but also reflect the owner's social status. The more complete the room is, the higher the owner's nobility.

As part of Javanese society, Laweyan batik traders still adhere to the main patterns of Javanese house architecture. Changes occurred in the middle *senthong*, which in the Laweyan community was no longer used to store rice but was converted into a *krobongan* with accessories that showed respect for Dewi Sri (Hastuti, 2011, p. 157). Changes in function are also found in the *gandok*, which has been used as an additional building for generations. In the Laweyan community, *gandok* is the center of batik production and the storage of raw materials (Cahyono, 2015).

The study of the Laweyan batik village from a tourism perspective is based on the Decree of the Mayor of Surakarta Number 646/116/1/1997, which designated *Langgar Laweyan*, *Langgar Merdeka*, *Langgar Makmur*, Ki Ageng Henis tomb, Former

Laweyan Market, and Former Bandar Kabanaran as cultural heritage buildings. This decision was continued in 2004, when Laweyan was designated a cultural tourism area. Research by Anis and Kaffah (2020) found that Laweyan has capabilities in tourist attractions, accessibility, and amenities. On the other hand, supporting services still need additional attention. Due to the many tourists, the Laweyan community even developed new products, such as handicrafts, household items, wooden batik, and glass batik (Basworo & Sujadi, 2018).

One topic of study that needs to be researched is the negative response to the development of the Laweyan batik craft industry. Soedarmono (2006b) notes that several folk tales originating in Surakarta deny the existence of the Laweyan community. This phenomenon is interesting to explore. Although the batik craft industry has a positive economic influence, Laweyan culture is seen as socially unfavorable. Even more interesting, almost all of the developed folk tales are based on stories found in traditional historiography, namely the *Babad Tanah Jawi* and the *Babad Sala*.

Spurred by Soedarmono's research, this study aims to explore the historical genetics of the negation of the Laweyan Batik community. The birth of the batik craft industry in Laweyan was closely related to Ki Ageng Henis's pioneering work. As an innovator, Ki Ageng Henis should receive the most substantial criticism. However, no folklore negates his pioneering work. Various studies rank him among successful Islamic preachers (Rusliana et al., 2021; Shodiq, 2017).

One of the reasons for the absence of folklore about Ki Ageng Henis is his position as the biological father of Ki Ageng Pemanahan and the grandfather of Panembahan Senapati from the Mataram Sultanate in Kotagede (Purwanta & Pelu, 2024). Because of his status as an upper-class person, the negation of Ki Ageng Henis can only be found in the thoughts and actions of the ruler. In this study, the analysis of the Ki Ageng Henis negation focuses on the politics of the tomb and the development of the Kauman batik center.

Following the title of this article, this study asks two research questions, namely: (1) Why is there a negation of the Laweyan batik craft industry? (2) What are the various types of negation aimed at the Laweyan batik community?

METHOD

This study uses historical methods (Gottschalk, 1986; Wasino & Hartatik, 2018). Data collection was conducted by reviewing documents from both

primary and secondary sources. The obstacle to collecting sources is that there are very few written policies from the Pajang, Mataram Kotagede, Surakarta, and Yogyakarta Sultanate periods. For example, there needs to be a document regarding the policy for building tombstones of figures buried in the Tajug ward of the Kotagede imperial tomb. Therefore, the placement of the tombstones of these figures was interpreted as the official policy of the reigning ruler at that time, with all its considerations and interests.

Data analysis was carried out using the symbolic action approach developed by Ernst E. Boesch. Symbolic actions have three main concepts as components. The first is that individual actions always refer to the culture in which they live. From this point of view, culture is a value system that contains the goals, organization, and ways to achieve each individual's goals (Swidler, 1986). Therefore, the symbolic actions of individuals and groups can only be understood in terms of the cultures that shape them.

The second concept is culture as a context for action. Borrowing Lewin's view of *Lebensraum* (living space), Boesch (1991) explains that culture is a field of action. From this point of view, culture provides both limitations and opportunities for action. Culture is a demarcation line differentiating "us" from "others." However, the demarcation line is not rigid, static, and objective. The boundary is dynamic and can be changed (Bursztyka, 2022). Culture also allows individuals to develop and discover things they did not know before. Culture as a context provides ample space for individuals to discover possibilities for action (Boesch, 1991, p. 32).

The third concept is action aimed at realizing desired conditions in the future (Boesch, 2001). Every deliberate action is an attempt to bring about a desired result. From this point of view, every action will bring complex results and consequences for subsequent actions. Mapping actions is increasingly difficult because individuals have different goals (Smyth et al., 2023). Therefore, Boesch (2001) reminds us that goals are polyvalent, and one action may be directed at achieving several of them.

Boesch (1991) compiled four elements from the three basic concepts that form symbolic actions: intention, procedure, goal achievement, and situational embeddedness. Intention is the desire to act to achieve a goal. Intention makes a person develop self-regulation to focus on achieving goals (Webb & Sheeran, 2007). Additionally, intentions allow people to enjoy every stage of the process toward achieving goals (Boesch, 1991, p. 46).

The second element is the process, namely, various instrumental actions required to achieve goals. Instrumental actions are concrete steps that must be taken and gradually lead to attaining the goal. Therefore, many experts consider instrumental actions to be goal-dependent (Thraillkill & Bouton, 2015). According to Max Weber's view of rationality in social action, process elements are actions based on the means available and the goals to be achieved (Ringer, 1997).

The third element is achieving goals as the main focus of action. As the main focus, goals are very valuable and meaningful. Because goals are polyvalent, an action can have a temporary negative aim, with a higher goal turning into a positive one (Boesch, 1991, p. 46). This means that someone can take personally detrimental action, but in the future, the loss serves a happy purpose.

The fourth element is situational embeddedness, namely, external factors such as the physical and social environment that provide the context for the action. Materiality, social dynamics, and temporality factors are carefully taken into account by action makers (Brielmaier & Friesl, 2023) so that these situational factors and the actions taken cannot be separated.

THE BACKGROUND OF NEGATION

Laweyan is the name of a village upstream of Bengawan Solo, which, during the Majapahit era, was administratively part of the Pengging Duchy. Laweyan comes from the word "lawe" in Javanese, which means thread, and the suffix "an" indicates a place. From this point of view, Laweyan was originally a place where traders bought yarn. Cotton from Java is of the best quality, so Laweyan is known to produce fine and strong yarn (Raffles, 1817). In subsequent periods, Laweyan was also known as a cloth market, especially lurik and mori. Traders shop for yarn and fabric through the Kabanaran River port near Laweyan Market.

A significant development occurred when Ki Ageng Henis came and settled north of Laweyan Market. The batik skills he acquired from his six older sisters encouraged Ki Ageng Henis to try his luck by making batik cloth as merchandise. Ki Ageng Henis's batik cloth is very popular with traders, so his business has grown quickly into a batik craft industry with several workers. This success made Ki Ageng Henis trusted as the village head when the old village head, Ki Beluk, died. Ki Ageng Henis' power increased when Sultan Pajang, who once studied with his father Ki Ageng Selo, gave Laweyan status as a *perdikan* (independent village)

(Mirsa, 2021; Widayati et al., 2021), an area exempt from the obligation to pay taxes. This status means Ki Ageng Henis earns income from the batik craft industry and trades taxes at Laweyan Market and Kabanaran dealer customs.

Ki Ageng Henis' steps to develop the batik craft industry helped break various old traditions. One result of this breakthrough is that small communities can buy and wear batik. For generations, the craft of batik has been synonymous with aristocrats, both royal blood and position (Rouffaer & Juynboll, 1899). In line with this, the study by Maziyah et al. (2016) found that in Ancient Mataram, batik cloth was used as a gift for regional officials rather than for trade. Hall's (1996, p. 89) research on textiles in Southeast Asia also found that Sultan Agung used batik to indicate and, at the same time, differentiate the social and political positions of his officials. From this perspective, Ki Ageng Henis' actions in developing batik as an economic commodity destroyed the nobility's monopoly on producing and consuming batik cloth. Therefore, it would be a natural response if, in the future, the Surakarta and Yogyakarta Sultanate palaces issued a ban on the general public from wearing specific batik patterns (Selamet, 2018). The ban is more of an effort to minimize the impact of the damage caused by Ki Ageng Henis' actions in making batik an economic commodity.

In 1570, Ki Ageng Henis died and was buried in the Laweyan public cemetery. Not a single family member continued Ki Ageng Henis' business. Ki Ageng Henis's sons and grandson, and Ki Ageng Sela's extended family, moved to the Mentaok forest to build the Duchy of Mataram, including Nyi Ageng Henis. This situation makes the employees of the batik craft industry the legal heirs of Ki Ageng Henis' entrepreneurial spirit and batik skills. They emerged as a new class in Laweyan society known as batik entrepreneurs. Even the "title" used by Ki Ageng Henis' grandson, namely Mas Ngabei Loring Pasar, is also preserved by being used as a title for batik merchants: Mbok Mas for the women of the batik merchant, Mas Nganten for her husband, Mas Rara for the daughter, and Mas for the son (Wahyono et al., 2014, pp. 19-20).

One of Ki Ageng Henis's skills that could not be inherited was his ability to build harmonious relationships with those in power. As a businessman, he became a key supporter of the Pajang Sultanate. Laweyan's position as a fiefdom and Kabanaran as the main gateway to the capital are evidence that the batik industry developed by Ki Ageng Henis received the patronage of Sultan Pa-

jang Hadiwijaya. Three members of his family were even appointed as high-ranking officials in the sultanate: Pemanahan (son), Penjawi (adopted son), and Juru Martani (nephew) (Purwanta & Novianto, 2024).

The inability of entrepreneurs to build harmonious relationships with those in power meant that the Laweya batik craft industry did not receive protection from the rulers. The ruler and his aristocracy might take steps to distance themselves and place the batik merchants among the others. From this point of view, the various forms of developed folklore represent a line of demarcation between supporters of religious culture and the community supporting the batik craft industry in Laweyan. Rulers also used the same pattern during the Mataram Kotagede period, the Surakarta and the Yogyakarta Sultanate period. They produce tomb politics and the development of Kauman batik as a means of separating oneself from others.

FOLKLORE

In this research, the negation of the Laweyan batik community was divided into two groups, namely folklore and the ruler's policies. The folklore is developed based on traditional historiographies, such as the Babad Tanah Jawi, Babad Sala, and Serat Witaradya, with additions at the end. The folk tales portray Laweyan as a place whose residents do not know manners and bring bad luck and evil. For example, there is folklore about Raden Pabelan. Babad Tanah Jawi (Winter Sr., 2022) explains that Raden Pabelan grew up to be a young womanizer who liked teasing women, both girls and married women. This lousy behavior embarrassed his family, so his father, Tumenggung Mayang, asked Prince Purbaya to marry a girl and stop his mischief. The request was rejected. Therefore, Tumenggung Mayang tried to trap Raden Pabelan by offering him the chance to seduce the Sultan of Pajang's daughter, Sekar Kedhaton. The goal is to have his son caught by palace guards and sentenced to death. The effort was successful, and Raden Pabelan made love for seven days and seven nights. On the eighth night, he was reported to the Sultan and executed. The execution took place by being intercepted on his way out of the Palace and stabbed by Pajang soldiers under the leadership of Wirakerti and Suratanu. It was depicted that Raden Pabelan's wounds covered his entire body, and his body was thrown into the Laweyan River. The unexpected impact was that Sultan Pajang also punished Raden Pabelan's parents, Tumenggung Mayang, by exiling him to Semarang (Winter Sr., 2022, p. 59).

The story of Raden Pabelan was further developed in other traditional historiography, namely Babad Sala. In the chronicle, it is said that Raden Pabelan's body was stuck in Sangkrah hamlet, which is a waste stop from upstream of Bengawan Solo. The body was then buried west of Sala village, close to Kedung Lumbu. The burial area is known as Bathangan village because Raden Pabelan's body was already a carcass (Javanese: *bathang*) when buried (Sayid, 2001, p. 20). The village has now been turned into the Beteng Trade Center (BTC) complex, and Raden Pabelan's tomb has not been moved.

Stories from traditional historiographies then developed into folk tales with various versions. One of them is said to have been that after hearing that soldiers had killed Raden Pabelan on his father's orders, Sekar Kedhaton then left the Palace and committed suicide by throwing himself into a well near the Palace. The tragic love story between Raden Pabelan and Sekar Kedhaton became folklore, which was negated when the body was dumped in the Laweyan River. The corpse of Raden Pabelan in Laweyan River was seen as making Laweyan a frightening land that would bring bad luck to its residents.

Another folk tale used to discredit the Laweyan village is the story of Raden Ayu Lembah. The tale of Raden Ayu Lembah was also written in accordance with the traditional historiography of the Babad Tanah Jawi. It is said that Amangkurat II took the initiative to marry the crown prince to the daughter of his younger sibling, Prince Puger, named Raden Ayu Lembah. Without daring to refuse, Prince Puger's family accepted the marriage. Their household was not harmonious because the crown prince was arrogant, quickly offended, and loved his two concubines more. Even then, the concubine's wife was appointed as the official wife, which angered Raden Ayu Lembah and led her to return to her parents' house.

At Prince Puger's house, Raden Ayu Lembah remained quiet out of fear of being blamed by the authorities. In this uncertain situation, Raden Sukra, who has a grudge against the crown prince, enters the internal conflict at Raden Ayu Lembah. He tried to take advantage of Raden Ayu Lembah's condition as revenge. Every day, Raden Sukra sends love poetry via Nyai Tambakbaya. The crown prince heard of Raden Ayu Lembah's closeness to Raden Sukra, so he sent a letter to Prince Puger. In the letter, the crown prince said that Raden Ayu Lembah, his wife, had betrayed him, had a relationship with Raden Sukra, exchanged batik cloth, and



Figure 1. Watercolor painting about the punishment of Raden Ayu Lembah and Raden Sukra. (Source: Digital Collection Leiden University)

so on (Winter Sr., 2022, p. 178).

Prince Puger was furious and asked his two sons to execute their sister. Raden Ayu Lembah died by being strangled with a batik cloth, and Nyai Tambakbaya was also killed. Raden Ayu Lembah's body was buried in Banyusumurup, Imogiri, Bantul (Kusumo, 2022). When Amangkurat II died, the nobility rejected the crown prince, Amangkurat III. With the nobles' support, Prince Puger then proclaimed himself Sunan Pakubuwana I (Nurhajarini et al., 1999, p. 68). Meanwhile, Amangkurat III, after his troops suffered frequent defeats, surrendered and was exiled by the VOC to Sri Lanka, where he died in 1734.

Stories from traditional historiography developed into folklore with various versions. One version was adapted into the drama Kethoprak, titled Semboja Kapugeran, which tells the story of the romance between Raden Ayu Lembah and Raden Sukra. The drama closed with the passing of the *Lawe* law, namely, tying and hanging Raden Ayu Lembah with threads until she died. Another folklore version states that the *Lawe* law was implemented in Laweyan village (Soedarmono, 2006b, p. 144). From this viewpoint, the *Lawe* law negates the Laweyan batik community.

The story of Raden Ayu Lembah also inspired a painter who, around 1890, painted it in watercolors. In the painting above, it is described that Sultan Amangkurat III (pictured above left) ordered Prince Puger to execute his beloved daughter Raden Ayu Lembah (pictured below right). Sultan Amangkurat III also ordered Raden Sukra to be executed (bottom middle image). Even Raden Ayu Lembah's servants did not escape the death penalty. They were being put in a tiger cage while naked (pictured below left).

Unlike the two previous stories, the Bahu Laweyan folklore is based on the *Serat Witaradya*, an imaginary story written by Ronggowarsito. It is said that the king of Pengging, Sri Ajipamasa, was sad. His daughter, Dewi Citrasari, was in pain to the point of being unable to speak. Based on Gandarwaraja's instructions, the medicine is the Trikaya gemstone, which is chewed by a person with a blackish-red tongue with a white tip. Kaskaya, Nusarukimi's son, was a young man with these characteristics, so he immediately swallowed the Trikaya gemstone and threw it at Dewi Citrasari. A giant who claimed evil intentions appeared from her body during the healing process. The giant said that he would kill anyone who approached Dewi Citrasari. After recovering, Dewi Citrasari married Kaskaya. A few days later, the king of Pengging, Sri Ajipamasa, stated that he had received instructions that 68 women had the same fate as his daughter and would bring misfortune to anyone who approached them (Putra & Handriyotopo, 2022). These women are called bahu laweyan.

The story from *Serat Witaradya* developed into a form of negation that all women descended from the Laweyan village will suffer men who approach them. As a result, many batik merchant residents marry their children to fellow Laweyan residents (Prakoso & Nadzib, 2022).

Various folktales that negate the Laweyan batik community cannot be said to represent the official position of the Mataram ruler, whether when the capital was still in Kotagede, Kerta, Plered, Kartasura, or Surakarta and Yogyakarta. Folklore better represents the agrarian people's worldview, which dishonors the trader profession, such as in the Laweyan Batik community.

THE TOMB POLITICS

At least two policies can be adopted as the official policy towards the Laweyan batik village: the abandonment of Ki Ageng Henis's tomb and the development of batik in Kauman village. The rulers of Mataram mostly pursued tomb politics through the construction of the capital, Kotagede. The Kotagede tomb was built during the reign of Panembahan Senapati.

The Mataram rulers implemented tomb politics because tombs were essential to Javanese culture. On the one hand, tombs are seen as a form of respect for ancestors as origins (Grave, 2018). From this viewpoint, without ancestors, no children and grandchildren would exist. Therefore, the construction of tombs is a recognition of the vital role of ancestors for their descendants. On the other hand,



Figure 2. Mataram imperial tomb in Kotagede Yogyakarta. This picture taken from Google Earth at 30 March 2024.

tombs also represent the success of children and grandchildren. This success was manifested in the form of building a beautiful tomb.

The high status of tombs in Javanese culture has led to the development of various terms for tombs, such as *Astana*, *Pasareyan*, and *Petilasan*. Some tombs use the name "*Astana*," which reflects the belief that the site was a palace or residence of the ancestors. On the other hand, many tombs use the term *pasareyan* to refer to the area as the ancestral resting place (Widyastuti, 2016). Different from the two initial terms, *petilasan* is a place where a figure does or experiences something special (Yatmin, 2017). Even though they are not dead human, the tombstones are built as a form of respect for deceased figures.

One of the tombs of great political importance is the Mataram imperial tomb, now known as the *Astana Makam Raja Raja Mataram* Kotagede. The tomb was built by Panembahan Senapati in 1589 and consists of three levels, namely the Prabayaksa, Witana, and Tajug wards (Soekiman, 1993). The leveling of the tomb is intended to show the role of the buried figures in the existence and development of the Mataram Sultanate. Prabayaksa is derived from two Javanese root words: *Prabu* and *Yaksa*. *Prabu* is king, while *Yaksa* means giant or big, so Prabayaksa means magnificent kings. From this point of view, the Prabayaksa ward is intended as a tomb for kings who had a vital role in developing the Mataram Sultanate.

The Prabayaksa ward is the lowest level with *joglo* architecture. The Mataram rulers were buried in this area. Nurhadi and Armeini (1978, p. 6) explain that in the Prabayaksa ward, there are 64 tombstones, and the Surakarta Sultanate manages them. Meanwhile, in the DIY Governor's Decree No. 26 of 2021 concerning the Mataram Kotagede Royal Tombs as cultural heritage, it is stated that there are 72 tombstones in the Prabayaksa ward (Hamengku_Buwono_X, 2021). This difference occurred because figures were added for the Prabayaksa ward for the period from 1978 to 2021.

In the Prabayaksa ward, two tombstones are fascinating to observe from the perspective of symbolic actions and are part of the tomb politics of the Panembahan Senapati. First is the tombstone of Ki Ageng Wanabaya from Mangir; half of it is inside, and the other half is outside the building. In Panembahan Senapati's view, the placement of the tombstone can be interpreted as indicating that Ki Ageng Wanabaya is a son-in-law, since he is the husband of his daughter, Pembayun. Conversely, he is also an enemy because he refuses to submit to Mataram. Ki Ageng Wanabaya's resistance to Mataram became legendary folklore and inspired various arts, such as Kethoprak performing arts and literature (Guntari, 2013; Macaryus, 2017).

The second tombstone is labeled "Hadiwijaya," the Sultan of Pajang. From the perspective of a symbolic act, the construction of the tombstone shows that Panembahan Senapati is respectful to Sultan Hadiwijaya, his adoptive father. The tombstone is a form of ennoblement because moving the Sultan Hadiwijaya's skeleton is impossible. Sultan Hadiwijaya already made a testament that he wanted to be buried in the tomb of his esoteric teacher, Ki Ageng Butuh, in present-day Sragen Regency (Winter Sr., 2022, p. 62).

The second level is the Witana ward, an abbreviation of Javanese words *wiwan* and *ana* (the origin of existence) (Kusuma & Subroto, 2024). Witana ward is intended as a burial site for figures who played a significant role in laying the foundation of the Mataram Sultanate, from establishing the Mataram Princedom as part of the Pajang Sultanate to finally establishing the Mataram Sultanate (Riswinarno, 2018). In the ward, which has *limasan* architecture, there are the tombs of Ki Ageng Pemanahan and his wife, Ki Juru Martani, and the extended family of Ki Ageng Sela, who helped build the Mentaok forest into the Mataram Princedom. Panembahan Senapati, the empress, and Panembahan Seda Krapyak were also buried in the Witana ward.

The highest level is called the Tajug ward. Unlike the naming of the first two wards, the Tajug ward is named after the buildings with pointed roofs. Tajug architecture, developed in the 8th century, was used for sacred buildings (Dewi et al., 2019). When Islam developed in Indonesia, Tajug architecture was also used for sacred buildings such as *langgars* and mosques. From this point of view, the Tajug is used to bury figures whom the Mataram kings highly respected. Even Soekiman (1993) referred to the people buried in the Tajug ward as figures who perhaps only lived in fairy tales, to describe the high level of respect accorded them. The Tajug ward has three tombstones: Nyi Ageng Henis, the mother of Ki Ageng Pemanahan, Panembahan Jayaprana, and Ki Datuk Palembang.

Through the tomb he built, Panembahan Senapati wanted to show that he was a ruler who respected his ancestors. The Kotagede tomb is also a medium for the public to learn about the significant figures who built and raised Mataram. From this point of view, Ki Ageng Henis should be buried at the Tajug ward, next to the tomb of his wife, Nyi Ageng Henis. Allowing Ki Ageng Henis' tombstone to remain in Astana Laweyan cemetery can be understood as the Palace's official stance on Ki Ageng Henis' position within the cultural construct built by the Mataram Kingdom and its successors, the Surakarta and Yogyakarta Sultanates, and the Mangkunegaran and Pakualaman Princedoms. The tomb policy carried out by the Mataram rulers and their successors was a symbolic action with solid cultural reasons. Despite having blood ties and essential support for the Mataram rulers, Ki Ageng Henis was deemed unsuitable to serve as an important figure in the Mataram Sultanate. At least two cultural reasons support the decision of the Mataram authorities: Ki Ageng Henis's profession as a trader and the batik innovation that makes batik cloth an economic commodity.

Ki Ageng Henis is the son of Ki Ageng Sela, so he is responsible for fulfilling the "knight's *dharma*," namely, persevering in improving his powers and winning every battle. In Javanese upper-class society, each group must fulfill *swadharma*, or sacred duties, according to its status and occupation (Naryana et al., 2023). A ksatria has a different *dharma* from a Brahmin or a king. In the *kakawin Arjunawiwaha*, it is explained that the sacred duties of a knight are not objects that can be seen with the five senses, as is the general opinion in society. The goal of chivalry is to obtain honor and heroism, as well as the welfare and peace of society (Kanwa, 1978, pp. 24-27). *Swadharma* of chivalry is to win

every fight and protect the people (Ciptoprawiro, 1986, pp. 34-36). To win a battle, every knight must persevere in developing their powers and weapons, such as the characters Raden Umbulsari and Raja Sri Ajipamasa in *Serat Witaradya* (Ranggawarsita, 1979).

In the Mataram era, one of the warrior figures considered a role model was Panembahan Senapati, as described in *Serat Wedhatama*, written by KGPH Mangkunegara IV. The 15th stanza is explained as follows (Zahra, 2018, pp. 23-24):

*Nulada laku utama,
Tumrape wong Tanah jawi,
Wong agung ing Ngeksiganda,
Panembahan Senapati,
Kepati amarsudi,
Sudane hawa lan nepsu,
Pinepsu tapa brata,
Tanapi ing siyang ratri,
Amamangun karyenak tyasing sesama.*

Translation

Modeling key behavior,
for Javanese people,
great man from Ngeksiganda (Mataram),
Panembahan Senapati,
very diligent,
reduce lust,
by the way,
without getting tired
work for the peaceful life of others

From the perspective of Javanese aristocratic ethics, Ki Ageng Henis, the only son of Ki Ageng Sela, has the responsibility to continue the school of esotericism his father had founded. His journey from Sela, located in Grobogan Regency, to the Pengging area in the current Boyolali Regency can be accepted and even appreciated if it is undertaken in the context of penance and in search of a supernatural teacher, such as Raden Narayana, who studied with Begawan Padmanaba in wayang stories. Besides that, Ki Ageng Henis is also responsible for maintaining continuous care practices, such as fasting, reducing sleep and worldly desires, and working for the people's good.

Ki Ageng Henis' wanderings were seen as problematic when he lived north of Laweyan Market and chose to work as a trader. Drawing on Geertz's research (1960, pp. 230-231), the merchant profession is seen as inferior from a Javanese chivalric code perspective because it is preoccupied with personal gain and neglects the common good. Even traders are seen as having the heart to squeeze the

sweat of their neighbors and relatives for personal wealth, a Javanese attitude towards ill-gotten wealth, which is personified in the form of *tuyul* (Wirayuda, 2011). From this point of view, the way of life chosen by Ki Ageng Henis is seen not only as different but also as contrary to that pursued by the rulers of Mataram, who devoted their energy to the good of society.

The differences, and even the worldview conflicts, between the rulers of Mataram and Ki Ageng Henis cannot be reconciled. The Mataram rulers could have carried out tomb politics by moving them from Laweyan to Kotagede and placing them outside the three wards. However, this step was not taken because the Mataram rulers still respected Ki Ageng Henis as the father of Ki Ageng Pemanahan. Therefore, leaving Ki Ageng Henis's tomb in Laweyan is considered the wisest course to show that there is a difference in his way of life from that of his children and grandchildren.

KAUMAN BATIK

Batik is a cultural product that is exclusively for the nobility. For ordinary people, crafts such as weaving were developed. However, since Ki Ageng Henis used his batik skills to develop batik cloth as a trading commodity at Laweyan Market, that exclusivity ended. As the identity of the upper class in Javanese society, Batik cloth can no longer be the exclusive preserve of the aristocracy, because anyone with money can buy and wear it.

Ki Ageng Henis's innovation was a heavy blow to the Javanese nobility because their cultural identity was to be traded as a commodity. Moreover, because Western colonialism exerted political and economic pressure, the nobles' monopoly over batik was increasingly eroded as Arab and Chinese traders entered the trade. Therefore, the Surakarta and Yogyakarta Sultanate palaces sought the best solution by establishing craft centers, specifically producing batik exclusively for the royal family and nobles. This policy was realized by selecting several women from Kauman village to be trained in high-quality batik, focusing on the level of fineness and the accuracy of the pattern.

Various efforts have been made to restore batik as a noble identity, such as the creation of the Parangrusak batik motif, which may only be worn by the king (Chairiyani, 2014). From a symbolic action perspective, the development of Kauman batik represents the latest and final effort to create an exclusive palace identity and differentiate it from the commercialized Laweyan batik. The primary consideration when choosing the wives of palace

officials from Kauman village was their high religiosity. Kauman village was the residence of Reh Pengulon officials, collectively called Abdi Dalem Pamethakan. Reh Pengulon's highest position is Penghulu Tafsir Anom, who is responsible for the prosperity of the Great Mosque, the conduct of palace religious ceremonies, and the administration of spiritual justice. Penghulu Tafsir Anom is assisted by *ketib*, *modin*, *qoyyim*, and *marbot* to carry out his duties. Surakarta Sultanate has seven *ketib*: *Ketib Winong*, *Trayem*, *Sememen*, *Cendana*, *Arum*, *Imam*, and *Anom*. The Yogyakarta Sultanate has nine *ketibs*, namely *Ketib Anom*, *Ketib Tengah*, *Ketib Kulon*, *Ketib Wetan*, *Ketib Lor*, *Ketib Senemi*, *Ketib Amin*, *Ketib Imam*, and *Ketib Cendana* (Triatmodjo et al., 2009).

As guardians of Islamic values and norms, the daily activities of the Kauman community are colored by religious activities. Kauman children were earlier taught to read the Holy Koran at home because their parents were graduates of Islamic boarding schools. Next, religious deepening is carried out in *langgars* around the house under the guidance of local kyais. After completing their religious studies in *Langgar*, the Kauman children continued to boarding school on the recommendation of the local kyai. The Islamic boarding school alumni returned home to further strengthen Kauman's Islamic values. The Islamic identity of the Kauman community became more robust with the establishment of *Madrasah Mambaul Ulum* on 23 July 1905.

The daily lives of the Kauman people reflect their orientation toward upholding Islamic law and achieving happiness in heaven. This religiosity made Sunan and the Sultan entrust the palace batik craft to the wives of the ulama in Kauman. They are seen as having a mature soul and as not being materialistic, thereby helping restore batik's position as clothing for nobles rather than a trade commodity. This policy was followed by the creation of batik patterns known as palace batik, such as the *truntum* motif created by empress Paku Buwono III, as well as the *Sidomulyo* and *Sidomukti* batik motifs, which appeared in the era of Paku Buwono IV (Widiana, 2020).

The Palace's policy of making Kauman women become palace batik crafters was the right step. However, new economic pressures pioneered by the West at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries undermined this. Kartodirdjo (2014) describes the occurrence of cracks and crises in the tradition-based life system. The cause is the penetration of the colonial system and the increasing openness of indigenous communities to external

influences. As a result, the relevance of many values is questioned, and many old cultural symbols lose their meaning. In this context, Western capitalist economic pressure also entered people's lives, so that, slowly but surely, handicraft batik, which was initially expected to become the Palace's identity, turned into a trade commodity. Kauman batik also became famous because its batik cloths were considered of higher quality, and its proximity to the Palace made it more prestigious (Sariyatun, 2005).

The capitalist economic system suppresses the traditional economic system developed by the Surakarta and Yogyakarta Sultanates. As a result, the two centers of power had to follow the wishes of the colonial government and Western entrepreneurs. They had to agree to lease land to Western businesspeople. In Surakarta and Yogyakarta, Land Tenant Associations were formed (Hanafi & Artono, 2015). The Mangkunegaran principedom entered the business world in the following years by establishing plantations and sugar manufacturers. From this point of view, the pressure of the Western capitalist system forces rulers to adapt to avoid their power becoming extinct. In various historical studies, this adaptation process is known as modernization.

The necessity of adapting to them led the rulers to realize that capitalism had penetrated almost every aspect of life. As a result, they could not oppose the capitalization process that also occurs in batik crafts in Kauman. Kauman batik cloth developed into a trading commodity, as innovated by Ki Ageng Henis in Laweyan in the 16th century. Thus, the rulers of Surakarta and Yogyakarta were forced to bury their dreams of returning batik to its exclusive status as a cloth for the nobility.

CONCLUSION

The ideological differences between Ki Ageng Henis, the Laweyan batik merchants, and the Mataram rulers developed into an intrapersonal conflict, especially for Panembahan Senapati and his heirs. They faced various difficult choices because Ki Ageng Henis was a cherished and respected grandfather. Even though it was possible, Panembahan Senapati could not end the batik trade by massacring the entire Laweyan population. From the perspective of the Mataram king, they were just ordinary people who did not understand the ideology and ethics of Javanese aristocrats. Therefore, letting Ki Ageng Henis remain in Laweyan and placing Nyi Ageng Henis in the Tajug ward is the most likely option. The politics of the tomb at least cured Panembahan Senapati's disappointment with the

ideological violations committed by Ki Ageng Henis and provided a clear line of demarcation regarding his dream of Javanese cultural identity.

The same psychological burden was experienced by the rulers of the Surakarta and Yogyakarta Sultanates as heirs to the Mataram ideology. From this point of view, Kauman batik politics is the most strategic step in creating and developing batik cloth with particular palace patterns that are not traded. In this context, the creation of *Sidomukti* batik was intended to realize the politics of batik as a high-value work of the nobility, not traded. Batik politics failed when clerics' wives also succumbed to capitalism. They changed Kauman from a village known for upholding Islamic values to one for batik craft, which is more famous than Laweyan.

One step to resolving intrapersonal conflict is to make peace with the past. Peace can only occur if a person has a positive view of themselves and the historical events that are the source of the problem. From this point of view, recognizing Ki Ageng Henis as the ancestor of Mataram is necessary, as its genealogical truth cannot be doubted. It would be better if this recognition were represented by moving Ki Ageng Henis's tombstone to the Kotagede Imperial cemetery and placing it next to Nyi Ageng Henis's tombstone.

REFERENCES

- Anis, M., & Kaffah, S. (2020). Rancangan Pengembangan Wisata Budaya Kampoeng Batik Laweyan. *IENACO (Industrial Engineering National Conference)*, Surakarta.
- Basworo, B., & Sujadi, S. (2018). Peran Brand "Kampoeng Batik Laweyan" dalam Meningkatkan Daya Saing Industri Batik "Kampoeng Batik Laweyan" Solo. *Benefit: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 3, 21. <https://doi.org/10.23917/benefit.v3i1.5777>
- Boesch, E. (1991). *Symbolic Action Theory in Cultural Psychology* (Vol.1). Springer-Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-84497-3>
- Boesch, E. E. (2001). Symbolic Action Theory in Cultural Psychology. *Culture & Psychology*, 7(4), 479–483.
- Brielmaier, C., & Friesl, M. (2023). The attention-based view: Review and conceptual extension towards situated attention. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 25(1), 99-129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12306>
- Bursztyka, P. (2022). De-Limitations of Culture. *Eidos. A Journal for Philosophy of Culture*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.14394/eidos.jpc.2022.0001>
- Cahyono, U. J. (2015). 'Keleluasaan' Pengembangan 'Gandhok' dalam Morfologi Rumah Jawa pada Abad 20. *Seminar Nasional "Menuju Arsitektur dan Ruang Perkotaan yang Ber-kearifan Lokal"*, Semarang.
- Chairiyani, R. (2014). Semiotika Batik Larangan di Yogyakarta. *Humaniora*, 5(2), 1177. <https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v5i2.3260>
- Ciptoprawiro, A. (1986). *Filsafat Jawa*. Balai Pustaka.
- Dewi, N., Novianthi Pratiwi, S., & Fajria, M. (2019). Interlocking System Pada Konstruksi Knock Down Bangunan Tradisional Jawa Tajug Sebagai Teknologi Responsif Gempa. *Jurnal Arsitektur ZONASI*, 2(3), 147-159. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jaz.v2i3.17610>
- Geertz, C. (1960). *Religion of Java*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Gottschalk, L. (1986). *Mengerti Sejarah [Understanding History]* (N. Notosusanto, Trans.). Universitas Indonesia.
- Grave, J.-M. d. (2018). Javanese Conceptions and Socialisation of Death. Death Funerals as an Active Orientation of Time and Values. *Moussons*, 32(2), 49-74. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4000/moussons.4302>
- Guntari, M. (2013). *Kajian Naskah Babad Bedhahing Mangir*. Museum Negeri Sonobudoyo.
- Hall, K. (1996). The Textile Industry in Southeast Asia, 1400-1800. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*. 39(2), 87–135. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/1568520962600055>
- Hamengku_Buwono_X. (2021). *Surat Keputusan Gubernur Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta No. 26/Kep/2021*. Yogyakarta: Gubernur DIY
- Hanafi, R., & Artono. (2015). Perkumpulan Penyewa Tanah di Surakarta (De Vereeniging van Solosche Landhuurders) Tahun 1882 – 1912. *Avatara: Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah*, 3(1). <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/avatara/article/view/10735>
- Hastuti, D. L. (2011). Status dan Identitas Sosial Saudagar Batik Laweyan Dalam Interior Dalem Indis di Awal Abad Ke-20. *Dewa Ruci*, 7(1). <http://jurnal.isi-ska.ac.id/index.php/dewaruci/issue/view/139>
- Kanwa, M. (1978). *Arjuna Wiwaha* (S. Pane, Trans.). Proyek Penerbitan Buku Bacaan dan Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Kartodirdjo, S. (2014). *Pengantar Sejarah Indonesia Baru: Sejarah Pergerakan Nasional* (2nd ed., Vol. 2). Ombak.
- Kusuma, A., & Subroto, T. Y. W. (2024). Unsur-Unsur Pola Bentuk Lantai Bangsal Witana Dalam Konteks Vastusastra. *NALARs: Jurnal Arsitektur*, 23(1). <https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/nalar/article/view/15248>
- Kusumo, R. (2022, 7 Juni). Kesunyian Banyusumurup, Kisah Makam Para Pendosa Kerajaan Mataram Islam. *Good News From Indonesia*.
- Macaryus, S. (2017, 2017-07-07). Legenda Wonoboyo: Persepsi Masyarakat Perdikan Mangir. *Seminar Nasional Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia Dalam Konteks Global*, Jember.

- Maziyah, S., Mahirta, & Atmosudiro, S. (2016). Makna Simbolis Batik Pada Masyarakat Jawa Kuna. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 26(1). <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/paramita/article/view/5143/4175>
- Mirsa, R. (2021). *Arsitektur Rumah Saudagar Batik: Simbol, Pola dan Fungsi Ruang*. Teknosain. <https://repository.unimal.ac.id/5852/1/Buku%20Arsitektur%20rumah%20saudagar%20batik.pdf>
- Naryana, I. M. S., Brahman, I. M. A., & Juniarta, M. G. (2023). Etika Yoga Dalam Kakawin Arjuna Wiwaha. *Pangkaja: Jurnal Agama Hindu*, 26(1). <http://ojs.uhnsugriwa.ac.id/index.php/PJAH/article/view/2359>
- Nurhadi, & Armeini. (1978). *Laporan Survei Kepurbakalaan Kerajaan Mataram Islam (Jawa Tengah)*. Pusat Penelitian Purbakala dan Peninggalan Nasional, Departemen P & K.
- Nurhajarini, D. R., Triwahyono, T., & Gunawan, R. (1999). *Sejarah Kerajaan Tradisional Surakarta*. Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Prakoso, W., & Nadzib, A. (2022, 20 April). Kenapa Ya Banyak Warga Laweyan Solo Saling Besanan? Ini Jawabannya. *Solopos*. <https://soloraya.solopos.com/kenapa-ya-banyak-warga-laweyan-solo-saling-besanan-ini-jawabannya-1300704>
- Purwanta, H., & Novianto, V. (2024). Three Warriors from Laweyan. *Santhet*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.36526/santhet.v8i2.4668>
- Purwanta, H., & Pelu, M. (2024). Batik Craft Innovation and Its Influence in Central Java [Article]. *Shidnij Svit*, 125(4), 119-134. <https://doi.org/10.15407/orientw2024.04.119>
- Putra, R., & Handriyotopo, H. (2022). The Bahu Laweyan Legend In Photographic Work. *Capture : Jurnal Seni Media Rekam*, 13, 168-181. <https://doi.org/10.33153/capture.v13i2.4061>
- Raffles, T. S. (1817). *The History of Java* (Second ed., Vol. 1). Gilbert and Rivington Printer. <https://www.delfer.nl/nl/boeken1/gview?query=Thomas+Stamford+Raffles&coll=boeken1&id=entifier=Kw9iAAAAcAAJ&rowid=1>
- Ranggawarsita, R. N. (1979). *Serat Witaradya* (Sudibjo, Trans.). Proyek Penerbitan Buku Bacaan dan Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Ringer, F. (1997). *Weber's Methodology*. Harvard University Press.
- Riswinarno. (2018). Tata Ruang dan Keruangan Kompleks Makam Kotagede (Sinkretisasi Budaya Jawa Dengan Islam). *Thaqāfiyyāt*, 19(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14421/thaq.2018.19205>
- Rouffaer, G. P., & Juynboll, H. H. (1899). *De batik-kunst in Nederlandsch-Indië en Haar Geschiedenis*. H. Kleinmann & Co. https://ia801409.us.archive.org/16/items/in.ernet.dli.2015.533878/2015.533878.de-batik-kunst_text.pdf
- Rusliana, I., Selamat, S., & Daryadi, Y. (2021). Para Saudagar Batik dan Pengembangan Muhammadiyah Cabang Garut, 1919-1940. *Jurnal Sejarah Citra Lekha*, 6, 110-118. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jsc.v6i2.33610>
- Sariyatun. (2005). *Usaha Batik Masyarakat Cina di Vordenlanden Surakarta Awal Abad XX*. Sebelas Maret University Press.
- Sayid, R. M. (2001). *Babad Sala* (Darweni, Trans.). Perpustakaan Rekso Pustoko.
- Selamat, J. (2018). Indonesian Batik Translation: A Case Study. *The International Journal of Visual Design*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18848/2325-1581/CGP/v12i03/11-17>
- Shodiq, F. (2017). Kyai Ageng Henis Dalam Sejarah Industri Batik Laweyan Surakarta. *GEMA*, 52, 2517-2536. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/61344-ID-kyai-ageng-henis-dalam-sejarah-industri.pdf>
- Smyth, A., Milyavskaya, M., Friese, M., Werner, K., Frech, M.-L., Loschelder, D., . . . Wang, K. (2023). What Constitutes Successful Goal Pursuit? Exploring the Relation Between Subjective and Objective Measures of Goal Progress. *Personality Science*, 4, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ps.12017>
- Soedarmono. (2006a). Dinamika Saudagar Kaum Perempuan Jawa Di Laweyan. *Konferensi Nasional Sejarah VIII*, Jakarta.
- Soedarmono. (2006b). *Mbok Mase: Pengusaha Batik di Laweyan Solo Awal Abad ke 20*. Yayasan Warna-Warni Indonesia.
- Soekiman, D. (1993). *Kotagede*. Proyek Pengembangan Media Kebudayaan <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/250647587.pdf>
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51(2), 273-286. https://is.muni.cz/el/1423/podzim2010/SOC978/SOC_470_Swidler.pdf
- Thrallkill, E., & Bouton, M. (2015). Contextual Control of Instrumental Actions and Habits. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Learning and Cognition*, 41(1), 69-80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xan0000045>
- Triatmodjo, S., Djunaedi, A., Sastrosamito, S., & Subroto, Y. W. (2009). Desakralisasi Ruang Cikal Bakal di Permukiman Kauman Yogyakarta: Sebuah Perubahan Makna Ruang Permukiman Tradisional di Kota. *Jurnal Manusia Dan Lingkungan*, 16(3). <https://digilib.isi.ac.id/1289/>
- Wahyono, T. T., Suwarno, Nurwanti, Y. H., & Taryati. (2014). *Perempuan Laweyan dalam Industri Batik di Surakarta*. Balai Pelestarian Nilai Budaya (BPNB) Yogyakarta. <https://repository.kemdikbud.go.id/1138/1/BUku%20Perempuan%20Laweyan.pdf>
- Wasino, & Hartatik, E. S. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Sejarah: dari Riset hingga Penulisan*. Magnum Pustaka Utama.
- Webb, T., & Sheeran, P. (2007). How do implementation

- intentions promote goal attainment? A test of component processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 295–302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2006.02.001>
- Widayati P., N., & Surya, R. (2021). *Kawasan Pemukiman Saudagar Batik di Laweyan*. Surakarta Subur Cetak Terpadu.
- Widiana, M. E. (2020). *Manajemen Usaha Batik Nusantara* (Karsam, Ed.). CV Pena Persada.
- Widyastuti, M. (2016). Penyebutan Makam di Dalam Masyarakat Jawa. *Seminar Nasional Toponimi*, Jakarta.
- Winter Sr., C.F. . (2022). *Babad Tanah Jawi – The Chronicle of Java: The Revised Prose Version of C.F. Winter Sr.* (Willem Remmelink, Trans.). Leiden: Leiden University Press. Downloaded from https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/id/0ce17675-5121-4cb9-abaa-1664df899cd1/9789087283810_Remmelink.pdf
- Wirayuda, A. (2011). Narasi Kekayaan Haram. *Basis*, 11–12, 51–54.
- Yatmin. (2017). Tradisi Ritual 1 (Satu) Syuro Di Petilasan Sri Aji Jayabaya Kediri. *Efektor*, 30. <https://ojs.unpkediri.ac.id/index.php/efektor-e/article/download/970/661/>
- Zahra. (2018). *Macapat Tembang Jawa: Indah dan Kaya Makna*. Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa.