

Tangible and Intangible Territories in Javanese Settlements: Baluwarti Surakarta Sunanate Palace in Indonesia

Avi Marlina^{1*}, Ahmad Farkhan², Reyhan Radditya Sulasyono³,
Kesit Himawan Setyadji⁴ & Rizki Prayoga⁵

^{1,2}Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Sebelas Maret,
Surakarta, Indonesia

^{3,4}Student of Magister Architecture Program, ⁵Student of Architecture Program,
Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: avimarlina@staff.uns.ac.id

| Received | Accepted | Published |
|------------|------------|------------|
| 20.10.2023 | 14.01.2024 | 31.01.2024 |

<https://doi.org/10.61275/ISVSej-2024-11-01-06>

Abstract

The ancient Javanese residences in Indonesia have special characteristics in managing spatial restrictions and controls. The spatial territory of Javanese residences occupies the most dominant position in accordance with the Javanese spatial hierarchy. Respecting ancestors of the house owners becomes a sustainable force in organizing spatial territory. This study, hence, examines the patterns of spatial territories in the ancient Javanese residences in Baluwarti Surakarta Sunanate Palace, Indonesia.

It employs a descriptive qualitative method, looking at several case studies of ancient Javanese residences. They were observed and documented. Moreover, key persons were interviewed, to gather data.

The research discovered two territorial patterns in ancient Javanese residences: tangible territories and intangible territories. These patterns are certainly useful for maintaining control over the management of ancient Javanese cultural heritage in a sustainable manner.

Keywords: Tangible Territory, Intangible Territory, Javanese Settlement, Javanese Spatial Pattern, Palace

Introduction

According to the theories of Altman (1984), people organize and claim spatial territories in various social contexts. They range from intimate territories, private territories, social territories, common territories to public territories. The territories at the urban level however are related to communities adapting behavior based on personal choices of individuals (Flachsbart, 1969). This is in contrast to what happens in the Middle East which uses the concept of territory as a form of ideological control over the land occupied (Parvin & Sommer, 1980). In the locus of Javanese royal settlements, people's adherence to the territorial concept is determined by the rulers as a form of adaptive behavior based on their personal choices.

Gold (1982) points out that territories represent the culture of a region and is passed down from generation to generation through a conservative socialization process. According to Altman & Low (1992), however, attachment of organisms to space forms a territory that affects the behavior and habits of the people in that particular community.

Taylor (1996) points out that territories are also generated by social forces that aim to establish power and bind the citizens of a region to the beliefs of the ruler, and such model of power reproduction also occurs in the royal residences in Java. In addition, the social status could also form a territorial control like the rich aristocrats who own the capital You-tien (2013). In line with the phenomenon in Baluwarti where a strong social hierarchy with power holders (royal aristocrats) exists, these rich aristocrats form a spatial territory obeyed by the residents living in the area.

Territory is also formed based on the form of space, time of activity, and community background agreed upon (Burhanuddin, 2010). These findings are in line with the phenomenon at the Baluwarti Surakarta Sunanate Palace, and therefore it can be used as a research basis to obtain complete information related to the territory with a strong community background.

However, this is in contrast to the findings in Karang Ampel Malang which reveals that close kinship relations do not influence the formation of territorial expansions. The different patterns of territory formation is influenced by the availability of space as territorial boundaries. Thus, territorial boundaries are not fixed and could change according to the needs and dynamics of the local communities and it shows the flexibility of space in this tradition (Putri et al., 2012). Interestingly, these non-fixed territories do not occur in the case of the Javanese Palace residences in Surakarta.

However, the hierarchy of territory also occurs in the Kanoman Palace area, starting from the peripheral territory to the central territory as the highest territory. The central territory is located in the core complex, and the peripheral territory is in the jurisdictional area. The supporting territory, furthermore, is located in the square area while the attached territory is located in the residential and public service areas which are marked by the personalized space of the palace (Nugrahadi & Franseno Pujianto, 2020).

Same thing also happens in the traditional Balinese houses. In Bali, the physical environment of the houses shapes the social behavior of the Balinese people in various contexts, such as in families, communities and traditional ceremonies. Indeed, it could be seen from the hierarchy of space divisions based on private, semi-private and public scales. This hierarchical division of space allows the house occupants and guests to adjust their attitudes and behavior while they are in a space (socially) and make strangers respect the territory that each person marks by the blocking a wall (Roosandriantini & Meilan, 2020). The territories in the form of blocking a wall were found in Baluwarti. Thus, this locus could answer the research problems regarding the discovery of territorial patterns closely related to the hierarchy of space.

Although many studies exist, they do not reveal about fixed territory patterns that last for hundreds of years since they only say that the layout in the highest hierarchy does not change over time and functions as restriction and access control (Marlina, 2022). However, gender-based territories also occur in Javanese residences in the Surakarta Sunanate Palace that can be seen in the spatial patterns of each residence and their use. In this connection, Hakim et al (2020) also show that a territory can be related to gender and says that the practice of territoriality in Semanggi areas has both verbal and non-verbal marking, as well as personalization. Moreover, territory as a form of organizing political, economic and cultural space is also seen in Baluwarti where space is the reproduction of royal power and the economic and cultural development in Java.

In this context, it is noted that the territorial patterns existing at the Baluwarti Surakarta Sunanate Palace, Indonesia are unusual. This research thus examines the palace and its territorial formations. Its aim is to discover the residential territory patterns in the old Javanese settlements in Baluwarti Surakarta Sunanate Palace, Indonesia. Its objectives are:

1. To determine tangible territory patterns dan intangible territory patterns
2. To fine what causes the formation of the territory patterns

The novelty in this study is to reveal the territorial phenomenon which fixed all the time and could be explained through the territorial patterns in the ancient Javanese residence in Baluwarti Surakarta Sunanate Palace, Indonesia.

Theoretical Basis

Territory

Territoriality is a way individuals or groups maintain their privacy regarding an area they consider their own, whereas. A territory is defined as the controlled area that determines the boundary among individuals through a sign or personalization as a sign of ownership (Altman, 1975; Laurens, 2004). Territories are seen as people's actions to defend their areas against others. They are generalized for people as individuals and groups who design space in accordance with the principle of territory adopted (Brown, 1997). Each level in the territorial hierarchy is different in personification, ownership and control. The territories are real, fixed, stationary and space-centered. Indeed, a territory serves more as an organizational function for people. Every human group and individual exhibits territorial behavior and implement various strategies to maintain effective territorial control (Hadinugroho, 2004).

The concept of territoriality involves several interrelated aspects of ownership, defense, physical, sign, exclusive use, personalization, identity, dominance, control, conflict, security, and defense (Edney, 1975). Weissman (1981) explains that territoriality is strongly related to how people interact with their environment. He identifies territoriality as a behavioral attribute that includes the relationship between individuals, groups, or organizations with the surrounding physical environment.

However, for people, territoriality serves not only as an embodiment of privacy, but it also has a social role. The boundaries of a person's territory towards other people could be gender-related, referring to the socio-cultural context based on the women' nature which has limitations related to the physical aspects and psychology etc. (Fatimah, 2001; Nurazizah et al., 2022).

Interestingly, territoriality is also caused by the economic needs of the people that influence each other as a result of gender differences, physical factors, and cultural aspects. Nevertheless, the concept of territoriality is interpreted as a way for individuals, groups, or institutions to claim, to control, and to manage areas as a form of organizing space in political, economic, and cultural contexts (Raffestin & Butler, 2012). In China, You-tien (2013) reveal that territoriality is a spatial strategy to consolidate power and to secure autonomy. In general, the formation of territories in China is influenced by politics and power through jurisdiction, influenced by capital (industrial, financial, and symbolic capital) and by civil aspects related to society.

Territoriality and Human Behaviour

Haryadi (1995) asserts that individuals in a physical environment are involved in behavior, activities, place, and time. Simultaneously, Rapoport (1977) describes a physical setting as being made up of physical elements and activities. Therefore, territoriality involves three main elements; the physical setting (territory), the actors (individuals/groups), and the types of activities carried out. Spatial activity shows strength and defense and reflects a territoriality owned and maintained physically through marking, as well as non-physically through regulations or norms (Haryadi, 1995).

Marking can be divided into two forms, namely: i) verbal forms (speech) expressing ownership of a place or item, and ii) non-verbal forms consisting of three elements (Rapoport, 1982): (1) Fixed-feature elements are forms that rarely change. These elements are related to architectural elements such as fences, beams, roofs, and stairs; (2) Semi-fixed-feature elements (constituent forming elements) includes items such as sofas, sunshades, and potted plants; (3) Unfixed elements are forms related to humans as residents, such as body posture, hand and arm movements, face and other body expressions.

The defense of personal space and territoriality have the same goal of achieving an optimal level of privacy and avoiding unnecessary pressure (Lang, 1987; Laurens, 2005).

Gifford (2010) supports this by revealing that territoriality is a human behavior associated with control, individualization, physical space, objects, and concepts. Laurens (2004) explains that territoriality has a close relationship with aspects such as physical space, sign, possession, defense, exclusive use, individualization and identity. According to (Gifford, 2010), several factors that affect territoriality include: (1) personal factors (gender, age, personality); (2) situational factors (physical and socio-cultural order); (3) cultural factors (behavioral habits of a person)

Based on the theories of territory, it can be seen that territoriality is related to the way individuals or groups protect their private territory and interpret it as a sign or personalization of ownership. Territory includes several elements: physical setting (territory and marking); non-physical (rules and norms, and behavior in accordance with local culture), actors (individuals or groups, gender, age, personality), and types of activities carried out.

Behavior Setting

Rapoport (1969) says that the behavioral approach in architecture emphasizes the relationship between people, society, and the spaces used or inhabited by them. This approach recognizes that different norms and cultures in society will produce different concepts and forms of space. In the context of interactions between people and space, behavioral approaches tend to use the term "setting" rather than space. Setting focuses more on the analysis of human activities which consist of four aspects, namely actors, types of activities, place, and time of implementation of activities (Rapoport, 1969).

Rapoport (1990) adds that behavioral setting describes the interaction between an activity and a more specific place where a group of people carry out activities in a specific place and time. A behavior setting includes two main components: 1) System of place or space (system of setting): a series of physical or spatial elements that have certain relationships and are related so that they can be used for certain activities; 2) Activity system (system of activity): a series of behaviors carried out intentionally by one or several people.

According to Rapoport (1990), the combination of the space system with the activity system gives meaning to the activities and the actors. The activity system in an environment is formed by various behavior settings (Rapoport, 1990). Haryadi & Setiawan (2010) reinforces this concept by stating that activities always occur in a setting, so that the system of activities occurs in a particular setting system. According to Laurens (2005), behavior setting is a stable combination of activities, places, and criteria that include the following descriptions:

- 1) repetitive activities in the form of behavior patterns;
- 2) having certain environmental arrangements related to behavior patterns;
- 3) forming the same relationship between the two;
- 4) carrying out over a certain period of time.

Haryadi and Setiawan (2010) then strengthen this by stating that behavior setting is a concept that includes elements such as the physical environment, social norms, activities, social interactions, as well as perceptions and subjective experiences of individuals or groups in an environment or special context.

This concept has the ability to influence the individuals or groups behaviors in different ways, and it can also be used to understand and explain human behavior in many situations and contexts. Likewise, in several theories on behavioral regulation developed by Hall (1978), Rapoport (1977), and Haryadi (1995) propose that behavioral regulations involve interactions between activities within a region that reflect the culture of the community. Behavior settings moreover have both a physical limit and a symbolic limit (Laurens, 2004).

The traditional communities, including the ones in Java have behavior settings in the form of territory, space, and the building layout that reflects hierarchical religious culture as a manifestation of the cosmological concept (Geldern, 1982; Behrend, 1982; Wiryomartono, 1995; Frick, 1997; Ronald, 2005; Santoso, 2008; Marlina, 2022). For the Javanese society, traditional norms are more important than the new norms and it is bound by unwritten rules that have been agreed upon in a community (Ronald, 2005). Cultural norms are passed from one generation to generation through the process of socialization. The loyalty to traditional customs

itself depends on a person's perception of rewards or benefits although psychologists argue that many behaviors are learned through experience without any rewards (Laurens, 2004). Based on the theories and research above, it could be concluded that behavior settings are closely related to repetitive activities, the behavior of space users, and time periods reflecting the customs of a society; and these settings have physical and symbolic boundaries.

Javanese Culture, Religion, and Rituals

Culture and social structure have an important role in determining human activities including in the types and locations of their activities (Rapoport, 1977). Rapoport (1982) also adds that an individual's background; such as his/her outlook on life, beliefs, values, and norms; will influence his/her behavior in the lifestyle and roles in society. Cultural forms, whether clearly visible (tangible) such as settlements, residential and environmental layouts, wedding celebrations, religious ceremonies, and others or those that are not physically visible (intangible) such as folklore, myths, songs, dances, cultural art performances, and the like can be studied because these cultural forms are not fixed, and they change from one generation to the next (Arifin, 2009).

Javanese architecture is rooted in its religious culture, and it is shown its religious life that has existed since the era of animism and dynamism. This characteristic greatly influences the Javanese people's outlook on life (Geertz, 1983; Geertz, 1986; Ronald, 2005). As Ronald (2005) says, Javanese beliefs are generally related to spiritual, ritual, and material aspects of indigenous life. He adds that Javanese society creates order with the aim of organizing life together, maintaining patterns that have existed before, and achieving certain goals that integrate and adapt to the local environment. Santosa (2000), says that Javanese society still holds firmly to the "ritual" procession formed through social agreement and expresses in the form of symbolic actions manifested into concrete actions and carried out in a certain space with a specific purpose.

Furthermore, Koentjaraningrat (1984) point out that tradition functions as controlling behavior which is coercive in its Nature. It means that the order of society is maintained without a legal system because its citizens automatically obey the tradition. If a violation occurs, society will automatically react to punish the violation. *Adat* (tradition) has the meaning of habits carried out in the same way by several generations with little or no change. Adding to this, Sumintardja (1978) says that these habits become unwritten rules of behavior. The word "adat" comes from "adah", which means habits that are often repeated and considered normative habits that become rules of behavior in society and are maintained by society. According to Ronald, (2005), *Adat* is inherited from generation to generation while habits tend to change easily and are not inherited from generation to generation. *Adat*, in addition, is considered as decrees passed down by ancestors.

Mulder (1985) asserts that Javanese people still have a fear of '*walat*' which is considered as the last element to provide an order. Kartodirdjo et al (1987) reinforce this idea by emphasizing that tradition is considered a sacred thing that must be adhered to and respected. Some traditions even become cults with sanctions involving religious and magical elements such as "*kuwalat*" which can cause bad luck, physical disability, reduced fortune, and other repercussions. The traditional societies have cults and symbols that support a traditionalist attitude which is reflected in the lifestyle of the gentry. Ronald (2005) strengthens it further by saying that in Javanese culture, many responsibilities are ritually directed to a power greater than human strength, namely the power of God who controls human life.

There is no doubt that culture and social structure play an important role in human activity. The background of individuals influences their behavior and lifestyle. The forms of culture, both visible and invisible physically can be studied. Javanese people have beliefs related to spiritual, ritual, and material aspects in their lives. They create rules for integration and adaptation to the local environment. Javanese people also continue to practice ritual processions as a social agreement in concrete actions in a certain space with a specific purpose.

Javanese Residences: Sacred and the Profane

In a society, there are always values which are considered immense or respected, including the main symbols, values, and beliefs that become the core of the identity of the society. These values preserve the social integrity in society and provide normative control over the dynamics that happen in society (Sutrisno & Putranto, 2007). In the context of the sacred concept, society has intrinsically built a social classification distinguishing between what is considered sacred and what is considered profane. This classification is based on the religious and normative dimension in society.

Javanese traditional houses, both inside and outside have mystical values that can be divided into two systems: the immaterial system and the material system. The values in the immaterial system are reflected in expressions such as *senhong tengah* that becomes a manifestation of the presence of *suksma kawekas* and the use of *soko guru* as a manifestation of the existence of the sacred spirit. On the other hand, according to Ronald (2005), the material system is reflected in expressions such as the flexible spatial system as a manifestation of the expression of feeling.

Priatmodjo (2004) shows that when relatives and courtiers approach places that are considered sacred, they must pay respects by worshiping and maintaining good behavior and politeness. They should speak thoughtfully and carefully also. In addition, offerings must be made to these sacred places on Thursday night and the night before Tuesday Kliwon, and for the sacred place in *kedhaton*, offerings must be given every day. Furthermore, Priatmodjo (2004) says that there are several rooms that are considered sacred: (a) rooms containing the King's seat, including *watu gilang* as the relic of the previous Kingdom; (b) rooms or buildings used to store royal heirlooms, including the storage of gamelan and royal chariots; (c) rooms or places used by the king and his family to meditate.

Review of Literature

Territoriality has been an issue of great interest to many scholars and much has been investigated in the past. For example, Yilmaz (2018) explores the functional, symbolic, and conflict aspects associated with human territoriality. He outlines the ways in which spatial control in human territoriality can influence social interactions, the fulfillment of individual and group needs, as well as the potential for conflict between individuals or groups over defined territorial boundaries. Ratnasari & Permatasari (2019) agree with this when pointing out that spatial territory could affect human behavior and social interaction in using space.

This spatial use is influenced by several factors like physical characteristics, social characteristics, and cultural characteristics. According to him, territoriality also involves the organization and arrangement of space by individuals or groups as a form of expression of identity, ownership, and control, and it is influenced by some factors such as culture, history, physical environment, and social dynamics in traditional settlements in Ngata Toro settlements. These settlements are divided into two categories of territories; sacred territories and indigenous territories (Zubaidi, 2019).

Khoiriyah et al. (2022) show that the territorial form of Kotagede area consists of 3 primary territories in terms of residential areas, secondary territories in terms of commercial buildings and public territories in terms of markets and pedestrian paths. Dewi Nur'aini & Ikaputra (2019), Abednego (2020), and Amra et al. (2018), agree with this proposition. They say that territoriality is an important factor in designing spaces that are responsive to user needs, reinforce place identity, and influence the use and maintenance of physical spaces. According to them, territories involving the spatial arrangements based on the hierarchy in Surakarta Palace residence is the important factor in using and maintaining the space that shows the palace identity, as can be seen in the findings of previous studies.

In contrast, Ponomarev & Ivshin (2020) reveal that territories not only strengthen identity but also concepts such as (re)branding as the strategy that involves changing the image of a city in order to increase its competitiveness, attract investment, and develop tourism and economy. This territorial (re)branding is based on local identity, community participation, and sustainable resource management. They show that this kind of management has a positive

impact on environmental quality, cultural diversity, community quality of life, and natural resources. It is noteworthy that the territorial (re)branding based on local identity is also carried out to develop cultural tourism in Baluwarti.

Susanti et al. (2020) point out that territorial shifts in residential spaces are usually in the form of changes of private spaces into public spaces. Notably, these changes occur in the territorial space of Kampong Mahmud in Bandung, and these events are in connection with the kampong's transformation into a religious tourism area, as they show. The increase in territorial structures occur in the form of a change in using existing public space to creating its own public space while the decrease in territorial structures occur due to the invasion of incoming territory in such a way that residents lose their private areas which are converted into public areas for visitors ortourists (Ratnasari et al., 2020). According to Ramadhani (2021), territorial shifts could be seen also in the tourist village showing changes and ambiguities in territorial alleys with the existence of various private activities and tourist attraction activities in residential alleys.

Purwanto (2021) explores the impact of spatial transformation on the territoriality of Javanese traditional houses, including changes in space configuration, changes in social relations, and changes in space use. She shows, that territoriality plays an important role in the spatial transformations of Javanese traditional houses in Kotagede. Territoriality in this context refers to the spatial arrangement that organizes the relationship between the space inside the house, between the house, and outside the house, as well as the relationships between the house and the surrounding environment. It is reflected in the configurations of spaces, patterns of social relations, patterns of space use, and symbols and meanings in the house.

Needless to say that the COVID-19 pandemic has changed the demands of territoriality on public spaces, including the need for physical distances, access restrictions, and new arrangements in the use of public spaces. In this connection, Yong et al. (2021) reveal that the management of public spaces are able to adapt new concepts of territoriality after the COVID-19 pandemic. This adaptation includes physical arrangements, access management, and management of the use of public spaces that are more flexible and responsive to changing situations. However, they show that the territories of the old Javanese residence in Baluwarti is not affected by the Covid-19 situation and other conditions. Indeed, they reveal this unique phenomenon at this site.

Many researchers argue that territory is a space where local interventions should be understood, adapted and implemented. Thus, meaningful development strategies can be implemented in the territorial/landscape / ecosystem asset. For this reason, Forster et al. (2021), Barrio (2022) and Lianto et al. (2022), see territory as an active socio-political arena related to geographic space owned and shaped by complex interactions between actors and ecosystems. Adhanani (2013) adds to this by saying that community participation is one of the key principles in territorial planning that can improve the effectiveness, fairness, and sustainability of territorial planning. Amalia & Amal (2019) add that the characteristics of spatial territoriality have different forms and patterns depending on the activity, time, cultural background and length of time people stay in a settlement. Moreover, Zakirova et al. (2020) point out the importance of integrating physical, social, economic and environmental aspects in territorial planning to produce sustainable and environmentally friendly spatial planning. Indeed, strong territoriality could affect the sustainability of a communal place as well as create emotional and social attachments between the community and the place (Rochani et al., 2022). The residence in Surakarta Sunanate Palace is a specific place and has a strong territory that affects spatial sustainability.

Nevertheless, Shah et al. (2021) point out that although barriers in the form of fences define territoriality and provide a sense of security, they also restrict foreigners from carrying out activities in their territorial areas. Chen (2022) contests this idea. According to him, the concept of territorial understanding as a concept involves the relationship between individuals and space. Thus, he does not interpret territory as a boundary in the form of a physical form or a fence, but rather focuses on how the use of imagination can affect the territorial understanding. Thus, he discusses the use of representational diagrams in strengthening territorial

understanding. The use of imagination is in line with the research locus since ritual activity involving imagination is a symbolic act of territory occurs in the daily lives of Javanese people.

Previous studies on territory reveal that territory is related to: spatial dominance and control, spatial arrangement; room-centered perspective; spatial hierarchy; parapet as a territorial boundary; the formation of a territory based on gender; organizing space in political, economic, and cultural contexts, territory affecting social interaction, territory as a form of expression of identity, ownership, and control; influence on the use and maintenance of space; fixed territories and there are changing territories; territories with different shapes and patterns; and spatial sustainability. They also reveal that territories are passed down through a conservative socialization process to subsequent generations. Therefore, territories shape the behavior, interaction, and habits of a community; maintain and reproduce power; and bind society. Previous studies explained that territories are formed based on the background of the local community. The territories obviously create emotional and social attachment between the community with its cultural background and the place.

Undeniably, this comprehensive theoretical framework is useful to examine the issue raised in this paper.

Research Methods

This study used a qualitative approach based on Creswell (2015), with the following research procedures:

- (1) Exploration of field phenomena
- (2) Literature Survey
- (3) Field observation and survey
- (4) Data collection that typically involves interviews
- (5) Organizing information units, themes, essential meaning
- (6) Data Analysis in accordance with the systematic procedure of the unit of analysis
- (7) Description that discusses the essence
- (8) Research findings

This research explored the empirical phenomena and transcendental phenomena related to the territory of ancient residential spaces in Java, and the locus is precisely on Javanese housing in Baluwarti Surakarta Sunanate Palace, Indonesia. Exploration of the territorial phenomenon was carried out for 2 years to reveal 9 dwellings built around 1745.

Purposive sampling was employed to select the dwellings. The following residential criteria were used in this study: residential buildings are still original, have sacred and profane spatial patterns closely related to local culture; the locus have rules and norms closely connected to local culture, used for daily activities and special activities; there are both tangible and intangible activities and behaviors which have physical and non-physical settings, there are actors (individuals or groups), and there are various types of special activities. Nine residences were selected in this research: Dalem Purwodiningratan, Dalem Suryohamijayan, Dalem Sasana Mulya, Dalem Mloyokusuman, Dalem Purwohamijayan, Dalem Mangkubumen, Dalem Joyodiningratan, Dalem Prabudiningratan, and Dalem Kesawan. Each residence has an area around 8000-10,000 m².

Data was collected from each residence in the form of physical and non-physical data: They included maps, residential site plans, house plans, images of daily activities and special activities, and images of actors in doing their activities. Data collection specifically involved interviewing individuals experiencing the phenomenon, owners and users of the houses, actors who conducted activities, and the elders of Baluwarti. They were 9 key persons.

All the data were then processed as follows in three stages:

- (1) comparing the data of 9 dwellings obtained through observation with data obtained through interviews of 9 people;
- (2) verifying the correctness of the answers from 9 sources or informants;
- (3) comparing the answers of informants with the information contained in the relevant documents. Data reduction, consisting 3 steps, was carried out by grouping information units, arranging themes, and arranging essential meaning.

The triangulation and data analysis are in accordance with the systematic procedure which goes from a narrow unit of analysis (important statement) to a broader unit (meaning) and describes in detail the two elements of “what” has been experienced by people and “how” they have experienced it (Creswell, 2013;2015).

Findings and the Discussion

Tangible Territory

Javanese Setting: Sacred and Profane Rooms

The locus of this research is in the area of Baluwarti at Surakarta Sunanate Palace (Fig. 1). 9 residences studied are located at North, South, West and East of the core areas of the palace (Fig. 1). They are: Dalem Purwodiningratan, Dalem Suryohamijayan, Dalem Sasana Mulya, Dalem Mloyokusuman, Dalem Purwohamijayan, Dalem Mangkubumen, Dalem Joyodiningratan, Dalem Prabuningratan, Dalem Kesawan. Dalem Purwodiningratan, Dalem Suryohamijayan, Dalem Sasana Mulya are located to the North of the palace while Dalem Mangkubumen, Dalem Joyodiningratan, and Dalem Prabudiningratan are located to the West.

On the other hand, Dalem Mloyokusuman is located in the North-East of the palace, and Dalem Purwohamijayan and Dalem Kesawan are located in the South of the palace (Fig. 1). The location of these Javanese residences are in the first circle of the palace which shows that they are placed in the highest hierarchy inhabited by the nobles (Soeratman, 2000; Setiadi, Hadi & Trihandani, 2001).

The physical setting of the palace shows a clear territory between the inside areas and outside areas (Soeratman, 2000). This setting is indicated by a clear barrier in the form of a fortress surrounding the palace in the form of a brick wall having a size of around 6 meters height and 2 meters width (Fig. 2). The layered fortress walls enclose the palace areas, the first layer of the fortress walls enclosing the core areas. On the other hand, the outer layer of fortress walls (with a black line) functions as a separator of the inner and outer areas.

Every Javanese residence must have a sacred room for praying, meditating, storing heirlooms, and other ritual activities. The palace itself has the most sacred and most private room called *krobongan* or *petanen* in Prabasuyasa which is located at the center of the core area. This description is in accordance with what Soeratman said (2000). Gusti, a son of the king said in an interview on Monday, February 21, 2022, about *krobongan*:

“The krobongan is specifically for weddings of the king's sons and daughters only. Krobongan in the prince's house is used for the sacred event of the marriage of the King's sons and daughters or for the sons and daughters of the nobles who own the noble houses. When someone in the King's family dies, Ndalem Ageng will be used to intercede the body before it is buried in the cemetery. Meanwhile, Prabasuyasa is used to store palace heirlooms.”

Suparno also told in an interview on Saturday, 29 April, 2023, about the *Senthong* in *Ndalem*:

“Senthong in Ndalem Ageng is also used for meditation.”

Prabasuyasa room can only be entered by the palace officials with special permission. To the East of Prabasuyasa, there is Sasana Sewaka room where courtiers and royal families appear before the King (*pisowan*). In the Sasana Sewaka room, all courtiers and royal families are arranged in accordance with their hierarchy, level, titles, and the etiquette of sitting before the king. That is sitting cross-legged facing the King. This condition is in line with what has been conveyed by Soeratman (2000) and Priatmodjo (2004). They say that respecting the sacred room can be done by behaving politely shown by the sitting position. Similarly, this phenomenon confirms the theory of territory presented by Altman, (1975) Laurens, (2004) Edney (1975; Weissman, 1981) who point out that territoriality is an attribute of behavior that must be controlled.



Fig. 1: The locus of ancient Javanese residences in Baluwarti

Source: Marlina, 2022



Fig. 2: The Outer Fortress of Surakarta Sunanate Palace

Source: Marlina, 2018

The spatial patterns of Javanese residences have the same spatial configuration. They include: *pendapa*, *pringgitan*, *ndalem*, *senthong tengah* (*krobongan* / *petanen*), *senthong kiwa*, *senthong tengen*, *gadri*, *gandhok kiri*, *gandhok tengen*, Pavilion, *pakiwan*, and *magersari*, as described by Kartodirdjo, et al. (1987), Frick, (1997), Ronald (2005) and Soeratman (2000). The complete Javanese residential plan layout can be seen in Figs. 3, 4. *Pendapa* is the public area used to welcome guests, while *ndalem* includes *senthong kiwa*, *senthong tengah* (*krobongan*), and *senthong tengen* are the private and sacred rooms with special territories (blue in Figs. 3,4), especially in *senthong tengah* (*krobongan*) as the most sacred and most private space. Guests or visitors are not allowed to enter the area of *ndalem*, especially *senthong tengah* (*krobongan*) without special permission from the owner. This phenomenon is in line with the theory of territory proposed by Altman (1975;1984), Brower (1980), and Porteus (1977) which says that people organize and claim space in various social contexts including intimate territory, private territory, social territory, common territory, and public territory. This is proven by statements from interviews with Danang as a resident of the noble residence on Thursday, March 23, 2023):

“If you want to enter the ndalem and senthong, I will accompany you because you have to get permission from the owner and the ancestors.”

Javanese people already have an understanding regarding *ndalem* area as the special territory in the form of marking which physically looks different from the other rooms. The distinctive features of this area can be described as follows : 1) *Ndalem* room is located to the north of *pringgitan* (blue in Figs. 3, 4); 2) It is bounded by a wooden walls (*gebyok*) or brick walls that surround the room; 3) it has 3 rows of rooms consisting of *senthong kiwa*, *senthong tengah* (*krobongan*), and *senthong tengen* ; 4) it has *krobongan* room which is different in shape from other spaces (Fig. 5, 6), and it is usually in the form of a glass room framed with carved wood; and inside this there are pillows, bolsters wrapped in Javanese clothes; 5) This room, furthermore, is higher than the surrounding rooms (Fig. 6); 6) The structure of this room consists of *Saka Guru* (pillars) in the middle different colors according to the strata of homeowners. The territory indicated by the different physical forms has been affirmed by Rapoport (1977), Gifford (2010) and Laurens (2004) which articulates that territoriality has a close relationship with elements such as physical space, signs, ownership, identity, exclusive use, individualization, and defense. Strengthening the statement that the *krobongan* is the most sacred in Javanese residences can be seen from the interview with Yeng on Sunday, January 2, 2022:

“Drying pillows and bolsters in the *krobongan* must have ‘*slametan*’ (Javanese ritual) first so that it is safe and smooth”



Fig. 3 :Dalem Mloyokusuman
Source : Marlina et.al,2023



Fig.4 : Dalem Purwohamijayan
Source : Marlina et.al,2023



Fig. 5 : *Krobongan* Dalem Mlokusuman
Source: Marlina,2023




Fig. 6 : The Height Difference at Ndalem Mloyokusuman
Source: Marlina,2023

The main activity of the wedding ceremony is the procession of “*ijab*” which is carried out in the *pringgitan* room (the boundary marker between *pendapa* and *ndalem*). It acts as a marker of domestic ritual territory as has been conveyed by Santosa (2000). Indeed, ‘*ijab*’ itself is the culmination of the trilogy of Javanese rites of life “*metu-manten-mati*” (born-married-dead). The territory of the room is related to the domestic gender construction where only men have the right to sit in the *pringgitan* room in the “*ijab*” (marriage ceremony), and this fact is in line with the research findings from Gifford (2010), Fatimah (2010), Nurazizah et al. (2022) and Hakim et al. (2020) saying that territories are gender-related.

The wedding ceremony in the form of stepping on an egg and washing the feet is at the center point of *pendapa* located between the 4 *Saka Guru* (pillars), which is interpreted as a sacred space. Marking space with special activities defines territories in Javanese settlements. Ronald (2005) says that the space between the four *Saka Guru* means honoring the existence of the sacred spirits, and all of the activities reinforce this statement. Haryadi (1995) and Rapoport (1977) further claim that territoriality contains three main elements: physical settings (territory), actors (individuals/groups), and types of activities carried out in these settings.



Fig. 7 : The ritual of *Sungkeman* in *Krobongan* shows territorial restrictions activity types and restrictions on the people conducting the activities in the sacred space

Source: Marlina, 2023

Sungkeman (bride and groom asking for their parents' blessings) as a traditional activity (Fig. 7) shows that socially, the space in front of *Krobongan* is always attributed to the power and the existence of the power holder who controls a particular territory. The description is in fact in accordance with the one presented by Santosa (2000). The traditional ceremony called *kacar-kucur* is a ritual in Javanese traditional marriage as a symbol that the husband gives all his income to his wife for the welfare of the family, and he has an obligation to give his wife a living. *Kacar-kucur* is held in front *krobongan* as a sign of a sacred space for wedding ritual activities. Thus, it shows the territory of space boundaries that distinguishes sacred space from profane space. This phenomenon goes along with the theory of territoriality by Laurens (2004). According to her, territoriality has a close relationship with aspects of physical space and markers of exclusive use of space. In addition, Gifford (2010) said that there are three factors which affect territoriality: (1) personal factors, (2) situational factors (physical and socio-cultural order); (3) cultural factors (behavioral habits of a person). Javanese ritual activities that have been passed down from generation to generation using this sacred space reinforce the findings of Gold (1982) which reveal that territory represents the culture of a region which is passed down to the next generation without written rules. Bambang, a resident of a noble house, told in an interview on Thursday, June 15, 2023, about *ijab* and *sungkeman* in the wedding ceremony:

"Ijab was carried out in the Pringgitan area, and sungkeman ceremony for parents during the wedding ceremony is carried out in front of the krobongan, because it is a very sacred event. Guests are seated in the pendapa, not allowed to sit in the ndalem."



Fig. 8 : The location of the courtiers' seats as a territorial distinction based on hierarchy

Source : Marlina,2023

The distribution of seating locations is an act of controlling status and controlling territory in the life of Javanese people. The seating positions of the invited guests of the Surakarta Palace coronation event are grouped into several parts, including: the group sitting cross-legged in Sasana Sewaka (Fig. 8), sitting on a chair in the outer tritisan Sasana Sewaka, sitting on a chair in the outer court, and the courtiers sitting cross-legged in a separate ward with Sasana Sewaka (Fig. 8). The sitting posture is developed by the palace to strengthen its territorial position and glorify the king. Spatial control in Dalem Mloyokusuman groups the invited guests according to a hierarchy. Grouping the seating layout according to level is a manifestation of power as a control of the territory of space. This phenomenon corresponds to the concept of territoriality which refers to the way individuals or groups maintain their privacy by using signs or personalization to establish boundaries (Altman, 1975; Laurens, 2004).

Intangible Territory

Offerings, Rituals, Mythology, Dances, Culture and Art

Offerings and rituals are closely fused with the daily life of Javanese people. These are the transformation of symbolic actions into concrete actions in a certain space with a clear purpose (Geertz, 1986; Ronald, 2005; Santosa, 2000). Rituals integrated with Javanese mythology have been passed down from generation to generation, and they manifest in the behavior of Javanese people, who consider that all objects have supernatural powers or have good and evil spirits (Koentjaraningrat, 1984). The offering activity, moreover, has three objectives: safety, protection, and routine (Endraswara, 2015). They are addressed to the spirits or ancestors as an act of respect and as a way to get permission to enter invisible territories and uses of a place. This is a marking of territory for entering a certain area, including the territory of the invisible spirit. The permission to enter this kind of territory can be in the form of burning incense or frankincense (Fig. 9) by an authorized officer. These are in accordance with the theory of Haryadi (1995) which says that intangible spatial activities show the strength of the spirits. Defense of a place reflects territoriality which is owned and defended non-physically. Dewi, as a resident of the noble house, told in an interview on Monday June 12, 2023, about offerings and rituals in noble houses:

“This space can be used for activities, but there must be a ‘slametan’ first, preparing offerings, burning incense to ask permission from the ancestors; and this has been done since our grandmothers and grandfathers, and we are ordered to do it until the next generation.”



Fig. 9 : Burning incense as a territorial marker

Source: Setyadi, 2023

Offerings can be in the form of *kembang setaman* (mixed sweet flowers) placed on the boundary of the territory of space as a marker of different areas. They can also be in the form

different kinds of food offered to spirits which include: *ingkung* (whole chicken), yellow rice, black coffee, *jajan pasar* (traditional snacks), bananas, *apem*, sticky rice, *jenang*, e.t.c. It is a normative controlled territory in Javanese society (Sutrisno & Putranto, 2005). Gatot, as an elder in the palace, explained about offerings and burning incense in the interview January 30, 2023:

“Offerings and burning incense to ask for permission to use this space. All activities that involve using the ndalem always begin with offerings and burning incense to permit the ancestors.”

Sedekah Bumi (the earth alms ceremony) and procession as a ritual manifest spatially by utilizing the territory of the region in a ritual setting. This is a ritual tradition as an expression of gratitude to God for the fruits of the earth availed. The ceremony is held to achieve harmony with both the visible and invisible universe. *Kirab* (carnival) is a ritual of walking through or around an area as a symbolic manifestation of a territory. Santosa (2000) says that ritual is a system of power embodied in social relations manifested in space and time. This strengthens the concept of Weissman (1981) which reveals that territory is closely related to the way in which human beings interact with their environments and describes territoriality as an element of behavior.

Bedhaya Ketawang dance is a sacred dance performed only during the coronation of the King or *Tingalan Dalem Jumenengan Pakubuwono*. It is performed at the center point of the *Sasana Sewaka* pendapa of Surakarta Sunanate Palace, which is a sacred place. It is performed on the sacred space as the logical framework of a territorial manifestation. In interview on Saturday, 29 April, 2023, Kanjeng as a Surakarta Palace culturalist remarked:

“Bedhaya Ketawang dancers must still be virgins because this is a sacred dance that is only performed during Jumenengan events in sacred place in the palace.”

Sutrisno & Putranto (2005) also says that the sacred concept is a normative territorial control of community life based on the religious dimension. These findings reinforce the theory of Koentjaraningrat (1984) which proposes that customs and rituals are considered sacred by the community function as regulators of behavior, and they are coercive. Customs and rituals, in addition, perpetuate power by maintaining the territory of space without a legal system because its citizens automatically obey them. The sacred dance as a control determines the boundaries between people: one with another through the marking of ownership (Altman, 1975; Laurens, 2004).

Javanese people are known to collect and respect heirlooms as a source of supernatural powers, a source of salvation, and as a symbol of power (Moedjanto, 1987). Heirlooms can be a variety of objects such as: daggers, spears, umbrellas, and other stuffs. They are placed in a special room with a strong territory so that only certain people are allowed to enter. Indeed, they believe that ownership of heirlooms will enable them to gain position and power that can overcome other people. As stated by Geertz (1983; 1986), Ronald (2005), the religious nature of Javanese society is shown through Javanese culture that continues to this day. Places that have heirlooms are believed to strengthen and maintain the territorial power. In line with the theory of Altman (1975) and Laurens (2004), territory is asserted through personalization as a sign of ownership. Brown (1997) also states that designing space is in accordance with the adopted principle of territory. This fact strengthens Lang (1987) who says that the defense of personal space and territoriality is to achieve an optimal level of privacy. Agus, as a resident of the noble house, said in an interview on Thursday, June 8, 2023, about heirlooms room:

“Keris and spears are heirlooms from parents who have supernatural powers, so they are always placed around the krobongan, and the area is fenced off so that no one else who is not family can enter.”

Samir (sash) has two colors, predominantly golden yellow, and there is a layer of red stripes on the edges that are the same length. *Samir* is used by visitors or people who enter the territory of the core areas or the sacred territory (Fig. 10). It is worn as a symbolic act of asking permission to the invisible world because the areas of the palace are inhabited or guarded not only by human beings but also by other creatures like spirits and ancestors. It is a marker for entering the territory of an area bordering the visible and invisible worlds. Agus told in an interview on Wednesday, June 7, 2023, about *Samir* :

“If you want to enter the ndalem room for a survey you have to use samir and burn incense every day to be safe.”

The use of it supports and is in line with the theories articulated by Altman (1975), Gifford (2010) Haryadi (1995) and Laurens (2005), in which they have said that factors that affect territoriality include the personal factors of Javanese society, the physical and social order of the Javanese culture, cultural factors and the behavioral habits of the people passed down to the next generation as an unwritten norm.



Fig. 10: Use of *samir* as a symbolic act of asking permission to the invisible world and as a sign of entering the territory of the intangible
Source: Setyadi, 2023

Conclusions

This paper concludes that tangible territory and intangible territories in the Javanese society are maintained to this day because the concept of territory is integrated with culture, rituals, customs and myths. Thus, they are able to perpetuate power over a region. Javanese people believe in spirits or souls in the form of objects, spaces, places, plants, animals, and even people. Therefore, according to them, all objects around them are alive and have supernatural powers and have territories. This belief system is developed to defend territories as manifestations of eternal powers.

The territorial patterns in ancient Javanese residences include tangible territories and intangible territories. Tangible territories are formed by: (1) Configurations of sacred spaces, (2) Colors of spatial elements, (3) Elements of the physical spaces (4) Heights of spaces (5) Structures and constructions of spaces and (6) Positions of spaces. Intangible territories, on the other hand, are formed by: (1) Rituals and offerings, (2) Sacred dances, (3) Culture and arts, and (4) Heirlooms.

Socialization practices of tangible and intangible territories are passed down from generation to generation in a conservative manner that incorporates Javanese beliefs and culture. These territories shape behavior, interactions and habits of the communities; transmits and reproduces power; and binds the Javanese society. In fact, territories in Java are formed based on the cultural backgrounds of the local communities, hence creating emotional and social ties between communities and places.

This tangible and intangible territory research has limitations on loci, so it is necessary to conduct similar research on loci in other Javanese palace areas, such as the Yogyakarta and

Cirebon palaces, to strengthen these findings. Interdisciplinary research collaboration is needed to enrich territorial knowledge and interpretation.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express her gratitude to Sebelas Maret University and the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM) for funding this research with contract number 228/UN27.22/PT.01.03/2023; Baluwarti Village Office, the owner of the residence in Baluwarti in Surakarta Sunanate Palace who participated in the survey surveyed; and all parties who have assisted in conducting the field surveys; the elders of the palace; source persons including key persons who have provided valuable information for researchers when collecting data.

References

- Abednego, I. A. (2020) Territorial Characteristics of Outdoor Space, Akcaya Settlement, Pontianak City, *Architecture & Environment*, 19 (2), 99-112.
<https://iptek.its.ac.id/index.php/joae/article/view/7477/5132>
- Adhanani, R. A. N. (2013) Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Perencanaan Teritorial (Studi Komparasi: Borobudur dan Nantes). *Jurnal Pembangunan Wilayah & Kota*, 9(4), 355.
<https://doi.org/10.14710/pwk.v9i4.6674>
- Altman, I. (1975) *The Environment and Social Behavior: Privacy, Personal Space, Crowding*. Wadsworth.
- Altman, I. & Chemers, M. M. (1984) *Culture and Environment*. Cambridge; California: Cambridge University Press; Brooks/Cole Publisher Company.
- Altman, I. & Low, S.M. (1992) *Place Attachment*. New York: Plenum press.
- Amalia, A. A. & Amal, C. A. (2019) Teritorialitas Ruang Pada Permukiman Kampung Melayu Kota Makassar. *Linears : Jurnal Ilmu Arsitektur*, 1(1), 28–34.
<https://doi.org/10.26618/j-linears.v1i1.1319>
- Amra, P. H., Tungka, A. E. & Warouw, F. (2018) Kajian Teritorialitas dalam Tatanan Hunian Islami di Kampung Arab Manado. *Jurnal Fraktal*, 3(1), 51–60
- Arifin, L S. (2009) Belajar Dari Kearifan Nilai Lokal Budaya Untuk Mengatasi Dampak Perubahan Iklim, Makalah, dalam Seminar Nasional Lingkungan Hidup. Univ. Kristen Petra, Surabaya.
- Behrend, T. E. (1982) *Kraton And Cosmos in Traditional Java*. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Brown, F. E. (1997) Space is the machine. In *Design Studies* (Vol. 18, Issue 3).
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0142-694x\(97\)89854-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0142-694x(97)89854-7)
- Burhanuddin (2010) Karakteristik Teritorialitas Ruang. *Jurnal Ruang*, 2(1), 39–46.
<http://jurnal.untad.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/RUANG/article/view/709>
- Chen, J. (2022) Toward the territorial meaning in walking and staying: use representational diagrams to invigorate imaginary walking. *Ri-Vista*, 20(1), 188–205.
<https://doi.org/10.36253/rv-12514>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013) *Research Design. Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Creswell, J. W. (2015) *Penelitian Kualitatif & Desain Riset. Memilih Di antara Lima Pendekatan. Terjemahan dari Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Dewi Nur'aini, R. & Ikaputra, I. (2019) Teritorialitas Dalam Tinjauan Ilmu Arsitektur. *Inersia: LN formasi Dan Ekspose Hasil Riset Teknik Sipil Dan Arsitektur*, 15(1), 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.21831/inersia.v15i1.24860>
- Edney, J. J. (1974) Human Territoriality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81(12), 959–975.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037444>
- Endraswara, S. (2015) *Etnologi Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Center for Academic Publishing Service
- Fatimah, D. (2010) Gender Dalam Teritori. *Jurnal Waca Cipta Ruang*, 2(2), 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.34010/wcr.v1i1.1661>

- Flachsbart, P. G. (1969) Urban Territorial Behavior. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(6), 412–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977261>
- Forster, T., Penagos, A., Scherr, S., Buck, L. & Ramirez, E. (2021) Territorial Approaches for Sustainable Development: Stocktaking on Territorial Approaches - Experiences and Lessons. *Giz*. <https://www.giz.de/de/downloads/giz2021-en-territorial-approaches-for-sustainable-development.pdf%0A>
- Frick, H. (1997) Pola Struktural dan Teknik Bangunan di Indonesia Suatu Pendekatan arsitektur Indonesia Melalui Pattern Language secara Konstruktif dengan contoh arsitektur Jawa Tengah. Yogyakarta: Kanisius & Soegijapranata University Press
- Geertz, C. (1983) *Local Knowledge Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic books Inc Publishers
- Geertz, C. (1986) *Mojokuto Dinamika Sosial Sebuah Kota di Jawa*. Jakarta: PT Pustaka Grafitipers.
- Geldern, R. H. (1982) *Konsepsi Tentang Negara & Kedudukan Raja Di Asia Tenggara*. Jakarta: Rajawali.
- Gifford, R. (2010) *Environmental Psychologi: Principle and Practice*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gold, J. R. (1982) Territoriality and human spatial behaviour. *Progress in Human Geography*, 6(1), 44–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030913258200600102>
- Hadinugroho, I. D. L. (2004) *Ruang Dan Perilaku: Suatu Kajian Arsitektural*. Usu Digital Library.
- Hakim, I. C., Sunoko, K., & Purwani, O. (2020) Spatial territoriality in the Semanggi embankment area. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 447(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/447/1/012029>
- Hall, Edward T. (1978) Human Needs for Autonomy and Dependence in Technological Environments: Review and Commentary.” In Brent R. RUBIN (ed.). *Communication Yearbook II*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press
- Haryadi, Setiawan. B. (1995) *Arsitektur Lingkungan dan Perilaku, Proyek Pengembangan Pusat studi Dirjen Dekbud*. Yogyakarta
- Haryadi,Setiawan, B. (2010) *Arsitektur Lingkungan dan Perilaku*, Gadjah Mada University Press. Yogyakarta Inc.
- Kartodirdjo, S. & Sudewo, A. (1987) *Perkembangan Peradaban Priyayi*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press
- Khoiriyyah, J. F., Ikaprasi, F. O. C., Zhaafirah, H. & Winasi, S. S. (2022) Analisa Teritorial Kawasan Kota Lama, Kecamatan Kotagede , Yogyakarta. 33–41.
- Koentjaraningrat. (1984) *Kebudayaan Jawa*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Lang, J. (1987) *Creating Architectural Theory: The Role of the Behavioral Sciences in Environmental Design*. New York: Van Norstrand Reinhold
- Laurens, J.M. (2004) *Arsitektur dan Perilaku Manusia*, Grasindo, Surabaya
- Lianto, F., Trisno, R., Husin, D. & Thedyardi, C. (2022) Kampung Taman’s Corridor Structure Investigation: A Territorial Analysis by Using a Snapshot Method. *Journal of Regional and City Planning*, 33(1), 66–83. <https://doi.org/10.5614/jpwk.2022.33.1.4>
- Marlina, A. (2022) *Gapura Kori Keraton Kasunanan Surakarta Dimensi, Proporsi, dan Makna*. Surakarta: K-Media Yogyakarta
- Marlina, A., Musyawaroh. & Cahyono, U. J. (2022) The Spatial Patterns of Javanese Settlements as the Representation of Patron-Client Politics: Nobles, Ulemas, and Merchants’ Settlements. *ISVS e-journal*, 9(5), 204-224.
- Moedjanto, G. (1987) *Konsep Kekuasaan Jawa: Penerapannya oleh Raja-raja Mataram*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius
- Mulder, Niels. (1985) *Pribadi dan Masyarakat Jawa*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan
- Nugrahadi, P. A. H. & Franseno Pujianto. (2020) Territorial Analisis of Keraton Kanoman. *Riset Arsitektur (RISA)*, 4(02), 190–204. <https://doi.org/10.26593/risa.v4i02.3806.190-204>

- Nurazizah, L. T., Dewiyanti, D., Natalia, T. W. & Chandra, N. (2022) Teritori Ruang Bermain Anak Pada Fasilitas Prasekolah Di Kota Bandung. *Vitruvian*, 12(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/dx.doi.org/10.22441/vitruvian.2022.v12i1.001> p-ISSN
- Parvin, M. & Sommer, M. (1980) Dar al-islam: The Evolution of muslim territorially and its implications for conflict resolution in the middle east. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 11(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743800000246>
- Ponomarev, E. & Ivshin, K. (2020) Territorial (re)branding as a factor in the sustainable development of the city. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 890(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/890/1/012184>
- Priatmodjo, D. (2004) Keraton Kasunanan Surakarta Masa kini : Suatu Kajian Antropologi Tentang Reposisi Kerajaan Tradisional. Depok: Universitas Indonesia. Dissertation.
- Purwanto, A. (2021) Teritorialitas pada Transformasi Spasial Rumah Tradisional Jawa studi kasus : Rumah Tradisional Jawa di Kotagede, Yogyakarta
- Putri, R., Pangarsa, G. W. & Ernawati, J. (2012) Pendekatan Teritori Pada Fleksibilitas Ruang Dalam Tradisi Sinoman Dan Biyada Di Dusun Karang Ampel Malang. *DIMENSI (Jurnal Teknik Arsitektur)*, 39(2), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.9744/dimensi.39.2.65-76>
- Raffestin, C. & Butler, S. A. (2012) Space, territory, and territoriality. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 30(1), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d21311>
- Ramadhani, A. N. (2021) Territoriality in Tourism Kampung Alley As a Shared Public Space. *Jurnal Arsitektur Arcade*, 5(3), 215. <https://doi.org/10.31848/arcade.v5i3.587>
- Rapoport, A. (1969) *House Form and culture*, Engelwood Cliffs, New York, Prentice Hall.
- Rapoport, A. (1990) *The Meaning of the Built Environment: A Nonverbal Communication Approach* (2nd ed.). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Rapoport, A. (1977) *Human Aspect of Urban Form*, New York: Pergamon Press,
- Rapoport, A. (1982) *Cross-Cultural Aspect of Environmental Design*; in book of *Human Behavior and Environment; Advances Theory and Research*. London: Plenum Press,
- Ratnasari, A. & Permatasari, R. (2019) Diskrepansi Pemanfaatan Ruang Publik Berdasarkan Teritori Ruang (Studi Kasus: Alun-alun Kota Klaten). *Undagi : Jurnal Ilmiah Jurusan Arsitektur Universitas Warmadewa*, 7(1), 1–10. <http://ojs.unr.ac.id/index.php/teknikgradien/article/view/462>
- Ratnasari, V. A. D., Sumartinah, H. R. & Septanti, D. (2020) Pergeseran Teritori Sebagai Bentuk Adaptasi Pada Teras Rumah Akibat Pengembangan Pariwisata Di Kampung Pelangi, Kota Semarang. *Jurnal Arsitektur Arcade*, 4(3), 305–313. <https://doi.org/10.31848/arcade.v4i3.504>
- Rochani, A., Yuliasuti, N. & Sudarwanto, B. (2022) Sustainable urban communities: Territoriality of waqf-based communal place in Kampong Cities. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1098(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1098/1/012073>
- Ronald, A. (2005) *Nilai-Nilai Arsitektur Rumah Tradisional Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Roosandriantini, J. & Meilan, F. Y. (2020) Penerapan Konsep Sosial Dan Behavior Setting Pada Rumah Adat Bali. *Atrium: Jurnal Arsitektur*, 6(1), 23–31. <https://doi.org/10.21460/atrium.v6i1.84>
- Salgueiro Barrio, R. (2022) Maps are plans: re-evaluating territorial hermeneutics through Manuel de Solà-Morales' project of description. *City, Territory and Architecture*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40410-022-00167-0>
- Santosa, R. B. (2000) *Omah Membaca Makna Rumah Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Bentang Budaya
- Santoso, J. (2008) *Arsitektur-Kota Jawa; Kosmos, Kultur & Kuasa*. Jakarta : Centropolis - Magister Teknik Perencanaan Universitas Tarumanegara
- Setiadi, Hadi. & Trihandayani. (2001) *Raja Di Alam Republik Keraton Kasunanan Surakarta dan Paku Buwono XII*. Jakarta: Bina Rena Pariwara
- Shah, A., Wulandari, E. & Izziah. (2021) Territorial characteristic through residential boundaries on Indo-Tiongkok relocation housing in Neuheun, Aceh Besar. *IOP*

- Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 1087(1), 012034.
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899x/1087/1/012034>
- Soeratman, D. (2000) *Kehidupan Dunia Keraton Surakarta 1830-1939*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Untuk Indonesia
- Sumintardja, Djauhari. (1978) *Kompedium Sejarah Arsitektur*, Bandung: yayasan Lembaga Penyelidikan Masalah Bangunan
- Susanti, I. S., Komala Dewi, N. I. & Permana, A. Y. (2018) *Tatanan Teritorial dalam Proses Transformasi Hunian*. *Jurnal Arsitektur ZONASI*, 1(1), 27–37.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/jaz.v1i1.11542>
- Sutrisno, M. & Putranto, H. (2007) *Teori-teori Kebudayaan*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius
- Taylor, Peter J. (1996) *Territorial Absolutism and Its Evasions*, *Geography Research Forum*, 16: 1-12
- Weissman, Gerald, D. (1981) *Modeling Environmental Behavior System*, *ABrief Nose, Journal of Man-Environment Relations*, Vol. 1. No. 2 The Pennsylvania State University
- Wiryoartono, A. B. (1995) *Seni Bangunan Dan Seni Binakota di Indonesia: Kajian Mengenai Konsep, Struktur, Dan Elemen Fisik Kota Sejak Peradaban Hindu-Buddha, Islam hingga sekarang*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Yilmaz, S. (2018) *Human territoriality: a spatial control strategy*. *Alternatif Politika*, 10(2), 131–155. <file:///Users/macbookavi/Downloads/1-Yilmaz-Human-Territoriality.pdf>
- Yong, S. De, Rachmawati, M. & Defiana, I. (2021) *Rethinking territoriality concept on public space after pandemic COVID-19*. *International Journal of Public Health Science (IJPHS)*, 10(4), 856–864
- You-tien, H. (2013) *Territoriality and Space Production in China*. *Cross-Currents: East Asian History and Culture Review*, 9(33), 115–142
- Zakirova, Y. A., Khusnutdinova, S. R. & Faizrakhmanova, G. R. (2020) *Transformation of the City Environment: Functional-Planning and Territorial Aspects*. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 753(4). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/753/4/042069>
- Zubaidi, F. (2019) *Types and Patterns of Territory In The Traditional Settlement Of Ngata Toro*. 18(2), 123–134