

Genealogical Custodianship and Layered Authority: Heritage Governance at the Amangkurat I Tomb, Indonesia

*Zikhra Dwi Imania¹, Lukmanul Hakim², Dedy Susanto³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo, Semarang, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: zikhradwi@gmail.com

Abstract

Religious tourism governance becomes complex when ritual authority, heritage administration, tourism planning, devotional recognition, and local livelihoods overlap. Existing studies emphasize collaboration and service improvement but provide limited explanations of how formal coordination can be introduced at sites where genealogical custodianship constitutes part of the governance structure. This study examines how sacred authority, genealogical custodianship, and cultural-heritage governance shape the management of the Amangkurat I Tomb; identifies the associated power relations and institutional problems; and formulates a context-sensitive institutional initiation strategy. A qualitative case study was conducted in January 2026 with 21 purposively selected informants comprising a key custodian, repeat pilgrims, nearby residents, local traders, and government officials. Data from interviews, non-participant observation, and documentary sources were examined through coding, triangulation, and interpretive comparison. The findings show that the authority of the *abdi dalem* derives from genealogical succession, reported court appointment, ritual service, and recognition by pilgrims. This authority coexists with cultural-heritage regulation, tourism planning, community interests, and local livelihoods, but these domains are not connected through a documented cross-actor mechanism. The resulting problems include concentrated custodial workloads, incomplete visitor records, pressure on facilities during peak periods, contested historical narratives, limited community consultation, and concerns about the position of local traders. The study formulates a six-stage institutional initiation strategy beginning with authority mapping and a limited coordination forum before administrative, legal, promotional, or physical development. This strategy is an analytical proposal rather than an implemented model. The study contributes a layered-authority perspective in which institutional development connects, rather than replaces, genealogical and ritual custodianship.

Keywords: *Abdi Dalem; Genealogical Custodianship; Heritage Governance; Institutional Initiation; Religious Tourism; Sacred Authority*

A. Introduction

Religious tourism involves more than travel to a sacred destination. It is also a social and religious process through which devotional practices, collective memory, ritual authority, heritage preservation, and local economic interests are negotiated. Pilgrimage sites acquire sacred significance through narratives, embodied practices, and recognition of the religious actors who guide visitors (Eade and Sallnow 1991). Pilgrimage scholarship also shows that contemporary journeys increasingly blur the boundary between pilgrimage and tourism (Collins-Kreiner 2010). When such sites also become tourism destinations, their management must address not only visitor services and promotion but also competing claims over history, authority, and the appropriate use of sacred space (Zhu 2025). Studies in Indonesia similarly show that religious destinations connect spiritual practices with cultural preservation and local economic activity, although these relationships do not always develop without tension (Larassanti, Zaenab, and Darmaningrum 2023; Azhaari 2024; Merina and Pratama 2025).

Governance becomes particularly complex when ritual authority and administrative authority are held by different actors. Research on Indonesian religious tourism has identified the roles of tomb custodians, government agencies, local communities, and tourism awareness groups in destination management (Hutapea, Siregar, and Ritonga 2022). Collaborative governance has also been proposed as a means of coordinating religious service, destination development, and public administration (Susanto et al. 2023). From an Islamic communication perspective, *da'wah* (Islamic religious outreach) may also be incorporated into tourism through *da'wah bi al-rihlah* (travel-based religious outreach), which connects pilgrimage travel with religious learning and cultural experience (Fikri 2022). These approaches demonstrate the importance of cross-actor coordination, but they do not eliminate the possibility that administrative intervention, commercial development, or promotional narratives may conflict with the authority through which a site is recognized as sacred. Indonesian evidence from the Sunan Bonang Tomb further demonstrates that the development of sacred zones may be accompanied by commodification when religious tradition, state support, and managerial authority intersect (Ghozi et al. 2025).

These tensions are evident at the Amangkurat I Tomb in Tegal Regency, Central Java. The tomb is officially registered as a cultural-heritage site and is promoted as a religious tourism destination (Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi 2022; Dinas Kebudayaan, Pariwisata, dan Ekonomi Kreatif Provinsi Jawa Tengah 2026). Locally, Amangkurat I is remembered not only as a seventeenth-century ruler of Islamic Mataram but also through narratives of spiritual distinction and blessing. Everyday ritual service is conducted by *abdi dalem* (royal court attendants serving as custodians), whose

authority is connected to genealogical succession, appointment by the *Keraton* (Javanese royal court), ritual service, and recognition by pilgrims. Cultural-heritage administration is undertaken by the regional Cultural Office, while tourism promotion and planning for the supporting area involve the Tourism Office. The *Lembaga Dewan Adat Keraton Surakarta* (LDA; Surakarta Palace Customary Council) is also involved in preserving customary practices and maintaining relations associated with the Surakarta court. Governance at the site therefore involves several forms of authority that overlap without being consolidated into a single formal organization.

This arrangement differs from an established tourism organization that merely requires stronger staffing, facilities, or managerial capacity. The site is sustained through genealogical custodianship, voluntary ritual service, government mandates, pilgrim recognition, and community participation. In this article, “institutional initiation” refers to the gradual development of formal or semi-formal coordinating mechanisms within this existing configuration. The concept does not imply replacing traditional custodianship with a modern tourism organization. It concerns how role boundaries, communication procedures, visitor services, documentation, accountability, and community participation might be developed while retaining the ritual authority of the *abdi dalem* and the heritage responsibilities of public agencies.

Previous studies offer several relevant but incomplete points of comparison. Research on the Jami’ Pekojan Mosque proposes internal measures such as role allocation, guide preparation, facility maintenance, and service innovation, together with external measures involving partnerships, branding, and digital promotion (Savitri, Karim, and Muhtadin 2023). The PAINS model—privacy, amenities, identity, networks, and safety—provides criteria for evaluating Muslim women-friendly tourism services (Hakim et al. 2025). Other studies examine local institutional capacity, genealogy-based educational tourism, and service-oriented religious tourism development (Aziz et al. 2024; Susanto et al. 2024; Susanto et al. 2025). These studies address collaboration, visitor services, human resources, promotion, and community participation. However, they do not explain how such measures should be negotiated at a pilgrimage site where everyday governance depends on genealogical *abdi dalem* custodianship and where ritual legitimacy, royal authority, cultural-heritage regulation, tourism planning, pilgrim recognition, and local livelihoods intersect. The research gap concerns this particular configuration of layered authority and the institutional mechanisms needed to connect its actors without displacing the sacred basis of custodianship.

Accordingly, this study has three objectives: (1) to examine how sacred authority, genealogical custodianship, and cultural-heritage governance shape the management of the Amangkurat I Tomb; (2) to identify the power relations

and institutional problems that emerge among the *Keraton*, LDA, government agencies, *abdi dalem*, pilgrims, residents, and local traders; and (3) to formulate a realistic institutional initiation strategy that does not weaken the site's sacred character. The article argues that the Amangkurat I Tomb is governed through layered forms of legitimacy rather than through a single managerial structure. Institutional development must therefore begin by clarifying and connecting these forms of authority instead of treating traditional custodianship as an organizational deficiency that can be corrected through formalization alone.

B. Methods

This study employed a qualitative case-study design to examine authority relations and everyday governance at the Amangkurat I Tomb. The case was defined as a governance arena involving genealogical custodianship, *Keraton*-based ritual legitimacy, cultural-heritage administration, tourism planning, pilgrims, residents, and local traders. This design enabled the analysis to examine relationships among actors within the site's sacred, historical, and institutional context rather than reducing the case to the managerial capacity of a single custodian (Yin 2018; Sugiyono 2022).

Data were collected in January 2026 from 21 purposively selected informants with direct knowledge of or repeated engagement with the site. They comprised one key custodian or *abdi dalem*; ten repeat pilgrims – five women and five men aged 39–59 – from Bojong, Pemalang, Jatinegara, and Bumijawa; six nearby residents aged 41–57; two local food and beverage traders aged 39–42; one Tegal Regency Cultural Office official; and one Tourism Office official. The interviews addressed genealogical and ritual authority, *bisyaroh* (voluntary honoraria or donations), visitor experiences, facilities, local livelihoods, community participation, cultural-heritage responsibilities, tourism planning, narrative control, and the feasibility of cross-actor coordination.

Table 1.
Informant and Evidence Matrix

Source or actor	Number	Evidence status	Primary analytical function
Key custodian/ <i>abdi dalem</i>	1	Interview and observation	Ritual authority, custodianship, workload, donations, and sacred narratives
<i>Keraton</i> /LDA	–	Mediated evidence	Genealogical and ritual legitimacy
Cultural Office official	1	Interview and documents	Heritage administration, preservation, facilities, and coordination
Tourism Office official	1	Institutional interview	Planning, promotion, DED, visitor data, <i>Pokdarwis</i> , and coordination

Repeat pilgrims	10	Interviews and observation	Devotional recognition, visitor experience, facilities, and feedback
Residents	6	Interviews and observation	Sacred norms, ritual support, traffic, waste, and participation
Local traders	2	Interviews and observation	Livelihoods, business arrangements, and zoning concerns

Source: Authors' fieldwork data

The interviews were examined together with non-participant observation of visitor flow, spatial capacity, facilities, voluntary-donation practices, and informal businesses. Documentary sources included the official cultural-heritage record, government tourism information, reports on restoration and pilgrimage activities, and previous research on *Jamasan* (a ritual cleansing ceremony) and community participation at the site (Mislakhunnisa 2022). Evidence from the custodian, pilgrims, residents, traders, and government officials was treated as direct interview evidence. Evidence concerning the Keraton and LDA remained mediated through interviews with other actors, official documents, ritual documentation, and previous research because neither institution was interviewed directly.

The analysis proceeded through data condensation, open coding, stakeholder coding, triangulation coding, and interpretive comparison. These stages produced nine categories: genealogical sacred authority, legal-bureaucratic cultural-heritage authority, tourism-development authority, pilgrimage and sacred narrative, ritual labor, community participation, local economic dependence, digital contestation of meaning, and institutional initiation. Credibility was addressed by comparing accounts across actor groups and with observation, documents, and previous studies. A major theme was retained when supported by at least two forms of evidence or convergent accounts from different groups. Member checking was limited to the key custodian, while other accounts were examined through comparison across participant groups and evidence sources. Interview excerpts were translated from Indonesian by the authors. Personal names have been removed and replaced with role-based identifiers. The absence of a direct *Keraton*/LDA interview and longitudinal visitor statistics limits conclusions concerning those actors and changes over time.

C. Results and Discussion

1. Results

1) Genealogical Custodianship and Layered Authority

Everyday management of the tomb remains centered on *abdi dalem* custodianship. The key custodian described the position as connected to family succession and appointment by the Surakarta *Keraton*. This authority is exercised through receiving pilgrims, explaining ritual etiquette and local history, maintaining the sacred atmosphere, and coordinating pilgrimage activities.

“There are two of us appointed as custodians by the Surakarta Palace – my younger sibling and me.” (Key Custodian, Interview 2026)

The custodian’s role operates alongside, rather than under, the authority of a single government office. The Cultural Office administers the protected heritage site and coordinates conservation, restoration, and facilities. The Tourism Office focuses on promotion, the Detailed Engineering Design (DED), and possible development of the supporting area. The *Keraton* and LDA remain associated with custodial appointment, royal memory, and ritual protocol. However, neither the *Keraton* nor LDA was interviewed directly; their involvement is reported through other participants, official documents, and previous research.

“Under the regulations, the Amangkurat I Tomb Site is cultural heritage administered by the Cultural Office. However, for management, processions, and activities, we coordinate directly with the Surakarta Palace.” (Cultural Office Official, Institutional Interview 2026)

“The inner site is within the authority of the Education and Culture Office, while the outer area – through a tourism-village framework – would enter the Tourism Office’s domain.” (Tourism Office Official, Institutional Interview 2026)

The interviews indicate that the division of authority is recognized but not formally integrated. The Cultural Office reported regular communication with the custodians but no cross-actor management team. The Tourism Office supported the creation of a coordination forum while clarifying that the inner heritage site was outside its direct management authority. Residents described communication as occurring mainly through notification about planned activities or projects rather than through joint decision-making.

Table 2.

Authority, Evidence, and Governance Problems			
Actor	Form of authority or interest	Evidence in this study	Main governance problem
<i>Keraton</i> / LDA	Genealogical and ritual legitimacy	Mediated through interviews,	No direct interview; role boundaries are not formally documented

			documents, and previous research	
Cultural Office	Legal cultural- heritage authority	and	Institutional interview and official documents	No formal cross-actor team; conservation requires coordination with ritual actors
Key custodian/ <i>abdi dalem</i>	Everyday ritual and service authority		Interview and observation	Workload, absence of shifts, limited staff, and weak administrative support
Tourism Office	Planning and promotion for the supporting area		Institutional interview	No integrated visitor data, satisfaction survey, dedicated personnel, formal narrative, or confirmed <i>Pokdarwis</i>
Pilgrims	Devotional recognition and visitor feedback		Ten interviews and observation	Queues, facility pressure, limited information, and no structured feedback mechanism
Residents and traders	Sacred, neighborhood, and livelihood interests		Eight interviews and observation	Limited consultation, traffic, waste, informal business arrangements, and displacement concerns

Source: Authors' interviews, observation, and documentary analysis.

The evidence therefore shows a layered governance arrangement. The *Keraton/LDA*, Cultural Office, Tourism Office, custodian, pilgrims, residents, and traders hold different forms of legitimacy, responsibility, or practical knowledge. The principal institutional problem is not the complete absence of communication but the absence of a documented mechanism through which these roles can be coordinated.

2) Sacred Narratives, Visitor Services, and Community Interests

Pilgrimage is sustained by narratives that connect Amangkurat I with royal history, spiritual distinction, and blessing. The ten repeat pilgrims described visiting individually, with family members, or through religious groups. Several reported annual visits during *Suro* (the first month of the Javanese calendar), *Mulud* (the period associated with the Prophet Muhammad's birthday), harvest periods, or Friday *Kliwon* nights in the Javanese calendrical cycle. Their motivations combined prayer, family tradition, spiritual reflection, and historical curiosity.

“My purpose is to seek blessing and send prayers for the ancestors. It has been a family practice since childhood; before an important family event, I come here and pray for ease.” (Pilgrim 1, Interview 2026)

Residents similarly regarded the tomb as both a royal historical site and a sacred inheritance. The custodian's account included local beliefs concerning the

spiritual status of Amangkurat I. These statements are reported as participant-attributed sacred narratives rather than independently verified historical facts.

“Visitors are expected to believe that he was a saint, because the body was said to remain intact and fragrant, with the hair and nails continuing to grow.” (Key Custodian, Interview 2026)

The interviews and observation also identified pressure on the site’s spatial and human-resource capacity. The key custodian reported receiving individual visitors and large bus groups, while the inner chamber accommodates approximately 40–45 people at one time. On one occasion, the custodian estimated that 16 buses brought approximately 850 pilgrims. Group sizes reported by the interviewed pilgrims generally ranged from 20 to 50 people. Most pilgrims described waiting for approximately 30 minutes to more than one hour during peak periods.

“During holidays, our group may wait in the outer courtyard for more than an hour because the inner area is full. The elderly custodians have to serve several groups at once.” (Pilgrim 3, Interview 2026)

The service system relies on *bisyaroh*, which participants described as voluntary giving rather than an entrance fee. Pilgrims agreed that donations should remain voluntary, although they expressed different preferences regarding financial records. The Cultural Office stated that it had not intervened in the donation system because everyday ritual service falls within the domain of the *abdi dalem*. The custodian also reported the absence of staff shifts and described periods of severe fatigue.

“The *abdi dalem* have not yet arranged staff or duty shifts. On some days, I sleep only two or three hours.” (Key Custodian, Interview 2026)

Facility concerns centered on parking, toilets, water, waiting areas, signage, and written historical information. Residents reported that buses sometimes obstruct village roads and increase waste during peak periods. These findings do not indicate a complete absence of government action. The Cultural Office reported restoration around the main tomb complex and pavilion in 2024, followed in 2025 by support for parking, lighting, toilets, ablution facilities, and a secretariat. The remaining complaints therefore concern capacity, maintenance, and integration into a visitor-service system rather than the total absence of facilities.

“At peak times, parking still spills onto the main road, and waste and bus congestion affect residents’ daily access.” (Residents 1 and 2, Interviews 2026)

The traders described pilgrimage as an important source of seasonal income but expressed concern about exclusion from future spatial planning. One trader estimated that approximately 70 percent of their monthly income

depended on pilgrim groups. This figure represents the participant's account and was not independently verified through financial records.

"Approximately seventy percent of my monthly income depends on pilgrim groups. We want better organization, but small traders should be consulted and not displaced unilaterally." (Trader 1, Interview 2026)

Another issue concerned the absence of an agreed historical narrative. The custodian believed that some online accounts portrayed Amangkurat I negatively, while the Cultural Office and Tourism Office stated that they had not issued a formal historical narrative for the site. Residents preferred information provided by the custodian and the *Keraton* to unverified social-media content. The actors therefore supported written and digital information but differed on who should authorize its historical and ritual content.

3) A Staged Institutional Initiation Strategy

Participants generally supported stronger coordination, but their support was conditional. Pilgrims wanted the *Keraton* and *abdi dalem* to retain authority over prayer procedures and sacred etiquette. Residents requested consultation before decisions were implemented. Traders wanted protection from unilateral relocation. The Cultural Office supported a forum that remained aligned with *Keraton* rules, while the Tourism Office warned that a new institution could reproduce factional interests or competition over resources.

"Residents agree with a joint forum so that actors do not work separately, but we worry that too many leaders could turn it into competition over revenue and management shares." (Resident 3, Interview 2026)

"We support forming an institution, but hidden interests must be anticipated. If those risks are managed, an institution would help the site progress more than leaving it without one." (Tourism Office Official, Institutional Interview 2026)

Comparison of these accounts produced a six-stage institutional initiation strategy. The sequence begins with documenting existing authority and establishing a limited coordination forum before introducing administrative tools, digital narratives, legal arrangements, or physical development. The proposed time frames are an analytical formulation based on the findings; they have not been implemented or empirically evaluated.

Table 3.

Proposed Stages of Institutional Initiation				
Stage	Time frame	Principal actors	Main actions	Safeguards
1. Authority recognition	0-3 months	Custodian, <i>Keraton</i> /LDA, Cultural Office, Tourism Office, village	Map authority, sacred boundaries, heritage responsibilities,	Written minutes and direct validation by

		representatives, residents, and traders	DED status, and existing communication	participating actors
2. Coordination forum	3-6 months	<i>Keraton/LDA, abdi dalem</i> , government offices, village, residents, traders, and academics	Establish a limited nonprofit forum before forming a legal entity	Conflict-of-interest rules, local representation, and reserved ritual authority
3. Basic governance tools	6-12 months	Forum secretariat, custodians, government offices, and community volunteers	Develop visitor records, feedback, donation records, peak-day procedures, maintenance, waste and traffic plans, and business zoning	Voluntary giving, transparent records, and participatory zoning
4. Narrative and information	6-12 months	Custodian, <i>Keraton/LDA</i> , cultural officials, historians, and tourism media personnel	Prepare verified history, etiquette information, signage, brochures, and digital content	Multi-actor review and separation of historical evidence from sacred narrative
5. Legal and human-resource preparation	12-18 months	Forum, <i>Keraton/LDA</i> , local government, legal advisers, universities, and local youth	Prepare a legal partnership, guides, volunteers, and custodial regeneration after roles have stabilized	Financial oversight and protection of custodial authority
6. Collaborative development	After 18 months	Forum or legal entity, government offices, universities, community businesses, and religious groups	Implement heritage-sensitive facilities, visitor management, educational programs, and local business development	Capacity limits, protected ritual periods, conservation standards, and periodic evaluation

Source: Authors' analytical formulation based on the study findings.

The strategy does not recommend the immediate replacement of genealogical custodianship by a modern tourism organization. It proposes coordination mechanisms that connect existing forms of authority while responding to documented problems involving workload, visitor records, facilities, community consultation, historical information, and local livelihoods. Its effectiveness remains to be examined through subsequent implementation.

2. Discussion

The findings indicate that the principal problem at the Amangkurat I Tomb is not merely limited managerial capacity but the coexistence of several forms of authority that are not formally connected. Genealogical custodianship, royal recognition, heritage regulation, tourism planning, pilgrim trust, and community interests each provide a different basis for involvement. Consequently, ordinary organizational strengthening would be insufficient because there is no single organization whose authority is recognized across all these domains. The practical issue is how these forms of legitimacy can be coordinated without transferring ritual control to actors who do not possess custodial recognition.

The persistence of *abdi dalem* authority can be explained by the interaction of genealogical succession, *Keraton* appointment, ritual service, and pilgrim recognition. Weber's concept of traditional legitimacy accounts for the significance of inherited service and royal appointment, while Bourdieu's symbolic capital explains how repeated recognition gives the custodian authority that cannot be reproduced through a government job description (Weber 1978; Bourdieu 1991). The evidence does not establish charismatic authority in the strict Weberian sense. It more cautiously shows that institutional position and social recognition reinforce one another. This explains why administrative intervention that disregards custodial legitimacy could generate resistance even when intended to improve services.

Layered authority also shapes the contestation of sacred space and historical narrative. The tomb simultaneously functions as a protected heritage site, pilgrimage destination, royal memorial, neighborhood space, and source of local income. Comparable research shows that religious heritage is continually redefined through interactions among state, religious, commercial, and community actors (Eade and Sallnow 1991; Zhu 2025). At the Amangkurat I Tomb, disagreements over historical representation arise because documentary history, royal tradition, custodial belief, and tourism promotion follow different standards of authority. A safe narrative policy should not treat local sacred claims as verified historical facts, but neither should it exclude them from explaining how participants understand the site. Historical information and

digital content should therefore distinguish documented history, attributed belief, royal tradition, and contemporary interpretation.

A coordination forum could connect the participating actors, but inclusion alone would not ensure collaboration. Collaborative governance is affected by prior conflict, differences in resources, institutional design, trust, and leadership (Ansell and Gash 2008). Collaboration may also reproduce policy asymmetries when partnerships are treated as neutral managerial arrangements rather than as arenas of power (Hall 1999). Tourism research likewise shows that power relations remain present even when community participation is formally recognized (Reed 1997). Residents, traders, pilgrims, custodians, and government offices also do not have identical interests. Treating them as one homogeneous “community” could conceal differences concerning traffic, sacred order, visitor growth, business access, and revenue (Blackstock 2005; Waterton and Smith 2010). A workable forum therefore requires separate representation, documented role boundaries, conflict-of-interest rules, and consultation before decisions are implemented. These safeguards explain how coordination could reduce fragmentation without creating a new center of elite control.

The relationship between sacred preservation and tourism development is similarly conditional. Participants did not reject facilities, information, or local economic activity; they objected to changes that could weaken ritual authority, displace traders, or transform the tomb into an ordinary attraction. Research on the Shaolin Monastery demonstrates that tourism income may support a religious site while excessive commercialization may overshadow its sanctity (Hung et al. 2017). At the Amangkurat I Tomb, this tension could be managed through zoning that separates the sacred core, visitor facilities, transportation, and local businesses. The *bisyaroh* system should remain voluntary, although an agreed record of receipts and expenditures may improve accountability. Because this study did not examine financial records, the proposed mechanism remains an option for negotiation rather than a tested solution.

Visitor services and human-resource regeneration must also be adapted to custodial governance. The PAINS model offers useful questions about privacy, amenities, identity, networks, and safety (Hakim et al. 2025), but the present data do not support a conclusion about gender-specific needs because visitor experiences were not systematically analyzed by gender. The model is therefore appropriate as a future service audit rather than as an empirical finding. Similarly, training local youth and volunteers may reduce custodial workload, but ritual guidance should remain with authorized custodians. Human-resource development and local institutional strengthening can support crowd management, information services, maintenance, and administration (Prihatiningtyas et al. 2022; Hasanah et al. 2025), while succession and ritual authorization should remain within the relevant custodial and royal processes.

The conceptual contribution of the article lies in defining *abdi dalem*-based religious tourism governance as a configuration in which genealogy and ritual legitimacy shape how heritage administration, tourism planning, and community participation can operate. Previous studies demonstrate the value of collaboration, genealogy-based educational tourism, and internal-external destination-development strategies (Aas, Ladkin, and Fletcher 2005; Savitri, Karim, and Muhtadin 2023; Susanto et al. 2024). The present case adds that genealogical custodianship is not simply a cultural attraction or a human-resource arrangement; it forms part of the governance structure itself. Institutional initiation should therefore begin by identifying existing authority and negotiating role boundaries before introducing legal formation, promotional expansion, or physical development. Rather than representing a completed institutional transformation, the proposed sequence provides an analytical basis for examining how sacred authority and administrative coordination may be connected.

D. Conclusion

The governance of the Amangkurat I Tomb is structured through layered forms of authority rather than a single managerial organization. Genealogical succession, the custodian's reported appointment by the Surakarta Keraton, ritual service, and recognition by pilgrims sustain the authority of the *abdi dalem*, while government agencies exercise separate responsibilities for cultural-heritage preservation and tourism planning. Pilgrims, residents, and traders contribute devotional recognition, local knowledge, and livelihood interests. The main institutional problem is therefore not a complete absence of communication but the lack of a documented mechanism for coordinating these different forms of authority. This fragmentation is reflected in concentrated custodial workloads, incomplete visitor records, pressure on facilities during peak periods, contested historical narratives, limited community consultation, and concerns about the position of local traders.

The study conceptualizes *abdi dalem*-based religious tourism governance as an arrangement in which genealogy and ritual legitimacy shape the possibilities of heritage administration, tourism development, and community participation. The proposed institutional initiation strategy begins with authority recognition and negotiated role boundaries, followed by a limited coordination forum, basic governance tools, jointly reviewed historical and visitor information, legal and human-resource preparation, and heritage-sensitive collaborative development. This sequence does not replace genealogical custodianship or demonstrate a completed institutional transformation. It provides a context-sensitive framework through which coordination may be

developed while protecting ritual authority, voluntary giving, cultural-heritage responsibilities, and local livelihoods.

References

- Aas, Christina, Adele Ladkin, and John Fletcher. 2005. "Stakeholder Collaboration and Heritage Management." *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(1):28–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2004.04.005>.
- Ansell, Chris, and Alison Gash. 2008. "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(4):543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>.
- Azhaari, Hasna. 2024. "Pariwisata Religi sebagai Pariwisata Berkelanjutan: Preferensi Penunjang Ekonomi Kerakyatan di Kota Semarang." *Jurnal MD: Jurnal Manajemen Dakwah* 10(1):1–26. <https://ejournal.uin-suka.ac.id/dakwah/JMD/article/view/2919>.
- Aziz, Abdul, Riezkh Ika Desya Putri, Faqih Mubarak, Luthfi Faridah, and Siti Anisatun Nafi'ah. 2024. "Penguatan Modal Sosial Berbasis Lembaga Lokal Pengelola Destinasi Wisata Edukasi Religi." *Transformatif: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat* 5(1):15–29. <https://doi.org/10.22515/tranformatif.v5i1.7716>.
- Blackstock, Kirsty. 2005. "A Critical Look at Community Based Tourism." *Community Development Journal* 40(1):39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsi005>.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Collins-Kreiner, Noga. 2010. "Researching Pilgrimage: Continuity and Transformations." *Annals of Tourism Research* 37(2):440–456. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.10.016>.
- Dinas Kebudayaan, Pariwisata, dan Ekonomi Kreatif Provinsi Jawa Tengah. 2026. "Makam Sunan Amangkurat." Retrieved July 30, 2026. <https://visitjawatengah.jatengprov.go.id/id/regency/kabupaten-tegal/destinasi-wisata/makam-sunan-amangkurat>.
- Eade, John, and Michael J. Sallnow, eds. 1991. *Contesting the Sacred: The Anthropology of Christian Pilgrimage*. London: Routledge.
- Fikri, Ibnu. 2022. "Da'wah bi al-Rihlah: A Methodological Concept of Da'wah Based on Travel and Tourism." *Jurnal Ilmu Dakwah* 42(2):160–173. <https://doi.org/10.21580/jid.v42.2.13591>.
- Ghozi, Ahmad, Andrik Purwasito, Warto, and Wakil Abdullah Rais. 2025. "The Architecture of Sunan Bonang's Tomb: Commodification of Sacred Zones in Religious Tourism." *Journal of Islamic Architecture* 8(4):883–899. <https://doi.org/10.18860/jia.v8i4.26328>.

- Hakim, Lukmanul, Ibna Azka Hafidzah, Dedy Susanto, and Fania Mutiara Savitri. 2025. "PAINS Model in the Development of Muslim Women-Friendly Tourist Destinations." *Indonesian Journal of Tourism and Leisure* 6(2):112-127. <https://doi.org/10.36256/ijtl.v6i2.473>.
- Hall, C. Michael. 1999. "Rethinking Collaboration and Partnership: A Public Policy Perspective." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 7(3-4):274-289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589908667340>.
- Hasanah, Luluk Ulfa, Ghulam Maulana Ilham, Endang Poerbowati, and Luthfiyah Puspa Maharani Ashari. 2025. "Pendampingan Penguatan Kelembagaan Kelompok Sadar Wisata Desa Claket menuju Desa Wisata Mandiri." *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Bangsa* 3(5):2442-2452. <https://doi.org/10.59837/jpmba.v3i5.2704>.
- Hung, Kam, Xiaoxiao Yang, Philipp Wassler, Dan Wang, Pei Lin, and Zhaoping Liu. 2017. "Contesting the Commercialization and Sanctity of Religious Tourism in the Shaolin Monastery, China." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 19(2):145-159. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2093>.
- Hutapea, Sabrina, Muhammad Habibi Siregar, and Hasnun Jauhari Ritonga. 2022. "Sistem Pengelolaan Obyek Wisata Religi di Makam Syekh Mahmud Barus." *Al-Idarah: Jurnal Pengkajian Dakwah dan Manajemen* 10(2):51-61. <https://doi.org/10.37064/ai.v10i2.21402>.
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. 2022. "Situs Makam Amangkurat I." Retrieved July 30, 2026. <https://referensi.data.kemendikdasmen.go.id/budayakita/cagarbudaya/objek/KB003265>.
- Larassanti, Eka, Zaenab, and Kartika Tri Darmaningrum. 2023. "Manajemen Wisata Religi dalam Meningkatkan Daya Tarik terhadap Makam Mbah Zakaria di Desa Rowolaku." *Journal of Community Development and Disaster Management* 5(2):73-79. <https://doi.org/10.37680/jcd.v5i2.2978>.
- Merina and Cahya Aditya Pratama. 2025. "From Sacred Space to Religious Tourism: The Transformation of the Thousand Doors Mosque, Tangerang, Indonesia." *Religious: Jurnal Studi Agama-Agama dan Lintas Budaya* 9(1):67-88. <https://doi.org/10.15575/rjsalb.v9i1.20062>.
- Mislakhunnisa. 2022. "Tradisi Penjamasan Makam Sunan Amangkurat Agung I dalam Perspektif Aqidah Islam: Studi Kasus di Desa Pesarean Kecamatan Adiwerna Kabupaten Tegal." Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo Semarang. <https://eprints.walisongo.ac.id/17046/>.
- Prihatiningtyas, Siti, Lukmanul Hakim, Uswatun Niswah, and Ahmad Fatoni. 2022. "Peningkatan Keterampilan SDM dalam Rangka Menunjang Program Destinasi Wisata Mina Politan." *Empower: Jurnal Pengembangan Masyarakat Islam* 7(2):248-261. <https://doi.org/10.24235/empower.v7i2.11003>.
- Reed, Maureen G. 1997. "Power Relations and Community-Based Tourism Planning." *Annals of Tourism Research* 24(3):566-591. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(97\)00023-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00023-6).

- Savitri, Fania Mutiara, Abdul Karim, and Badrus Saufil Muhtadin. 2023. "Mosque Development Strategy Based on Religious Tourism in Jami' Pekojan Mosque Semarang." *Munazzama: Journal of Islamic Management and Pilgrimage* 2(2):109-124. <https://doi.org/10.21580/mz.v2i2.12369>.
- Sugiyono. 2022. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta.
- Susanto, Dedy, Najahan Musyafak, Raharjo, Anasom, Uswatun Niswah, and Lukmanul Hakim. 2023. "Da'wah Tourism: Formulation of Collaborative Governance Perspective Development." *Jurnal Ilmu Dakwah* 43(1):249-267. <https://doi.org/10.21580/jid.v43.1.13214>.
- Susanto, Dedy, Muhammad Zainal Mawahib, Anasom, Ahmad Syauqi Istiqlaly, Lukmanul Hakim, and Saerozi. 2024. "Potential for Developing Educational Tourism Based on the Genealogy and History of the Walisongo in Java." *Munazzama: Journal of Islamic Management and Pilgrimage* 4(2):114-129. <https://doi.org/10.21580/mz.v4i2.23084>.
- Susanto, Dedy, Najahan Musyafak, Lukmanul Hakim, and Agus Riyadi. 2025. "Living the Message: Embodied Da'wah and Religious Tourism Innovation at the Sunan Muria Pilgrimage Site." *Muharrrik: Jurnal Dakwah dan Sosial* 8(1):169-182. <https://doi.org/10.37680/muharrrik.v8i1.7369>.
- Waterton, Emma, and Laurajane Smith. 2010. "The Recognition and Misrecognition of Community Heritage." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16(1-2):4-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250903441671>.
- Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Yin, Robert K. 2018. *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Zhu, Yujie. 2025. "Contested Sacred Space: State Power, Spatial Politics, and Heritage Tourism." *Tourism Geographies*, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2025.2495192>.