

RULER AND REALM: THE DIVISION OF AIRLANGGA'S KINGDOM
IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY*

Max Nihom

Few topics in Classical Indonesian studies have attracted as much attention as has the division of Airlangga's realm by *mpu* Bharāḍa into the kingdoms of Janggala and Pañjalu. The borders have been seen to run North-South (Krom), or East-West (Berg, Teeuw and Uhlenbeck, Pigeaud, Buchari), or both (Kern, Bosch, Stutterheim). The division has been seen as historical (Bosch, Buchari), apocryphal (Teeuw and Uhlenbeck), legendary (Pigeaud), and mythic (Berg). It has been taken as evidence of the prominence of duality symbolism and of the existence of kinship moieties. Evidence has been discerned of Indian meditational systems, of Polynesian demigods, and of quasi-universal lunar deities. In one view this act really did take place, or was regarded as having taken place, on Java; another view has removed the scene of action to Bali. In short, confusion reigns.

The purpose of this study is to approach the problem yet again, but from a different angle. I use geographical data which at first sight may seem to have little to do with the division of the kingdom. Still, with this impulse, I first take a brief look at verses 3-6 of the Simpang inscription which give a general account of Bharāḍa's action. Then, with an eye to seeing whether the geographic facts fit the exigencies of philology and after reviews of the secondary literature, I reexamine *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 68.3-4, the other major text locus on the division.

I

With some temerity one may submit that scholars dealing with the borders drawn by Bharāḍa have one by one fallen into an ethnocentric trap. Namely, Java, and in particular, East Java, has been mentally represented as a rectilinear system of orientation bisected by the line drawn by the sage. One then imagines that Bharāḍa started at a point X on the periphery and drew a line through to a point Y on the opposite periphery. But does this necessarily have any connection with Javanese representations of land area? Is it not more likely that Airlangga's kingdom was thought of, not as a parallelogram, but as a circle? If so, would the center or origin of this system of orientation not be the point from which one or more axes radiate? In this case, the points on the circumference intersected by radials should have some relationship to what is represented by these lines.

* The research for this article was made possible by financial support from the Netherlands Organization for Pure Research (Z.W.O.).

Let us apply this fanciful notion to the map of East Java. Taking as base line the distance from Mount Arjuna to Mount Brama, this line may be extended an equal distance, arriving at Tenggarran (see Figure I). Using Mount Arjuna as center and approximately perpendicular to the line Tenggarran-Mount Arjuna-Mount Brama, the line going Southwest to Northeast starts out at Plumbangan and then extends through Arjuna out into the sea, reaching the coast at a point across the Brantas North of Rẽmbang. Now, admittedly, this does not appear very cogent. Of the four end-points, only three are on land and there would seem to be no obvious connection among Tenggarran, Plumbangan, and Mount Brama, let alone between these three and Mount Arjuna.

On the other hand, we may observe that this radius, the distance from Mount Arjuna to Mount Brama, is identical to the distance Majapahit-Singosari. By itself this should be enough to suggest that the length of the line segment--let us call it R--is of some significance. Moreover, noting that this length R may be used to form a perfect triangle with, as corners, Majapahit, Singosari, and a point on the coast--across the Brantas north of Rẽmbang--whereby this last point on the coast is also identical to the one intersected by the line Plumbangan-Mount Arjuna-sea, the probability that these geographic data are pure coincidence may safely be said to decrease. One may go so far as to say that these facts shift the burden of proof away from the necessity of showing their salience.

This statement is only reinforced when it is noted that this distance R (35 km.) is a common one between sites in East Java. Below is a list of these equivalences, all accurate to ± 3 percent. They represent but a portion of such equivalences and are chosen without regard for possible regularities.

Sidang Sẽdati-Truneng	Kẽlragen-Sumbẽrgurit
Truneng-Pacẽkan	Blota-Rẽmbang
Pacẽkan-Jawi	Rẽmbang-Grẽsik
Jawi-Truneng	Grẽsik-Blota
Plumbangan-Kẽdĩri	Tẽpas-Jago
Plumbangan-Cẽkẽr	Tẽpas-Ngrimbi
Panataran-Ngẽndat	Karang Kates-Kayunan
Panataran-Kranggan	Kayunan-Majapahit
Kranggan-Gunung Brama	Majapahit-Gunung Butak
Kranggan-Kidung Pluk	Prabalingga-Gunung Argapura
Plumbangan-Kĩdal	Surawana-Indrakila
Kĩdal-Iĩsanabajra	Pamotan-Bajranẽgara
Iĩsanabajra-Kẽlragen	Pamẽkasan-Sumẽnẽp (on Madura!)

These examples chosen ad hoc may, on the one hand, suggest that a reason must exist for the predominance of this distance between East Java sites. Any doubt that its frequent occurrence could be adventitious loses some of its remaining strength insofar as the same scalar apparently operates in at least one instance on Madura--and for Madura one cannot adduce a density of archaeological sites such that occurrences of a given distance between any two of them could easily be considered random.

Still, if lines are drawn on a map in accordance with the above data, the resulting mess is distressing. Clearly, if we have chanced onto a system or systems for the siting of temples, inscriptions, or settlements in East Java apparently independent of gross considerations of terrain, then it would be advantageous to fix the base line, or, if one will, the original measurement, in addition to making at least partial sense of the patterns which criss-cross the map.

As to the first, the distance R between Mount Arjuna and Mount Brama is a suitable candidate. The ruins on Arjuna are known to be of respectable antiquity¹ while Brama with its lake-filled crater has been deemed the object of an autochthonous ancestor cult.² Further, astride the plain which stretches between the Gunung Wŕlirang, Anjasmara, and Arjuna complex and the Tŕngger range, Mount Arjuna and Mount Brama would supply convenient landmarks from which to derive a standard distance, even though the method used must at present remain obscure. In any case, the axes of Figure I with as origin Mount Arjuna might be deemed to accord with an understanding of an indigenous system of direction: for Majapahit the directions of the compass are also skewed.³ These axes, moreover, could be taken as a renewed indication of the "montja-pat" symbolism with its center plus four.

II

In an attempt to find an order in at least one of the apparent patterns generated by this scalar R, I should like to focus on Bharāḁa's famous deed.

The background is as follows: King Airlangga, or as it is sometimes spelled, Erlangga, reigned in the first half of the eleventh century. Krom gives his birth as AD 991; his date of death is unknown.⁴ In any event he reigned from 1019 to 1042, at which time, having requested Bharāḁa to divide the kingdom,⁵ he withdrew to an ascetic life.

Although Buchari by filling up part of the seventy-five year gap in East Javanese history after 1042 left by Krom has also shown that the division of Airlangga's kingdom was a real event which occurred in the eleventh century,⁶ the two prime sources describing the borders are not documents of the eleventh but of the fourteenth century. The Simpang inscription, found on the base of the statue presently in Surabaya, probably dated from c. AD 1350.⁷ Published

1. Nicolaas Johannes Krom, *Inleiding tot de Hindoe-Javaansche Kunst*, 2 vols. (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1923), pp. 350ff.

2. J. G. de Casparis, "Oorkonde uit het Singosarische (Midden 14^e Eeuw A.D.)," *Inscripties van Nederlandsch Indië* (Batavia: Kon. drukkerij de Unie, 1940), p. 51.

3. H. Maclaine Pont, "Eenige Oudheidkundige Gegevens omtrent den middeleeuwschen bevolingstoestanden van den zoogenoemde 'Woeste Gronden van de lieden van Trik,'" *Oudheidkundig Verslag* [henceforth OV] (1926): 94.

4. N. J. Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, 2nd ed. (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1931), pp. 233, 271.

5. In addition to the Simpang inscription verses, this "request" is known from later sources such as the *Calon Arang* and *Nāgarakērtāgama*.

6. Buchari, "Sri Maharaja Mapanji Garasakan: A New Evidence on the Problem of Airlangga's Partition of His Kingdom," *Madjalah Ilmu-Ilmu Sastra Indonesia* 4, 1-2 (March-June 1968): 1-27.

7. This is the accepted date. Berg is of another opinion which need not be delved into here. (C. C. Berg, *Herkomst, Vorm en Functie der Middelfjavaanse Rijksdelingtheorie* [Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uit. Mij, 1953], pp. 145-55). See also Poerbatjaraka, "De Inscriptie van het Mahākṣobhyabeeld te Simpang (Soerabaya)," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* [henceforth BKI] 78 (1922): 426-61.

by Kern in 1910, it was reedited twelve years on by Poerbatjaraka.⁸ Verses 3-6, which are discussed below, have also been examined by Bosch and by Berg.⁹

- yaḥ¹⁰ purā paṇḍitaś¹¹ śreṣṭha¹² āryyo Bharāḍ abhijñataḥ¹³/
jñānasiddhiṃ samāgamyā'bhijñālābho¹⁴ munīśwaraḥ// (3)
- mahāyogīśvaro¹⁵ dhīraḥ satweṣu karuṇātmakaḥ/
siddhācāryo mahāwīro¹⁶ ragādikleśawarjjitaḥ// (4)
- ratnākarapramāṇān¹⁷ tu dwaidhīkr̥tya yāwāwanim¹⁸/
kṣitibhedanasāmarthyakumbhavajrodakena¹⁹ wai// (5)
- parasparawirodhena nṛpayor yuddhakāṅkṣinoḥ/
etasmā²⁰ janggalety eṣā paṃjaluwiṣayā smṛtā²¹// (6)

Although these verses do not supply details on the borders drawn by Bharāḍa, they deserve some discussion. Previous authors have tended to regard the attributes found in verses 3-4 as loosely strung epitheta. This does the inscription an injustice. Rather, more attention ought be given to the Indian--and in

8. Poerbatjaraka, "Inscriptie te Simpang"; H. Kern, "De Sanskrit-inscriptie van't Mahākṣobhyabeeld te Simpang," *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* [henceforth *TBG*] 52 (1910): 99-108.

9. F. D. K. Bosch, "Kumbhawajrodaka en Toyeng Kuṇḍi Sankeng Langit," *TBG* 58 (1919): 429-47; Berg, *Herkomst*, pp. 44f.

10. Corrected after Kern for *yō*.

11. After Kern for *banditaś*.

12. After Kern for *śreṣṭha*.

13. Bosch and Poerbatjaraka *abhijñātaḥ*; a short seventh syllable in an even-numbered *pada* is better. Nor is the pattern of -~ for syllables 2 to 4 in even-numbered *padas* desirable for normal (i.e., *pathyā*) *śloka*s, but Bharāḍ as a proper name may be excusable (cf. T. E. Vetter, "Zur Metrik in einem Tantra-text," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 26 [1983]: 267). In any event, while Bosch reads as per above, this is not included among his list of emendations of Kern.

14. Bosch, *-labho*.

15. Kern, *mahāyogīśvara*, corrected by Bosch.

16. Kern, *mahāwīra*, corrected by Bosch.

17. Kern, *-pramāṇān*, whereby he is undecided as to whether to prefer final *n* or *ṭ*; Bosch reads *-pramāṇan*, which, Skt. *awanī* and *awani* both being feminine, is unlikely. Poerbatjaraka, as above.

18. Bosch, *yāwāwanim*, which is against the meter.

19. Poerbatjaraka *kṣitibhedanam samarthyā*, which, with its long fifth syllable, is against the meter. Moreover, it is not a *vīpulā* because of the long third syllable (cf. Vetter, "Zur Metrik," p. 268).

20. Kern *atasmāj*, for which he suggests the improvement *athāsmāj*; Bosch, Poerbatjaraka, and Berg, as above.

21. Bosch, *smṛta* (a misprint?).

particular the Buddhist Sanskrit--antecedents of the lexical items found in Javanese Sanskrit texts such as the above.²²

He who at first was an excellent learned man, the celebrated noble Bharāḍ is he who, having obtained the attainment of gnosis, is one who possesses the supranormal attainments, a lord of sages.// He is the great lord of yogis, steadfast, who has as nature compassion towards living beings, a preceptor of accomplished ones, a great hero, one become devoid of the defilements of passion and so on.// He, when two princes who were opposed to each other were desirous of battle, divided in two the land of Java which has as circumference the sea by means, truly, of juggled magical water capable of splitting the earth:// on account of him *this* [land] is Janggala [and] the one remembered had as compass Pamjalu.//

These verses may be separated by context, if not by syntax, into two groups. Verses 3-4 treat of Bharāḍ and verses 5-6 of the division of Airlangga's kingdom in, as we know, the eleventh century, and its result. Verses 3-4 appear to describe the religious development of the sage. The term *abhiññālabha-* is itself attested in the Indian Buddhist *Sekoddeśa* and its commentary or *tīkā*.²³ Consequently, *abhiññā* is not "transcendental wisdom" (Kern, Bosch, Poerbatjaraka), but a reference to the supranormal powers--usually five or six in number in both tantric and nontantric Buddhism²⁴--which follow upon the attainment of gnosis.²⁵ Learnedness would seem to precede acquisition of the *abhiññās*; *purā*, "at first" might therefore be understood to refer to the spiritual career of Bharāḍ rather than to a temporal specification ("of old") of the events described in verses 5-6.

It is worthwhile observing that, unlike verse 3, verse 4 contains attributes --*mahāyogīśvara*, *mahāyīra*, and *siddhācārya*--which impress one as predominantly tantric or tantristic²⁶ in character. Concerning *mahāyogīśvara* at 4a, the term

22. The model for such an approach need still be J. G. de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia: Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th Century A.D.*, vol. 2 (Bandung: Masa Baru, 1956). As verse 6ab is a locative absolute, for the sake of English syntax I have translated it before verse 5.

23. Sanskrit *Sekoddeśa* being lost, in the Tibetan translation we read: "That (Buddha Word) is not to be effected by the learned, (but) by those who have obtained the *abhiññās*." (*de ni mnon ses t'ob rnam kyis/ bya ba mk'as rnam kyis min ŋid/*, in Lokesh Chandra, *Kālacakra Tantra and Other Texts*, vol. 1 of 2 (Sata Pitaka Series 69-70), New Delhi, 1966, p. 36. The commentary specifies the *abhiññās* and allows us to retrieve Sanskrit *paṇḍita* and *abhiññālabhin* (M. C. Carelli, ed., *Sekoddeśatīkā of Nāḍapāda (Naropa): Being a Commentary of the Sekoddeśa Sections of the Kālacakra Tantra*, G.O.S. no. xc [Baroda, 1941], pp. 5, 10-11.)

24. Cf. Etienne Lamotte, trans., *Le Traité de la Grand Vertu de Sagesse*, vol. 4 (Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1976), pp. 1809-27.

25. On *jñāna* as gnosis, see Alex Wayman, "Notes on the Sanskrit Term *Jñāna*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 75 (1955): 253-68.

26. This distinction was proposed by Ernst Steinkellner, "Remarks on Tantristic Hermeneutics," in *Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Memorial Symposium*, ed. Louis Ligeti (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1978), p. 447, n. 5: "I use the words 'tantric' in the sense of 'related to the tantras' and 'tantristic' in the sense of 'related to the systematic or religious traditions based on the Tantras.'"

yogīśvara is prominent in the *Rājapatigundala* where its presence and implications deserve further study, while in India it is used for those engaged in practices of tantra.²⁷ It is also found at *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 68.2 (see *infra*), again as an epithet of Bharāḍa. Similarly, a reflex for verse 4a *dhīra* may be located at *Nāg.* 16.3c, where as *mahāmuni* Bharāḍa is *mapagēh*, "firm, resolute." But resolute or firm in what? *Nāg.* 68.2 is plain: Bharāḍa is *pēgat ring tantra*, "accomplished in the tantra."

As for 4c *mahāvīra*, granted the information that Bharāḍa was a practitioner of tantric rites--a fact which has not gone unnoted in the secondary literature²⁸--we may note that in the Buddhist tantric literature a *vīra* is a participant in the so-called circle rites,²⁹ while a successful practitioner abiding in the center of the circle would seem to be known as an *ekavīra*.³⁰ As for *mahāvīra*, in the *Samvarodayatantra* (18.12) for example, a disciple requesting tantric consecration, *abhiṣeka*, calls the preceptor or *ācārya*, by this term.

Lastly, *siddhācārya*, rather than "a magically powerful teacher" (*een tover-machtige leraar*) is perhaps better understood as a "preceptor of accomplished *siddhas*," where these are accomplished yogins.³¹ From these perspectives, verse 4 describes Bharāḍa as the preceptor in tantric rites. He is especially suited to assume this role because he is resolute and by nature has compassion towards living beings, while as preceptor he, a great hero, is devoid of the defilements of passion, etc.

Such a man would seem well equipped to undertake the partition of Java. In verse 5, Kern's rendering of *ratnākarapramāṇam* . . . *yawāwanim*, "the land Java, which possesses a number of gem-mines," was corrected by Bosch and Poerbatjaraka

27. The *Rājapatigundala* has been published in Th. Pigeaud, *Java in the Fourteenth Century*, 5 vols. (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1960-63). In Indian Buddhism an example of *yogīśvara*, apparently as a synonym of *yogīndra*, may be found in Munidatta's Sanskrit commentary on the *Caryāgiti* (see Per Kvaerne, *An Anthology of Buddhist Tantric Songs: A Study of the Caryāgiti* [Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977], p. 121).

28. The main contemporary proponent of the existence of the *gaṇacakra* or "circle-rite" is Berg (*Herkomst*), the adequacy of whose evidence has been disputed by P. J. Zoetmulder, "The Significance of the Study of Culture and Religion in Indonesian Historiography," in *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography*, ed. Soedjatmoko et al. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965), pp. 326-43.

29. *Samvarodayatantra* 8.35, 13.15, 17.8, 18.17, 26.10 (Shin'ichi Tsuda, *The Samvarodayatantra: Selected Chapters* [Tokyo: Hokuseido, 1974]); *Hevajratantra* II.v.3 (David S. Snellgrove, *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study*, 2 vols. [London: Oxford University Press, 1959]).

30. Cf. *Guhyasamājatantra* 18.76 (S. Bagchi, ed., *Guhyasamāja Tantra or Tathāgataguhyaka* [Dharbhanga: Buddhist Skt. Texts No. 9, 1965]).

31. A *siddha* is a practitioner accomplished in yoga: "The Buddhist Sahajīya yogins of much renown are commonly known as the *siddhācārya*. . . ." Some of them, generally said to number eighty-four and to have been active in Bengal between the eighth and twelfth centuries, wrote the mystic songs called *caryāpada* (cf. Sh. DasGupta, *Obscure Religious Cults*, 3rd rev. ed. [Calcutta: Mukhopadhyay, 1969], pp. 7-9, 202-3; Kvaerne, *Anthology of Buddhist Tantric Songs*). Among these eighty-four we do not find the name Bharāḍa, unless, as is conceivable if not proven, this is related to Bhadra or Bhāde.

to "The land Java, which has jewel mines as measure."³² To this Berg gives the sensible rejoinder that *ratnākara* should here rather be taken as "sea."³³ It is particularly sensible because there are no mines for precious stones on Java. However, his conclusion that the compound means "taking the sea as instrument for measurement" (*de zee as richtsnoer/maatstaf nemende*), with as its consequence that the sea is the Straits of Madura, whereby the measure of the Straits has a bearing on the length of Bharāḍa's flight--125km according to Berg, is faintly ridiculous. Nevertheless, he may well be correct in his emphasis on the importance of the coast (see *infra*). In fact, the meaning of this phrase is simple. According to the dictionary,³⁴ *pramāṇa* has the meaning "measure of any kind (as size, extent, circumference, length, distance . . .)." The terminus plainly means "the sea-girt land of Java"--it is, after all, an island.

With respect to vs 5cd, Kern assumes--somewhat against his will--that *sāmarthya* may be taken as a nominative and translates: "The capacity to divide the earth (and: to divide the land in two) by water-jar, lightning (or: diamond) and water."³⁵ He regards this half-verse as "gibberish" (*wartaal*). Poerbatjaraka compares it with *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 68.2b (see *infra*) and inclines to taking *sāmarthya*, which he sees as parallel to *dwaiddhīkṛtya*,³⁶ as if it were an imperfect with as object *ṣṭitibhedanam* (sic): "This division of the land he accomplished with cursing-water of the *kēndi*."³⁷ Grammatically, this is not probable. Bosch's solution is much better: "[He divided the land Java] . . . by means of *kumbhavaṣṭrodaka*, which has the capacity to divide land."³⁸ In other words, *ṣṭitibhedanasāmarthyakumbhavaṣṭrodaka* is a single compound functioning as agent to *dwaiddhīkṛtya*. This crosses the caesura commonly found between quarter-verses, but is certainly not impossible and makes the most sense.

In verse 6 the main difficulty is the reference of *etasmāj*. Bosch proposes that it is a correlative of vs 3a *yah*.³⁹ This gives good sense. The four verses are in fact one sentence. Concerning 6cd, the key to understanding is that both *eṣā* and *smṛtā* are feminine, and consequently refer back to *yawāwani*. Of the kingdoms resulting from the division of the land of Java into two, the one (*eṣā*) which still exists--at the time of the Simpang inscription--is "Jangala." Pamjalu is but remembered (*smṛtā*). In fact, in verse 9 of the inscription King Wiṣṇuwardhana (d. 1268) is reported to have reunited the land (*ekīkṛtya punar bhūmim*). Whether or not he really did so is not important here. The salient point is that the inscription describes the state of affairs at the

32. Bosch, "Kumbhawajrodaka," p. 443; Poerbatjaraka, "Inscriptie te Simpang," p. 433.

33. Berg, *Herkomst*, pp. 44f.

34. Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899), p. 685.

35. Kern, "Sanskrit-inscriptie te Simpang," p. 104.

36. Poerbatjaraka ("Inscriptie te Simpang," pp. 453f.) has *ekīkṛtya*, itself found in the inscription in verse 9. Here it is a mistake. From the context it is clear that he means *dwaiddhīkṛtya*.

37. Ibid.

38. Bosch, "Kumbhawajrodaka," p. 443.

39. Poerbatjaraka regards *yah* as connected with 3b *abhiñāta*, itself regarded as a calque on Malay *yang terkenal*.

time of its composition: the land divided by Bharāḍa has been reunified. "Janggala" is paramount.⁴⁰

III

The division of the kingdom is treated at greater length by *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 68.3-4, where, as in the Simpang inscription, Bharāḍa's action is performed by magical means. Although almost all the details of the passage are contested, by far the most ink has been spilt on the description of the border or borders furnished by 68.3, which, as Kern observed, is "confused."⁴¹ The confusion has persisted. Therefore, after the Javanese text of the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, we provide a synopsis of the various theories which have been propounded and continue with a new hypothesis. *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 68.3-4:⁴²

rāhyang tekhi pinintakāsihan amarwang bhūmi tan langghyana
ingānyeki tlas cinṭhnanira toyeng kuṇḍi sangkeng langit
kūlwān pūrwwa dudug ring āṛṇnawa mapārwang lor kidul tan madoḥ
kādyādoḥ mahlēṭ samudra tēwēking bhūmi jawa rwa prabhū (68.3)
ngkai ring tiktiki wrksa rakwa sutapārāryyan sangkeng āmbara
nang deṣeng palungān tikang pasalahan kuṇḍi praśāsteng jagat
kāṇḍēg deni ruhur nikang kamāl i puñcaknyāngawit cīwara
nā hetunya sināpa dadyalita tēkwan mungawi ri pāntara (68.4)

Kern, whose translation formed the springboard for all subsequent polemic, renders this as follows (from the Dutch):⁴³

To this great holy one a request was directed to divide the land in two; to this he assented; its (sic) border was indicated by him as "Water in the jar from heaven." In West-Easterly direction to the sea in two and in North-Southerly direction, not far, as far as it is separated by the sea, when the land Java had two kings. (68.3) By a tamarind-tree, it is said, the excellent ascetic, having descended from heaven, came to rest, namely, the village Palungan was the place where (his) famous jar of drinking water was set down. He was impeded by the height of a tamarind-tree, where, at the top, his monk's robe was caught. That was the reason why it was cursed by him to become small when he was between heaven and earth. (68.4)

The first to comment on this translation was van Stein Callenfels in 1916,⁴⁴ who drew attention to the fact that at 68.3a *āṛṇnawa*, which Kern had rendered "the sea," could also be understood as a "large river" (*grote rivier*). With this meaning in mind, the river Brantas may be seen as playing a role in the

40. That is, irrespective of whether or not the events described in the inscription actually took place (in all probability they did, see *infra*), the inscription regards the kingdom existing at its date of composition to be Janggala which vanquished Pañjalu.

41. Kern, "Sanskrit-inscriptie te Simpang," p. 162.

42. After Pigeaud, *Java*, 1: 52.

43. Kern, "Sanskrit-inscriptie te Simpang," pp. 161ff.

44. P. V. van Stein Callenfels, "[untitled,]" *OV* (1916), pp. 104-7; "De Graf-temple te Bhayālangö," *ibid.*, pp. 149-55.

description. Moreover, because the so-called Kawi-wall, which may be connected with the Pinggir Raksa of the *Pararaton*, may also be considered to have extended East-West along the Brantas before turning southwards towards the sea and northwards along the river Lekṣa, he held that the fragments of this wall should represent a part of the border. Further, because a stone with a representation of the churning of the ocean motif is found on the Southwestern flank of Mount Kawi and because such is also said to have been presented by King Hayam Wuruk on the occasion of the *śraddhā* ceremony of the Rājapatnī in AD 1362, which rite is the motivation for the telling of the story of the division of the kingdom of Airlangga in the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, and because the headwaters of the river Lekṣa are a bit to the East from the site of this stone with a churning motif, therefore, in van Stein Callenfels' view, Kamal Pandak alias Prajñāpāramitāpurī should be found in this vicinity of Mount Kawi.

These notions were substantially developed by Bosch in 1919.⁴⁵ Bosch echoes van Stein Callenfels in his opinion on the role of the Brantas, but argues that at 68.3 the border mentioned does not refer to that between Kōḍiri (Paṃjalu) and Janggala in its entirety, but only to that part encompassed by the Pinggir Rakṣa, whose presumed middle section running East-West is what is described in the phrase *kūlwān pūrwā dudug ring āṛṇawa*: "(The border) East-West extends to the āṛṇawa." The next question is whether the āṛṇawa should be equated with the river Lekṣa instead of with the Brantas as argued by van Stein Callenfels. Bosch rejects this on the grounds that in both Sanskrit and Old Javanese the term means "large river," while the Lekṣa is only a few meters wide. He reconciles his interpretation with 68.3 by having *dudug ring* mean that the East-West line coincides with (*samenvalt met*) another line, that is the Brantas. He then translates . . . *ng lor kidul tan madoh/ kādyādoḥ mahēlēt samudra* as "and in North-Southerly direction, not far, as far as it is separated from the sea," whereby the part meant is that portion of the Kawi-wall running from the Brantas towards the coast. Lastly, Bosch understands the words *toyeng kundi sangkeng langit* to refer to the line along the Lekṣa, which he sees as the line drawn by mpu Bharāḍa North-South with "water in the jar from heaven."

Bosch next turns to an analysis of Bharāḍa's epithet *yogīśwara*, translated by him as "master of magicians." By magic he has in mind the meditations called *kaśina* of Indian Buddhism. He believes that through *apokaśina*, "the water-circle," the practitioner is able to create rivers and streams. This is what Bharāḍa does at 68.3. The water is poured out from the jar to become the Lekṣa, and the spot where this occurs is on the Southern flank of Mount Kawi. This place, identified as Kamal Pandak alias Palungān alias Prajñāpāramitāpurī, where Bharāḍa, caught on the tamarind-tree, sets down his jar, may be related to the site of the stone with the churning of the ocean found at the nearby Sirah Kēncong.

In his annotated reissue of Kern's *Nāgarakṛtāgama* edition and translation, Krom in 1919⁴⁶ was not yet able to reflect on the views of Bosch. Krom saw two separate and essentially irreconcilable strands in the narration of 68.3-4: on the one hand that Bharāḍa in his journey through the air was caught on a tamarind-tree which was then cursed to become small and, on the other, that Bharāḍa, at Airlangga's request, divided the kingdom, whereby the spot where the jar was set down is to be seen as the place from which the division took place. In any

45. Bosch, "Kumbhawajrodaka."

46. Cf. Hendrik Kern, *Het Oud-Javaansche Lofgedicht Nāgarakṛtāgama van Prapañca* (1365 A.D.) (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1919).

case, the border itself is unclear. While Krom is sympathetic to the opinion of van Stein Callenfels that *ārṇawa* might well refer to the Brantas near the Kawi-wall, he thinks that if this were the case, the description of the border between the kingdoms would be incomplete as it would refer only to the portion South of Mount Kawi. Consequently, he finds this construction unlikely. Instead, Bharāḍa "divides Java in a Western and Eastern part, up to the sea (as far as the Sunda and Bali straits . . .), while in Northerly and Southerly direction the sea (the sea of Java and the Indian Ocean) also limits the realm at a relatively short distance compared to the other seas."⁴⁷ In other words, the island of Java is much longer than wide. Moreover, according to Krom, the borders of the kingdoms are not indicated as such by the Javanese text. Instead, this specifies what amounts to an axis to be superimposed on the map. The axis has as origin Kamal Pandak, which Krom thinks was perhaps situated on the Southern slopes of Mount Kawi. Thus, although having some scruples as to the salience of the churning motif of Sirah Kĕncong, Krom believes, together with van Stein Callenfels and Bosch, that the sanctuary may have been located near the line formed by the Pinggir Rakṣa.

The next author to treat of the subject did so from the perspective of ethnology. In his doctoral dissertation of 1922, Rassers⁴⁸ sought to integrate the division of Airlangga's kingdom with an analysis of the themes of the Pañji stories. He finds a clear connection between the Pañji novels and the legends surrounding Airlangga in that the ascetic abode *pūḡawat*, founded for his daughter and mentioned in an inscription,⁴⁹ is a Sanskrit calque of Javanese *pucangan*, itself a favorite spot for a figure in the Pañji story *Cĕkĕlwanĕngpati*. Therefore, Rassers identifies the figure in this story with Airlangga's daughter.⁵⁰

Crucial in Rassers' view of Javanese culture is the presence of duality symbolism reflecting Javanese kinship phratries: hence, the concomitant emphasis on unity--the moieties are dependent on each other--and on division--they are also separate.⁵¹ As for the division of the kingdom, Rassers notes that *Nāg*. 68 certainly does seem to suggest a division into two kingdoms, evidence for whose prior partition he implicitly ascribes to 68.3d.⁵² This situation, then, represents the original phratry and clan structure. Moreover, whereas Kern noted that Bharāḍa may also be called Bharāj or Nakṣatrarāja, "king of the constellations,"⁵³ Rasser believes that the sage may be equated with the moon, from whose jar he divides the two phratries and their territories into four by way of the magical water which is moonlight. In consequence, the division, first into two and then into four, reflects the idea of the division of the center into the four points of the compass: in other words the montja-pat

47. Ibid., p. 292.

48. Willem Huibert Rassers, *De Pandji Roman* (Antwerp: de Vos-van Kleef, 1922); see also J. J. Ras, "The Pañji Romance and W. H. Rassers' Analysis of Its Theme," *BKI* 129 (1973): 411-56.

49. Published by Hendrik Kern in his *Verspreide Geschriften*, vol. 7 (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1917), pp. 96ff.

50. Rassers, *Pandji Roman*, pp. 132ff.

51. Rassers does not distinguish between phratries and moieties.

52. Ibid., pp. 135ff.

53. But Krom has observed that Kern had already retreated from this view in 1913. Cf. N. J. Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, 2nd ed. (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1931), p. 273 n. 5.

system of one plus four described for Java by van Ossenbruggen.⁵⁴ Thus, Rassers rejects Bosch's identification of the border as the Pinggir Rakṣa and considers that to translate *dudug ring* as "coincides with" is "most arbitrary, if not impossible" (*hoogst willekeurig, zoo niet onmogelijk*),⁵⁵ even as he embraces the mythic nature of the division.

In an article on the historical role of Majapahit, Maclaine Pont in 1926⁵⁶ offered an explanation which has been more or less neglected in the subsequent secondary literature. Referring to (unspecified) charters, he notes that they speak of a crossing of the North-South and East-West borders of Bharāḍa's division at Palungān, which he identifies with Kamal Pandak. He reports two series of posts which may have bearing on the border. The first runs approximately West-East from the Southern part of the district of Bajranegara towards, he thinks, the salt lake near Canggu. The second starts North of Mount Anjasmara in the *desa* Jabung. This he sees as a continuation of the Kawi-wall. From there, it proceeds Northwards past Canggu. While certain about this North-South line, being as it is an extension of the Kawi-wall, he has reservations regarding the line West-East. In any event, he believes it to be of great importance in the later history of Java because it defines the border between "Java" and "Mancanegara" even in early colonial times. As for the salt lake, Maclaine Pont observes that this must have been sacred and suggests a connection with the holy water poured out by Bharāḍa.

After expressing his initial opinion in 1919, Krom in 1931 found occasion to revise his views in his *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*.⁵⁷ Criticizing his own earlier position, he is here less inclined to think that Bharāḍa's interrupted flight is as irreconcilable as he previously thought with Bharāḍa's division of the kingdom out from the point where the water-pot was set down. Palungān is not the place from which the act of partition takes place, but its end-point. The border is indicated "with water in a jar from heaven: West-East up to the great water did he divide North-South not far, as far as (or: as if) the sea were the border."⁵⁸ The line, therefore, runs North-South, dividing Pamjalu from Janggala, each kingdom theoretically bounded on three sides by the sea. Krom now quite agrees that the Pinggir Rakṣa of the *Pararaton* is identical to the archaeological remnants called the Kawi-wall and that this formed part of the border. Yet, he does not see it as the part formed by the water flowing from Bharāḍa's jar. On the contrary. It is precisely at the part where Bharāḍa did not specify a border that a material wall was necessary, not only by virtue of the literary evidence of his flight, but also by a determination of the compass of Janggala made possible by data supplied by Chinese officials regarding a visit to Java at a later date.⁵⁹

54. F. D. E. van Ossenbruggen, "De Oorsprong van het Javaansche begrip montjapat in verband met primitieve classificaties," *Verhandelingen en Medewerking der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen* [afd. Letterkunde] 5, 3 (1917): 1.

55. Rassers, *Pandji Roman*, p. 234n.

56. H. Maclaine Pont, "De Historische Rol van Majapahit: Een Hypothese," *Djawa* 6 (1926): 294-317. See also his "Aantekeningen bij het Artikel van Dr. van Stein Callenfels: 'Bijdragen tot de Topographie van Oost-Java in de Middeleeuwen,'" *OV* (1926): 87-99, and "Eenige Oudheidkundige Gegevens," pp. 100-26.

57. Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, pp. 272-78.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 274.

59. *Ibid.*, pp. 277, 309.

Meanwhile, in 1932 Stutterheim⁶⁰ identified the Bhayālangō of Nāg. 69.2 and 74.1 as the mortuary temple of the Rājapatnī. According to this author, Bhayālangō was placed at the site of the *tugu* or borderpost of Nāgarakṣērtāgama 68.5 which is the weak point of the division of Airlangga's realm where the temple named Prajñāpāramitāpurī, to be equated with Palungān, was built. Stutterheim sees its location as in the vicinity of Tulung Agung near the southern reaches of the Brantas, thereby contradicting Kern⁶¹ who saw the site Bhayālangō as distinct from Prajñāpāramitāpurī. Endeavoring to bring this into harmony with previous views on the location of the border, Stutterheim criticizes Bosch and asserts that there is no necessary connection between the Pinggir Rakṣa and the division of the realm. Firstly, the "churning" motif, found at Sirah Kēncong and related to Hayam Wuruk's gift on the occasion of the *śrāddha* or memorial rite of the Rājapatnī, is not of decisive importance, because a) the gift was not made of stone--as is the motif at Sirah Kēncong, but of flowers and food; and b) as the motif of the churning of the ocean is so common on Bali, it is unmeet to attach too much importance to its presence in Sirah Kēncong. Secondly, because, as Bosch noted, Bharāḍa's feat is primarily magical and suprahuman in nature, a man-made border is neither necessary nor appropriate. Therefore, for Stutterheim Bhayālangō is to be associated with Kamal Pandak which itself is to be seen as the borderpost (*tugu*) of Nāg. 68.5. The apportionment being magical, what is described in 68.3 is not the border, but rather the situation that existed after the division: "West-East (the parts) hit upon the *ārnawa*; split into North and South it wasn't far, namely, as far as the '*mahēlēt samudra*.' That was the moment when the land of Java obtained two kings." Consequently, the border as described by Stutterheim first extends Northwards from Bhayālangō alias Kamal Pandak in the vicinity of Tulung Agung up to the Brantas and thence Eastwards to the sea.

Perhaps Stutterheim's most important contribution to the discussion is that he focused attention on the critical status of the phrase "*mahēlēt samudra*," offering two interpretations. As "the part of the sea which lies between land," the expression may refer to the Straits of Madura. Alternatively, "the piece of land that lies between the waters" implies two parallel pieces of land running West-East along the Brantas to the sea from the point where the river turns Eastwards. In this case *adoh*, "far"--which is "not far," *tan madoh*--refers to the comparatively short distance from this point to the seashore.

In 1953 Berg⁶² devoted an entire book to a theory on the division of the realm in indigenous Javanese historiography. This volume--*Origin, Form and Function of the Middle-Javanese Theory of the Division of the Realm*--is impossible to summarize. Berg not only believes that Bharāḍa's action is not historically founded, but that the division of Airlangga's kingdom is itself a product of myth. This he combines with a discussion of agricultural myth (rice/water) and Indian antecedents (Agastya), all coupled to a reevaluation of Javanese chronology. For the profound difficulties engendered by Berg's methodology,

60. W. F. Stutterheim, "Oudheidkundige Aantekening XVIII: Bhajālangoe de grenspaal tussen Pañjalu en Janggala," *BKI* 89 (1932): 101-5; "Oudheidkundige Aantekening XVII: Tjandi Bhayālangoe en Prajñāpāramitapurī," *BKI* 89 (1932): 97-100; "Oudheidkundige Aantekening XLVIII: Waar lag Erlangga's kluizenarij van den Pucangan?" *BKI* 95 (1937): 406-10.

61. Kern, *Oud-Javaansche Lofgedicht Nāgarakṣērtāgama*, p. 164.

62. Berg, *Herkomst*.

the reader is referred to Bosch.⁶³ Here it suffices to note that it is far too difficult to disentangle Berg's argument in such a manner that one is fairly certain of what is premise--justified or otherwise--and what conclusion. Yet Berg can certainly not be accused of neglecting detail: if anything, his reasoning is overly reticulate. Whatever the merits of his ideas, however, his pungent analyses of the views of others are to be disregarded at one's peril. We consequently restrict the discussion to these and to what one may call his "first-order" conclusions on *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 68.3-4.

Berg regards Bosch's conclusion that the magic water poured from the pot formed the river Lekṣa--based on the translation of *kādyādoh mahēlēt samudra* as "as far as it is distant from the sea (van de zee)"--as untenable. Rather, because *hēlēt* denotes that which lies between two things of equal size, inherent in *mahēlēt samudra* is that a sea lies between two coasts. Hence, "from the sea" as an improvement of Kern's "by the sea" (*door de zee*) is incompatible with the use of both *hēlēt* and *samudra* in the text.

As for Stutterheim, Berg sees him as attempting to synthesize Bosch and Kern. Stutterheim's idea that *kūlwān pūruwa* and *lor kidul* refer to the direction of the divided land(s) he rejects as without textual foundation. Choosing the Brantas, as that author does, to be the border which runs South to North and then West to East, Kamal Pandak should then be at its end-point, to wit, the Straits of Madura, not near Tulung Agung. In fact, Berg reasons that the notion that the border must pass through Kamal Pandak and/or Bhayālangō rests on Kern's unwarranted assumption that *tugu* means "borderpost." This Berg regards as an "obsession" (*dwangvoorstelling*). Moreover, because Bharāḍa's action is mythic, no veritable representation is required. In consequence, he sees no attraction in Krom's argument that the border extended South/North where the Pinggir Rakṣa does not reach, namely, to the North of Mount Kawi, and believes a different explanation of the Kawi-wall is necessary.

Berg reserves his most detailed critique for Kern: "Kern separated *maparwa* of 68.3c from the following *ng lor kidul*, ignored the demonstrative pronoun *ng*, put *lor kidul* and *kulwan puruwa* on the same footing, and inserted an 'and' in his translation, thereby suggesting a border which extended in part West to East and in part from North to South."⁶⁴ Instead, for *maparwa ng lor kidul* one should not lose sight of 68.3a *amarwa ng bhūmī*, which may be considered as parallel. Joined to the fact that *dudug* indicates a direction, the border must be seen to run solely West-East through a North-South complex. Since the expression *mahēlēt samudra* means "(the fact of having) the sea between" (*(het) de zee tussen zich hebben(de)*), both *āṇawa* and *samudra* refer to the Straits of Madura. The end-point of the West-East line must therefore be on the coast. Further, *mahēlēt samudra* is a nominal and not a verbal phrase and may be rendered "the southern coast of Madura and its Javanese counterpart." Thus, the first part of 68.3d means "over a distance equal to the length of the Straits of Madura." He concludes that Bharāḍa ended his flight on the Javanese coast near the mouth of the Porong (= Kamal Pandak) and began it approximately 125km due West from this point. Berg therefore translates 68.3-4 as follows: "This holy man was requested to be willing to divide the land in two and he did not want to refuse. The border between both parts, which he indicated from the air by means of water from the jar, runs as follows: West-East up to the sea, with

63. F. D. K. Bosch, "C. C. Berg and Ancient Javanese History," *BKI* 112 (1956): 1-24.

64. Berg, *Herkomst*, p. 38.

North and South as halves over a (relatively) short distance, namely as far--one could say--as the coasts extend which have the sea between. In such a way Java got two kings (68.3). On this spot--so one says--the pious ascetic stayed his flight at the top of a tree and came down from in the air. The well known 'place for the placement of the jar' (or: of the breaking forth [?] of the jar, *kruikbreuk*) is the village Palungān. Because of the height of the *kamal*-tree whose crown caught his robe he came to rest and thence he cursed it to become small while he was yet up in the air."⁶⁵

Unlike Berg, Schrieke⁶⁶ in 1957 does not really treat of the subject at length. For him the division of the realm between Airlangga's two sons is an example of a more general feature of Javanese dynastic succession. Adducing several parallels, he thinks its purpose was to avoid strife. Because Schrieke does not enter into the vexations of the disposition of the border itself, we may leave it at that.

In 1958 Berg's convoluted theories were challenged by Teeuw and Uhlenbeck.⁶⁷ Perhaps in reaction to the brashness of Berg's speculations, it is only after meticulous consideration of the bases of Old Javanese philology that they examine *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 35.2-3 and 67.3-68.5. Their approach is one of linguistic sobriety. For example, in response to Berg's suggestion⁶⁸ that 68.3d *kādyādoh* should be understood as *kādyā* plus *adoh*, that is, as an irrealis of *kādī* plus an *a*-form of *doh*, they remark⁶⁹ that *ā* may be long for metric reasons. As for the translations of 68.3-4, they concur substantively with Berg's criticisms of previous writers, but, in the case of 68.3a-c, they are of the opinion that it is unclear whether *ng lor kidul* is subject or object of *maparwa*. In contrast to Berg, they prefer the former: "the North and South became halves." Yet again the main stumbling block is 68.3d. While *mahēlēt samudra* does mean "having sea between," but not "the sea," the phrase as they see it may not be regarded as nominal. Nor are they enamored of a specific, geographical understanding of 68.3cd. They take not far (*tan madoh*)/ as far (*kādyādoh*) to mean that the distance between North and South may be "not far" in geographical terms, yet "it seemed as far as if there were a sea between, when the land Java had two princes." From this perspective they no longer see any reason to inquire into the precise location of the border.

Concerning 68.4, they provide a cogent treatment of the end of 4c--*kamal i puñcaknyāngawit cīwara*, where *angawit*⁷⁰ is taken in accordance with Modern Javanese *kawēt*, *ngawēt*, "sling around," with *cīwara* as subject not object--and they make a further most important point when they note that the subject of 4d *munggwī* is the tree and not Bharāḍa. This means that the tamarind tree stood, *munggwī*, in the border region, and accordingly *ri pantara* is not, as after

65. Ibid., p. 37.

66. B. Schrieke, *Indonesian Sociological Studies: Selected Writings of B. Schrieke*, pt. 2; *Ruler and Realm in Early Java* (The Hague: van Hoeve, 1957), pp. 16-19.

67. A. Teeuw and E. M. Uhlenbeck, "Over de Interpretatie van de *Nāgarakṛtāgama*," *BKI* 114 (1958), 210-37.

68. Berg, *Herkomst*, p. 194.

69. Teeuw and Uhlenbeck, "Over de Interpretatie," p. 220, n. 8.

70. The *Nāgarakṛtāgama* editions of both Kern and Pigeaud read *angawit*, without variants; Teeuw and Uhlenbeck read *angawēt*.

Berg, "in the air." This interpretation, of course, invalidates his denial of 68.5a *tuğu* as a borderpost.

The next scholar to treat of the subject is Aichele in 1959.⁷¹ To my knowledge he was the first to do so in a language other than Dutch. In his study "Lor-Kidul," he attempts to demonstrate on the basis of numerous examples, mostly from the Old Javanese *Rāmāyana*, that the phrase *ng lor kidul* in fact means "in allen Himmelsrichtungen, überall, ringsum."⁷² Applying this towards the close of the article to *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 68.3, Aichele first notices that Teeuw and Uhlenbeck's notion of *ng lor kidul* as subject of *maparwa* implies a division West-East. This he deems unlikely. Instead, he offers the idea that *ng lor kidul* is a synonym of *rāt*, "die Welt, Umwelt, das weite Land." *Nāg.* 68.3cd now reads: "Das weite, im Westen wie im Osten bis zur See reichende Land war gespalten in zwei einander nicht ferne Teile, (die aber)--als hätten sie einen Ozean zwischen sich--einander fern waren, seitdem das Land Java zwei Herrscher hatte."⁷³ ("The spacious land, reaching to the sea in the West as in the East, was divided into two parts which were not far from each other--(yet) which, as if they had an ocean between them, were distant from each other, ever since the land Java had two rulers.") Clearly, Aichele too does not believe that the story of the division of the kingdom refers to a palpable border.

In his magnum opus *Java in the Fourteenth Century*⁷⁴ Pigeaud follows Berg, Teeuw and Uhlenbeck, and Aichele insofar as he regards the historicity of the "Erlangga Kamal Pandak legend" as minimal. Nor is he convinced, as van Stein Callenfels, Krom, and Bosch are, that the Pinggir Rakṣa has anything to do with Bharāḍa's act. He believes that an imaginary line runs West-East along the Northern foothills of the Pēnanggungan massif to the Straits of Madura, but finds Berg's placement of Kamal Pandak at the mouth of the Porong as without foundation. To his mind, what is apparently more important than the division itself is that it is an oral tradition: "The 14th century Majapahit view of it as a dynastic disintegration which came about in historical times was a later development of the primitive tribal conception of human societies forever splitting up into moieties." The tamarind tree is to be seen as feminine and "as representative of the chthonic process." "Berg's hypothesis about the jar as a container of the fructifying liquid, i.e. sperma, seems plausible . . ." and the tree "marks the center of the cultivated earth."

On the text itself he disagrees with Aichele's rendering of *ng lor kidul* as "the wide country."⁷⁵ He himself translates *maparwa ng lor kidul tan madoh* as "with the halves, north and south, not far away (from each other)," and translates 3d: "seemingly far way (though), with between them an ocean, at the moment that Java-land got two kings."⁷⁶

The next try is that of Johns in 1965.⁷⁷ This article has two parts: a

71. W. Aichele, "Lor-Kidul," *BKI* 115 (1959): 328-35.

72. *Ibid.*, p. 328.

73. *Ibid.*, p. 335.

74. Pigeaud, *Java*, 4: 202-11.

75. *Ibid.*, 2: 81.

76. *Ibid.*, 3: 80; further we need only note that 68.4b *desa* is not "village" but should be "district" (3: 80) or "rural district" (2: 81).

77. Anthony H. Johns, "On Translating the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*," *Lingua* 15 (1965): 531-63.

critique of Pigeaud's translation of the *Nāgarakṛtāgama* and a translation of cantos 63-69. The initial portion of the study contains two points: first, that particles--such as *rakwa*--are best left untranslated or, if translated, better rendered opportunistically and second, that Dutch scholars have tended to ignore syntactic structure and thereby have overemphasized the importance of prosody. As for his translation, this is unexceptionable. Broadly speaking, he follows the understanding of Teeuw and Uhlenbeck. He believes the boundary to have run West to East and adopts their view that the two kingdoms while "not far apart in fact" were "as distant as though an ocean lay between them, when Java had two princes."⁷⁸ We need only add that he takes 68.2c *ārnawa* as "sea" and not as "great river" and that he regards the subject of *munggi* to be the tree. Because the thrust of his article is his insistence on syntactic cohesion of a translation rather than an understanding of particulars, we may leave it at that.

In an important article published in 1968,⁷⁹ which fills in some of the seventy-five years left blank by Krom after the stone of Pamwātan, the last known inscription of Airlangga in AD 1042, Buchari, basing himself on newly revealed epigraphic evidence, postulates that the king had five children. The eldest, his daughter Sanggramawijayā, was replaced as *rakryan mahāmantri i hino*⁸⁰ in 1037 by her younger brother Samarawijaya, who later became the ruler of Pañjalu. Buchari views another son, Mapañji Garasakan, as most likely the son of Airlangga and a Balinese princess and as the first king of Janggala. However, by 1052 he had been succeeded as king by his (half) brother Mapañji Alanjung Ahyes, and sometime between 1052 and 1059 a fourth (half) brother Samarotsāha in turn gained the throne.

Irrespective of the accuracy of these kinship relations, the inscription of Mapañji Garasakan which Buchari calls Turun Hyang B and for which he proposes the date AD 1044 specifically mentions the war against the king of Pañjalu.⁸¹ Because, accordingly, there cannot be much remaining doubt that Janggala and Pañjalu actually existed in the period after 1042, the date of the stone of Pamwātan, there no longer need be any hesitation with regard to the historicity of the partition of Airlangga's realm.

In Buchari's opinion, the geographical disposition of such inscriptions which have come to light for the period after 1042 ought to determine the border between Janggala and Pañjalu. Taken together with the information provided by the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, the fact that inscriptions of Airlangga have been found North of the Brantas and Porong rivers, means that the boundary should be along the river Lanang or Solo. According to Buchari, the Lanang, a small tributary of the Lamong, is said to have arisen from magic water from a jar: because this river is not far from the site of the stone of Pamwātan, Buchari believes that the likelihood is that the Lamong was the boundary between Janggala, the Northern kingdom ruled by Mapañji Garasakan, and Pañjalu, the Southern realm over which Samarawijaya reigned.⁸²

78. Ibid., p. 559.

79. Buchari, "Sri Maharaja Mapanji Garasakan."

80. On this title see Buchari, "Rakryan Mahāmantri i Hino," *Journal of History* (1967-68), pp. 7-10. See also Antoinette M. Barrett Jones, *Early Tenth Century Java from the Inscriptions* (Leiden: KITLV, 1984), pp. 98ff.

81. *tatkāla niran hañar ablah lāwan haji panngjalu*, Buchari, "Sri Maharaja Mapañji Garasakan," p. 3.

82. Ibid., p. 9.

IV

After this compendium of views on the division of the kingdom which by force of circumstance must necessarily be selective, we turn to our own interpretation of the text. As for an opinion on the views of previous writers, one cannot but be impressed by the energetic seriousness and erudition of the earlier scholars, representing as most of them do the academic culture of the Netherlands in its colonial period. On the other hand, despite the advantage of hindsight conveyed by the research of Buchari, one also cannot but be struck by the hopelessly antiquated anthropology and their naivety insofar as they deemed the border to be solely legendary or mythic. What I mean is this: after careful application of philological method, these writers tend to want to ignore text-historical fact. If Airlangga's kingdom were divided, whether this be by a historical Bharāḍa or not, and if there exists a tale, legend, or narration of this division, as there does in the text before us, then, because we possess textual evidence of a border being drawn, a specific line must have been meant in the text, regardless of whether or not this border is or could be historically accurate. In short, the question of whether this border described by *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 68.3 should or could be applied to the eleventh century is secondary and text-historically irrelevant. Our purpose must hence be to attempt to fix the border there described.

The honored one is he who, requested to divide the land, did not refuse. These the borders were marked by him with water in a jug from heaven. West and East (they went) up to the great river. He divided the North and South, (but) not far, as is far the intervening sea, when Java had two princes.

a. *amarwa ng bhūmi*: Previous writers have generally held to the meaning "divide in two" for *amarwa*. Since adding the expression "in halves" implies that these are equal, "to divide" will do nicely.⁸³

b. *ingānyeki tlas*: It has been assumed that "the border," (*h*)*inga*, is singular, or, at least, best translated as such. This is unnecessary. The text clearly mentions two borders: one West-East and one of the North and South. Observe that this implies a radial system, a notion to be developed below. Placing emphasis on the division rather than Airlangga's realm itself, it is only natural that the reference could be to the borders of the resulting parts. In any case, *-nya* may be plural as well as singular and if it were plural it implies that such an interpretation could well be appropriate, as does mention of the occurrence taking place "at the time when (*tēwēk*) Java had two princes."

Nor is the meaning of *tlas* unambiguous. One might consider it a marker of the preterite:⁸⁴ this would again be in accordance with the use of *tēwēk*. One might also consider connecting it syntactically to *iki*, in which case, as "complete," in the sense of exhaustive, it would refer to the completeness of Bharāḍa's act which hereby would not be interrupted, but would be marked, by the *kamal* tree at 69.1a.

c. I understand *ng lor kidul* as the object of *maparwa*. Although Teeuw and Uhlenbeck refuting Berg⁸⁵ noted that on purely linguistic grounds one cannot

83. Cf. P. J. Zoetmulder, *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*, 2 vols. (The Hague: 1982), 2: 1307.

84. Cf. Pigeaud, *Java*, 5: 231.

85. Teeuw and Uhlenbeck, "Over de Interpretatie," p. 234.

choose between regarding it as subject or object, because of the parallel with 68.3a *amarwa ng bhūmi tan langghyana*, that is, verbal *parwa* + object + negative phrase, the latter seems more likely.

d. As repeatedly observed in the discussions of the views in the secondary literature, the single most obscure point of the verse is the expression *mahēlēt samudra*. It has generally been understood to refer to a point between, that is, an interstitial space (Pigeaud) which is then deemed to be the sea. I propose that it is best rendered here as "the sea forming an interruption or discontinuity," or, more shortly, "the intervening sea." To this end, compare *Rāmāyana* 8.183:

ndya kunēng anung mutusana ng sinangśaya
 ikanā ri Daṇḍaka atīta ring madoh
 mahēlēt tasik gunung alas jurang trēbis
 priya Raghawa ndya ta gamā nirān wruha

What indeed would help bring doubts to a conclusion?
 From here to the Daṇḍaka (forest) is very far,
 The ocean, mountains, forests, and impassable ravines intervening.
 How is the beloved descendent of Raghu to come to know (of this)?

The expression *atīta ring madoh/ mahēlēt tasik*, etc., bears a distinct resemblance to *tan madoh/ . . . mahēlēt samudra* in the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*. In both passages *hēlēt* clearly refers to an interruption in continuity. Applying this notion to the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, one might hold that what is "not far" is not the sea as such but a point which is not far (*tan madoh*), that is, the point which is not far as the sea which intervenes is far (*kadyādoh*). As tortuous as this may seem, its import is clear once, that is, it is noted that *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 68.3cd describes not two points (one, call it point A, which is by the *āṇawa*, and one, call it point B, which is not far) but *three* different points. Namely these two plus a third, call it point C, on a line which meets the sea, that is, where the sea "intervenes."

The extent to which this interpretation makes any sense depends not only on the reader's philological judgment, but most especially on the map of Java. Observe the following: because Java is an island *any* line will reach the sea in short order. Therefore, it is more likely that a line, the border, is meant. If this is so, then that point on the coast, point C, should be the end-point of the line segment of specific length, just as should be the case with point A at the *āṇawa*. The next step is to propose that these could be identical in length. Going outwards in different directions, they could then be seen to do so from a center. Hence, the test is to see whether such a point of origin can be found.

The reader is asked to refer to figure 2. If we choose the length R of the line segment to be that noted in the first part of this article--the distance from Mount Arjuna to Mount Brama--and take as fixed point Karang Kates at the confluence of the Brantas and Lēkṣa, the resulting arc sweeps through the summit of Mount Anjasmara. If we now take as origin the summit of this mountain and draw a circle of radius R such that R is equal to the distance between Karang Kates and the mountain, we note that the circumference reaches the sea at a point across the Brantas north of Rēmbang. It is inescapable that this point, C, is identical to that point on the coast which we observed to be equidistant from Majapahit and Singosari *and* the point on the coast forming the extension of the line Plumbangan-Mount Arjuna. It is too much to presume coincidence.

Taking the summit of Anjasmara as center and drawing a line of length R at almost exact right angles to the line Anjasmara-point C, its end-point should be

the postulated point B; that is, that point equally as far from the origin, the top of Anjasmara, as point C on the coast. The reason we choose this particular, right angle is the fact that of the circle formed with as origin Anjasmara of radius R, this point B--Northwest of Tenggaran--is one of only two points of the circumference of this circle on the Brantas. The other point has already been mentioned. It is Karang Kates at the confluence of Brantas and Lekša, which is therefore the postulated point A. Moreover, the location of point B is no accident: the area around B is where the Brantas changes course from South-North to West-East.

Therefore, the proposal is that point B may be identified as Kamal Pandak and that the line Karang Kates-Mount Anjasmara-point B is the borderline, dividing Airlangga's kingdom, drawn by *mpu* Bharāḍa, as understood by the fourteenth century *Nāgarakṛtāgama*.

This hypothesis may solve the dilemma evinced by the expression "as is far the intervening sea." Concerning the comparison nor far/as is far, this might be explained as follows: From the perspective of a radial system of orientation with as center Mount Anjasmara, the kingdom is first divided into East and West by the line Anjasmara-Karang Kates. Depending on how one defines distance in such a system, the furthest one could get from point A would be a point at 180° or 360° distance. In any event, point B is defined as "not far"--compared to point C--from point A. Taking into account that in Indic systems of direction one generally moves clockwise (*pradakṣina*), the comparison not far/as is far implies that the border must turn not Eastwards, but Westwards from Anjasmara. As explained above, how far B is from the mountain is answered by the phrase *mahēlēt samudra*, as far as the point on the coast.

Now there is no arguing with the geometry of the proposed borderline. Yet a hypothesis should provide a corollary. The one in mind is the identification of the capitals of Pañjalu (Kēḍiri) and Janggala. As for the first, by the fourteenth century this is commonly acknowledged to be Daha, i.e., the modern Kēḍiri and is so designated by the *Nāgarakṛtāgama* (68.1b). Because line 68.1c is missing, the capital of Janggala is much more difficult. Various sites have been proposed, including the village Bakong on the Porong, the village Sidukari and Jēdung on the Northern slopes of the Pēnanggungan. As to the last, it has been noted that a village named Kahuripan, the traditional name of Airlangga's capital, lies in its direct vicinity.⁸⁶

We may attack the problem from the following perspective. According to the *Calon Arang*, after Bharāḍa divided the kingdom into two--one in the East and one in the West--and retired to his hermitage, the king of Kēḍiri became convinced that the sovereign of Janggala was about to attack. He went to his father Airlangga, who tried to dissuade him from war. After the king of Kēḍiri left for home, Airlangga visited Bharāḍa in order to ask him to impede the skirmishing armies of Janggala and Kēḍiri.⁸⁷ What I should like to emphasize here is that Bharāḍa is again asked to arbitrate, just as when he divided the kingdom in two. Therefore, is it not logical to expect that the place of completion of the division, point B, Kamal Pandak, be equidistant from the kratons ascribed to both kingdoms? So it is: the reader may observe that point B is equally far from the town of Kēḍiri and from Jedung, at the usual distance R.

86. Cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis*, p. 279; Buchari, "Sri Maharaja Mapanji Garasakan," pp. 9-11.

87. Cf. Poerbatjaraka, "De Calon Arang," *BKI* 82 (1926): 141-42, 176-77.

Consequently, the view of Krom⁸⁸ that Kahuripan, the seat of Airlangga, could well have become the capital of Janggala would seem to be correct. In any event, regardless of the historical disposition of the capital(s) of Airlangga's and his sons' realm in the eleventh century, Kēḍiri-Daha and Jēdung-Kahuripan were so regarded in the fourteenth, at the time of the *Nāgarakērtāgama*.

Nor does this exhaust the geometric possibilities afforded by our hypothesis. Plumbangan, at the end-point of the line Plumbangan-Arjuna-point C, is also at distance R from Kēḍiri. One could see this as a link between the skewed directions of the compass observed for Majapahit by MacLaine-Pont noted above and the system used for the division of the kingdom. Further, at approximately right angles from point B (Kamal Pandak)-Jēdung is a line whose end-point, at distance R, is Gunung Butak. Extending this Southwards we reach the Brantas at the point (D) where the Kawi-wall proceeds from the river towards the Southern beach. This would be of only anecdotal interest were it not that drawing a line, again of length R, at right angles to the line Majapahit-Singosari (= R) we again reach point D. In other words, Majapahit can be said to be at a distance of 2R (over Singosari) from point D. It is also 2R's distance from point A, Karang Kates where the Kawi-wall goes Northwards from the Brantas. This is if the line of length 2R is taken from Majapahit over Bogēm.

Although such does appear to suggest a connection between the division of the kingdom and the Kawi-wall--I leave aside the question of whether this wall is to be identified as the Pinggir Raksa of the *Pararaton*--at least from the perspective of Majapahit and Tumapēl it also should occasion some skepticism. After all, there is nothing remarkable about Bogēm it would seem, save that it may be near Parwatīśapura, the mortuary temple also called Lobeñcal, of king Hayam Wuruk's brother-in-law who died in AD 1389.⁸⁹ On the other hand, note that Candi Jago, the mortuary temple of king Wiṣnuwardhana (d. 1268) is at distance R from Jēdung, while Candi Kiḍal, the mortuary temple of king Anūṣanātha (d. 1248) is of distance 2R from Kēḍiri, reckoned over Plumbangan. These data suggest that this length R, in addition to being crucial for the determination of Bharāḍa's borderline as described in the *Nāgarakērtāgama*, was also of great importance in the general disposition of (mortuary) temples.

In fact, as we have seen, the scalar R is a factor which occurs in all kinds of situations. As a final example of research which might be motivated by the seeming importance of the scalar R, we may again take a look at the circle of this radius centered on Mount Anjasmara. On its circumference between point A, Karang Kates, and point B, Kamal Pandak, one finds the state temple of Panataran (Palah); located propitiously to the Northeast at the distance R is, of course, Anjasmara. Although not uncontested, scholarly writing on Majapahit generally relates Panataran/Palah with worship of a mountain deity. Speculation regarding the identity of the deity Acalapati of Palah (Siva?) mentioned in the *Nāgarakērtāgama* (27.4/5) is beyond the scope of this study. Nevertheless, that this state temple of Majapahit lies on the circumference of the circle of radius R which has as center Mount Anjasmara--the name alone looks suspiciously Saivite--is another "coincidence" not without interest.⁹⁰

What this article has tried to indicate is that textual data available from the fourteenth century on the partition of Airlangga's kingdom in the eleventh

88. Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*.

89. Ibid., p. 442.

90. Cf. S. Supomo, *Arjunawijaya: A Kakawin of Mpu Tantular*, 2 vols. (Leiden: KITLV, 1977), 1: 77-80.

century is consistent and may be used to reveal some unexpected perspectives on indigenous Javanese historiography. It remains to future research to determine whether these results are systemic and to examine their consequences for history and religion.