



F. Bosch

C.C. Berg and ancient Javanese history

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 112 (1956), no: 1, Leiden, 1-24

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

C.C. BERG AND ANCIENT JAVANESE HISTORY

I

During the years 1950—1955 Berg has published with short intervals six studies on the history and historiography of Ancient Java¹⁾ which contain a number of theories and hypotheses so revolutionary that, should they prove tenable, they would necessitate a complete revision of much which up to the present had seemed as firm as a rock to our historical knowledge. But we ask ourselves immediately whether this necessity is as imperative as a first and superficial acquaintance with these studies would seem to suggest. It is a question which amply merits our consideration. As a matter of fact many readers will have been greatly impressed by Berg's fascinating and acute arguments and will have accepted straight away that the author — than whom nobody is better versed in eastern Javanese tradition and than whom nobody has acquired greater merit for the research into the history of eastern Java — must be right all along the line and that they would therefore be well advised to rid themselves of their antiquated notions, in order to exchange these for his views.

¹⁾ These studies are: "Kertanagara, de miskende empirebuilder" (the neglected empirebuilder), *Oriëntatie*, July 1950, pp. 1-32 (= Kert.); "De evolutie der Javaanse geschiedschrijving" (The evolution of Javanese historiography), *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks* 14, no. 2, 26 pp. (= Ev.); "De geschiedenis van pril Majapahit, I: JA&. mysterie van de vier dochters van Krtanagara" (The history of early Majapahit, I: the mystery of the four daughters of Krtanagara), *Indonesië* IV, 1950/51, pp. 481-520 (= PM. I); "De geschiedenis van pril Majapahit, II: Achtergrond en oplossing der pril-Majapahitse conflicten" (II: Background and solution of the early Majapahit conflicts), *Indonesië* V, 1951, pp. 193-233 (= PM. II); "De Sadeng-oorlog en de mythe van Groot-Majapahit" (The Sadeng war and the myth of Greater Majapahit), *Indonesië* V, 1951, pp. 385-422 (= SO—GM); "Herkomst, vorm en functie der Middeljavaanse rijksdelingstheorie" (Origin, form and function of the Middle-Javanese theory concerning the division of the empire), *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks* LIX, no. 1, 306 pp. (= Rd). — Apart from these studies, Berg published two more papers in *BKI* 110, 1954, three in *Indonesië* VIII, 1955, and one in *Studio Islamica*, 1955. As these, however, are chiefly concerned with New-Javanese history, they will be only referred to incidentally in the following discussion.

But, if I am not mistaken, Berg will be the first to disapprove of such an easy surrender to his ideas. Rather, he will welcome it if these ideas are seriously investigated on their merit and if criticism is not spared, even to the extent that serious objections would be brought forward. One should not forget that an important matter is at stake. This time the main issue does not concern, as it usually does in historical studies, more or less acutely formulated questions with regard to the interpretation of certain historical facts or the investigation into the relations between these facts and the conclusions to be drawn from them. Here we are required to give our opinion on a completely new vision of the history of ancient Java and its recording by native authors, coupled with a thorough reevaluation of the native sources.

The object Berg envisaged in writing these studies is indicated most clearly and concisely by his own words: "I am interested in the problem of the genesis of delusions" (Rd. 10). In Berg's line of thought this means: consideration, of the problem why among the Javanese people certain notions which are not based on historical reality, but which fit into a pre-existent mythical pattern, have led to an elementary form of historiography which western historians have held too long and in too naive a fashion to be an adequate record of historical facts. Or, in Berg's own elegant formulation: "The scientific need for knowledge of Javanese *history* is relatively small; the study of the process and of the results of Javanese *historiography* on the contrary lead to an insight which may be useful also outside of Java, as it helps in creating the norm without which the nature of our own civilisation could not be measured" (Ev. 22).

It is clear that in order to study the problems at issue here successfully, it will be necessary in the first place to define which ideas in Javanese historiography are delusions and which are not, and it is on this very point that Berg's new conception has to be brought in and that the critic takes a stand.

However, before the latter is allowed his say, the remark is due that Berg's articles give the impression of having been compiled at great speed, at too great a speed! Not only the latest literature on the subjects under discussion proves often not to have been consulted; it is a more serious defect that the author feels repeatedly compelled to retract opinions which he had recorded only a short while ago, and this becomes particularly precarious when this retraction occurs in the course of the same article where this opinion had been pronounced **earlier** (Rd. 130). In this way the critic is **led** to doubt **time and again**

whether the object of his darts may have disappeared or have been moved miles away:

But to come to the point. A general objection against Berg's method is connected with the circumstance that he usually starts from a certain intuitive "brain wave", an idea which as a rule shows the tendency to declare that an occurrence or a person which up to the present have been believed to be historical are fictitious. Such a procedure is of course quite permissible, because where would scholarship be in case it would be no longer allowed to promote its progress by means of intuition and its resulting sudden trains of thought? But it is not permissible that the argument based on this intuitive insight is not further constructed in the normal scientific way by carefully weighing all the pros and cons, but that it is handled in a manner like that of an eloquent lawyer presenting his defence. On the one hand all facts and circumstances which argue in favour of his idea are set out to their best advantage and are elaborated with great acumen, an acumen which regrettably often deteriorates into quibbling. On the other hand possible counterarguments are either neglected or ruthlessly run down or they are attacked one by one, consequently losing their combined force, or again, in view of the popular nature of the periodical, their refutation is withheld from the reader or deferred to some "later time" which is never realised.

A second objection against Berg's method lies in the argumentation he uses in his papers, an argumentation which only too often shows the aspect of an extremely unstable tower of hypotheses piled on top of each other. The construction of this tower usually proceeds in this way that, the brain wave which forms the starting point produces a number of possibilities, from which the most likely is selected to serve by way of a secondary hypothesis as the substratum for a number of new possibilities. Next, these are scrutinised one by one and studied regarding their probability, producing a tertiary hypothesis, which in its turn produces the basis for again other possibilities with the resulting still further reaching hypotheses and conclusions. It needs no further argument to show that the top of this tower finally arrives in a rarified atmosphere where historical truth can not be present but in an homeopathic dilution. Unfortunately however, it still often happens that the foundation on which the primary hypothesis is based is thoroughly unsound, with the result that the whole construction, base and superstructure included, are doomed to a tragic collapse.

The rather strong assertions made here will of course have to be

made true. However, it is impossible on the one hand to provide a critical discussion of all the theories and hypotheses which Berg has propounded in many hundreds of pages of print; whilst on the other hand it is chiefly the method he has applied in his studies which is at stake. Therefore the analysis of only one of his subjects will and must suffice for the present. In doing so we will of course fix our choice on a theme which runs like a continuous thread through all his arguments, determining their general tenor and providing us with a clear insight into his working methods.

II

The "proto-Pararaton". Because the reader perhaps no longer visualises what Berg has stated concerning this subject, scattered as these remarks are over several papers, I believe it useful to summarise the main points of his argument, omitting all immaterial detail and wherever necessary employing his own words.²⁾

Berg starts by drawing the reader's attention to the fact that Ken Angrok, with the royal name of Ranggalah Rājasa, who is generally considered as the founder of the Singosari dynasty and who should have ruled from 1222 to 1227, is not mentioned in one single charter, as little as his son Anūṣanātha or Nusapati who should have governed from 1227 to 1248, according to the Nāgarakṛtāgama. The first king to be mentioned by the charters as having ruled over Singosari is Jayawiṣṇuwardhana who, according to both the Pararaton and the Nāgarakṛtāgama, was the grandson of Angrok/Rājasa.

We are therefore forced to ask ourselves where Prapanca, the poet of the Nāgarakṛtāgama, acquired his knowledge about Angrok and Nusapati.

The answer is to be found in the Nāgarakṛtāgama itself. In canto 35 ff. of his panegyric Prapanca³⁾ tells us: "that, when in 1359 he travelled through Eastern Java with king Rājasanāgara, he visited the monastery of Darbaru near Pasuruhan and that there he found documents which "made a light dawn upon him". Immediately after

²⁾ Even when no quotation marks are used in the following paragraphs, Berg's line of thought continues to be reproduced.

³⁾ By way of warning it should be pointed out that Berg's rendering of Nāg. 35: 2-4, 36: 1-2, 38: 3 etc. which follows, is coloured by what Berg reads into these passages. In this way the words "made a light dawn upon him" suggest more than Prapanca can have intended, because in 35: 2d *winacāmangun waspada* does not mean much more than "of which the reading provided information"; see also Berg's own translation elsewhere (Rd. 265).

his discovery, the poet tells us, he went to the king to report⁴) and this led to an extra journey to the temples of Kagēñgan, Kiḍal and Jajagu.⁵) After this special journey Prapanca has an old Buddhist priest inform him about the royal ancestors placed in the funerary temples⁶) and more in particular⁷) about the divine lord of Kagēñgan. This story — which probably is no more than a literary device to make his own information appear more authoritative — shows that Kagēñgan, Kiḍal and Jajagu are the funerary temples of Angrok/Rajasa, Angrok's son Nusapati or Anuṣanatha, and Nusapati's son Jayawisṇuwardhana. The whole manner in which this part of the Nagarakṛtāgama is constructed, viz. the cantos 35—49, lead us to suspect that it was only during his visit to Darbaru that Prapanca heard about the existence of Angrok/Rajasa and Nusapati as predecessors of Jayawisṇuwardhana. This is in complete agreement with the fact that the charter of 1358 still mentions Jayawisṇuwardhana as the first king. Therefore Prapanca's find at Darbaru in 1359 must have been related to Angrok/Rajasa and Nusapati. Now the whole of Javanese literature possesses only one single document which can have provided Prapanca with the information which caused the reactions described in the Nagarakṛtāgama, and that is the Pararaton. As this text in its present form, however, contains information relating to the period after 1365, the Darbaru document can not have been the complete Pararaton. Still, we may assume, also due to other consider-

⁴) The text mentions nothing about "discovery" and "reporting". It reads (35: 4b) : *nuduy i kasewakan, dating i Singhasdri matutur manangkil marlk*, i.e. "and (I) returned to my duties. Having arrived at Singhasāri I went to pay my respects as an obedient servant". Here *matutur* cannot mean "to relate", "to report". As is proved by the analogous use of this word in passages like 41: 1b *sa-Yawabhūmi bhakti matutur*, "the whole country of Java was submissive and obedient", and 45: 2b *sa-Yawakpī maluy ātutur atis&dara n-umarēk*, "the whole country of Java was obedient and very respectfully paid its respects", the meaning "docile", "obedient" is beyond doubt.

⁵) The connection laid here between the poet's visit to Parbaru and the king's journey to the temples mentioned is not justified. The journey, which according to custom contained visits to various sanctuaries on its programme, was simply continued without showing any extraordinary features.

⁶) The next reads: *k'rāma ni tuhatuha*, "careers of the (royal) ancestors (who had been buried in the funerary temples)". This moves the emphasis from the funerary temples about which Prapañca as dharmmadhyaksa ring kasogatan was fully informed to the careers, about which he expected to obtain new information from the old priest. Quite an appreciable difference.

⁷) Because the tale of the priest starts with the life of the bhāṣaraat Kagēñgan (Ranggah Rājasa, alias Ken Agrok), the word *mukya* at the beginning of 38:6c can not mean "more in particular", but "to start with".

ations which do not matter at this moment, that the present Pararaton developed from what might be called a "proto-Pararaton" and that this proto-Pararaton definitely must have contained the story of Angrok and the affiliated information concerning Nusapati and Jayawisṇuwardhana. The assumption that Prapanca at Darbaru read the proto-Pararaton completely explains his later behaviour, because in his circumstances he must have drawn the conclusion that Jayawisṇuwardhana must have been preceded by a certain Angrok and a Nusapati as older members of the dynasty" (Ev. 3—4).

Now, what Prapanca found at Darbaru was to him no less than a revelation, a "bolt from the blue" (Rd. 169). In order to appreciate this one should consider that "Prapañca as one of the creators of Javanese history stood at the border of what may be called in a certain sense prehistorical and historical Java and that due to this he neither possessed experience in the description of facts, nor sufficient material to enable him to attain an articulated view of Java's past. The scope of Prapanca's vision must have been restricted in 1359 to the memories of living men. As far as his information for the period before 1359 is concerned we should therefore not expect more than what an intelligent but superstitious man can tell us, based exclusively on the authority of other intelligent but superstitious people" (Rd. 19). No wonder therefore that Prapanca experienced "the sensation of his life" (Rd. 265) when his discovery at Darbaru for the first time brought him into contact with something that bore a vague resemblance to historiography and that he was even completely upset when he had to learn from the proto-Pararaton that Wiṣṇuwardhana whom he had always considered as the founder of the Singosari dynasty had been preceded by an Angrok and a Nusapati.

To us who observe Prapanca's naive astonishment from a great distance the case is given "an extra piquancy" (Rd. 157), because we know that his discovery of these rulers is based on a fiction. That is to say, Angrok and Nusapati never existed in reality, but they are the product of a highly uncritical fusion of a Sindok-myth and a story concerning Wiṣṇuwardhana.

This fusion must have come about in the following manner. Angrok represents the memory of a king of the beginning of the 10th century, a memory overgrown with myths. This king is mpu Sindok, no longer known to the Javanese of the early 11th century, and due to this neglect and to the fact that he had been promoted to the status of forefather of the Erlangga dynasty he filled the conditions necessary to grow into

a legendary figure (Rd. 67). The name of this ruler was considered under the influence of popular etymology as a combination of the uricereemonial personal article *si* and the name *Ndok*, giving rise to *Ngrok*, which in its turn led to the creation of the hyper-correct- form *Angrok*. At the time when this Angrok was made the founder of the Singosari dynasty, he was given divine status. As such he revealed himself as Bhatāra Guru and in this quality he obtained the two spouses which belong to this divinity, viz. the eudaimonic-Uma, corrupted to Umang in the Pararaton, and the demoniacal Durga, called Dēdēs for fear of this dangerous goddess. The two eldest sons of Dēdēs are called *together* Wongatēng-Agnibhaya, "the danger of the fiery clitoris", and those of Umang, again *together*, Tohjaya-Sudhatu i.e. "the good fortune of the well-established victory". It is easily understood that in both cases the double name gave rise to two sons who obtained one half of the name each. The same origin must be ascribed to the two grandsons which the Pararaton attributes to Dēdēs, viz. Ranga-Wuni (= Wiṣṇuwardhana) and Mahisa-Campaka (= NarasinghamQrti) from one single grandson, called Campaka-Wuni, "(Clitoris) flower of femininity".

These are the elements of the Angrok-myth from which the story in the Pararaton concerning Angrok must have originated by means of a fusion with the historical drama reconstructed by Berg, in which Wiṣṇuwardhana is the chief personage. According to this reconstruction there are reasons to assume that Wiṣṇuwardhana after the destruction of the "evil" Linggapati and the annexation of the latter's state — probably Koripan — married Linggapati's widow Jayawardharī and that he had a son born from this marriage consecrated as ruler of the new united kingdom of Kēḍiri and Koripan. "If we assume that this is correct, Jayawiṣṇuwardhana would be a regicide and hence he would have been guilty of one of those dangerous infractions of the correct cosmic order which the Javanese call *malati* and which demand a necessary adjustment" (Ev. 12). Because this adjustment was never realised "the trauma of the dissatisfied sense of justice" has been assuaged by meeting out punishment to the sinner in another world, viz. in a myth. In this myth "the founder of a new dynasty likewise had to secure by unfair means the queen whose widowhood he had caused and to beget by her an impure child, which was of course predestined for the function of executing punishment upon the regicide" (ib.).

These are the very events we observe in the Pararaton. Here

Tunggul Amētung assumes the role of Linggapati, Dēdēs that of Jayawardhanl, and Nusapati that of the "impure" Kṛtanagara. Furthermore, of the abovementioned duality Campaka-Wuni Wuni has been identified with the historical Wiṣṇuwardhana and made the son of Nusapati, whilst Campaka has become identified with the likewise historical Narasingha. "That the historical Jayawiṣṇuwardhana in this way became to a certain extent the grandson of the mythologised Jayawiṣṇuwardhana could not meet with objection among a society which did not think along historical lines" (Ev. 13).

As the credulous person he was, and suffering moreover from historical nearsightedness (Rd. 19), Prapanca has eagerly swallowed the story he had learnt due to his discovery of the proto-Pararaton, but in the historical cantos of his panegyric he has nevertheless "refashioned it into the form which suited him best" (Ev. 15). In his further use of the data from the proto-Pararaton he has also introduced another novelty, i.e. he has added chronograms to his poem, Śaka-dates in words. However, in most cases these are not based on facts but on computation. "In this way he has presumably put the date of 'the fall of Kēḍiri' at 1222 by taking the 'seven cycles' of the introduction to the proto-Pararaton on his own authority to mean seven decades and to deduct these seventy years from the date of Kṛtanagara's death" (Ev. 15).

If on the one hand Prapanca's uncritical mind has been deeply influenced by his acquaintance with the proto-Pararaton, on the other his data and his "fabrications" (Ev. 16) in their turn have left their mark on both the further development of the Pararaton and on later Mataram historiography. The latter was especially interested in the list of ancestors included in the Nāgarakṛtāgama. In this way the Mataram pujanggas have followed Prapanca's example and have provided their dynasty to its honour and glory with so radical a list of ancestors that they retraced the genealogy of Sultan Agung back to Adam. Moreover, the structure of the Pararaton which had come into being under Prapanca's influence provided the scheme for the composition of the Babad Tanah Djawi. During and after the heyday of Majapahit the readers of the Pararaton cannot but have obtained the impression that from Dēdēs two families had originated, viz. an impure one — that of the "regicide" Wiṣṇuwardhana and his "impure" son Kṛtanagara — constituting an elder line, and a pure one — that of Wonga tēlēng and Narasinghamūrti — as the junior line, and that after a short reign of the elder, impure line during the Singosari dynasty the younger, pure

branch had more definitely assumed the government since the establishment of the Majapahit dynasty. It is this structure which has come to dominate the Babad Tanah Djawi completely, as may be proved by its description of the relation between Dĕmak and Mataram and between Mataram and the East India Company.

Another, more tangible example may show the strong effects of Prapanca's example during the Mataram period. When Sultan Agung's pujangga was forced by circumstance to create an illustrious forefather for this *homo novus*, he remembered in good time how the great pujangga of Majapahit in similar circumstances had given Wiṣṇuwardhana a grandfather of the type of the grandson⁸) and so he "created the — fictitious — figure of Senapati. Hence Agung is to Senapati what Wiṣṇuwardhana is to Angrok (*Indonesia* VIII p. 122 sq.).

Finally, none of Prapanca's "fabrications" has made a greater stir and has caused greater misunderstanding than the list of the dependencies of Majapahit, inserted in the cantos 13 and 14 of his panegyric. What are the facts of the case? During the 14th century there have been two empires of Majapahit: the actual one, which included not much more than the nuclear territory on Java and Bali and perhaps Madura, and the empire of the myth of Great Majapahit, "the dimensions of which have been determined perhaps for the first time, and certainly in the most impressive manner, by Prapanca in his Nāgarakṛtāgama by the simple method of exhaustively applying his knowledge of geography. The list of 'Majapahit dependencies' is valueless to the student of political history, because it is in no respect based on adequate facts. However, as a mythical document and as a reflexion of the geographical knowledge of the times it is of great importance for cultural history and it is only to be hoped that it will for once arouse interest for this reason" (SO-GM 413).

⁸) I must confess that I have not been able to follow Berg's line of thought here. Even if we assume that the Mataram pujangga knew something about the founding of the dynasty of Singosari many centuries earlier, this knowledge can never have assumed another form but that of a firm belief in Angrok as its ancestor, in agreement with what tradition may have taught him on this point. To suppose that the great pujangga of Majapahit (Prapanca) would have presented Wiṣṇuwardhana with a grandfather, implying that this great pujangga would have committed a *pia fraus* in this matter, can never have occurred to him and even less could he have deliberately followed this example.

III

So far Berg on the proto-Pararaton and some connected subjects. It was of course impossible to mention them all.

The first point to invite criticism is the fact that the author in his attempt to remove Angrok and Nusapati from the stage of history by declaring them to be fictitious, has neglected to pose and to answer the most obvious question, namely how the gap should be filled between the Kēḍiri and the Singosari period which is opened by the evaporation of these two rulers. After all, it is an absolute fact that, according to the charter of Lawadan, Kṛtajaya, alias Śrīṅga,⁹⁾ governed as the last ruler of Kēḍiri until after 1205, up to 1222 "according to both the Nāgarakṛtāgama and the Pararaton, whilst Wiṣṇuwardhana, according to Berg the first king of Singosari, assumed the government in 1248. Was there an interregnum without a king between these two, and if not, who were the rulers? And which political event was the cause that during this interval the seat of government was moved from Kēḍiri to Tumapel? Any unbiassed reader of the story of the occurrences during this interval as these are rendered by the panegyric and the Pararaton will certainly find a much more satisfactory answer to these questions than the breakneck hypothesis which Berg substitutes for it. Because neckbreaking it is, this hypothesis. That mpu Sindok was some kind of legendary figure, promoted by Erlangga to the status of — fictitious — ancestor of his dynasty; that moreover the name Sindok would have been corrupted to Angrok due to popular etymology, and that finally the origin of Angrok was due to this ruler who had lived more than three centuries earlier — believe it who may. The same may be said concerning the conjecture — which remains hanging in space without any further adstruction — that the two eldest sons of Dēḍes *together* would have been called Wongateleng-Agnibhaya, "Danger of the fiery clitoris", and those of Umang *together* Tohjaya-Sudhatu, "Good fortune of the well-established victory", two names which because of their highly improbable composition and of their quite fantastic meaning it would be proper to remove from the realm of possibilities. For the rest it is evident that this conjecture has only been proposed to prepare the way for a new conjecture which fits quite well into a later part of the argument, namely that the two grandsons of Dēḍes, Ranga Wuni and Mahisa Campaka, would have

⁹⁾ Concerning the identification of Kṛtarājasa and Śrīṅga see L. Ch. Damais, "Epigraphische Aantekeningen III" (Epigraphical Notes), *TBG* 83, 1949, pp. 10-15.

originated from one single grandson, called Campaka-Wuni, "(Clitoris) flower of femininity".¹⁰⁾

Then follows the hypothetical reconstruction of the drama of Wiṣṇuwardhana where improbabilities and impossibilities likewise vie for first place. To mention only a few. Because regicide is exceedingly common in Javanese history, with or without revenge in reality, it is far from clear why only the removal of Linggapati would have caused "a trauma of the dissatisfied sense of justice", which had to be assuaged in a myth. Why not in all the other cases? Or did this creation of myths make still other victims and have we to expect many other mythologisations of persons still registered as historical? And what should we think in all seriousness of the fusion of myth and story resulting in conceptions so horribly complicated that in the resulting picture every historical ruler comes to be accompanied by a mythical shadow-ruler, with whom he is historically and/or mythically identified, and that moreover names are split up and shifts and overlappings take place which make confusion worse confounded, so that in the end nobody is astonished any longer to see an historical personage appear from this chaos as his own mythical grandfather. Which Javanese *auctor intellectualis* would have been able to invent this kind of puzzles? Would he not have suffered the same experience as is told of the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara whose head, when at a critical moment too much thought was demanded of it, burst asunder into many pieces?

Now it has become clear from the above that Berg's Angrok hypothesis, born from the marriage of the unacceptable reconstruction of a myth and the no less unacceptable reconstruction of a series of historic events, shows no attractions which might promote its accept-

¹⁰⁾ This is a curious name for a man, but quite apart from this the conjecture proposed here is completely untenable. Like Berg remarks, *campaka* is the name of a flower, but it does not follow from this that "flower" might be taken here to mean "clitoris flower". Furthermore, whilst *wuni* can actually mean "what is hidden", "femininity", it is much more probable that in this case — like in so many others where Javanese grantees are named after flowers or plants or fruit — it indicates the fruit of the salamander tree. In the name conjectured by Berg we would therefore have either a juxtaposition of two names from the vegetable kingdom, which is of course impossible, or, maintaining the meaning "femininity" for *wuni*, "Campaka of femininity", which makes as little sense.

In passing I may note that Berg's identification of Ken Dēdēs with the demonical goddess Durgā cannot pass muster. The buddhist Dēdēs shows no demoniacal characteristics in the story as told in the Pararaton. Moreover, it is highly probable that it is she whose image we have to see in the well known Leiden statue of the Prajāṇṇamīta, the most serene of all Mahāyāna goddess statues.

ance,¹¹⁾ the important question rises what we have to think of the reliability of Prapanca in his historical cantos in general and in his presentation of events concerning the "lost" rulers Angrok and Nusapati in particular.

If anything has left a deep impression on the reader of Berg's papers, it is the degradation which Berg has made Prapañca suffer in the forum of history. How little is left of the laurel wreath which Krom had pressed upon his brow with the words: "To state of a panegyrist that on the whole he is completely, reliable is to him no small praise. Prapanca deserves it; we should.... thank him for a large number of data concerning facts and conditions which would have totally escaped our notice, had we not possessed this single manuscript" (HJG 19). This is to be confronted with Berg's scathing judgment on this viewpoint of Krom: "As an historian Prapanca.... has been highly overrated by Krom, I believe" (Ev. 15), or in greater detail: "For many years, I have occupied myself intensively with Krom's work and I am entitled to say that the reverse is true of 'unknown, unloved'. Nevertheless I believe that a large part of his 'Hindu-Javanese History' will prove to possess no definitive value. The science of criticism of historiography has discovered and successfully fought the anachronism, the sin against chronology. However, another point for attack should be 'anotypism', i.e. historiography which runs counter to the pattern of the culture under discussion. To my mind, Krom's book is highly 'anotypical' and the unacceptableness of his arguments is already implied in his first chapter where he applies different standards to the Naga-rakṛtagama and the Babad Tanah Djawi, in stead of starting from the view that both are products of one and the same culture" (SO-GM 416).

Indeed, if Berg's opinion of Prapañca would prove to be well founded, the completely reliable historian of Krom's vision would be

¹¹⁾ Berg's strongest argument for the non-existence of Angrok and Nusapati is a) that not a single charter is known of these kings, and b) that their names are not mentioned in a single charter. As regards the first point, I can see nothing strange in this. As Angrok/Rajasa only ruled for five years, there is nothing extraordinary in the fact that he did not issue any charter during this short period. To this we may add that so many Javanese rulers are known who have left no charters, that this negative achievement cannot serve to put Angrok and Nusapati in a class by themselves. The second point, viz. the non-occurrence of the names of these two rulers in inscriptions, is not so certain as Berg believes it to be. In the three inscriptions, also mentioned by him (Ev. 143), viz. of Kandangan, of 1248, and of 130S, it seems quite likely that Angrok/Rajasa is mentioned indirectly. I do not think that Berg has been successful in nullifying the demonstrative force of these inscriptions, taken singly and together.

degraded to a credulous and superstitious, slightly tragic figure, easily gulled and incapable of seeing beyond his personal memory; what is worse, he would become a forger of dates, a maker of fabrications, a juggler with facts, in short a figure which might be well worth studying as a product of the civilisation of his time, but who would remain far below our lowest expectations as a source of information concerning the ancient history of Java.¹²⁾

However, this unflattering image designed by Berg is considerably changed when we take into consideration that Prapañca was not only a bhūjanga, a man of letters, but also a devout Mahāyānist, and this implies that he was an active member of a world religion which, in his time still, united its believers in one large cosmopolitan community. That Prapañca formed part of this community and that he put his poetical activities at its service is proved i.a. by the title "Sugataparwa" of one of his works (94: 3). As the author of this work devoted to the Buddha Prapañca must have been well informed about the life history of the founder of Buddhism and this circumstance alone must have carried his mind far beyond the narrow limits of the memories of living men within which Berg wants to see him enclosed. When we add to this the knowledge indispensable to any good Buddhist about Buddhist church-history with its councils, patriarchs, literary products and so on, the thesis becomes absolutely untenable that before his discovery of the proto-Pararaton the poet had seen all events which had taken place in the past couched in a "prehistoric obscurity. The most important point in this connection is, however, that Prapañca occupied the elevated office of dharmamādhyaṣṭa ring kasogatan, Superintendent of the Buddhist clergy, and that in this capacity he had the supreme control over all Buddhist foundations in the state. As such he must also have had the supervision over the state archives of charters pertaining to these foundations. Now the fact that in all these charters the date constituted a highly important element with its exact indication of year, month, week and day and occasionally even of the hour of its issue, and that furthermore these charters, apart from the names of rulers, ministers and other dignitaries, far from seldom contain important historical data — this fact fully warrants the conclusion that the knowledge of Java's past at the disposal of Prapañca must have been considerably more

¹²⁾ The great change in Berg's own opinion on Prapañca within one single year is demonstrated by his words written in 1950: "_____ a scholar who knew what he wanted, it seems, and of whom we may expect that he was comparatively well versed in the history of the dynasty which he served" (Kert. 4).

extensive, exact and "articulated" than that with which we have to content ourselves. Seen in this light Berg's outline of Prapañca's historical ignorance and nearsightedness becomes a caricature in which it is difficult to retrace something of the original.

IV

For the time being we will withhold our final judgment on Prapañca as an historian until we have discussed two other subjects.¹³⁾

The first concerns Berg's revolutionary theory aimed at pricking the bubble of the mythical Greater Majapahit and to replace it by the Majapahit of actual fact — *pauvres restes d'un empire autrefois immense!*

The subject broached by Berg undoubtedly deserves a more thorough treatment than it has had up to now, but in that case not viewed from Berg's standpoint of casting doubt on the reliability of Prapañca's wellknown list of dependencies. It should be viewed in the larger frame of the trade movements which at the time of the rise of the spice trade not only connected the islands of the archipelago with each other, but which had already linked or were about to link these islands with the ports of India and via the latter with the Mediterranean littoral. The result of such a study might well prove to be that a Greater Majapahit had come into being, not so much as the effect of an urge for political expansion, but due to the same motives which centuries later were to lead the East India Company to found factories and to occupy bases for the promotion and protection of its trade.

But enough of this. That, nevertheless, this Greater Majapahit which Berg has so easily removed from history by one stroke of his pen was not merely a product of Prapañca's vain desire to exhibit his knowledge of geography, but did actually exist is shown most clearly — if one wants to deny all confidence to native reports — by the *Suma Oriental* of the Portugese Tomé Pires who stayed in Malacca between 1512 and 1515 and who visited Java from there. In his rather extensive and generally reliable information on Javanese history this author states: "It is said that the rule of Java extended up to the Moluccas

¹³⁾ Berg's earlier mentioned opinion that Senapati never existed in actual fact, but that he was created by Sultan Agung's pujangga in order to provide this *homo novus* with a suitable ancestor, was refuted by De Graaf in a paper read on March 1 at the Congress of the Oriental Society of the Netherlands, and entitled "De historische betrouwbaarheid der Jayaanse overlevering" (The historical reliability of Javanese tradition). [This paper is published in this present issue of the *BKI*. Ed.].

to the East and also over a large part of the West, i.e. over nearly the whole island of Sumatra, until one century ago. Then a decline set in."¹⁴) This notice by a near-contemporary says enough, unless we should want to put it aside, under the supposition that the stranger Pires had become the credulous victim of what his Javanese informants were pleased to make him swallow.

The last and most important point which remains to be discussed leads us back to our startingpoint: Prapañca's discovery of the proto-Pararaton. In case it would prove to be true that it was only at Darbaru that he set eye for the first time on this important document and that it "opened his eyes" concerning history and even "cured him of the cataract" (Rd. 20), then his historical knowledge before this discovery cannot have been worth much, our previous arguments notwithstanding. However, before we submit to this conclusion, we cannot help asking whether it is probable that a document as highly important as the proto-Pararaton must have been according to Berg only existed in this one manuscript which, once it had strayed into the rather obscure monastery in the distant eastern corner of the island, remained hidden there without the Majapahit bhujanggas knowing of its existence and which undoubtedly would have continued to remain hidden there for ever, in case Prapañca's chance visit to the monastery had not brought it to light. Berg does not attempt to explain this curious circumstance, nor does he state positively what the contents were of this extremely rare and mysterious document which should have been the precursor of the Pararaton. He does say that it must have contained the Angrok myth, with "a tail" (PM II202), containing information on Nusapati and Wisnuwardhana. He likewise puts the time of compilation of the document at shortly after 1325 (Ev. 24), but we would be particularly interested to know the relation of this work to the historical cantos of the. Nagarakrtagama, as Berg considers the proto-Pararaton to have been its source. As to this last point, how are we to explain that the panegyric deviates on many and important points from the story in the Pararaton, which of needs must also be based on the proto-Pararaton. And why is it that the Nagarakrtagama reports numerous facts, and names and dates which are lacking in the Pararaton and which therefore

¹⁴) H. J. de Qraaf, "Tomé Pires' *Suma Oriental* en het tijdperk van godsdienst-overgang op Java" (Tomé Pires' *Suma Oriental* and the period of religious transition on Java), *BKI* 108, 1952, p. '48.

cannot have been taken from this source. On these and similar questions Berg keeps silent.

But why should we enter still more deeply into these matters once we are brought to the sobering revelation that Prapafica's visit to Darbaru did not produce anything of the slightest importance, let alone the discovery of a proto-Pararaton.

Regarding the importance of this visit Berg and Krom occupy completely opposing standpoints. Whilst to Berg it is the climax of Prapafica's journey, one will look in vain for the name Darbaru in the index of Krom's standard work, whilst Prapafica's visit is not mentioned in the text by one single word, evidently because the author considered it too unimportant to waste precious space upon it in his work. The text provides an unambiguous answer to the question as to who is right. We read in the verses concerned:¹⁵⁾

35:2.... Prapafica remained behind, West of Pasuruhan, with the sole aim of amusing himself. He preceded to a *kuṭi* 16.) called Darbaru on the village-lands of the desa Hujung, where he asked the *sthdpaka* for information concerning the land belonging as property (to the *kuṭi*). This person (thereupon) gave him to inspect a piece of writing (*likhita*), a beautiful charter (*suprasāsti*),¹⁷⁾ the reading of which gave him the (desired) information.

35:3 The contents of the manuscript (*lēpit*) were as might have been expected:¹⁸⁾ (a statement of) the high and the low fields which were the permanent property of the *kuṭi*: one plot in Markamam, sawahs in Balunghura, still other sawahs in Hujung. The contents of this beautiful charter (*suprasāsti*) roused the poet's desire to stay away from the kraton. Once his work in the kraton will have been finished he will therefore settle down later in a *kuṭi* as a man without possessions (*daridra*) and this will certainly be at Darbaru.¹⁹⁾

.35:4 Because (at present) he was in a hurry, he departed etc.

¹⁵⁾ In the following translation by Kern I have made a few corrections in accordance with Poerbatjaraka (*BKI* 80, 1924, p. 235), Berg (Rd. 157 and 264) and my own views.

¹⁶⁾ As Van Naerssen has shown (*BKI* 95, 1937, pp. 450 sq.), in charters and in the Nāg. the words *kuṭi* and *wihāra* exclusively denote Buddhist foundations. The difference between these two types of foundations, however, remains unclear.

¹⁷⁾ In the Nāg. (*su*)*prasāsti* is the ordinary word for "charter" (see i.a. 72: 2). There is no single reason to consider this with Berg as "an important piece" which "to him (Prapafica) meant the sensation of his life."

¹⁸⁾ I have adopted Berg's correction of *yathdswa* to *yath&rtha*.

¹⁹⁾ In Berg's translation 35: 3d reads: "but due to a lack of (sufficient good) deeds it was not to be his fate to settle down in a monastery, and in Parbaru at that." Here (*nirdkṛta*) has been taken to mean "earlier deeds", or *karnum*, but to

Nothing more can be deduced from these lines than that Prapafica, staying in the Pasuruhan area as he was, used this opportunity to show, as superintendent of the Buddhist clergy, his interest in the affairs of the Buddhist monastery at Darbaru by paying it a visit of courtesy and that on his request he was shown the pride of the monastery, i.e. the charter of its foundation. We are therefore dealing solely with the record of an event with which pleasant memories were connected both for Prapafica and for the inhabitants of the monastery. That the poet would have been shown any other important document apart from the charter a proto-Paraton or something similar, cannot possibly be distilled from the text. Hence, the proto-Paraton is a phantom and so the whole towering construction of hypotheses built on this phantom collapses....

When the dust raised by this collapse has lifted, freeing the stage of history of impurities, a rehabilitated Prapafica triumphingly comes to the fore. For with the disappearance of the proto-Paraton any reason has disappeared to continue to reproach him for the ignorance, near-sightedness and gullibility which were said to have characterised his relation to historical reality. Gone also is any reason to doubt the genuineness and the reliability of his knowledge of the past and the purity of the manner in which he has used these to record the facts he knew.²⁰⁾ Finally, it becomes evident that he belongs to quite a different historical climate than the compiler of the mythical prehistory of the Babad Tanah Djawi.2i).

In this way Prapafica remains what he was; apart from slight touches to be applied in view of new insights gained since 1931, he continues

me there is no doubt that *ptira* in this case refers back to *pura*, "kraton", used in the preceding *pāda*, so that *purākṛta* means "work in the kraton". For the rest, the contents of 35: 3d are not of paramount importance to the question under discussion.

²⁰⁾ As regards the contents of the so-called historical cantos 40-49, which Prapafica states to have learnt from the mouth of the thousand months old buddhist *sthāpaka* Ratnāmśa, I am inclined to subscribe to Berg's view that this is no more than a literary form to give greater authority to the poet's own statements, on the understanding, however, that this information was not taken from the proto-Paraton, as Berg assumes, but that it was directly due to Prapafica's personal knowledge of the past which he had acquired i.e. from the charters under his care. Ratnāmśa cannot have told the poet much news, or it should have been the succession and the connection between the events which could not be so easily learnt from the charters alone.

²¹⁾ For the necessity to distinguish sharply between actual and mythical historiography and the dangers which lie in the attempts to include the two in one single characterisation, see the important remarks by Drewes in *Djāwd*, 1939, pp. 244-248.

to present a striking resemblance to the figure Krom has outlined once and for all, with all the faults and shortcomings inherent in the poet's person and times. This also serves to disprove the reproach addressed to Krom, that by trusting too blindly in Prapañca he designed the badly proportioned picture which would have robbed the greater part of his Hindu-Javanese history of its value.

To bring radical changes into this picture, much stronger arguments will have to be brought up than those produced in the vein of Berg's hypotheses.²²⁾

V

In order to illustrate Berg's methods still further, something should be said about his treatment of a subject which — no less than the proto-Pararaton — dominates the whole of his argumentation and which is mentioned again and again, dragging also related subjects along in its fast race aloft, to ever bolder hypotheses and conclusions.

The "brain-wave" this time concerns Nāgarakṛtāgama 41: 5 which is interpreted to mean that in the year 1275 king Kṛtanagara underwent a consecration to Bhairawa-Buddha according to the tantric ritual, and that in this capacity, armed with tremendous magic powers by his priests, he proclaimed a political programme aiming at the establishment of a coalition under Javanese supremacy, a sort of holy alliance, with the nusantara in order to project the archipelago against the aggressive imperialist policy of the Mongol emperor Kubilai Khan. This programme once proclaimed would have had the most far-reaching results. Not only that the political wisdom it shows would elevate Kṛtanagara to the position of the most important political personage of Indonesia before the coming of the Europeans, to be ranked as an empire builder with Julius Cesar, Jan Pietersz. Coen and.... Sukarno.²³⁾ It would

²²⁾ It is not superfluous to emphasise this point particularly, as the danger, is no longer imaginary that an uncritical reading of Berg's papers will lead to the adoption of quite a different view in wide circles. In this way several of Berg's most daring hypotheses have obtained the place of honour in the recent work by D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia* (1955), whilst the "orthodox" presentation, of the facts has been either banished to the background or completely suppressed. Curiously enough, an exception is made for the period of Angrok and his direct successors, where Berg's proto-Pararaton hypothesis is tacitly passed over, and which is described in accordance with the old recipe. As it was the author's intention "to indicate the importance of C. C. Berg's attacks upon accepted notions" (Preface, p. V), one might have thought that this hypothesis as being the most important of all "attacks" would have been as much (or as little) entitled to a place of honour as all the other hypotheses.

²³⁾ Thus Berg in a radio lecture, entitled "Djaka Dolog, the monk of Surabaya".

also have determined Gajamada's foreign policy during the Majapahit period, it would have caused an "interdict" (i.e. a period during which no tantric rites were allowed to be performed and Kṛtanagara's programme for a holy alliance was suspended) and also a "semi-interdict" (i.e. the period of the practical lapse of the interdict"). And finally it would have compelled Prapafica to suppress or distort various facts connected with the "interdict" and the "semi-interdict". In short, the consecration of Kṛtanagara to Bhairawa would have caused a kind of chain-reaction, the explosive force of which was propagated far into the period of Majapahit and which would even have influenced the historiography of Mataram.

No useful purpose is served by entering into further details when we are again forced to the chilling discovery that the whole top-heavy pyramid of hypotheses has been built on quicksand.

The passages concerned are to be found in 41:5 c and d:

*nāgasyabhawa śāka sang prabhu kumon dumona rikanang tanah
ri Malayu
lēwēs mara bhayanya sangka ri kadewamūrtHn ira ngūni kdlaha
nikā //*

According to Berg this means: "In 1275 he (king Kṛtanagara) gave the order for an expedition against Malayu, which would submit, or had submitted, to him in fear of his deification (*kadewamūrtHn*) earlier (*ngiini*)" (Kert. 4sq.). Berg takes this to mean that the king was deified in 1275, i.e. consecrated to Bhairawa-Buddha by his priests, and so enabled to proclaim an imperialist programme, including i.a. the order for the expedition against Malayu, but that this order was only *executed* in 1292; it was successful because Malayu was as it were paralysed by terror and awe for the king's deified condition into which he had entered (seventeen years) earlier due to his consecration. Berg therefore distinguishes between the deification and the order, both of 1275, and the execution and Malayu's submission, both of 1292. This view, which shifts the Pamalayu from 1275 — up to the present

²*) The same words are applicable to all the considerations which Berg has devoted to the Cāmuṇḍā statue of Ardimulya and its inscription (see i.a. PM II 200, SO-GM 387, 402, and Rd. *passim*). The date of this inscription, initially read as 1254 Saka = A.D. 1332, has been corrected by Damais to 1214 Saka = A.D. 1292 in his *Etudes d'épigraphie indonésienne III* in BEFEO XLVI, 1952, pp. 2 and 73. However, this publication appeared too late to be noticed by Berg and to be used in his Rd. For the statue see also my remarks in BKL 110, 1954, p. 11, and for a further justification of the correction of the date Damais in BEFEO XLVII, 1953, pp. 151-153.

generally accepted as the first year of the expedition, and mentioned as such also by the Pararaton — to 1292, is contradicted by the fact alone that Nāg. 42:2 mentions among the subject areas which came to bring respectful homage to the king also Malayu. This cannot be harmonised with the date of the king's violent death, viz. Jyaiṣṭha 1292, the second month of the year. Even if we assume that the expedition sailed in the first month of the year 1292, it is impossible that the subjection of Malayu was realised in that single month, to be recorded as the successful result of the king's government. But even quite apart from this objection — to which various other ones might be added — Berg's interpretation of 41: 5 is unacceptable. The keyterm in the verses quoted above is the word *kadewamiirtin*. Berg takes this to mean "deification" and considers it to be the king's consecration to Bhairawa-Buddha which gave him the power to proclaim his political programme etc. etc. However, in doing so he has overlooked that to the poet of the Nāgarakṛtāgama *dewamūrti* is a common term which he uses to indicate several rulers, like Wiṣṇuwardhana (41:2), Hayam Wuruk (73:1) and rulers from the houses of Singosari and Majapahit in general (49: 5). In these cases it always means "incarnate form of the divinity". This is quite in agreement with the prevalent view which considered the ruler to be an incarnation or a partial incarnation of the god. *Kadewamiirtin* therefore means "the status of deified ruler". Once any reason has lapsed to give this word the special meaning which Berg wants to put in it, all traces of a consecration to Bhairawa-Buddha and of the proclamation of a political programme disappear from Nāgarakṛtāgama 41: 5. And we may repeat the words of Matt. 7:27: "And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell: and great was the fall of it".

VI

As in the above I have referred in passing to the historiography of Mataram, I wish to mention here, in connection with the earlier objections against Berg's methods, a third and perhaps the most serious objection.

Krom's opinion on the new Javanese historiography and its relation to historical reality is made evident from the passage concerned in his Hindu Javanese History. There he indicates the unreliability of the tradition of the babads and the difficulty of discovering how much historical truth they contain and continues: "Actually, this is only

possible when we know already from other sides what had happened and when armed with this knowledge one investigates how much of this may be found again in traditional Javanese history. Usually this is so pitifully little that one shrinks back from using babad or sejarah without further means of control" (HJG26).

Berg, however, thinks differently. As he holds the view that fundamentally Nāgarakṛtāgama and the Pararaton — and who knows, perhaps even the charters²⁵) — on the one hand and the Babad Tanah Djawi on the other are all shoots from the same trunk and have all introduced the same mythical pattern into their writing of history, he not only uses the historical data in order to interpret the Babad, but does not even shrink from applying the babad tradition as a key for obtaining access to and enlightenment about historical reality. One example for the sake of clarification: Berg, after having first rightly connected the four daughters of Kṛtanagara, the wives of Kṛtarājasa, with the four principal conquered countries of Kṛtanagara, then attempts to identify these four women with the four spouses of the Bra Wijaya of the Babad Tanah Djawi, an attempt which compels him to put the data contained in the charter of 1305 on a veritable bed of Procrustes in order to make them agree with the Babad.²⁶)

To my mind, a more dangerous method could hardly be imagined. It reminds us of the remarks on the relation between myth and historical reality in Mircea Eliade's fascinating little volume; "Le mythe de l'éternel retour". There the author shows by means of many

²⁵) Again and again Berg intimates rather clearly that he trusts the charters with their dates — up to the present the sheet-anchors of our historical knowledge! — as little as the other native sources. How should we otherwise explain remarks like: "Official documents have often been written in order to make the subjects believe what those in authority would like them to believe" (PM I 481; from the context it is clear that the charters of the years between 1254 and 1364 are meant), and ".... as regards the charters one gets the impression that a date has been added to the text, because that happened to be the proper thing, and as regards this text (viz. the Wirataparwa) that a date has been added because it lent itself to such a pleasant game" (Rd. 13). See also Rd. 126, where the suggestion is made, that the charters of 1329 and 1330 have been antedated. — If anything has become evident due to the recent chronological studies by Damais, it is that the reliability of the dating of the ancient Javanese charters, like that of the literary works, is beyond all suspicion.

^x) One probable reason why this attempt has missed the mark is because the husband with the four spouses whom Berg identifies with Kṛtarājasa and whom he considers to represent less an actual person than a type — the type of "the" king of Majapahit —, has been proved to be most probably an historical person, who lived about the year 1515. This becomes apparent from Pires' *Suma Oriental*, as was shown after PM I had already appeared (see De Graaf, *op. cit.*, p. 138).

examples that the memory of an historical event or person remains preserved unchanged in the collective memory of the people for not more than one or two centuries. This is the result of the fact that this memory operates with structures different from ours. The event is integrated into the category of mythical acts — e.g. the fight against a monster — whilst the person is assimilated to a mythical archetype: god, hero, ancestor. The examples mentioned by Eliade are so typical that I cannot help quoting one of them (*op. cit.*, p. 71). The Yugoslav national hero Marko Kraljevic was distinguished for his matchless bravery in the struggle against the Turks. He is an historical personage of flesh and blood and the date of his death is exactly known: 1394. This has not prevented that Marko, after having been absorbed into the collective memory of his people, has lost his historical personality and that his life and his deeds have been recreated in accordance with the model of the mythical norms. In the Yugoslav ballads and epics his mother is a fairy, and also his wife is a fairy, complete with wings on which she threatens to fly away at every moment. He undertakes a fight with a three-headed monster, killing it, and thereupon he is victorious over another mythical figure which shows the characteristics of his brother. There is no lack of anachronisms: in this way he is occasionally said to be the friend and then again the enemy of the famous Jan Huniadi who lived at a much later time, etc.

Supposing one were to cast doubt on the historical data in this connection and to attempt to reconstruct the personality of Marko and the course of events by means of the legend, the pitiable results this would produce are beyond question, in spite of all complicated hypotheses and clever arguments on which such a reconstruction would be based.

In Javanese tradition matters stand not much differently, I believe, and in this respect the most sensible procedure would be for the time being to continue to adhere to the well-tried scientific method of starting from what is known to try and explain the unknown, and not the other way about.

VII

Up to now only criticism of Berg's work has been voiced, but it would be most unjust to leave matters here: It is quite evident that a person of Berg's stature, with his enviable knowledge of ancient Javanese history and historiography, cannot continue for five years to put his views on paper without producing constructive ideas which

will greatly benefit our knowledge of and our insight into the material he has treated. Again, a few examples will have to suffice. His interpretation of the charter of 1305 as proof of the existence of a *unio mystica* between king Kṛtarājasa and his four wives, the daughters of Kṛtanagara, where these are said to constitute the essences of the nusantara Bali, Malayu, Madura and Tanjung Pura (PM I) opens up perspectives which may contribute considerably to a clarification of the magico-religious* ideas of the late Singosari period. No less important is his improved translation of the notorious verse Nāgarakṛtāgama 68:3 (Rd.35 sq.) which throws at least some light on the still highly obscure division of the Javanese empire.²⁷⁾

These and similar results of Berg's researches undoubtedly constitute a welcome increase of our knowledge and therefore it is all the more regrettable that these sound building stones have been used only too often to erect unsound constructions. For it should again be strongly emphasised that the problems Berg has raised concerning what might be called the psychology of Javanese historiography are of primary

²⁷⁾ This is not the right time to enter more deeply into this obscure verse and the many explanations to which it has been exposed. I only want to indicate that the corrections Berg has applied to Kern's translation of 68: 3a-c constitute a considerable improvement. Berg's rendering in Rd. 37 sqq. reads: "This holy man (mpu Bharāda) has been politely requested to divide the land into two and he did not wish to refuse this. The frontier between the two regions which he has indicated by means of water from the jar from the sky runs as follows: West-East up to the sea, with the North and the South as halves, over a (comparatively) short distance; _____", which Kern had rendered as: "_____the frontier has been indicated by him as "Water from the jar from the sky". In a West-Easterly direction up to the sea in two parts, and in a North-Southerly direction, not far...." On this translation all attempts at an explanation had stranded up to the present. It is a great advantage of Berg's translation that it unbends the dividing-line suggested by Kern, becoming a line which runs exclusively from West to East (Rd. 38). However, when Berg translates the next *pada kadyidoh mahēḥt samudra tewik ing bhumi JawSrwa prabhu* by "so far namely— one might say — as the coasts go, which have a sea between them", letting *samudra* refer to the Straits of Madura and taking the words in question to mean "over a distance which is equal to the length of the Straits of Madura", he gets on dangerous ground. After all, these words may also be explained in quite a different way; to me the translation of (*tan madoh*) *kady&doh mahēḥt samudra* by "(over a short distance), but (still) so far as if a sea lay between them" seems preferable to Berg's rendering. It is therefore quite clear, in the first place, that due to the straightening of the dividing line, combined with the impossibility to determine with any certainty the meaning of 68: 3d, all indications concerning the course of mpu Bharada's journey through the air have fallen away, so that further guesses will no longer be of any use. In the second place it has become evident that the whole argument which is based on Berg's Straits-of-Madura-hypothesis and which occupies a great part of Rd., has become completely unsettled.

and farreaching importance. To throw light on the dark backgrounds of this historiography is a task, fascinating as perhaps no other, but at the same time it is an undertaking where those delusions in whose genesis one is interested often show a tendency to reveal themselves as real facts, whilst to the contrary supposed facts, together with the hypotheses and conclusions deduced from these facts, equally often threaten to go up in the smoke of delusions and illusions. This is the reason why both categories should be studied with the greatest seriousness and sober-mindedness and why they should be carefully distinguished:

In his great treatise published in 1938 under the title "Javanese Historiography", as well as in his doctoral dissertation, his *kidung* editions and translations and in numerous papers, Berg has personally given the example, how problems concerning historical subjects are to be approached in order to come closer to their solution. In this circumstance we see a wellfounded reason for the hope that after his over-impetuous rush during the past five years he will continue his studies in the same field in the same level-headed and scientifically justified manner which we know of him of old.

F. D. K. BOSCH.
