In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries an important negara known as Gelgel flourished in Bali, occasionally extending its influence to neighbouring areas. Despite its dense population, material prosperity, and apparently strong royal rule, its dealings with the Portuguese and Dutch authorities were incidental. This has had consequences for the documentation of its history in Western sources. At the same time, the traditions concerning Gelgel and its origins are important for the Balinese self-image. Some fundamental features of this polity can be safely said to be historical facts, the information on them being derived from contemporary Dutch texts as well as later indigenous ones. The trouble is, however, that there is considerable disagreement among those few scholars who have ventured to make detailed comparisons between these two kinds of sources about the possible connections between them. Much new ground has been broken as regards the long-neglected history of Bali in recent years, often by scholars working in the border area between anthropology and history. As far as the important but enigmatic period between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries is concerned, however, the sparse material has admitted of widely divergent interpretations.

Fact-finding missions using indigenous texts as a 'second-best' kind of source, to be used where contemporary European materials are lacking, are supposedly out of fashion now (Schulte Nordholt 1992:27-32). There seems to be a growing awareness that traditional 'historical' texts of the babad type, committed to paper as they were a considerable time after the events they purport to describe took place, are of intrinsic value as documents of the way in which Indonesian peoples have looked at their past. Dutch and other European reports on Bali in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are so different from this babad literature in outlook and aim that questions as to which kind of text takes precedence over which other seem irrelevant. Nevertheless, it is of considerable importance
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for the study of the development of Balinese historiography to look at the relations between historical events which are known to have occurred in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the way in which these events are recorded in babad of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

It is questions like these that have recently prompted Dr. Helen Creese to institute a new investigation into the fall of the kingdom of Gelgel in the late seventeenth century (Creese 1991). She has arrived at very different conclusions here from those subscribed to by earlier Dutch scholars like Berg (1927) and De Graaf (1949). However, I feel that more could have been done on the basis of a critical analysis of the little contemporary material there is. After consulting much the same sources as Dr. Creese, I have arrived at conclusions that are largely at variance with hers. These conclusions I will present below. The chronological scope of this article is wider, however, since I will also make a few suggestions concerning the origins and early development of the Gelgel negara. For this purpose, I will use a wide range of sources: European and Indonesian, published and unpublished.1 As I am a historian, and not a philologist, I will not make a detailed analysis of the Balinese texts, but will rather compare the general picture emerging from these sources with that presented by other kinds of material. The focus thus will be on the order in which historical events took place, rather than on the functioning of traditional texts in a particular environment, and so the method is an inductive one. This does not mean that I am not interested in questions concerning cultural patterns as embedded in traditional sources. It is my view, however, that a great many careful comparisons should be made between different types of sources before we can proceed with questions concerning Balinese historiography. Where Bertolt Brecht once inquired — rhetorically — into who actually built Thebes with its seven gates, I fear that the anonymous jaba who supposedly built the gates of puri Gelgel will not become any the less anonymous as a result of this study of chronological cornerstones and dynastic patterns. Nevertheless, the Gelgel kingdom and its origins have played such an important role in the Balinese conception of the past that a minute investigation of its foundations in historical events seems quite justified.

1 Among these latter a list of dates entitled Babad Gumi (LOr 10.548) will play an important role in the following discussion. It contains some 75 complete chronograms referring to events ranging from the origin of Mount Mahameru in Saka 19 (= A.D. 97) to the building of a watering place in Saka 1614 (A.D. 1692). Creese (1991:251, note) does not believe the reliability of these dates to have been established; as will be seen, I do not quite share her view. Another list, likewise known as Babad Gumi (LOr 10.547), presents a number of chronograms virtually haphazardly, and seems less useful for the present study. The history of these interesting texts should obviously be dealt with by a trained philologist.
The origins of Gelgel

The Babad Dalem, a text preserved in several versions, the prototype of which is now generally believed to have been first written in the early eighteenth century (Wiener 1990:145-6; Schulte Nordholt 1992:39), gives the traditionally most authoritative account of the origins and later history of the Gelgel negara. It has played an important role as cultural basis for the authority of the formal, paramount rulers of Bali and is 'a text of major importance within Balinese society as a whole', according to Wiener (1990:30). It is quite clear that this chronicle contains at least some grains of historical truth in the traditional European sense of the word. The existence of a paramount king with the title Raja Dalem and of the latter's powerful patih, the location of their residences at Gelgel and Jero Kapal, the presence of a royal harem with 200 wives, the suzerainty, or pretensions to suzerainty, of this ruler over Balambangan, Lombok and Sumbawa, the not quite successful wars with Pasuruan and Mataram, and the perpetual rebellions of sub-rulers and relatives of the king—all this can be taken as hard historical fact, as these data are given in both Balinese and European sources (Rouffaer and Ijzerman 1915:197-202, 1929:75-103; Colenbrander and Coolhaas 1919-53 VII-1:414-5; Vickers 1989:217, note). But do these sources allow us to say anything about the origins of this remarkable negara, which the Babad Dalem presents in such an obviously anachronistic way?

Inevitably, any conclusions we draw are bound to be highly speculative due to the dearth of contemporary materials. The stories of origin of the Balinese ruling class have had great importance for the traditional Balinese self-image, but their historical background has apparently been deemed impossible to reconstruct by most serious modern observers (cf. Stuart-Fox 1991:12-3). Even so, an examination of what little material there is might enable us to make some tentative new suggestions.

The story of the origins of Gelgel as given in the Babad Dalem is well-known, so that I need only give a brief summary here. In the time of the great patih Gajah Mada, the island of Bali was invaded by forces from Majapahit. After its conquest, the island was given in vassalage to a certain Kresna Kepakisan, whose elder brothers were rulers of Balambangan and Pasuruan. This Kresna Kepakisan was a member of a Brahmana family from Java, and had his caste changed to that of Ksatriya by Gajah Mada. The

---

2 Unless otherwise indicated, I am following here text B, edited and translated by Warna et al. (1986), and the summaries given by Berg (1927) and Wiener (1990). Berg used a text entitled Pamancangah, which is closely related to version B, while Wiener used a version from Geria Pidada in Klungkung, which is likewise close to text B. These three sources show some differences on points of detail, which will be discussed in their proper place. Another text, here referred to as version A, is contained in Warna et al. and in Putra (1991); it differs from the other versions in many respects. See further Creese (1991:254, note, 258).
latter also provided him with some powerful *pusaka* weapons, heirlooms which were to become important symbols of the Balinese kingdom. Kresna Kepakisan was accompanied by a number of Javanese noblemen, who were installed as vassals of the new ruler and became the ancestors of the various Wesia families on the island. The seat of government was first at Samprangan, in what is now the kabupaten of Gianyar. However, Kresna Kepakisan’s youngest son, Dewa Ketut, moved the royal seat to Gelgel, in the kabupaten of Klungkung, from where he and his descendants ruled the kingdom for some four generations. In Dewa Ketut’s time, Majapahit vanished from the scene as a consequence of internal disorders, and its heirlooms were taken over by Balambangan, Pasuruan, Bali, and Madura (Berg 1927:92, 103-32).

Though the above may be the most authoritative account, it is far from being the only one. The founding of a Balinese kingdom is connected with the demise of Majapahit in a number of stories, such as the *Usana Jawa*, the appendix of the *Tattwa Sunda*, the Javanese *Serat Kanda*, and the traditions collected by Raffles. Here the first Balinese king is depicted as the son of the last Majapahit king, or even as being identical with that last king (Berg 1927:132-8; Brandes 1920:226, 230; Raffles 1817 II:121, ccxxxiii).

As has long been observed, the *Babad Dalem* account is manifestly anachronistic, representing as it does the golden age of Majapahit in the fourteenth century as being immediately followed by its demise in the sixteenth century. Since the date of the conquest by Majapahit is said in a near-contemporary source to be 1343, while the fall of the Gelgel kingdom occurred in the latter part of the seventeenth century, the genealogy is completely impossible, since it implies that seven kings, in five generations, ruled for a period of some 300 years! This anachronism has been explained in different ways. Berg (in 1927) argued that the *Pamancangah / Babad Dalem* account of the conquest by Majapahit contained many elements with an obvious core of historical truth, so that the circumstances surrounding the beginnings of the Kepakisan dynasty could hardly be denied. Therefore, several generations were allegedly omitted by later tradition (Berg 1927:130). Schulte Nordholt, on the other hand, posited that the connection between the fourteenth-century conquest of Bali and the origins of Gelgel was a later interpretation. The genealogies of the various noble families hardly reach back further than the sixteenth century, so that we are left with a gap of at least 150 years (from about 1350 to 1500). The obsession with finding genealogical links with Majapahit supposedly was the outcome rather of later power relations (in about 1650-1730) combined with the threat posed by Muslim neighbours (about 1550-1670), which led the ruling elite of Bali to view themselves as heirs to the Hindu tradition of Majapahit (Schulte Nordholt 1992:35-7).

But one may well wonder whether this is sufficient to explain the account of Gelgel’s origins in the chronicle. I believe there is still reason to
take a closer look at the various sources relating to the latter days of Majapahit. Some of these sources may provide indirect clues as regards the Balinese origin story.

The most important European source for late Majapahit is, of course, Tomé Pires’ *Suma Oriental*. The section on Java in about 1512-13 describes the current rivalry between the Islamized coastal districts in the Pasisir and the Majapahit kingdom in Daha (Kadiri), with its subordinate rulers in East Java. The king in Daha was Batara Wijaya, the prototype for the traditional last king of Majapahit, Brawijaya. He was, however, something of a *roi fainéant*, and the real power rested with his *patih* and father-in-law, Amdura or Guste Pate, apparently the same person as Barbosa’s King Pateudra, Patih Maudara of the *Hikayat Banjar*, and Viceroy Pa bu Ta la of the *Semarang chronicles* (Cortesao 1944:175; Dames 1921:190; Ras 1968:417, 425; De Graaf and Pigeaud 1984:29-33). The king was the focal point of a complex network of kinship ties between the ‘Heathen’ (i.e., Hindu-Buddhist) rulers of East Java. His son, Sepetat, was ruler of the Pasuruan area (‘Gamda’), and his daughters were married to the king in Daha and the ruler of Madura. His sister’s son, Pimtor or Pijntor, ruled Balambangan, and was also ruler of Panarukan, Pajarakan, and Kaniten (‘Canjtam’). Pimtor’s daughter was also the wife of Sepetat. Pimtor must obviously be connected with the Menak Pentor of an eighteenth-century Balambangan *babad* text, who was ruler three generations before Tawang Alun I (flor. 1647) and four generations after Brawijaya of Majapahit. Balambangan, according to Pires, was a strong buffer against further encroachments of the Muslim Pasisir lords (Cortesao 1944:174-5,196-8, 227; Kumar 1976:358).

In the *Babad Dalem*, as it happens, Balambangan, Pasuruan, Bali, and Madura are represented as the heirs of Majapahit, who took over its *pusaka* heirlooms. This corresponds with historical facts, as far as these can be ascertained. Exactly these areas are represented by Pires as being still ‘heathen’ and still (together with Muslim Tuban) subject to, or allied with, the king in Daha (though the position of Bali is not explicitly mentioned in this connection by Pires). They also seem to have survived the fall of Daha, in perhaps 1527, for a while as ‘heathen’ realms. Pasuruan, accord-

---

3 Of course I am aware of the problems with the authenticity of the *Semarang chronicles*, which seem to have been subject to over-editing in modern times (De Graaf and Pigeaud 1984:iii-x, 1-12).

4 See Fernao Mendes Pinto’s travel account, where the king of Pasuruan in the 1540s is said to have been the sister’s son of one Quiy Panaricao (Kyai Panarukan?) (Catz 1989:386). This name could also be interpreted as Panyarikan, ‘secretary’, however, which occurs as an alternative name for some early Gelgel dignitaries in the *Babad Dalem* (Berg 1927:19).

5 Pires’ account of Bali is disappointingly vague. We only learn from it that Bali, Lombok (‘Bombo’) and Sumbawa had kings of their own, used to go on plundering raids, and carried on some trade in East Java (Cortesao 1944:201-2).
ing to Javanese lists of dates, was conquered by the Muslim kingdom of Demak in about 1535\(^6\), and, if we are to believe the Portuguese writer Pinto, was still stubbornly 'heathen' in the late 1540s. Balambangan remained a Hindu realm until the second half of the eighteenth century. West Madura was Islamized in the reign of the father of the ruler who was deposed in 1624, thus presumably in the second half of the sixteenth century (East Madura was reportedly ruled by a member of the Muslim royal house of Demak until 1582) (De Graaf and Pigeaud 1974:169-97). The Hindu character of Bali needs no further comment.

There is another correspondence between the Babad Dalem and external sources. The rulers of Pasuruan and Balambangan were in fact closely related, though the exact details of their relationship differ. If this is so, is it possible that the royal clan of Gelgel also belonged to the same kinship group? There is reason to answer this question in the affirmative, since a relationship between the kings of Balambangan and Bali is actually explicitly mentioned in another Portuguese source. This is the Information on the Golden Chersonese by the Portuguese-Makassarese geographer Manuel Godinho de Eredia, written in about 1600. Eredia's short account of Bali seems to be unreliable in many ways, but still deserves careful scrutiny. It states: ‘The king of the island is called Rajagaia; he is descended from the royal family of Balambuan; so far he has carried on little trade and commerce with the Portuguese, confining all his favours to the English and Serracenos or Moros from Meca, being himself a Mau-methano' (Mills 1930:253). The remainder of the account is dedicated to a description of a fabulous dog with carbuncles on its head which the king was lucky enough to own.\(^7\) Eredia's informants were a Christian who had been a page to the king and feeder of the precious dog, and some persons who had visited the island in 1580. Among these sometimes improbable statements, we should note that concerning the kinship tie between the rulers of Bali and Balambangan, which is more or less consistent with what the Babad Dalem says on this head (although it does not depict the Kepakisan dynasty as being directly descended from rulers of Balambangan).

Any conclusion drawn from this scant information must necessarily be very speculative, though the available evidence does point to the possibility of the forebear of the Gelgel rulers being a member of the kinship group that ruled much of East Java at the time of Majapahit's decline.

---

\(^6\) The date lists mention 1533, 1535 or 1539 as dates for this. The Balinese list of dates, Babad Gumi (Lor 10.548), mentions the defeat of Pasdahan in 1538. This Pasdahan could stand for Pasrahan (Pasuruan), or for Pesedahan in kabupaten Karangasem.

\(^7\) Interestingly, Wiener (1990:393) refers to a modern Balinese tradition according to which the Dewa Agung of Klungkung owned an heirloom dog which possessed protective qualities. Before the fall of Klungkung to the Dutch in 1908, an incident had led to the death of this precious animal, thus paving the way for the subsequent defeat of the realm.
Moreover, there seem to be Javanese traditions concerning kinship ties between the rulers of Balambangan and Bali. These genealogical relationships may subsequently have been streamlined in later times, with the first rulers of Balambangan, Pasuruan and Bali being represented as three brothers. Probably for reasons pointed out by Schulte Nordholt, the beginnings of the Balinese kingdom were then connected with the golden age of Majapahit and Patih Gajah Mada (who, judging from Javanese traditions, was confused with the last patih of Majapahit, Pires' Amdura).

Now let us look at the sequel of the story of Gelgel. The earlier parts of the Babad Dalem are characterized, as is pointed out by Wiener (1990: 152-81), by long, descriptive, ‘non-historical’ passages. With the second king of Gelgel, Dalem Baturenggong, this picture changes drastically, however. Several distinctly ‘historical’ episodes are recounted. There is said to be internal stabilization with the fruitful relationship between the king and the Brahmin of Brahmins, Nirartha, between the secular ruler and the priest. Externally, foreign invasion is beaten off and Baturenggong extends his power over Balambangan, Lombok, and Sumbawa. The king is a fierce opponent of Islam, and an enemy of Pasuruan and ‘Mataram’ (Berg 1927: 138-44; Wiener 1990:181-5). Internal and external aspects are closely interwoven. The Brahmin Nirartha flees from his brother-in-law, the king of Balambangan, whom he later curses so that he is killed by a Balinese force. Balambangan as far west as Puger is then subdued by Baturenggong.

8 Sutherland (1973:138) refers to the family tradition of the Citrosoman bupati family, whose ancestor was appointed regent of Japara by Sultan Agung (r. 1613-46). The regent in question was supposedly descended from the Dewa Agung, raja of Bali, via the rulers of Balambangan and Sedayu. Note, however, that the title Dewa Agung seems to be anachronistic, as the title of the Gelgel rulers was Dalem (Radia Dalam in Dutch documents).

9 Berg himself, although placing the origins of Gelgel in the fourteenth century, indicates that the Pamancangah / Babad Dalem drew direct inspiration from the Nagarakertagama, especially in the description of Hayam Wuruk’s conference with his vassal rulers after Gajah Mada’s death (Berg 1927:91-2). The Balinese date list Babad Gumi (LOr 10.548) mentions the conquest by Majapahit in the Saka year 1265 (= A.D. 1343), and Gajah Mada in Saka 1286 (A.D. 1364), the year of his death, which dates may have been directly or indirectly borrowed from the Nagarakertagama. Otherwise, the Babad Gumi does not mention any persons or events prior to the Batan Jeruk rebellion in Saka 1408 (perhaps an error for 1480 = A.D. 1558, as in LOr 10.547) in common with the Babad Dalem. In 1424 (A.D. 1502) the defeat of Tatarukan – a name that is possibly connected with the prince of Tarukan, the mad brother of the first king of Gelgel (cf. Stuart-Fox 1987:406) – is noted. The first ruler of Gelgel to be mentioned in the Babad Gumi is I Dewa Sganing, in the year 1545 (A.D. 1623).

10 Nirartha, coming to Balambangan from Daha via Pasuruan, marries the sister of the king of Balambangan, Pati Keniten. She is the ancestress of the Brahmana Keniten sub-group. The name Keniten is of some interest. It recurs later in connection with a daughter of the king, whose refusal to marry Baturenggong is the cause of the Balinese expedition to Balambangan. The princess in question then flees to Pasuruan with a half-brother. She is a member of the race of Keniten on the maternal side (Rubinstein 1991:57; Berg 1927:140). Keniten, or Kaniten, was a region in East Java.
The height of the latter’s reign is placed by Berg in the mid-sixteenth century. This seems logical enough if, as Berg believed, the king visited by the Dutch in 1597 was one of his sons, the king in question being described as being about 40-50 years of age at the time. It would also square with the date given in a list of dates bearing the title *Babad Gumi* (LOr 10.547) for a rebellion that took place during his sons’ minority, namely 1558 (Rouffaer and IJzerman 1929:78; Vickers 1986:329).

The internal and external facets of Baturenggong’s power and glory may be considered as having come to possess an etiological function: from his time stem later Balinese ideas of the ideal relationship between a secular and a religious ruler and the claims to sovereignty over neighbouring regions, which were certainly important in the political situation of the eighteenth century, when the *Babad Dalem* was supposedly first written. *Kresna Kepakisan* here has the function of immigrant king, *Dewa Ketut* is the founder of the court at Gelgel and an idealized exemplar of Hindu kingship, and Dalem Baturenggong is the source of Gelgel’s external expansion. But was there still room for such expansion in the mid-sixteenth century? It seems clear in any case that an enterprising ‘man of prowess’ would have had an opportunity of gaining a strong, independent position in, and perhaps outside, Bali after the rapid fall of the Muslim realm of Demak at precisely this same time.11 In point of fact, something to that effect is said by Fernao Mendes Pinto in his much-debated travel account *Peregrinacanam*. This remarkable mixture of fancy and historical and geographical fact12 contains a lengthy account of the ‘emperor’ of Demak, Pangeran Dipati, and his disastrous expedition to the ‘heathen’ kingdom of Pasuruan. In this version of the expedition, which is at variance with that of later Javanese chronicles, the ruler in question is repeatedly rep-

which was conquered by Balambangan in the early sixteenth century (Cortesao 1944:197; Noorduyn 1976); an Adipati Kaniten is mentioned in Javanese chronicles as a vassal of the ruler of Pasuruan at the end of that same century (De Graaf and Pigeaud 1974:179-84). Quite interestingly, Crawfurd (1820 II:324) informs us that this person was a refugee from Balambangan, but I am unable to identify the source of this statement.

Concerning the territorial expansion of Gelgel, it may be worth noting that the *Babad Gumi* (LOr 10.548) lists the defeat of Banyu Anyar in 1419 (A.D. 1497), of Tatarukan in 1424 (A.D. 1502), Jambrana in 1448 (A.D. 1526), Pasdahan in 1460 (A.D. 1538), Banyu Anyar again in 1461 (A.D. 1539), Patembokan in 1468 (A.D. 1546), Kapal in 1481 (A.D. 1559), and Balambangan in 1520 (A.D. 1598). Who the victor in these battles was we are not told, though some of the chronograms may pertain to Gelgel’s expansion. However, with the exception of the conflict with Balambangan, these early dates cannot be confirmed with any certainty from other sources.

Catz (1989) has recently pointed to the need for regarding *Peregrinacanam* as a piece of literature in its own right rather than as just a less than perfect travel account. The text seems to give a good idea of the atmosphere of maritime Southeast Asia in the sixteenth century. Apparently, Pinto made use of any and every story he heard during his long stay in the region, after which he wrote his Odyssey.
resented as emperor of the whole of Java, Bali, and Madura; sometimes the names Angenia (Kangean, or Lombok?\(^{13}\)) and Timor (according to Pires a name for the islands to the east of Java) appear in the list of dependencies. After the murder of Pangeran Dipati during the siege of Pasuruan\(^{14}\), the revolting cruelties against the relatives of his murderer were ‘the cause of the violent uprisings that occurred throughout Java and the islands of Bali, Timor, and Madura, which are rather large states, each governed separately by a viceroy who wields supreme power, in accordance with the age-old ways of their heathen customs’ (Catz 1989:392). This murder, occurring in 1546 (or 1548-49?), was followed by a period of chaos and bloodshed in Demak.\(^{15}\)

Pinto mentions a ‘king of Panarukan, prince of Balambangan’ who assisted Demak in its attack on Pasuruan, while Javanese date lists note the conquest of Balambangan in 1546. Alvarado, another Portuguese visitor, confirms that war was being waged against some heathen rulers in that year, while a third witness, Manoel Pinto, shows that the ruler of Demak was victorious over these heathen as late as 1548, and aspired to become the Great Turk of the East (Schurhammer 1926:244-5). If the Balambangan area was under Muslim suzerainty at the end of the Demak period, there must have been a revival of Hindu power before the late sixteenth century, when, as we know from other sources, Balambangan was ‘heathen’. We may speculate that Bali played a role in this revival, and that this may be the historical background of the Babad Dalem account of Baturenggong’s territorial conquest in the West. Though this can be no more than speculation, there are in fact Javanese and Madurese traditions concerning Balinese bands of soldiers making westward incursions in the second half of the sixteenth century (Raffles 1817 II:143; De Graaf and Pigeaud 1974:177). As for eastward expansion, there is no way of either confirming or disproving the claim that Baturenggong ruled Lombok and Sumbawa; all we know is that in about 1600 Lombok was regarded as a dependency of Bali and that in 1633 the king of Gelgel pretended to be the rightful ruler of Sumbawa, including Bima (De Jonge 1865:160, 1870:201; Leupe 1856:30).

\(^{13}\) In sixteenth-century Portuguese maps and descriptions, Lombok is sometimes referred to as Amjane, Anjano, Amgeane, and so on (Cortesao 1944:201).

\(^{14}\) It is sometimes suggested that Pinto confused Pasuruan with Panarukan to the east, which was known by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century as a ‘heathen’ kingdom. Although this is quite possible, the hypothesis is based on shaky evidence, to say the least; the list of dates translated by Raffles (1817 II:233) actually mentions a conquest of Panarukan in 1540, followed by that of Balambangan in 1546. It seems rather far-fetched to identify the victory of Pasuruan in Peregrinacam with the defeat or conquest of Balambangan in 1546, as De Graaf does in various of his works.

\(^{15}\) For the date of Pinto’s supposed visit to Java, see Schurhammer (1926:245). Pinto places the death of the ‘emperor’ just before certain events in China, which we know took place in 1548-49. In any case, Manoel Pinto’s account shows that Demak was still an expanding empire in late 1548.
If Pinto suggests some kind of bond between Java and Bali, this is also suggested by some other authors of the same century. Pigafetta, visiting the archipelago in 1521-22, mentions Bali as a town in easternmost Java. Diogo do Couto, writing in about 1595, makes a similar observation, saying: ‘[Java] has several kingdoms on this [northern] seashore, the one subjugated to the other. Beginning from the “head”, or the eastern side, we shall name those of which we have knowledge. [They are:] O Valle, Paneruca [Panarukan], Agasai [Gresik], Sodayo [Sedaya], Paniao [Pajang] (the king of which resides thirty legoas away in the interior and is like an emperor of these [aforementioned] and other [kingdoms]), Tubao [Tuban], Berodao, Cajoao, Japara [Japara]’, and so on (Rouffaer 1903:268-9). O Valle probably refers to ‘the (land of) Bali’, while Paniao or Pajang was the successor to some of Demak’s power and glory. Taken literally, do Couto’s words would mean that Bali was believed to be under the suzerainty of the Muslim ‘emperor’ of Java as late as the period of the hegemony of Pajang (about 1550-1587). Including Eредia’s mysterious assertion that the king of Bali was a Muslim, we thus have no fewer than three mutually independent statements regarding some kind of Muslim sovereignty over this manifestly Hindu island. Though none of these vague sources can be taken at face value, they do instil some doubt into us about the black-and-white picture of Gelgel’s golden age presented by the Babad Dalem. Taken together, they might suggest that there were periods in which Balinese rulers were obliged to acknowledge Javanese rulers as suzerains, or when claims of such suzerainty were asserted. In 1597, when the Dutch visited Bali, they were told by the chief minister of the kingdom of the importance of supporting the ruler of Balambangan against Muslim Pasuruan; if Balambangan fell, Bali itself would be in dire straits, since in that case Muslim incursions could be expected any day (Rouffaer and Ijzerman 1929:82-3). These were perhaps words spoken from bitter experience.

The later history of Gelgel

The period from 1597 until the middle of the seventeenth century is not exactly rich in contemporary historical documents, and what little there is has been variously interpreted. The general picture we get from Dutch and Portuguese sources is one of a markedly rural society, in which local lords occupied a strong position in spite of the high prestige enjoyed by the ruler and his chief ministers. Despite the fact that the negara Gelgel flourished concurrently with Southeast Asia’s ‘age of commerce’, as recently
defined by Anthony Reid (1993), its role in the commercial network of the region was limited. The Dutch, who made an abortive attempt to establish closer trade contacts with Bali around 1620, complained about the absence of a Chinese community on the island and the headstrong character of its king (De Graaf Collection). After the first detailed reports of 1597, therefore, the few detailed sources concerning Bali were prompted by diplomatic or missionary concerns.

Let us now turn to the indigenous traditions as represented by the Babad Dalem. The reigns of Baturenggong’s two sons, Dalem Bekung and Dalem Saganing, who reigned after him in turn, are depicted as two opposites. Bekung’s reign was full of calamities such as rebellions and disastrous wars, while Saganing’s was peaceful and happy (though not altogether without tension); Bekung was weak, cowardly and rather treacherous, Saganing was wise, brave and able; Bekung was childless, while Saganing is noted for his numerous offspring (Warna 1986:84-94).

Berg (1927) and Creese (1991) have each given quite different dates for these two persons. Berg observed that traditional accounts gave the years 1579, 1581, or even 1585 for the nobleman Pande’s rebellion against Bekung – one of the chief events of the latter’s reign. He also, rather loosely, connected Pande’s rebellion with an uprising the Dutch heard of during their visit to Bali in 1597, which uprising was said to have taken place ten or twelve years earlier, that is, in about 1585/87. He also connected a disastrous expedition against Pasuruan, mentioned in the Babad Dalem as having taken place towards the end of Bekung’s reign, with a war against that same kingdom that was still going on at the time of the Dutch visit, and which obviously ended in failure around 1600 (Berg 1927:155). Creese, on the other hand, connects Bekung’s war in Java with the fighting that was going on in the 1630s. Saganing may have been the king whose death around 1650 was recorded in Dutch documents. The latter’s son Dalem Di Made might then have been the new king who was in contact with the Dutch in 1656. The main reason for Creese’s reinterpretation seems to be a chronological one: it fits in better with the number of generations given in various versions of the Babad Dalem. Also, Di Made’s putative son Dewa Agung Jambe is known to have flourished in 1687-1722. In Creese’s opinion, it is more reasonable to question the

---

17 Creese (1991:247) mentions that one of the Babad Gumi date lists (Kirtya 808 = LOr 10.548) gives the year 1586 for Pande’s revolt, which would fit in very well with the Dutch accounts discussed below. However, the date stated for this in the transcript of this text that is available to me is Saka 1500 (A.D. 1578). Since particularly fateful events were associated with turns of (Saka) centuries, this date seems rather suspect, though still reasonably close to the Dutch dating. Another Babad Gumi (LOr 10.547) mentions warfare in Gelgel in Saka 1490 (A.D. 1568). Though it is clear that these indigenous dates can never serve as cornerstones for a historical reconstruction, the dates given in Babad Gumi texts, especially the LOr 10.548 version, sometimes seem to be confirmed by external sources.
Discussion and Debate

traditional chronograms than the genealogies (Creese 1991:252-3).

Berg did not make a detailed comparison of Balinese sources with Dutch texts relating to the 1597 visit, and nor did Creese. Of the rebellion in about 1585/87 the Dutch visitor Lodewycksz gives the following account:

'Beside the king there is a governor, whom they call Quillor. He rules over the island like the great chancellor in Poland, and whatever he decrees is done. And below him are several other lords, each of whom governs a place on behalf of the king; this they do with great unity, so that if one plans to rise against him, he is immediately attacked by the others, and is exiled at the least, as happened ten or twelve years ago to one of the king’s closest kinsmen and blood relatives, who rose against the king and hatched a major plot against him to attack him in his house and kill him, to which end they collected many people together; when discovered, they were all taken prisoner and sentenced to death. The king felt compassion for the numerous men, however, and changed the sentence, exiling him to a barren, uninhabited island to the southeast of Bali, called Pulo Rossa or Wild Island ...' (Rouffaer and Ijzerman 1915: 201).

This story corresponds to the Babad Dalem account in several important respects. The ringleader of the rebellion, the nobleman Pande, is a relative of the king, at least according to one interpretation; his family is of 'the kin of Kepakisan' (treh Kepakisan) (Worsley 1972:17-8). After a series of intrigues and murders of Byzantine complexity, the king is compelled to disgrace him, whereupon he decides on a desperate attack on the Gelgel palace. He is opposed, however, by the other rulers, who are loyal to the king. The end of this dramatic story is different from that in the Dutch text, since Pande and most of his relatives here are killed in the final battle. Berg has observed that the Dutch may have misunderstood part of the story they were told and that anyway the Balinese chronicle is no objective source (Berg 1927:156). However that may be, to my mind the similarities

---

18 The genealogy of the Arya Kepakisan family is very complicated, however. In modern genealogical tradition, the common ancestor is called Arya Kepakisan and is supposedly a descendant of the pre-Majapahit kings of Kadiri (Anandakusuma 1989:62). Friederich (1878:53,60-62), on the other hand, was informed that the members of this family were the descendants of the Majapahit patih Gajah Mada. According to a Dutch source from 1714, a king of Mengwi who belonged to this kinship group claimed that his 'great-grandfather' (ancestor) had ruled Majapahit in former times (De Graaf Collection). The distantly related Karangasem princes of the eighteenth century made similar claims (Bijvanck 1894:303). In the Usana Jawa (provisionally dated by Hinzler (1976:41) in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century), Arya Kepakisan is a brother of Arya Damar and of the last king of Majapahit, who founded Gelgel. Some traditions represent Arya Kepakisan himself as ruler of Bali (Berg 1927:107; Stuart-Fox 1987:326).

19 A modern variant of the Babad Dalem claims that Bekung came to hate his four uncles and exiled them to far-off places some time before the Pande rebellion (Putra
are too obvious to be ignored. The *Babad Dalem* gives us a romanticized and epic version that is in harmony with Balinese values and conventions, though its basis in historical events that took place in the late sixteenth century seems difficult to deny.

Berg's arguments concerning the identity of the Pasuruan wars in the Dutch accounts and the *Babad Dalem* respectively seem to fit well into this chronological framework. I will not repeat these arguments in detail. Suffice it to say that they seem convincing enough. In both cases an army of '20,000' men sets sail from Kuta in Bali to help defend Balambangan-Panarukan against the aggression of Pasuruan, only to be eventually defeated (Berg 1927:155).\(^{20}\) Again, the *Babad Dalem* version contains a number of anachronisms. So Mataram, which supposedly supported Pasuruan, was hardly an ally of the latter in 1597, whatever some Balinese and Javanese traditions may say. Even so, it makes more sense to connect the Pasuruan war with the fighting that took place in about 1596-1600 than with the wars of 1635-47, when Mataram, rather than long-conquered Pasuruan, was the chief enemy. Moreover, a second unsuccessful military expedition against the king of Mataram under Bekung's nephew Di Made is mentioned in the *Sedjarah Arya Tabanan* (and hinted at in the *Babad Dalem*). This has been connected by De Graaf, whose arguments I will not repeat here, with the warfare of the 1630s (De Graaf 1958:258-60). Creese (1991:252) suggests that this second war may have occurred in the 1650s or 1660s, but this view is not supported by any Dutch or Javanese sources.

The king whom the Dutch encountered in 1597, Raeye de Baelle (Raja di Bali), was connected by Berg with Dalem Bekung, although the Dutch mentioned several children of his, which is hard to reconcile with the alleged childlessness of Bekung. Vickers asserted that the king in question was Dalem Saganing (Berg 1927:154-6; Vickers 1989:52). The problem is that different versions of the *Babad Dalem* disagree as to which of these two brothers was ruler at the time of the Pasuruan war. The question must be left undecided.\(^{21}\) Eredia's Muslim king Rajagaia (presumably Raja Gajah), who is said to have ruled around this time, cannot be connected with any known Gelgel king, although a legendary king in the *Usana Bali* and some other traditions bears a similar name (Raja Sri Gajah Waktra or Gajah Wahana) (Hinzler 1986:156-7).\(^{22}\) This should not disappoint us too

---

1991:47). This story, if it is based on a genuine tradition, may also be connected with the Dutch account, but in any case quite complicates the entire matter.

20 The *Babad Gumi* (LOr 10.548) states that Balambangan was defeated in Saka 1520 (A.D. 1598), but does not say by whom.

21 The attempted uprising of Pinatih, one of the chief events of Saganing's reign, is placed by the *Babad Gumi* (LOr 10.548) in 1527 (A.D. 1605). If this date and version B of the *Babad Dalem* are accepted, Saganing may have ascended the throne in the period between about 1600 and 1605.

22 Concerning Rajagaia's being an adherent of Islam, we may well ask whether the fact that Gajah Wahana is depicted as the son and successor of Mayadanawa, the
much, considering the plethora of names and titles by which Southeast Asian rulers were known.

According to the date list, the Babad Gumi (LOr 10.548), Saganing died in 1623 – a date that cannot be verified. It would fit in well, however, with the statement that he was quite old when he died if it is true that his father was at the height of his power in the middle of the sixteenth century (Warna 1986; Vickers 1989).23 Saganing’s son Di Made, according to Berg, reigned around the second quarter of the seventeenth century, while he was identified by that same author with the ruler who died in about 1650 and whose death was followed by a ferocious civil war (De Jonge 1872: 22-4). This would square with the impression given by the Babad Dalem that he was the last Gelgel king of the legitimate dynasty, who was succeeded by the usurper Anglurah Agung. Creese, on the other hand, wishes to place him rather in the 1650s and 1660s, which would make him ruler immediately before the appearance of Anglurah Agung in the Dutch sources (1665). This would at the same time eliminate the chronological ‘black hole’ postulated by Berg between Di Made and his putative son Dewa Agung Jambe in the late seventeenth century (Creese 1991:254). As it happens, there are two Dutch sources that give some information on the family of the Gelgel king in the 1630s: Oosterwijck’s account of his embassy to Bali in 1633, and the missionary Justus Heurnius’ description of the religious and political conditions on the island in 1638. Though these were known to both Berg and Creese, neither in my view made full use of the important pieces of information contained in them.

Oosterwijck was sent to Bali as a VOC representative to negotiate a treaty against the Muslim empire of Mataram. The embassy failed to achieve its goal, since the Gelgel king at that time – his name is unfortunately not mentioned – wished to live on a footing of peace with both the Dutch and Mataram (Leupe 1856). An interesting account of the embassy’s stay in Bali was included in the Dagh-Register. From it we learn that the king declined to see the ambassadors because of a number of deaths among his closest relatives; his mother was dying at the time, and two of his sons had also recently passed away. Another prince, the king’s oldest (living) son and heir to the throne, whose name was Pannackan Patiekan and who bore the title ‘young king’, did meet the Dutchmen during their visit (Colenbrander 1898:177-82). Other noble persons mentioned here include the king’s brother, Pannackan t’Jouw, the king’s legendary king with a false religion who forbade the worship of Hindu gods, could be of some importance.

23 It might also tally with the 1633 report on Bali by Oosterwijck (Crawfurd 1820 II:236-58). Here we are told of an unheard-of scandal that took place at the funeral of ‘the late king of Bali’, when one of his wives leapt off the funeral pyre which was supposed to consume her and her lord. The woman, though despised, was permitted to live on, and still regularly came to the market. One gets the impression from this that the death of the ‘late king’ had not occurred a very long time before 1633.
closest adviser, Gusti Panida or Ponida, and Gustij Bonoga, Jure Mandawan, Jure Lantingh, and Jure Kintut Babij (Colenbrander 1898:177-8,181-2).24

A point of departure for further identifications is the name Gusti Panida. A person of that same name and occupying the same position is found in the Babad Dalem. According to this text, this Gusti Panida was the son and successor of Kiyayi di Ler, one of Saganing's two chief ministers. 'Ki Gusti di Ler was still alive but of an advanced age. He handed over his function to Kiyayi Panida, who became his successor. He submitted to Sri Aji Pamade [i.e., Di Made] ... The ministers in function were Ki Gusti Pinath, Ki Gusti Abiyan Tubuh, Ki Gusti Agung, and Ki Gusti Panida; these four were the chief ministers' (Warna 1986:94-5).

As for Di Made's own family, the Babad Dalem mentions a brother of his, Dewa Cauw or Cau, who seems to have been the eldest son of Saganing by a commoner wife (Warna 1986:94; Anandakusuma 1989:54). He could well be the Pannackan t'Jouw of the Dutch report. Pannackan seems to be a princely title, and occurs as such in several letters written by the VOC to Balinese rulers in the 1630s.25 As for t'Jouw, this seems to be the expected seventeenth-century Dutch spelling of the indigenous name Cau, the c sound being rendered as t'J by such contemporaries as, for example, Jeremias van Vliet (Andaya 1975:55, 65, 71). In November 1636 letters were sent to the king of Bali and his brother in which the latter is referred to as Radja Panouckan t'siauw, so that he is obviously the same person (De Graaf Collection). As we shall see, he may have played a political role much later on.

The son of the king, Pannackan Patiekan, may also be identified with a person mentioned in the traditional genealogies; Di Made's second son was Dewa Pacekan, who is mentioned as such in a number of sources, although the only one to give details about him is the Babad Gumi (LoR 10.548). In this source he is mentioned in connection with the successful repulse of troops from Mataram in 1568 (A.D. 1646), an event that is actually confirmed by both Javanese and Dutch sources26, and his death is

24 The names t'Jouw and Panida are discussed in the text in question. The name Jure Mandawan should be connected with Mandwang, a place in kabupaten Klungkung, whose name sometimes occurs among Balinese personal names (Anandakusuma 1989:43; Kumar 1976:155). The name Jure Kintut (Ketut?) Babij may have to do with the name of a place Babi, in kabupaten Karangasem. Jure Lantingh may have been a member of the important Jelantik family (I am grateful to Adrian Vickers for this suggestion). For Gusti Bonoga, no acceptable connection has been found.

25 It is, of course, tempting to connect pannackan with pangakan or pungakan, a ksatriya dalem title for children of Sudra mothers. If this is correct, the title may have become devalued over the centuries.

26 According to these Javanese and Dutch sources, the local ruler of Balambangan, Tawang Alun I, was supported by the Balinese, but was defeated by a Mataram force in February 1647 (thus still in Saka 1568) and was obliged to take refuge in Bali. The Javanese force at first tried to pursue him but had to retreat in spite of an alleged
noted as occurring in 1650. He was the last of the deified rulers of Bali who had *meru* dedicated to them at the Pura Padharman Dalem Gelgel of the Pura Besakih temple complex (Goris 1969:102; Stuart-Fox 1987:146-8). Pacekan’s elder brother, Dewa Pambayun, may have been one of the royal sons who died shortly before the Dutch embassy in 1633. This conclusion can be drawn from Justus Heurnius’ 1638 report.

In this brief account we are given much valuable information on religious practices in the period of the hegemony of Gelgel, on the close ties existing between the king and the Brahmana clan, and on the importance of Sengguhu priests. But we are also presented with a picture of the intrigues afflicting the throne of Gelgel at the time. The king’s eldest son had died five years previously. He, in turn, had a son of 16 or 17, Radja Tangap. But the king also had a younger son, Radja Pandjakan, who was a little older than Tangap and whose mother was the sister of a certain Gusti Padma. There was conflict between the two princes as to who was the rightful heir to the throne (Leupe 1855:258-62). It seems probable that Patienan and Pandjakan are two slightly corrupt variants of Pacekan. Pacekan’s mother was presumably Ni Gusti Pacekan, a daughter of Kiyayi di Ler who was given in marriage to Di Made. If this is correct, Gusti Padma was a leading member of the Ler family, which regularly provided Gelgel with senior ministers. He is missing in the genealogies, however, and it would perhaps be premature to assume the name to be a corruption of Panida.

A third category of sources on Bali in these years is the documentation of an abortive Portuguese missionary attempt here in 1635. According to the reports found here, which testify to a rather rudimentary knowledge of the island, the king of Bali was a very young man, and was cruel and sickly, while his aged *syahbandar* was the real ruler of the kingdom (Jacobs 1984:325; Jacobs 1988:35). This information is not in agreement with Dutch sources, which almost definitely show the same king to have been ruling in 1633 and 1636 and to have been an elderly person. It is a known fact, however, that in Southeast Asian states old rulers often handed over the royal power to their sons while themselves still remaining king. Perhaps it is his son, the young king, who is meant, or perhaps some

---

27 The *Babad Gumi* (LOr 10.548) lists the deaths of I Dewa Pambayun and I Dewa Ketut in Saka 1554 (A.D. 1632). These two persons may well have been the two sons of the king who had recently passed away when Oosterwijck visited Bali in the spring of 1633. It should be borne in mind that Saka years end around March, so that these deaths obviously occurred still in Saka 1554. Among the names of Di Made’s eight sons we find those of both Dewa Pambayun and Dewa Ketut, although we are told nothing about their lives.

28 Letters sent to a number of Balinese rulers by the VOC in the 1630s seem to show that at particular times other persons besides the old king were important. In 1633 and 1636 letters were addressed to the paramount king, but letters sent in January 1638
local ruler – a VOC source of 1619 counted no fewer than 33 petty rulers coming under the Raja Dalem, or paramount ruler (Colenbrander and Coolhaas 1919-53 VII:1:414-5). The syahbandar in question could be reminiscent of some member of the Agung or Ler families.

The subsequent fate of Dewa Pacekan is rather mysterious. As was mentioned above, the year of his death is given by the Babad Gumi as 1650, while according to the same source his father, Di Made, died in 1642. Together with his inclusion in the Pura Besakih list of deified rulers, this would open up the possibility that Pacekan was king of Gelgel for a while, and that later tradition for some reason preferred to remain silent about this. Interestingly, Van Eck in his historical sketches mentions a 'Radja Pandjakan' as ruler in Bali around 1650; unfortunately he does not give a reference for this, and I for one have not been able to trace his (presumably Dutch) source (Van Eck 1878:336).

These observations bring us to the interesting question of what happened between Di Made’s demise and the appearance of the usurper Anglurah Agung. Was there a chronological ‘black hole’ here, as postulated by Berg, or did Anglurah Agung’s reign follow directly upon Di Made’s, as late as the 1660s, as Creese believes? The problem is that there is not a single, unanimous version of the story. Whether one accepts or rejects Creese’s solution, the fact remains that some traditions allow a considerable period of time to lapse between Di Made and Anglurah Agung. The Babad Blabatuh, Babad Gumi, and the Pura Besakih list of rulers all present a longer perspective. Moreover, the Babad Dalem, or at any rate the more original version of this, creates a fragmentary impression in the final part, as was pointed out by Berg long ago. The story of Di Made’s reign breaks off abruptly just before the account of the abortive expedition against Mataram (for details of which we have to turn to the Sedjarah Arya Tabanan). This is followed by two shorter passages concerning Badung and Nyalian (not included in the B text of Warna et al.), after which, finally, our chronicle recounts the fall of Gelgel. This latter part does not explicitly mention the names of the king or his sons (Berg 1927:160-7; De Graaf 1958:258-60; Berg 1932:xiii, xxvii).

The majority of facts seem to point to a chronological gap in the Babad Dalem account. A comparison between Dutch and Balinese materials leaves little doubt that Di Made was the king ruling in the 1630s, and it

were addressed to Radja Tangab (the Radja Tangap of Heurnius’ report), the ‘young king of Bali’, and to Gusty Agon (Gusti Agung), apparently the leading member of one of the chief minister families at the Gelgel court. In March 1639 the VOC sent some letters to Panackan Gede, whom it addressed as ‘wealthy/powerful king’ (Vermogen Conick), and to Panackan Bagus Tangab (De Graaf Collection).

Creese (1991:251 n) and Vickers (1989:219 n) both have 1638, but the transcript of the Babad Gumi (LOr 10.548) in my possession has the chronogram warna gana panca dewa, which must obviously be interpreted as 1564 (A.D. 1642). Perhaps this is an error.
may be argued that he either died or vacated his throne for some other reason before 1650/51, in which year Berg and De Graaf would place his demise. The *Babad Gumi* may not be very authoritative in its statement that Di Made died in 1642, but again Dutch sources are of help to us here. They inform us that in 1647-48 a king of Bali, or at least in Bali, entered into diplomatic relations with the VOC. In early 1648 a gift-giving mission (*schenckagie*) left Batavia for Bali, but the rough weather prevented the ship from landing on the island, so that the letter and gifts for the Balinese king and the return embassy from Bali had to wait out the easterly monsoon in Solor for several months. In a letter from the fort of Solor dated August 1648, the Dutch officer in charge expressed his concern that Panjer and Toulock, the two servants of Radie Camassan, should soon return to Bali (Heeres 1895:428-9). This probably implies that by that time Di Made had already disappeared from the scene.\(^{30}\) The Dutch appear to have entered into relations with what they considered to be the principal ruler on the island (the letter of 1647-48 is addressed to ‘the king of Bali’), but perhaps a division of the realm was already under way. A Gusti Wayahan Kamasan is actually mentioned in the *Babad Dalem* as a brother next in age to Gusti Panida. ‘Ki Gusti Panida passed away and was succeeded by his son, Ki Gusti Agung Ler Pacekan, together with Ki Gusti Babelod ... However, now Ki Gusti Wayahan Kamasan was the seniormost of the siblings ... The son of Ki Gusti Kamasan who succeeded him was Ki Gusti Punardesa. His fame was beyond compare’ (Warna 1986:95). Later, Ki Gusti Kamasan is mentioned as a prominent figure among the noblemen attending an audience at Di Made’s court. Gusti Kamasan, therefore, may have held sway over at least part of the island in the late 1640s, in which case his kinship ties with Dewa Pacekan may have been of importance for his career. Perhaps Di Made was the last effective king of Gelgel, and the period of gradual erosion of the royal power between his and Anglurah Agung’s reigns was deliberately shortened as it was disturbing for the idealized image of the past that the Balinese elite later tried to construct.\(^{31}\)

\(^{30}\) A VOC decision (*Resolutie*) of January 1687 mentions one ‘Balinese Radja Sangsit, a son of the brother of Dimade, one of the former regents of Bali, who is now deceased’, who was permitted to settle in the Company’s territory with his wife and children (De Graaf Collection). This may corroborate Creese’s ‘short’ chronology, since the uncle of a person living in 1687 is more likely to have been at the height of his powers in about 1660 than in the 1630s. The harem system of Southeast Asian courts often made for considerable variations in age within one and the same generation, however.

\(^{31}\) Hinzler (1986:155) has pointed to the tendency, discernible in the *Usana Bali*, each time to select seven rulers from lists of royal forebears. We should note that there were seven kings of Samprangan and Gelgel, and that each of these represented a specific period, namely that of the immigration to Bali and the founding of Samprangan; the decline of Samprangan; the rise of the ideal form of kingship in Gelgel; the territorial expansion of a world ruler; decline and calamities; the restoration of royal power; and the final decline of the legitimate Gelgel line.
The political shift in 1651-1686

A number of Dutch sources bear witness to an internal Balinese struggle for power after 1650. As is well-known, there was a civil war raging in Bali, with the whole country being in revolt and everyone trying to make himself master, in 1651, after the death of the ‘old king’. As Creese observes, in 1656 a ‘new king’ is mentioned and is still regarded as having authority over Balambangan and Lombok. Nevertheless, already in 1657 two apparently local rulers established contact with the VOC, while from a report of 1661 we learn that the Balinese princes, divided into different factions, had been waging mutual war year after year. At the same time, Gusti Panji Sakti came to the fore in North Bali (Coolhaas 1968:75; De Hullu 1904:114-6; De Jonge 1872:94; De Graaf 1949).

All this is hard to reconcile with the Babad Dalem’s account of the power and glory of Di Made, whom Creese wants to place in this period. It makes much more sense to connect the Dutch sources with the Babad Gumi date lists (LOr 10.547 and LOr 10.548). Judging from chronograms included in the latter, there was a major clash between families supplying the two chief ministers, Agung and (Kal)Ler, in precisely 1651, while the following decades were filled with incessant warfare, in which the Sidemen, Sibetan and Jelantik families were the main protagonists. In 1664-65, according to LOr 10.548, a certain Anglurah Agung Jimbaran defeated his rivals, quite in agreement with Dutch sources, which mention a Gusti Agung as ruler from 1665. Helen Creese has engaged in an interesting discussion about whether the Gusti Agung of 1665-67 was really the same person as Anglurah Agung or Gusti Agung Di Made Maruti, who was killed in 1686. This is in no way certain. Although the Babad Mengwi does associate Gusti Agung Di Made Maruti with the village of Jimbaran, another source, Babad Blabatuh, represents Ngurah Agung Jimbaran as a younger brother and war chief of the principal Agung (Berg 1932:xxv-xxvi). There could, therefore, have been more Agungs than are mentioned in the Babad Dalem.

The Babad Gumi (LOr 10.548) contains chronograms that offer very interesting parallels with the Babad Dalem account of Dewa Agung Jambe’s rise and Anglurah Agung’s final defeat. It will be remembered that the last legitimate king of Gelgel, usually supposed to be Di Made, fled to Guliyang (southernmost Bangli), where he eventually died, after Anglurah

---

32 According to LOr 10.548, Ngurah Bungahya was killed in fighting against Ida Neng Lurah Agung Bukihan in 1573 (A.D. 1651), while LOr 10.547 notes the collapse (rundah) of Lurah Kaler in the same year. Bungaya is mentioned in the Babad Dalem as a nephew of Panida and Kamasan. The Sedjarah Arya Tabanan and Babad Mengwi both mention confrontations between the Agung and Kaler factions ending in the defeat of the latter, though there are variations in the names and details. According to the Sedjarah Arya Tabanan, Gusti Panida was killed by one Gusti Agung Badeng, the alleged grandfather of the first ruler of Mengwi.
Agung's usurpation. His two heirs quarrelled, and the younger (the Dewa Agung Jambe of the royal genealogies) went to Sidemen, whose ruler welcomed him. Then followed the war against Agung and the founding of Klungkung, after which point the Babad Dalem ends.

In the Babad Gumi (LOr 10.548), I Dewa (Agung) Bagus Jambe is mentioned in connection with Sidmen (Sidemen) in 1677. The next entry takes us back four years, to the death of one I Dewa Cawu at Guli(h)yang in 1673. Next, we are reminded of the defeats of earlier rebels against the legitimate king, namely Batan Jeruk in 1486 (sic) and Pangeran Pande in 1578. A few entries later, the rise of I Dewa (Agung) Jambe in Klungkung in 1683 is described, and after that the defeat of Agung at Gelgel in 1686. The latter date is confirmed by Dutch sources (De Graaf 1949).

So the Babad Gumi presents I Dewa Cawu rather than (his brother?) Dalem Di Made as the royal person who died in Guli(h)yang, which leads us to the obvious assumption that Dewa Agung Jambe was the heir (son, or grandson?) of this Cawu. In any case, he is not enumerated among the eight sons of Di Made mentioned in the Babad Dalem.

Some preliminary conclusions

A reconstruction of the chronology of the Gelgel period in accordance with my suggestions would present the following picture. The kingdom was probably founded at the time of Majapahit's decline, by a family related to the 'heathen' lords who ruled much of East Java at Tomé Pires' time. Its stabilization was helped by the sudden collapse of the Muslim empire of Demak in the mid-sixteenth century. The king at that time, Dalem Baturenggong, may have died shortly after the middle of the sixteenth century. His two sons, Bekung and Saganing, reigned in the second half of the sixteenth century and the first quarter of the seventeenth, and managed to hold their own in the face of internal rebellions and external aggression. Di Made reigned in the 1630s. His death or disappearance, before 1648, was followed by a series of struggles for the throne, especially after 1650. One of the two families supplying the hereditary ministers, Ler, seems to have held considerable power for a time, but between 1651 and 1665 its rival, Agung, gained power in South Bali. In 1686 one of its members was defeated and killed, and Gelgel was finally abandoned in favour of Klungkung.

Dewa Agung Jambe, the next paramount king, is not mentioned in the

33 A certain Radja Tiou of Badung was in contact with the VOC in 1666, stating in a letter that his father had entertained friendly relations with the Governor-General before him. Dewa Agung Jambe's mother was the sister of the founder of the royal house of Badung, which could suggest a connection between Tiou and Jambe's predecessor, Cawu. On the other hand, the Babad Mengwi mentions a Gusti Agung Cau who fell in battle against his cousin, the first king of Mengwi, and who seems to have had some connection with Badung.
Babad Dalem genealogy. The supposition that he was a son of Di Made seems improbable from a chronological point of view. So it appears that a very complicated sequence of events has been simplified, and has been done so consciously rather than from a lack of historical memory. Some sources still bear traces of the longer perspective.

The question then is why this erosion of royal power occurred. Although this question is somewhat beyond the scope of this article, which only seeks to establish a chronological framework, a few observations may be made in this connection. The rebellions and dynastic conflicts that are so frequently mentioned by both Dutch and Balinese sources point to weaknesses in the system of royal rule which are certainly not unique for Bali. The loyalties secured and administrative apparatus built up by a few strong rulers in the first half of the Gelgel period may have weakened in the same ways as in many other negara in Southeast Asia. An extra strain was certainly put on the royal resources by an ecological deterioration around the middle of the seventeenth century, which must have had serious repercussions in a densely populated, predominantly agricultural country like Bali. Dendrochronological evidence from East and Central Java has shown that the years 1645-1675 were unusually dry (Tarling 1992:489-90). Combined with dynastic tensions, this perhaps paved the way for the later shift of power to stronger local centres on the island.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few more words about the relation of babad accounts to actual historical events. Our investigations show the Babad Dalem to be a very unpredictable source. Some accounts of situations and events correspond closely with what we know from external sources to be facts, but the chronological place and sequence of events seems to be totally unreliable. Nor can we posit as a rule of thumb that the text becomes more reliable the more closely we approach the time of its author(s). This is probably no news for Bali scholars. Nevertheless, if my above observations and the observations made earlier by Helen Creese should turn out to provoke further debate on intricate questions of Balinese and Indonesian historiography such as these, they will not have been wholly in vain.
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