ROY E. JORDAAN

Bĕlahan and the division of Airlangga's realm

Introduction

While investigating the role of the Śailendra dynasty in early eastern Javanese history, I became interested in exploring what relationship King Airlangga had to this famous dynasty. The present excursion to the royal bathing place at Bĕlahan is an art-historical supplement to my inquiries, the findings of which have been published elsewhere (Jordaan 2006a). As this is a visit to a little-known archaeological site, I will first provide some background on the historical connection, and the significance of Bĕlahan for ongoing research on the Śailendras.

The central figure in this historical reconstruction is Airlangga (991-circa 1052 CE), the ruler who managed to unite eastern Java after its disintegration into several petty kingdoms following the death of King Dharmawangśa Tĕguh and the nobility during the destruction of the eastern Javanese capital in 1006 (Krom 1913). From 1021 to 1037, the name of princess Śrī Sanggrāmawijaya Dharmaprasādottunggadewī (henceforth Sanggrāmawijaya) appears in several of Airlangga's edicts as the person holding the prominent position of *rakryān mahāmantri i hino* ('First Minister'), second only to the king. Based on the findings of the first part of my research, I maintain that Sanggrāmawijaya was the daughter of the similarly named Śailendra king, Śrī Sanggrāmawijayottunggavarman, who was the ruler of the kingdom of Śrīvijaya at the time. It seems plausible that the Śailendra princess was given in marriage to Airlangga to cement a political entente between the Śailendras and the Javanese. This conclusion supports an early theory of C.C. Berg (1938) as revised by J.G. de Casparis (1958, 1999), the revisions taking account of new insights into the chronology of Rājendrachola's attacks on insular Southeast Asia, and of the confirmation of the date of the destruction of the Javanese capital to 1006.

ROY E. JORDAAN, a graduate of Leiden University, is a private scholar whose main interest has shifted from medical anthropology to Indonesian 'classical' archaeology, particularly of Java during the reign of the Śailendras. His most recent publication is *The mahārājas of the isles; The Śailendras and the problem of Śrīvijaya* (co-author B.E. Colless), Leiden: Opleiding Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië [Semaian 25], Universiteit Leiden, forthcoming. Dr Jordaan may be reached at rejordaan@hotmail.com.

In reaching this conclusion, I also evaluated more recent theories, particularly those of Boechari (1967) and Weatherbee (1968), who independently of each other contested the validity of the Berg-De Casparis theory. Both Boechari and Weatherbee share the view that the similarity of the name of the princess and the Śailendra king is a mere coincidence, and that Airlangga, who was of mixed Balinese-Javanese ancestry, based his claims to the Javanese throne primarily on his marriage to the daughter of the slain king, Dharmawangśa Tĕguh. But whereas Boechari tries to demonstrate that the title of *rakryān mahāmantri i hino* ought to be glossed as crown prince (or princess) and that, therefore, Sanggrāmawijaya was Airlangga's eldest child from this union, Weatherbee argues that she was the daughter of the slain king. As my rejection of these theories is too complex to be summarized in the present article, suffice it to say that Boechari and Weatherbee unjustifiably represent Airlangga as a minor prince. They seem to underestimate the fact that Airlangga was an affinal relative (*sambandhin*) of King Dharmawangśa Tĕguh and, through his noble Javanese mother, Princess Mahendradatta, also a distant descendant of the famous Javanese king Siṇḍok. Certainly Airlangga's pedigree was impressive enough for the Hindu-Buddhist clergy and other prominent people to request him to claim the Javanese throne, and for the Śailendras to involve him in the entente. Additionally, Boechari and Weatherbee do not take account of Poerbatjaraka's emendation (1941) of the fourteenth Sanskrit verse in the Calcutta or Pucangan inscription of 1041, which states that Airlangga had escaped the destruction of the capital solely in the company of his servant Narottama. Boechari and Weatherbee fail to explain how the daughter of King Dharmawangśa Tĕguh could have escaped the massacre, traced Airlangga's whereabouts in the jungle, and rejoined him in the community of forest monks (and, as Boechari would have it, borne him a daughter).

Berg's theory of Sanggrāmawijaya's Śailendra origins also fits better with a related hypothesis that seeks to explain the famous division of Airlangga's realm to resolve a dispute between sons born of two royal consorts, an event briefly alluded to in the Old Javanese *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, the Wurare inscription, and the folktale *Calon Arang*. According to the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, Airlangga made the decision 'out of love for his children, in order that both could be rulers', while the Wurare or Simpang inscription explains the division as involving 'two princes who were opposed to each other [and] were desirous of battle'.

The division of Airlangga's realm has been subjected to a protracted scholarly debate that is even more difficult to summarize than the controversy about Sanggrāmawijaya's identity. Significantly, whereas several participants in the debate saw the division of Airlangga's realm as mythic, legendary, or simply fictitious, Boechari (1968) ultimately demonstrated its historicity on the basis of hitherto unknown inscriptions, while Max Nihom (1986) traced some of the geographical and topographical features of the division on the

basis of a groundbreaking philological analysis of relevant Sanskrit and Old Javanese texts. Nevertheless, many things remain to be investigated, such as the underlying socio-political causes of the division, the actual creation of and the relationship between the two separate kingdoms of Janggala and Pañjalu (or Kaḍiri), and the long-term consequences for Java and the Śailendras (see Jordaan 20006b).

Let us turn now to Stutterheim's discovery of evidence of a seemingly deliberate change in politico-religious terminology after the division of Airlangga's realm, with the rulers of the two partitioned kingdoms calling themselves 'partial' incarnations (*aṅśavatara*) of Viṣṇu instead of the expected 'full' incarnations (Stutterheim 1940:352-3). Although not remarked upon by Stutterheim himself, this odd fact reminded me of his earlier description of a possibly similar phenomenon in the art-historical representations of the goddesses Śrī and Lakṣmī at the ancient royal bathing place of Bĕlahan on Mount Penanggungan (Stutterheim 1938). In a fine illustrated volume on historical eastern Java, it is reported that the two life-size statues 'are thought to represent aspects of the lotus goddess Śrī-Lakṣmī, mythical wife of Wiśnu and the bestower of prosperity and royal fortune' (Bullough 1995:17). (See Plate 1: Present condition of the ritual pool (Bĕlahan I)). However, since the centrally placed statue of Viṣṇu mounted on Garuda has long been regarded as King Airlangga's portrait statue or effigy (*Notulen* 1909; Krom 1913), I agree with Stutterheim that there may be more significance to the presence of the statues of the two goddesses on either side of this Viṣṇu image, namely that they represent the two royal consorts to whom Airlangga was married (Stutterheim 1938; see also Moens 1955; Bernet Kempers 1959:70; Kinney 2003:64). If this is true, it could be argued that the art-historical division of the single lotus goddess into two 'aspects' is comparable with, and perhaps even set the example for, the 'partial' incarnation of Viṣṇu in the case of King Airlangga's sons, the rulers of Janggala and Pañjalu.¹

Airlangga's eviction from Bĕlahan

An impediment to the above interpretation is the strong rejection by Th.A. Re-sink (1967) of the connection between Bĕlahan and King Airlangga, in a Dutch-language article bearing the suggestive title 'Bĕlahan of een mythe ontluisterd',

¹ In my opinion, the toponym Bĕlahan itself points to this possibility, as it derives from the Old Javanese *bĕlah*, 'split', 'cleft', 'cut in half', *bĕlahan* meaning 'cleavage' or 'division' (Zoetmulder 1982:233). Rather than associate the toponym with the nearby ravine (*jurang*), I suggest that it relates to a historical situation the memory of which was, for a long time at least, kept alive by means of a folk-etymological designation, and that the name Bĕlahan in fact relates to the art-historical division on this site. Among Indonesian historians, the division of Airlangga's realm is referred to as *pembelahan kerajaan Airlangga* (see, for example, Slametmulyana 1979).

Plate 1. Present condition of the ritual pool (Bélahan I) with the remaining statues of the goddesses Lakṣmī and Śrī. The side wall is built right against the slope of the hill on top of which in the early nineteenth century a small temple shrine was found, now lost. (See also O.D. 7020.)

Plate 2. Reconstruction drawing of the ritual pool by De Haan (1924). The added roman numerals (I, IIa-IIb) show the positions of the three top-pieces, which are presently kept in the Museum Nasional in Jakarta and in Taman Apsari in Surabaya, respectively.

Plate 3. Top-pieces of the goddesses Lakṣmī (IIa; O.D. 11971) and Śrī (IIb; O.D. 11973).

Plate 4. The statue of Viṣṇu mounted on Garuda (artificially completed with the Jakarta top-piece), now kept in the Trowulan Archaeological Museum, Mojokerto (O.D. 11864).

Plate 5. Female spouting figure (reproduced from Th.A. Resink, 1941, Fig. 2)

Plate 6. The front and back of the chronogram stone *in situ* (above, O.D. 6930 and O.D. 6931) around 1920, and (bottom) the stone in its present even more damaged condition.

Plate 7. Śiva statue believed to hail from Bèlahan (O.D. 507).
Note the unusual motif on either side of the shoulders,
which is also found on the borders of the top-pieces
and on the chronogram stone.

Plate 8. Small gold-and-silver plaque from Bělahan, showing a Harihara figure (reproduced from W.F. Stutterheim, *Djāvā* 1938, Fig. 6)

Reconstructed plan of the Bēlahan site (based on Resink 1967:258, 1968:3-5)

Legend: *a.* and *b.* gates to separate walled courts, now vanished; *c.* the easternmost court, formerly enclosing a small temple which, as shown in a painting by Sieburgh, had a staircase on its western façade, three small shrines in front and, to its north, a long sleeping platform (*balaī*) with steps; *d.* a now vanished hermitage (*paṭapaṇ*) with a gate; *I.* the ritual pool with the remaining statues of Lakṣmī and Śrī; *II.* the bathing pool, now vanished; *ps.* *prāsāda silunglung*, a temple structure with a small shrine to the north (now vanished).

'Bĕlahan or a myth robbed of its lustre'.² Since it caused even Bernet Kempers (1978:32), the first director of the Indonesian Archaeological Service, to doubt the long-accepted connection, we need to evaluate Resink's evidence and arguments carefully, to see if Stutterheim's hypothesis is indeed no longer tenable.

Resink's attack on the 'myth' is three-pronged, comprising stylistic, architectural, and epigraphic data. The stylistic argument concerns the so-called *opzetstukken*, 'top-pieces' or 'crowning stones', that is, the removable pieces of emblematic sculpture, that were formerly placed over the nimbi of the statues of Viṣṇu, Śrī, and Lakṣmī. Resink notes resemblances of these top-pieces with the ornamentation found on three stone inscriptions issued by King Siṇḍok in the second half of the tenth century CE. (See Plate 2: Reconstruction drawing of the ritual pool by De Haan.) The most striking resemblance is the motif of two royal parasols (*payung*), a smaller one placed on top of a larger one, each having slightly upturned ends. (See Plate 3: Top-pieces of Lakṣmī and Śrī.) Even though additional research on other edicts known to have been issued by King Siṇḍok failed to produce similar specimens (which demonstrates that the motif cannot be regarded as a fixed sign, symbol, or seal of Siṇḍok), Resink nevertheless asserted that the parasol was a favoured motif in the days of Siṇḍok. Moreover, his detailed comparison of other decorative motifs, such as clouds and lotus flowers, yielded so many other resemblances that Resink felt justified in concluding that the top-pieces dated from the same period as the Siṇḍok inscriptions, which implied that the old Rouffaer-Krom hypothesis that the statue of Viṣṇu represented Airlangga had to be abandoned. (See Plate 4: Statue of Viṣṇu mounted on Garuda.)

Architectural data seemed to support the proposed earlier dating of the archaeological site, which once consisted of three distinct yards surrounded by walls, several entrance gates, various small buildings, a cloister cell, and two separate pools (referred to by Resink as Bĕlahan I and II). (See Plan of the Bĕlahan site.) Drawing on De Haan's pioneering architectural research and reconstruction work on the site, Resink enumerates a number of typically central Javanese architectural features in support of his earlier founding date. In view of the presence of these features, he finds it odd and 'flatly contradictory' of De Haan to endorse the Rouffaer-Krom hypothesis, dating the royal bathing place to the mid-eleventh century.

As to the epigraphic data, Resink first casts doubt on Stutterheim's analysis of the pictorial chronogram (*sĕngkala*) on the face of one of the water outlets or spouts from Bĕlahan, supposedly reading 971 Śāka, that is 1049 CE (Stutterheim 1934). Arguing against this interpretation, Resink says, is the fact that the representation on the other side of the stone is not quite identical to

² An American translation by art historian Claire Holt was subsequently published in the Cornell University journal *Indonesia* (1968, no. 6, October) under the title 'Bĕlahan or a myth dispelled'. The American edition has a postscript on portrait statues.

the front side with its presumed chronogram. Hence his argument that if it proves impossible to interpret the pictorial rebus on the back as a chronogram this should also apply to the picture on the front, implying that it contains no chronogram at all. Moreover, Resink questions the numerical values which Stutterheim attached to the visual elements on the stone. Having thus rejected Stutterheim's epigraphic analysis, Resink then adduces epigraphic evidence to support his own earlier dating. This evidence consists of the inscriptions of Sutji and the copper plate of Nglawang. Not only had these two inscriptions been found in the close vicinity of Bělahan, but they also mention King Siṇḍok and his consort Dyah Kěbi. Additionally, both inscriptions explicitly mention the toponym Cunggrang (the equivalent of the present-day village of Junggrang, nearby) as well as the sacred monastery of Pāwitra. Finally, there is the corroborative evidence in the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, Prapanca's eulogy, which contains an account of a visit by King Hayam Wuruk to a famous *dharma* (religious domain) located at Cunggrang on Mount Pāwitra (now Mount Penanggungan).

Observing that the stylistic, architectural, and epigraphic data are in full harmony and leave no room for doubting Bělahan's founding by King Siṇḍok, it seemed unacceptable to Resink that Krom marshalled eleventh- and twelfth-century inscriptions to support his hypothesis about the bathing place as the site of Airlangga's interment. These inscriptions are the edicts of Keboan Pasar (1042), Sumengka (1059), and Talan (1136). The first refers to a king bearing secular titles (*aji/pāduka śrī mahārāja*) as well as a spiritual title (*mpuṅku*), who became an ascetic, whom Krom identified as Airlangga. The two other inscriptions commemorate the construction of hydraulic works by a former king who is referred to as *pāduka mpuṅku bhaṭāra guru sang lumāh ri tirtha*, which had been translated as 'the reverend Bhaṭāra Guru who was interred in a sacred pool' (Krom 1913:596-8, 1914a:442-4). Resink's first remark is that the identity of the issuer of the Keboan Pasar edict is far from certain, and so is his identification as the Bhaṭāra Guru of Sumengka and Talan. Secondly, he notes that the edicts of Sumengka and Talan do not supply any information as to the exact location of the hydraulic works they refer to, whereas topographical information is provided in the inscriptions of Sutji and Nglawang. Indeed, the villages of Sumengka and Talan were located so far away from Bělahan that it seemed reasonable to assume that the said *tirtha*, which he glossed as 'holy spring', was somewhere in the immediate surroundings of the two villages, which would help to explain the absence of topographical data, as it would have seemed superfluous to provide local inhabitants with this information. According to Resink, locals could not have had the slightest idea that the *tirtha*, totally unknown to them, which was mentioned in the steles erected in their villages, might refer to the tomb/bathing place located on the slopes of distant Mount Penanggungan.

After his rejection of Airlangga's candidacy for the interment, Resink addresses the question of which other king's ashes could possibly have been buried at Bĕlahan. In view of Siṇḍok's involvement in the construction of the royal bathing place, he thinks it likely that the work was undertaken for the sake of the preceding king 'Wawa', who was Siṇḍok's father-in-law. On the basis of several arguments which need not be repeated here, he identifies a small burial temple (*prāsāda silunglung*) on the hill south of the ritual pool as the place of interment. However, he claims that other royal persons could have been interred at Bĕlahan, given the discovery of an empty shaft in the vicinity of the cloister and evidence of burial gifts under the floor of the pools. However, since these places were less frequently mentioned in the Sutji-Nglawang inscriptions than the small temple, he believes that these interments were of less important royal persons.

Concluding his article, Resink ventures the suggestion that the genesis of the Bĕlahan site is very old and that the spring at the bathing place was venerated as early as pre-Hindu times. Resink envisages the following scenario. The spring as a place of veneration attracted King 'Wawa' to the site. Following the last wishes of his father-in-law, King Siṇḍok and his wife had the *prāsāda silunglung* constructed for his interment together with the lower-lying ritual pool (Bĕlahan I), which in accordance with Balinese burial customs was inaccessible to the general public and used solely on holy days to invoke the descent of the deceased king's divine spirit. Next, Siṇḍok had the bathing pool (Bĕlahan II) constructed, where the common people, segregated by gender and social status, could take a bath. This was followed by other construction work resulting in the layout of the Bĕlahan site that four centuries later would inspire Prapañca's poetic description in the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*.

Resink's views on Bĕlahan evaluated

No reviews of Resink's 1967 article on Bĕlahan are known to me, except for a short addendum to Boechari's article (1968:26) on Mapaṅji Gerasakan and the division of Airlangga's realm, and some architectural and art-historical comments by Jacques Dumarçay (1986).³ Leaving aside Dumarçay's comments for later, let me note here that Boechari's addendum does little more than mention a few inaccuracies, such as the rendition of Siṇḍok's father-in-law's name as 'Wawa' or 'Bawa' instead of Bawang, and the suggestion that it is the same person as King Rakai Sumba Dyah Wawa. Boechari adds that he finds Resink's

³ In her unpublished PhD thesis, art historian Judith Patt (1979) accepts Resink's early-tenth-century dating of Bĕlahan and maintains that the bathing place is connected with Siṇḍok rather than with Airlangga, although she admits the possibility that the ritual pool was 'slightly later in date' than some of the other parts of Bĕlahan (1979:137-8, 156).

arguments unconvincing. Regrettably, he did not, to my knowledge, keep his promise to return to the question of the dating of Bĕlahan in connection with the discovery, in Batu (Malang), of a second statue of Viṣṇu.

At first sight Resink's arguments seem well-founded and reasonable, but on closer inspection his use of the work of Krom, De Haan, and Stutterheim is inaccurate and incomplete. For instance, not only had the reference in the *Nāgarakṛtāgama* to Cunggjang and Pāwitra been used by Krom (1914a:443, 1923:43-4, 1931:270), this scholar had also dated parts of the Bĕlahan site to the days of Siṇḍok. The same holds for De Haan (1925), whose mid-eleventh-century dating (rejected by Resink) specifically concerns the ritual pool (Bĕlahan I), not the Bĕlahan site as a whole. The presence of the bathing pool (Bĕlahan II) is mentioned only cursorily, at the very end of De Haan's article, as a very recent (1922) discovery. Long before Resink, De Haan had observed that the site as a whole offered ample opportunity to study the transition from central Javanese architectural and stylistic elements to later eastern Javanese ones, as he had demonstrated in his architectural research on the gate entrances (De Haan 1924). So, contrary to what Resink suggests, both Krom and De Haan were fully aware of the earlier origins of the site. In contrast, Resink himself, owing to his emphasis on the pre-Airlangga past, presents a truncated picture of its later development. Focusing myopically on the more distant past, he ignores crucial pieces of evidence, including those he himself advanced just before the Japanese occupation of Java during the Second World War (Resink 1941), which attest to the use of the site in post-Siṇḍok times extending to the days of Airlangga and beyond. Let us not, however, anticipate conclusions but rather discuss Resink's arguments systematically, so that the effort does not have to be repeated by others.

Regarding the ornamentation of the removable top-pieces (*opzetstukken*), the first thing to note is that Resink's stylistic argument is based on only three steles, which is too small a number to support his far-reaching conclusions. Since the parasol ornament is lacking on the other three Siṇḍok steles kept in the National Museum at Jakarta, I think Resink is right in concluding that the *payung* (parasol) cannot have been intended as a fixed sign, symbol, or seal of this king (as the *garudamukha*, 'Garuda face', seemingly was for Airlangga). If he insists on viewing the *payung* as a 'favoured' motif in Siṇḍok's times (Resink 1968:9), I must dismiss the claim as an unwarranted generalization. Besides, to be able to say that the *payung* was used to indicate that the figure or object under it was worthy of veneration, we first have to know what it symbolizes, but Resink is silent about this. In all probability, the double *payung* motif at this particular spot was used as an emblem of royalty. Royal processions in present-day Central Java and Bali (and elsewhere) show that not only statues of divinities, but also living kings, queens and other dignitaries are entitled to be shaded by parasols. Yet, even if it were true that the

design of the top-pieces was based on Siṇḍok models, it is quite possible that Airlangga had them deliberately copied to emphasize his descent from this famous king. This is not a far-fetched idea, as in the Calcutta or Pucangan inscription Airlangga claims to be Siṇḍok's great-great-grandson, and also reports his pilgrimage to Siṇḍok's memorial shrine in Īśānabajra on his accession to the Javanese throne. These acts are so conspicuous as to arouse Berg's suspicions, leading him to claim that Airlangga was a usurper and that his pedigree was fabricated. Berg (1961:17) states, 'Erlangga was probably said to be Siṇḍok's descendant because he was not'. Without going into Berg's post-war views again (Jordaan 2006a), and leaving aside the veracity of Airlangga's pedigree, there is no reason to assume that Airlangga would have hesitated to use Siṇḍok's decorative elements if they served his purposes. This possibility undermines Resink's argument. After all, is it not true that the columns topped by Corinthian capitals on the US Capitol building in Washington DC serve a similar legitimizing purpose, and would it not be foolish to claim that these buildings were erected by the ancient Greeks?

As to the architectural evidence, I have already mentioned that Resink's representation of De Haan's views is inaccurate and that the latter's mid-eleventh-century dating specifically related to the ritual pool with its statues of Viṣṇu, Lakṣmī and Śrī (Bĕlahan I), not to other parts of the complex. De Haan adds that construction of Bĕlahan had probably begun before Airlangga's retirement in 1042. As an example of Resink's occasionally ignoring evidence that runs counter to his own Siṇḍok-era dating, let us take a closer look at the small temple (*prāsāda silunglung*), which he tentatively identifies as the burial place of King 'Wawa'. In support of his contention he quotes Sieburgh's early description (1967:263), the first part of which reads: 'Near these bathing places, but located much higher on the hill, is a grave or mausoleum having the perfect shape of a small temple in Janggala design; it is completely closed and most probably still contains the ashes of the deceased'. Understandably, Resink is particularly interested in this reference for its use of the terms grave and mausoleum, but conveniently ignores the information on its Janggala design, which implies a dating in post-Airlangga times.⁴ Ironically, if one were to follow Resink's own line of reasoning, which proceeds from the dubious assumption (see Krom 1916:528) that superstitious beliefs would cause a king not to start the construction of his own burial-place but rather leave this to his descendants, one could well argue that this grave was Airlangga's!

⁴ One anonymous referee remarked that since Sieburgh worked in the early nineteenth century, 'we might wonder what precisely he meant in art-historical terms by the designation Janggala and how it relates to the art-historical categories presently in use'. The answer to this question goes beyond the scope of this article. The point is that in the days of Resink's writing the name Janggala was known to apply to the post-Airlangga period and that Resink ought to have tried to reconcile this with his assignment of the *prāsāda silunglung* to Siṇḍok times, that is in the tenth century.

Another possible connection with Airlangga is indicated by similarities in the design of the Bělahan pool with Balinese sanctuaries such as Goa Gajah, Tirtha Empul, and Gunung Kawi. The similarities are found in the spouting statues (Holt 1967:74; Putra and Stuart-Fox 1977:15; Klokke 1994b:367), and the shape of the niches of the royal statues and the framing of the Balinese rock-cut temples (Bernet Kempers 1959:69; see also Dumarçay 1986:15; Kinney 2003:65-6). In his concluding remarks Resink himself notes that it would be fruitful to extend the discussion of Bělahan to the examination of 'analogies' with some of the sacred sites of Bali. Yet, rather than taking these art-historical parallels as clues that something might be amiss with his proposed revision of the eleventh-century founding date of the royal pool Bělahan to a tenth-century dating, he opines that 'As a consequence of this revision, a general re-examination of established concepts concerning the relationship between Central Javanese and East Javanese architectural styles becomes desirable' (Resink 1967:265, 1968:34).

Another piece of evidence ignored by Resink concerns his own pre-war research on the *spuierbeelden*, free-standing spouting statues comprising two bare-breasted female attendants and one squatting male attendant, each of them holding a vase from which in former times water emerged (Resink 1941). (See Plate 5: Female spouting figure.) According to De Haan, the architect-restorer in the employ of the Netherlands East Indies Archaeological Service, there were originally five spouting figures of different types in Bělahan, but as far as is known only three have survived time and the greed of art collectors. Designated as a 'remarkable curiosity' is the skirt worn by the sparsely clothed attendants, consisting of pieces of leaf-shaped cloth, which Resink takes for a sort of bark skirt. After consulting Stutterheim about this matter, he reports their agreement that this bark skirt need not be a stylistic or iconological feature, but rather may have been intended as a 'representation', that is, referring to a historical situation. The explanation that seems plausible to them is a connection with the king-recluse Airlangga, who in the Calcutta or Pucangan inscription is said to have worn bark clothes (*valkaladhara*) during his stay among forest monks. Closer inspection by Stutterheim of one of the damaged statues led to the discovery of a loose pedestal in Trawas that still had the broken-off feet of one of the female attendants. This discovery ultimately resulted in the successful restoration of the damaged statue, which was kept in the Museum of Batavia, now the Museum Nasional in Jakarta. Since the statue had been sent to the museum from Mojokerto, and, like the Viṣṇu-Garuda statue and the pedestal with the broken-off feet, had passed through the intermediate station of Trawas, Resink concludes that the said spouting figures must have originated from Bělahan. He also points out that this discovery entails a revision of Krom's dating of the statue from the later times of Majapahit to the days of Airlangga, which, moreover, would be in

accordance with their chronological position in Stutterheim's well-known book of illustrations (1926:61, photographs 80 and 81) depicting the cultural history of Java. This art-historical evidence relating to the spouting figures that Resink had once put forward in support of the eleventh-century dating is inconsistent with his 1967 proposition.

The spouting figures bring us to the function of the bathing pool (Bĕlahan II), which Resink suggests was constructed by Siṇḍok for the use of the common people. This conjecture seems most unlikely to me, considering that such democratic motives were totally alien to Javanese kings.⁵ More decisive is the find of a ritual deposit box containing semi-precious stones and a small gold-and-silver object (that we will look at more closely below), which leaves no doubt about the sanctity of the bathing pool (Bĕlahan II), as Stutterheim (1938) had observed.

Turning now to the epigraphic evidence, I think Resink is right to draw attention to the reverse side of the stone slab, but it is hard to say whether his inability to discern a chronogram in it should as a matter of course reflect on the front side of the slab. Resink (1968:21) states, 'there is the important fact that the back of the stone shows the same principal elements as the front, i.e., the central figure of the moon disk surrounded by a wreath of clouds; and therefore it should be considered as a possible chronogram no less than the front. But here the combination possibilities of the ciphers (if that is what they are) are quite limited [...] and the highest valuable obtainable for a date is 410 Śaka [488 CE], which is impossibly early.' However, a closer look at the old O.D. photo of the back of the stone reveals that it does not have the same principal elements as the front. (See Plate 6: Front and back of chronogram stone.) Absent from the back are the Rahu demon and the flying *ṛṣi*. What matters here is Resink's view that the possible combinations of the presumed ciphers on the back are limited and meaningless. The question to be asked is, rather, whether the ornamental motifs on the back were really intended as ciphers. Is it not possible that the ornamental differences relate to the distinction between back and front side, such that only the front side of the slab should be read as a chronogram? Still, given the uncertainty on this point, I will not at this stage draw the chronogram into the discussion, partly because we do not know what the date signifies.⁶

⁵ Presumably he was misled in this by De Haan's use (1925:144) of the designation 'functional construction work', which was meant to indicate that Bĕlahan II had really been designed as a bathing pool. However, De Haan did not say or imply that the bathing pool had been constructed for the sake of the common people or for public use.

⁶ Stutterheim (1934:196-202) puts forward the hypothesis that 1049 CE was the year of Airlangga's death, but this idea may no longer be tenable. A recently discovered Balinese manuscript of the Old Javanese *Nāgarakṛtāgama* mentions Śaka 974 (1052 CE) as the date of the division of Airlangga's realm (Hinzler and Schoterman 1979:483; see also Robson 1995:74). Since according to the Wurare inscription and the *Calon Arang*, Airlangga himself was involved in the division

Clearly unacceptable is Resink's decision to disregard Stutterheim's dating of the script on a small gold-and-silver plaque that had been found close to the ritual pool during a clean-up of the site in 1937. Resink bases his decision on the fact that the object was lost during the war against Japan, thus preventing him from verifying Stutterheim's analysis. I think, however, that Stutterheim's professional reputation and integrity need not be questioned, especially if we take account of the firm way in which his statement is phrased: 'The discovery [of the small gold-and-silver plaque] might be more important than it already is if we could decipher the inscription on it satisfactorily. Much is still missing and the words that can be read, "lĕlat curukan wi(taya)tahli (bharyā)nadaçāryā", make little sense. Yet this result too is not without significance, because the type of script indicates that we must in fact be in the time of Airlangga: *the script is completely identical to the extant edicts of this King.*' (Stutterheim 1938:301, emphasis in the original.) Stutterheim's self-assured tone is not exceptional, as epigraphists generally are confident about their ability to distinguish inscriptions from each other on the basis of their palaeography and phraseology (see, for example, Poerbatjaraka 1926:111; Krom 1914b:244-5, 1931:215-7; Boechari 1968:15).

This leaves Resink's objections against Krom's use of the eleventh- and twelfth-century inscriptions of Keboan Pasar, Sumengka, and Talan. To begin with, it must be observed that the calling into question of Krom's identification of the Bhaṭāra Guru of Tirtha as Airlangga is not satisfactory. Not only is no justice done to Krom's characteristically careful reasoning (which is as subtle and convincing as Resink's own 1941 argument about the free-standing spouting figures), but Resink also takes no account of Damais's epigraphic notes on this matter. Damais's work is referred to only in connection with his comparison of the ornamentation on the three Siṇḍok inscriptions with the top-pieces, but if Resink had taken the trouble to consult the footnote relating

---

(albeit indirectly, the task having been delegated to a tantric master, Mpu Bharada), Boechari (1990:129) maintains that Airlangga must have died shortly afterwards, in view of the fact that the Garaman inscription of 975 Śaka (1053 CE) reports on the war between Janggala and Pañjalu, and that Airlangga apparently 'could not interfere anymore'. Be that as it may, I would urge caution in discounting the date 1049. If we can rely on the folktale *Calon Arang*, the division of the Javanese realm took place in two stages. Allegedly, the first division was jeopardized by acts of aggression by the ruler of Kaḍiri (Pañjalu) against the ruler of Janggala, forcing Airlangga to return from his hermit's cell to intervene in the conflict. To restore peace he had Mpu Bharada reconfirm the division, 'so that everyone knew the borders' (Poerbatjaraka 1926:176-8). Conceivably, the fraternal war, referred to in the Garaman (1053) and Turun Hyang B (1054) inscriptions, broke out soon after Airlangga's demise, some time between 1049 and 1052. While 1049 is near enough to comply with Turun Hyang B's statement that the war broke out 'soon after the division', we cannot exclude the possibility that it was the year of the first division. Perhaps the Balinese scribes had the division dated to 1052 to accord with their unilateral, if temporary, separation from Java by Anak Wungśu and his immediate successors consequent upon the political upheaval after Airlangga's death (Jordaán 2006a).

to the date of the Gandhakuti or Keboan Pasar inscriptions he would have learned that Damais was not opposed to Krom's identification of Airlangga as the hermit bearing the title *aji pāduka mpuṅku*. In the Gandhakuti inscription the full title is *aji pāduka mpuṅku sang pinakacatra ning bhuwana*. According to Damais (1952:64-5, note 3), the title probably refers to Airlangga as a hermit.⁷

As to the distant find-spots of the Sumengka and Talan inscriptions, I fail to see why the distance should mean that the references to the *tīrtha* in them cannot relate to Bĕlahan. Surely the inscriptions were not intended, as Resink wants us to believe, to be read by ordinary people but rather to serve as administrative records for posterity, like the inscriptions the Romans left in England and other distant places. Other eastern Javanese inscriptions, such as the Kamalagyan (Kĕlagen) stele of 1037, demonstrate that Airlangga was known for his hydraulic construction works.⁸ Since the Talan inscription of 1136 reports that the king who was deified in the *tīrtha* used the Garudamukha as his seal, I think we cannot but agree with Krom (1923:43) that this was most probably King Airlangga.

A comparison of these inscriptions indicates that Airlangga identified or associated himself with both Viṣṇu and Śiva. For instance, in the Talan inscription, sealed with the *garudamukha*, the king is referred to as Bhaṭāra Guru. We already know that in Bĕlahan Airlangga is represented as Viṣṇu mounted on Garuda, but Stutterheim (1938:304) is convinced that the beautiful statue of Śiva, now kept in the National Museum in Jakarta, also hails from Bĕlahan on account of striking decorative resemblances. (See Plate 7: Śiva statue believed to hail from Bĕlahan.) If true, he says, the statue probably represents a Śaiva apotheosis of Airlangga. This idea is contested by Resink, but largely because he chooses to disregard the evidence of the religiously mixed character of the

⁷ Slametmulyana (1979:33) translates the title as *Raja Pendeta Sang Pelindung Jagat* ('The Priest-King and Protector of the World'). In the Sumengka inscription of 1059 the then reigning king Samarotsāha, who claims to be an adopted son or son-in-law of the *pāduka mpuṅku*, also refers to the latter as 'deified mahārāja' (*mahārāja dewata*). Both Boechari (1968) and Slametmulyana (1979) have identified the deified mahārāja and the *pāduka mpuṅku* as Airlangga.

⁸ Krom 1931:266. One of the referees objected to this inference by pointing out Wisseman Christie's view (1986:78-9) 'that hydraulic works were very much the preserve of the village and not of any higher authority, including kings. Airlangga's Kamalagyan inscription is the exception which proves the rule'. Arguably, it depended on the scale and nature of the hydraulic works. Villagers will have been responsible for water management in their own villages, but larger supralocal hydraulic works, such as those mentioned in the Kamalagyan inscription, could only have been realized with the administrative support of the government. Note that the claim of Kamalagyan's 'exceptional' status is refuted by the Sumengka inscription of 1059, which mentions repairs to a canal that was constructed by the *pāduka mpuṅku* (Boechari 1968:4). Water architecture in temple complexes such as those of Jalatunda, Bĕlahan and Goa Gajah (and similar projects on the Prambanan plain during the Central Javanese period) was undoubtedly the prerogative of the king. Airlangga evidently was so well-known for his association with Bĕlahan that the mere mention in the Sumengka and Talan inscriptions of the king's spiritual title and his deification at this sacred pool sufficed to indicate his involvement in other hydraulic works.

site. For instance, the very Sieburgh whom Resink quotes in connection with the burial in the small Janggala-style temple recorded the following note: 'as seems to have been the case in Majapahit, a syncretic doctrine of Śiva and Viṣṇu characterizes all the remains which we have seen in *Blahan* [Bĕlahan]; yet inclining more towards Śaivism than Vaiṣṇavism' (quoted in Bruijn 1937:148). Sieburgh, who in the first half of the nineteenth century was one of the early Dutch visitors to the site, reported the presence of many Śaivite statues, such as of Durgā, Gaṇeśa, and Nandi, which were later removed or stolen (see also Domis 1836:169-70). I share Stutterheim's conviction that the Śiva statue was one of these.⁹ Fortunately, the discovery of a combined Viṣṇu-Śiva image in a ritual deposit box at the site, to which I will return shortly, is strong evidence of Airlangga's association with both Hindu deities. Krom (1931:271) connects this phenomenon to 'the practice recorded in later-dated documents of multiple interments of kings in different forms' (see also Stutterheim 1938:301). Incidentally, the Amoghapāśa statue of Kutri, in Bali, is believed to represent Airlangga's Buddhist 'deification statue' (Schnitger 1934:149-51).

The founding date and the statuary of Bĕlahan's ritual pool

The most unsatisfactory aspect of Resink's theory is that it has nothing to say about the identity of the life-sized statues and the image of Viṣṇu mounted on Garuda at the ritual pool (Bĕlahan I). Considering Boechari's comments, I can see no way to link these statues with King 'Wawa', or with Siṇḍok and his wife Dyah Kĕbi.

This flaw also has a bearing on Dumarçay's architectural and art-historical analysis (1986) of Bĕlahan I. In line with Resink's theory, he posits that the two female deities were already situated in their niches in the mid-tenth century, together with the statue of Viṣṇu on a small base between them. However, Dumarçay fails to state his reasons for thinking that Resink 'undoubtedly was

⁹ Following the 2006 Jakarta workshop on 'Stranger-kings in Southeast Asia and elsewhere', I had the opportunity to visit the Taman Apsari in Surabaya, the Bĕlahan temple site, and the Mojokerto Museum, where I took a closer look at the ornamentation of the top-pieces and the back slabs of the statues of the two goddesses. Aside from the Śiva statue, the chronogram stone and the top-pieces, I did not see any other specimens of what Stutterheim calls 'clouds with wisps of fog and flowers'. As to what this motif represents, I question the appropriateness of seeing here 'wisps of fog' (*nevelslierten*), which Stutterheim himself had on an earlier occasion interpreted as 'flame motifs' (see Stutterheim 1938:304, note 1). In my opinion, this motif represents *pulung kraton*, 'fireballs', which in Javanese thought are taken for a sign of royalty. This would also help to explain the presence of this motif in Siṇḍok's charter stone D 70, mentioned by Resink (1968:14, note 10). Unlike Resink, however, I do not think that it is 'therefore' equally possible that the Śiva statue in question belonged to the obscure Walandit site mentioned in the charter. It is worthy of note that there is a place named Kapulungan in the immediate vicinity of Bĕlahan and also that Airlangga's association with Śiva is attested by his identification as Bhaṭāra Guru in the inscriptions.

right to believe' that this part of Bĕlahan was constructed before the eleventh century.¹⁰ While he admits that the date of the hypothetical first construction phase is hard to determine, he nevertheless claims that 'it should be situated in the second half of the tenth century' (Dumarçay 1986:9). One cannot expect others to be persuaded to accept this claim without evidence and sound arguments. Moreover, several of Dumarçay's opinions are difficult to reconcile with a dating of the Bĕlahan ritual pool to the second half of the tenth century. Dumarçay himself assigns Goa Gajah – a Balinese temple complex with a pool and spouting figures that are very similar to those of Bĕlahan I – to the eleventh century, which he refers to as 'the Javanese period of Bali' (Dumarçay 1986:15), but which is in fact the same as the Airlangga period of Java. Seen from a historical perspective, it makes much more sense to date the founding of both Goa Gajah and Bĕlahan to the same mid-eleventh-century period.¹¹

Dumarçay's hypothesized second construction phase involves a modification of the wall containing the statues of Viṣṇu and the two female deities, which Dumarçay assumes is also the period in which the relief sculpture carrying the chronogram of 1049 CE was incorporated into the structure. Dumarçay believes the chronogram stone was placed in an axial niche above the statues, and dates this phase of construction precisely. However, as it stands, Dumarçay's argument is circular, with the construction phase being put forward to account for the presence of the chronogram stone, and the chronogram being used to date the construction phase. Instead, separate evidence is required for each of these (the date of the hypothesized architectural renovation on the basis of datable artefacts such as coins or pottery shards, and the incorporation of the chronogram in the wall), before proposing their interconnection.¹²

¹⁰ Dumarçay 1986:9. Dumarçay seems unaware of Boechari's critical remarks (1968) about Resink's theory. His only reservation about Resink's early dating is the argument about the presence of ogees and semicircles (Dumarçay 1986:8-9), and that Resink in his demonstration of these architectural features had based his findings on a document of mediocre quality, namely an indistinct painting by Sieburgh – whose name is misspelled as Siebung (Dumarçay 1986:9, note 11).

¹¹ Since the political contacts between Bali and Java were temporarily suspended following the division of Java and the subsequent war between Janggala and Pañjalu (Jordaen 2006b), Goa Gajah's founding date can be fixed around the mid-eleventh century. Without further evidence, there is no reason to assume that Bĕlahan's ritual pool was not constructed in the same period as the Goa Gajah complex (Holt 1967:74; Fontein 1990:44, 85; Klokke 1994b:367). Moreover, it has yet to be determined in what direction the cultural exchange actually took place, from Java to Bali or the other way around (see Stutterheim 1938:304, note 1). Concerning the latter possibility, account has to be taken of the fact that Java was still recovering from the destruction of its capital in 1006, and from the social chaos caused by Airlangga's struggle to conquer the Javanese throne.

¹² We do not know where the chronogram stone was originally located. *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1922 merely reports that the 'curious' stone was found in the immediate vicinity of the two pools. De Haan (1925:144) states that the 'very curious' stone was found 20 metres east of the ritual pool. Resink arbitrarily changed this to 'unfortunately it is quite uncertain precisely where at Bĕlahan II the stone was originally located'. Dumarçay changed this to Bĕlahan I, suggesting that the stone

During my recent visit to Bĕlahan, it occurred to me that Dumarçay may have misunderstood some of Resink's statements as well as the reconstructed plan of the site, since he gives the impression that the ritual pool was located close to but separate from the hill of the 'Janggala' temple. Personal inspection of the ritual pool convinced me that the side wall must be as old as the wall containing the statuary, since they were built as one architectural whole and right against and into the foot of the hill, undoubtedly to prevent it from subsiding. It is the very hill of the small temple, long since destroyed to make room for a few houses (see Plate 1). Furthermore, I could not detect any sign of renovations in the overall structure other than those of the Archaeological Service, such as the drain pipe in the side wall.

Fortunately, the front and back of the chronogram stone yield evidence contradicting Dumarçay's claim that the statuary of Viṣṇu, Lakṣmī and Śrī should be dated to Siṇdok times, in the tenth century. The evidence consists of the motif that I interpret as 'fireballs' (*pulung kraton*), which also adorn the three top-pieces. The conclusion seems justified that the statues date from the same period as the chronogram stone, namely the mid-eleventh century.¹³ However, as stated earlier, we do not know what the significance is of the date 1049 CE. It seems likely to me that it was the date of an important political event, as yet unknown, rather than simply marking a particular construction phase. If not Airlangga's death, the date might com-

---

was placed in an imaginary axial niche. Additionally, Dumarçay's claim that the wall was renovated to create a niche for the chronogram stone seems incompatible with Resink's idea (1976:259) that the stone had functioned as a double-sided spout, with the water entering from one side of the stone, and issuing from the front and back. My own inspection revealed the presence of holes in both sides of the stone, not just in one, as Resink inferred from O.D. photograph 6931 (note that the crack in the stone starts at the opposite hole, on the other side, hence not visible in this photo). Furthermore, the back of the stone has two holes: one in the centre of the disc, and another a few centimetres lower. All this seems to indicate that the stone had functioned as a three-sided spout (see also Patt 1979:120). How could Dumarçay's axial niche possibly allow for this?

¹³ The untenability of Dumarçay's distinction between a first and a second construction phase does not necessarily call for a rejection of all of his findings on Bĕlahan. Take Dumarçay's observation that the statue of Viṣṇu mounted on Garuda could not have functioned as a spout because of the absence of a hole. Dumarçay's ideas about the placement of this image on the rock wall in between the two female statues can be brought to bear on the suggestion that 'the sculpture may have been installed further up on the monument' (Kinney 2003:67, note 1). Note that the latter suggestion is at variance with the policy of the Netherlands Indies Archaeological Service. Given the strict guidelines for the reconstruction of Hindu-Javanese temples and the severe administrative penalties that were imposed on Perquin for violating these, it seems inconceivable that the newly appointed young architect De Haan would have risked his career by making the same mistake as his unfortunate predecessor, and relocating the statue to a spot other than its original one. The reconstruction drawing reproduced by Bernet Kempers may or may not be drawn exactly to scale, but neither he nor any former director of the Archaeological Service has ever questioned the image's placement on this particular spot. Surely, Stutterheim would not have gone to such great lengths to complete the photograph of the Viṣṇu on Garuda with the top-piece that is kept in the National Museum?

memorate his abdication and retirement into a cloister, alluded to in several contemporary documents, or it might mark the division of his realm.¹⁴

Dumarçay's hypothesized third construction phase need not detain us, since it concerns thirteenth- and fourteenth-century architectural and stylistic changes to other walls, gates and temples, which go beyond the scope of this investigation. Here we are only interested in the identification of the Viṣṇu statue and the two female attendants, a question which Resink does not answer.

Perhaps to compensate for this, Resink (1968:34-7), in the postscript to the American edition of his article, rejects even the possibility of a connection between statues and deceased royalty that is central to the notion of 'portrait statues' – a notion especially popular among pre-Second World War scholars. Although he rightly notes that the evidence for the identification of such posthumous statues of deified kings and queens is often weak and subjective, Resink goes too far in denying the validity of the idea altogether. He takes no account of the fact that the connection between a historical figure and a statue is sometimes alluded to in Old Javanese documents. For instance, the famous Jākā Dolog statue in Surabaya bears an inscription on its pedestal stating that 'statues were made having the features of living persons' (Brandes 1906:54). Although it soon transpired that this statement was meant figuratively rather than literally (Kern 1910), it did not prevent Brandes's remark from heralding the beginning of the portrait statues 'hype' (see Klokke 1994a:179). Nevertheless, the identification of the Viṣṇu statue of Bĕlahan as Airlangga is not based solely on the statue's 'individual facial features', as Resink has us believe, since Rouffaer and Krom as champions of the portrait statue idea knew perfectly well that the statue's face had been badly damaged and inexpertly repaired. Their admittedly tentative identification also takes account of Airlangga's close association with Viṣṇu and Garuda, as is attested by his Garudamukha seal and by his nickname Rĕsi Gĕntayu ('Hermit of the Garuda Bird'). Further, Krom calls attention to the identification of Airlangga as, on the one hand, the Bhaṭāra Guru who was interred at Tirtha, and as the deified king of Tirtha who had the Garudamukha as his seal, on the other. More recently, ironically almost simultaneously with the publication of Resink's article, Boechari's research (1968:2-3, 13 note 10) yielded clear evidence of Airlangga's identity as the *pāduka mpuṅku* of the Gandhakuti inscription and

¹⁴ In a personal conversation, Amrit Gomperts ventured the suggestion that the year 1049 of the chronogram stone may have coincided with a solar or lunar eclipse. Through the good offices of Ger de Bruyn and Richard Strom of the Astron astronomical centre in Dwingeloo, the Netherlands, it was subsequently established that in 1049 there was no solar eclipse in Java, but that two lunar eclipses did occur, both total. The lunar eclipses were on 20 February, 15:37 UT (around midnight, local time) and on 15 August, 21:48 UT (that is, 16 August, about 5 o'clock local time). Other things considered as well, it seems more likely to me that the disc in the stone represents a moon rather than a sun, and that the chronogram is a *candrasēṅkala*.

the *pāduka mpuṅku bhaṭāra guru sang lumāh ri tirtha* of the Sumengka inscription.¹⁵ The identification of the Śrī and Lakṣmī statues as Sanggrāmawijaya and Airlangga's anonymous second consort, respectively, can now be added as an argument in support of Rouffaer's hypothesis, since Airlangga is the only king in early eastern Javanese history known to have had two spouses in prominent positions: the first holding the office of *mahāmantri i hino* ('First Minister'), the second being his *paramēśvari* ('First Queen'). Noteworthy in this connection are the textual allusions in the *Smaradahana*, an Old Javanese text which Poerbatjaraka (1919) has demonstrated contains historical information, such as a reference to the marriage of King Kāmeśvara of Kaḍiri with Princess Kiraṇa of Janggala, who are likened to the divine couple Kāma and Rati. What concerns us here is the curious statement that Queen Kiraṇa 'had not split in two as in her former births'. Regrettably, only one former Javanese incarnation of Kāma is mentioned in this Old Javanese text, namely Śrī Sānadharmma, otherwise unknown. Of Rati it is merely said that she did not stay behind (in heaven) but followed him (Kāma) again. In earlier Indian incarnations, Rati had split into the two princesses Bāsawadā and Ratnāwali of Ceylon, who were the spouses of the historical King Udayana.

Stutterheim on the statuary of Bēlahan

If Resink felt justified in rejecting the relationship between statue and king, we should bear in mind that it is only recently that the study of the many-stranded relationship between an object of art, the artisan, and the royal commissioner or patron has been put on the research agenda of art historians of ancient Java (Klokke 1998). Stutterheim's Bēlahan study goes a long way towards meeting these modern demands, and can, therefore, be said to have been ahead of its

¹⁵ Boechari's evidence must be regarded as conclusive because the phrase *anugraha pāduka mpuṅku* was used by Mapañji Garasakan when referring to the former grant of Airlangga, his father, to the village elders of Turun Hyang. Whereas Airlangga's grant is recorded on the front side of the stone slab and runs through to the back until line 12, Garasakan's additional grant is recorded in the appended edict which begins on line 13. The new grant was a token of gratitude from Garasakan to the villagers for their help in the war against the king of Pañjalu. For convenience's sake, Boechari (1968:2-3) refers to Airlangga's edict as Turun Hyang A, and to Garasakan's edict as Turun Hyang B. The date of issue of Turun Hyang B was subsequently reconstituted as Śaka 976, that is 1054 CE (Setya Wardhani 1982:88; see also Boechari 1990:134).

Turun Hyang B reports that the war between Garasakan and Haji Pañjalu occurred 'just after the division' (*hañar blah*, from *hañar* meaning new, and *blah* meaning divide, spilt, burst). The use of the latter term in a contemporary edict lends support to my suggestion that the name Bēlahan could be derived from *blah* or *bēlah*. As to the use of the name Cunggrang in later official documents, such as the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, I think this can be explained as attempts by Singhasari and Majapahit kings to eliminate reminders of the divisive years of early eastern Javanese history and to stress the newly restored unity of the realm. Several Singhasari and Majapahit rulers took pride in presenting themselves as the restorers or protectors of this unity.

time. Undoubtedly, Stutterheim would have discovered many other relevant things and also revised his 1938 conclusions, if he had not died prematurely in the first year of the Japanese occupation of Java. To illustrate Stutterheim's imaginative and logical mind, I quote his discussion of the Bĕlahan royal statues, which brought him via an art-historical route to the same conclusion as Berg, and in the very same year. Sometimes, it seems, certain discoveries are 'in the air'. Freely translated, Stutterheim's reasoning is as follows:

'[I]f the designer had the intention – which we now no longer need to doubt – to give the Viṣṇu statue the appearance of a portrait or a divine replica of the deceased Airlangga, we must also assume that the other two statues, that is of the goddesses Lakṣmī and Śrī associated with Viṣṇu, represent the earthly consorts of the deified ruler. This conclusion allows for no exception in the royal protocol of the Old Javanese *kraton*. But if this were true, it is curious that the statues of his consorts are so much bigger than that of the king. If we assume, on the one hand, that the demands of royal (*kraton*) protocol were important enough to be given expression in a building, we must also be consistent in this and interpret the relationship between the statues of Viṣṇu and the two goddesses as reflecting reality. But how can we solve this problem?

Before attempting this, we need to be aware that the problem is twofold. Firstly, the consorts of the king are depicted as larger than the king himself, which in the language of the Old Javanese kingdom would imply that dynastically speaking they were more significant. Secondly, there appear to be two consorts, whereas it is generally assumed that Airlangga had only one official wife.

If for the moment we leave the second problem aside and proceed from the assumption that the ruler had two consorts, we need to look for a clue that the two consorts in question were more important dynastically than their husband. Fortunately, we do not have to search far for such a clue. We all know that Airlangga was the son of a Balinese prince and not of a Javanese king, implying that he could lay no claim to the throne of this particular island or kingdom of islands. Indeed, everything we know about Airlangga's career seems to indicate that he could mount the throne only through or as a result of his in-lawship to the king of Java. In other words, Airlangga's relationship to his consorts was, dynastically speaking, exactly in line with the differing size of the statues.

However, the fact remains that after 1037 it was he and not one of his consorts who wore the crown of Java. In a certain sense this relationship [between husband and wives] is contradictory [to Airlangga's lower birth] and should actually have cancelled it out. The designer nevertheless managed to express both [aspects] by making Airlangga's statue smaller than those of his wives (thus expressing his lower birth), but locating it at a higher spot (thus expressing his higher dignity). As is generally known and still valid in the world of the Javanese *kraton*, to be seated higher implies higher dignity, though not necessarily through higher birth. What remains is the problem of the two consorts.

[...] If from 1023 (Airlangga's oldest extant edict) until 1041 we regularly encounter a certain Sanggrāmawijaya as *mahāmantri i hino*, who appears to have been replaced by another incumbent only at the time of the founding inscription of the Pucangan cloister, which, moreover, is one year before Airlangga himself enters

religious life, I think a better explanation for this event can be given than her [alleged] retreat to the cloister, namely the hypothesis that Sanggrāmawijaya was one of the consorts of the king who had died before 1041, after which the king in mourning remembered his early vow to erect the cloister on Mount Pucangan and enter a religious order himself shortly thereafter. That the said consort could not have been his main wife is indicated by the separate mention of a *parameśvari* (first wife), together with Sanggrāmawijaya as *mahāmantri i hino* in one and the same inscription, as was correctly observed by Krom (1931:268). [...]

If the above holds any truth, we might see the two consorts in the two spouting figures [i.e., the statues of Lakṣmī and Śrī] in the small pool of Bělahan. What catches the eye is the slight differences in their representation. The statue of the goddess on the right of the king and, therefore, the one to be ranked first, has a wealth of pearl-strings attached to her *payung* which are absent from the figure on the left. The latter, on the other hand, is taller. Although the difference in height is so small as to allow for an explanation of an actual difference in bodily height – in contrast to the difference in size with the statue of Airlangga himself – it remains possible that it provides a clue about her position: the figure on the right, superior in rank, could represent the *parameśvari*, while the lower-ranking figure, who seems more realistically depicted in terms of size, could represent *mahāmantri i hino*, Sanggrāmawijaya Dharmmaprasādottunggadewī' (Stutterheim 1938:306-8).

Supplementary remarks on history and art

Thus, after more than half a century, we seem to have arrived at the same point where Berg and Stutterheim left us in 1938. In my opinion, art-historical research on Bělahan should be continued along the lines set out by Stutterheim. However, being interested primarily in the fate of the Śailendra dynasty, I intend to resume historical research on their position in early eastern Javanese history, and leave the finer details of the art-historical investigation to specialists in this field. Still, there are a few things worth noting here.

The first concerns Stutterheim's remark in a footnote at the very end of his Bělahan article:

'After the completion of this article, the author received [a copy of] the article by Prof. Dr. C.C. Berg in *Bijdragen* (BKI) 97, in which the family relationship analysed above is discussed. As far as could be ascertained, the remarks made by Dr. Berg do not require a revision of what has been proposed in the above' (Stutterheim 1938:308).

Understandable as it is as a supplementary, spur-of-the-moment footnote, it is much to be regretted that Stutterheim left it at this and did not at a later moment use Berg's findings to bring his argument to its logical conclusion. To clarify this we must take another look at the design of the top-pieces and take account of the fact that Stutterheim mentions only the wealth of pearl-strings

attached to the royal parasol of the goddess Lakṣmī and their absence in the portrayal of the goddess Śrī. Closer inspection shows that this observation is not wholly correct, as pearl-strings are also visible in the flowers underneath Śrī's parasol. But far more important than the strings of pearls is the presence of four small 16-spoke wheels underneath Śrī's parasol, and their absence from Lakṣmī's. These wheels may have served to distinguish the two goddesses from each other, and most likely represent *dharmacakra*-s, the Wheel of the Law, one of the oldest Buddhist symbols (Coomaraswamy 1965; Brown 1996). This provides a strong iconographical confirmation of Stutterheim's identification of the goddess Śrī as the princess Sanggrāmawijaya, who after all was a Buddhist princess. Yet this confirmation, important as it is, is still a step away from bringing Stutterheim's argument to its logical conclusion, which is that Sanggrāmawijaya was not a Javanese noblewoman but a foreign princess. For if she had been a Javanese princess, as well as being Airlangga's first wife, she would as a matter of course have been accorded the position of *paramēśvari* or first-ranking consort. In Bĕlahan this would have corresponded with her positioning on Viṣṇu's right and her representation as a single undivided lotus goddess, Śrī Lakṣmī.¹⁶ Furthermore, there would not have been any need to divide Airlangga's realm. Here we must keep in mind that if Sanggrāmawijaya (and Samarawijaya) really were Airlangga's children by a Javanese consort, as Boechari would have it (or if Sanggrāmawijaya was a daughter of the preceding Javanese king Dharmmawangśa Tĕguh, and Samarawijaya her son, as claimed by Weatherbee), their right to succeed Airlangga to the throne should not have raised any problem at all, given the prevailing rules of rank and primogeniture. As a rule, the rights of children born to the first-ranking queen would override those of other children whom Airlangga may have fathered with other royal consorts. The succession problem and the partitioning of Airlangga's realm, therefore, constitute strong circumstantial evidence of Sanggrāmawijaya's and Samarawijaya's non-Javanese ancestry.¹⁷

¹⁶ As to why Stutterheim himself did not draw this conclusion, it must be borne in mind that he had in 1927, on the basis of a rash interpretation of the recently discovered Kedu inscription, assumed that the central Javanese king Rakai Panangkaran was a scion of the Śailendra dynasty (Stutterheim 1927). This premature interpretation he subsequently developed into a theory about Java's hegemony in the Malay Archipelago under the aegis of the Śailendras, who he supposed were of Javanese origin (Stutterheim 1929). He never abandoned this theory, in spite of severe criticism levelled against it by Bosch (1929). The new information supplied by the Wanua Tengah III inscription is even more difficult to square with the theory of the Śailendras' Javanese origins than was already the case with the Kedu inscription (for details see Jordaan 2003).

¹⁷ Boechari (1968:8), partly following Moens (1955), imagines a similar scenario by suggesting that the division of Airlangga's realm was caused by discord between the children of Airlangga's first wife and those children he may have had from a second marriage with a Balinese wife. However, Boechari's proposal cannot be accepted because of his mistaken gloss of *mahāmantri i hino* as crown princess, which turns Sanggrāmawijaya into Airlangga's daughter instead of his wife and First Minister (see Jordaan 2006a). Boechari (1968:18, note 23) also fails to supply evidence for the

We may not yet have found an inscription that provides incontrovertible evidence of the Śailendras' foreign origins, but if we interpret the formal arrangement and design of the Bělahan royal statues as a contemporary text reflecting Javanese protocol, as Stutterheim does, it shows that the art-historical information is in no way inferior to the 'hard' inscriptional evidence being sought. The message is simply set in stone in a different way.

The second point concerns the discovery, in the centre of the bathing pool (Belahan II), underneath an ill-described pyramidal object, of a cube-shaped stone box topped with a diamond-shaped lid (*Jaarboek* 1936). According to Stutterheim, the box was similar to ones found earlier in Kalasan, Prambanan, and Songgoriti. Its contents comprised about ten semi-precious stones of green, violet, and white colour, and a small metal plaque about ten centimetres long. The plaque consisted of a gold half and a silver half joined together, displaying an embossed image of a god standing on a lotus cushion. (See Plate 8: Small gold-and-silver plaque from Bělahan, showing a Harihara.) On account of the seemingly larger left breast, Bosch suspected that the god was meant to represent an *ardhanārī*, that is, a fused male-female figure having a male right-side and a female left-side. This idea, however, was rejected by Stutterheim, who believed it was an optical illusion that the left breast appeared more pronounced than the right one, caused by the slightly arched stance (*bhangga*) of the figure. He also questioned Bosch's alternative identification of the figure as a Harihara, a combined Śiva-Viṣṇu image, since Bosch had not adduced any arguments for this. Stutterheim surmised that Bosch's suggestion was based on the fact that the figure was divided into a gold part and a silver part. Although he agreed that this must have had a special purpose, Stutterheim said he did not know whether the image could be connected with the deities Śiva and Viṣṇu, even though it was not impossible, considering that the colour of the Śaiva half of a Harihara is white and its Vaiṣṇava half yellow. What he found striking was the figure's rather unusual hand gesture, with a raised thumb which he identified as 'an interment gesture', relating to the idea of the release of the soul from bondage to the earthly sphere and its ascent into the higher, heavenly spheres of the gods. He added that this interpretation would accord with the hypothesis that Bělahan was the place of Airlangga's interment. Some years earlier, Stutterheim (1934:198, note 3) had noted 'that Bělahan must be a place of interment, as can be inferred from the name of the village it belongs to: Wanasonja, which is a Javanization of a former Wanaśūnya, in which *śūnya* could mean *muksa*, *ilang*, etc.'.

Leaving aside his notion of a Hindu-Javanese temple as a 'place of interment', 'burial shrine', or 'mausoleum', long since refuted by Soekmono

---

Balinese origins of Airlangga's second wife. He only notes that the goddess on Viṣṇu's left wears a crown (*prabhā*), 'the shape of which is uncommon in East-Java', but it is unclear whether this observation is meant to support his conjecture about the queen's Balinese origins.

(1974, 1995), I think Stutterheim was right in linking the special hand gesture with mortuary rituals aiming at the deliverance of the soul of the deceased king. In that case, Bĕlahan is not King Airlangga's burial place, but the place where he was deified. Considering the evidence, Bĕlahan would seem to be a precursor of Majapahit mortuary practices and late eastern Javanese 'deification statues' (Klokke 1994a). Be that as it may, endorsement of Stutterheim's revised idea does not, in my opinion, preclude acceptance of Bosch's proposal that the gold-and-silver image represents a Harihara, given that it fits perfectly with Airlangga's association with both Viṣṇu and Śiva, attested to in the inscriptions as well as in the statues that hail from Bĕlahan. The Harihara figure is yet another expression of the divided or bipartite nature of the Bĕlahan site.

The larger of the two pools seems also to express this bipartite nature. According to De Haan (1924:144-5), Bĕlahan II 'has a totally different character [from Bĕlahan I] and represents what we referred to as a functional construction work, because it was really used as a facility for bathing. This is borne out by its simple and practical design with a large number of water outlets that are evenly distributed [along the sides of the pool]. Regrettably, very little remains of this structure. [...] It consists of a rectangular pool with sides of 13.44 metres and 9.10 metres. In about the middle of the shorter side a wall protrudes, as a result of which the pool is divided as it were into a front and a back part. In both the front and back parts there were two water outlets in the northern and southern walls, while twelve water outlets had [once] been installed in the western wall. None of the water outlets has been found. In the back part of the northern wall a tail-piece was found which made it possible to establish the location and height of the series [of water outlets].'

Relying on De Haan's architectural expertise, I think that the old Dutch designations *badplaats* (bathing place) and (*graf*)*badplaats* (tomb-bathing-place) are rather misleading, and had better not be translated literally. Instead I propose using the term 'bathing pool' for Bĕlahan II, which was actually used for this purpose, and 'ritual pool' for the smaller pool with the royal statues (Bĕlahan I), which presumably was only used on holy days for invoking the descent of the deified king, as suggested by Resink (see also Stutterheim 1931). As to the bathing pool, Sieburgh opines that it was a women's pool, an idea suggested to him by the high walls that still surrounded this pool when he visited the site during the first half of the nineteenth century. Very little is known about the design and ornamentation of this pool, except that one of the spouts (presumably the tail-piece mentioned by De Haan) was decorated with *makara*, the motif of a mythical aquatic monster, which some researchers take for a Śailendra emblem. I do not know why the women's pool, if indeed it was one, was divided into two

sections, nor why the ritual deposit box had been buried in the centre under a pyramidal object. Still, seeing that the division mirrors the differences the two goddesses, with the front section being somewhat larger than the back, it is conceivable that the two sections were reserved for Airlangga's two royal consorts, according to their rank. As indicated by the 'interment gesture' of the gold-and-silver image found in it, the ritual deposit box more likely was a 'reliquary casket', serving a memorial function rather than having served a purpose in a foundation ritual.¹⁸ If correct, this would help to explain the use of the rather unusual reference to *pāduka mpuṅku bhaṭāra guru sang lumāh ri tirtha*, which has caused so much perplexity among scholars and resulted in the clumsy terms (*graf*)*badplaats* and tomb-bathing-place. It now appears plausible that the information provided in the inscriptions reflects what actually happened, namely that Airlangga was deified in Bělahan in the form of Bhaṭāra Guru.

Summary

First reported on in the first half of the nineteenth century, the ruins of the royal bathing place of Bělahan on Mount Penanggungan in eastern Java attracted increasing attention from archaeologists and art historians. In 1909, Rouffaer put forward the idea that the statue of Viṣṇu mounted on Garuda in the Mojokerto Museum may once have adorned the Bělahan ritual pool and may represent King Airlangga, the famous eleventh-century eastern Javanese ruler (*Notulen* 1909). The idea was taken up by Krom (1914), who adduced epigraphic evidence in support of the identification. Subsequently, the Krom-Rouffaer hypothesis gradually acquired the status of an established theory.

In 1967, Resink questioned the hallowed status of the theory, which he dubbed a myth. His attack on the theory was three-pronged, comprising stylistic, architectural and epigraphic data. He proposed that the ritual pool and certain other structures at the site date from the reign of King Siṅdok in the first part of the tenth century, and therefore could not have been the site of Airlangga's enshrinement as the god Viṣṇu.

As is often the case in academia when a dominant view is openly challenged, most art historians were left perplexed by Resink's attack and held

¹⁸ One of the anonymous reviewers objected to my use of the term 'reliquary casket', observing that 'reliquaries only occur in Buddhism and in ancestral cults. Until now nothing has been found in the Classical Period which reminds of reliquaries, and cannot therefore be mentioned between whiles. [This] interesting subject deserves a separate investigation'. However, I was not referring to Airlangga's bodily remains, but to his ritual remains, which prompted me to use the gloss 'reliquary casket', now put between inverted commas, instead of urn. Note that the reviewer refers to the Classical Period, whereas the Bělahan temple site belongs to the East Javanese period (circa 928-1500); it is precisely this period that witnessed a resurgence of ancestral cults.

back, prudently awaiting further research developments. A few people such as the architectural historian Dumarçay endorsed the new theory. Some professional art historians, on the other hand, seemingly unmoved by Resink's arguments, continued to appeal to the Rouffaer-Krom hypothesis, or pointed to the art-historical correspondences between Bĕlahan and the eleventh-century Balinese bathing place of Goa Gajah while ignoring the inconsistencies between their dating and Resink's rival theory.

There would have been no reason to involve myself in this art-historical conundrum if I had not just confirmed Berg's 1938 identification of Airlangga's first wife as Śrī Sanggrāmawijaya, a Buddhist Śailendra princess. She also happens to be the princess whom Stutterheim (1938) persuasively linked with the goddess Śrī depicted on Viṣṇu's left at the Bĕlahan ritual pool. The statue of Lakṣmī, on Viṣṇu's right, Stutterheim identified as Airlangga's second wife. The curious division of the lotus goddess into Śrī and Lakṣmī reminded me of Stutterheim's earlier report (1934) of references in inscriptions to Airlangga's sons as 'partial' incarnations of the god Viṣṇu. The possibility dawned on me that the art-historical and the religio-political divisions are similar symbolic phenomena, and may have a connection with the historical division of Airlangga's realm into the kingdoms of Janggala and Pañjalu. Hence, my decision to critically review Resink's theory and the extant art-historical evidence to see if this would yield clues for finding a way out of the current impasse. I hoped that the exercise would also shed new light on the enigma of the division of Airlangga's realm.

Perusal of the archaeological literature confirms that the history of the Vaiṣṇava-Śaiva complex of Bĕlahan begins in the period of King Siṇḍok's reign in the early tenth century and ends sometime after the fourteenth century. This being said, there is evidence of Bĕlahan's occupation and use during the eleventh century, when King Airlangga ruled eastern Java. Some of this evidence, such as the iconography and art style of some of the free-standing spouting statues, Resink had discussed in his 1941 article but failed to mention in his 1967 article. However, the most unsatisfactory aspect of Resink's rival theory is that it has next to nothing to say about the identity of Viṣṇu and of Lakṣmī and Śrī.

Focusing on the statuary of the ritual pool, I found that epigraphic evidence from Boechari's 1968 research could be brought to bear on this problem. His research on the Turun Hyang inscription had yielded incontrovertible evidence in support of Krom's identification of Airlangga as the *paduka mpuṅku* of the Gandhakuti and Sumengka inscriptions. Almost certainly, he was the same individual as the *paduka mpuṅku* who was interred at the Bĕlahan bathing place in the form of Bhaṭāra Guru. Textual and epigraphic evidence supports the idea that royal personages were enshrined as Hindu deities, sometimes as Hindu and Buddhist deities. The gold-and-silver plaque

from the deposit box at Bělahan, on which a representation of Harihara is embossed, is particularly important.

Finding that the epigraphic and art-historical data relating to the bathing place fit Airlangga much better than Siṇdok, I conclude that the statuary of Bělahan's ritual pool may well represent Airlangga and his two royal consorts, as posited by Stutterheim. How, then, to explain the unusual arrangement of the statues? Elaborating on Stutterheim's identification of the statue of the goddess Śrī as Sanggrāmawijaya, I argue that her positioning on Airlangga's left can be explained by the princess's foreign Śailendra origins. The second princess Airlangga married most likely was a Javanese noblewoman, and precisely because of her being Javanese she was ranked higher than Sanggrāmawijaya. In inscriptions she was accorded the position of First Queen (*paramēśvari*), whereas Sanggrāmawijaya held the subordinate position of First Minister (*mahāmantri i hino*). At Bělahan, the First Queen's superior status is reflected in the positioning of the goddess Lakṣmī on Viṣṇu's right, and Sanggrāmawijaya's subordinate status in the positioning of the goddess Śrī on Viṣṇu's left.

According to Old Javanese textual sources, the discord between the sons born to Airlangga's two royal consorts was a crucial factor in his decision at the end of his long reign to divide his kingdom 'in order that both princes could be rulers'. Conceivably, with each of the sons claiming descent from Airlangga and following the conceptual model of Bělahan's ritual pool, the territorial division led to changes in religio-political terminology, such as the 'partial' incarnation of Viṣṇu in the rulers of Janggala and Pañjalu.

Acknowledgements

Following the Eighth Indonesian Archaeological Conference (PIA) in Yogyakarta, 15-18 February 1999, in which I was able to participate thanks to a travel grant from the International Institute of Asian Studies and the J. Gonda Foundation, I had the opportunity to visit various eastern Javanese temple sites, including Bělahan. This short study trip was meant to broaden my art-historical knowledge, which up to then had been largely confined to central Javanese Hindu-Buddhist antiquities, especially Candi Prambanan and Candi Kalasan. Little had I known that many years later I would revisit the Bělahan site and devote a special article to it in connection with my ongoing Śailendra research. The publication of this article gives me the opportunity to express my gratitude to both institutions for their financial support. I am grateful to Rita DeCoursey for the careful final editing and her suggestion to use the terms ritual pool and bathing pool, and to Affandy Santoso, Hans Borkent and Siebolt Kok for their help with the illustrations and the scanning of the photographs. I also want

to thank one of the anonymous referees of the manuscript whose 'minimalist interpretations of the evidence' and critical yet constructive comments resulted in a further refinement and expansion of my arguments.

References

- Berg, C.C.
1938 'De Arjunawiwāha, Er-Langga's levensloop en bruiloftslied?', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 97:19-94.
1961 'Javanese historiography; A synopsis of its evolution', in: D.G.E. Hall (ed.), *Historians of South East Asia*, pp. 13-171. London: Oxford University Press. [School of Oriental and African Studies, Historical Writing on the Peoples of Asia 2.]
- Bernet Kempers, A.J.
1959 *Ancient Indonesian art*. Amsterdam: Van der Peet.
1978 *Herstel in eigen waarde; Monumentenzorg in Indonesië*. Zutphen: Walburg Pers.
- Boechari
1967 'Rakryān Mahāmantri i Hino; A study on the highest court dignitary of ancient Java up to the 13th century A.D.', *Journal of the Historical Society* 2:7-20.
1968 'Sri Maharaja Mapanji Garasakan', *Majalah Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Indonesia* 4:1-26.
1990 'The inscription of Garamān, dated 975 Çaka; The new evidence on Airlangga's partition of his kingdom', in: Edi Sedyawati, Ingrid H.E. Pojoh and Supratikno Rahardjo (eds) *Monumen; Karya persembahan untuk Prof. Dr. R. Soekmono*, pp. 125-42, Depok: Lembaran Sastra, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Indonesia. [Seri Penerbitan Ilmiah 11, Edisi Khusus.]
- Bosch, F.D.K.
1929 [Review:] 'Dr. W.F. Stutterheim, a Javanese period in Sumatran history, Surakarta 1929', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (TBG)* 69:135-56.
- Brandes, J.
1906 'Een Buddhistisch monniksbeeld', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (TBG)* 48:37-57.
- Brown, Robert L.
1996 *The Dvāravātī wheels of the law and the Indianization of South East Asia*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill. [Studies in Asian Art and Archaeology 18.]
- Bruijn, Jean Victor de
1937 *H.N. Sieburgh en zijn beteekenis voor de Javaansche oudheidkunde*. Leiden: Luctor et Emergo. [PhD thesis, Leiden University.]
- Bullough, Nigel
1995 *Historic East Java; Remains in stone*. Singapore: AdLine Communications.
- Casparis, J.G. de
1958 *Airlangga*. Surabaya: Penerbitan Universitas Airlangga.

- 1999 'Airlangga; The threshold of the second millennium', *IIAS Newsletter* 18:30.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K.
[1965] *History of Indian and Indonesian art*. New York: Dover Publications. [First edition 1927.]
- Damais, Louis-Charles
1952 'Études d'épigraphie indonésienne', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 46:1-105.
- Domis, H.I.
1836 *De Residentie Passoeroeang op het eiland Java*. 's-Gravenhage: De Groot.
- Dumarçay, Jacques
1986 *Le savoir des maîtres d'œuvre javanais aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles*. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient. [Mémoires Archéologiques 17.]
- Fontein, Jan
1990 *The sculpture of Indonesia*. With essays by R. Soekmono and Edi Sedya-wati. Washington: National Gallery of Art, New York: Abrams.
- Haan, B. de
1924 'Drie Oost-Javaansche poortjes', Bijlage L, *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1923, Weltevreden/'s-Hage: Albrecht/Nijhoff.
1925 'Oost-Javaansche badplaatsen, II. Bělahan', Bijlage M, *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1924, Weltevreden/'s-Hage: Albrecht/Nijhoff.
- Hinzler, H.I.R. and J.A. Schoterman
1979 'A preliminary note on two recently discovered mss of the Nāgarakṛtā-gama', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 135:481-4.
- Holt, Claire
1967 *Art in Indonesia; Continuities and change*. Ithaca, N.Y./London: Cornell University Press.
- Jaarboek*
1936 *Jaarboek III 1936 van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*. Bandoeng: Nix.
- Jordaán, Roy E.
2003 'Wanua Tengah III and the problem of the origin of the Śailendra dynasty'. Paper, International Conference on Indonesian Art, New Delhi (IGNCA), 4-6 March.
2006a 'Who was Sri Sanggramawijaya?', in: Willem van der Molen (red.), *Milde regen; Liber amicorum voor Hans Teeuw bij zijn vijftigste verjaardag op 12 augustus 2006*, pp. 95-115. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.
2006b 'Exploring the role of the Śailendras in early eastern Javanese history'. Paper, International KITLV/ARI-NUS/IIAS/LIPI workshop 'Stranger-kings in Southeast Asia and elsewhere', Jakarta, 5-7 June. [To be published in Monash University Working Papers on Southeast Asia.]
- Kinney, Ann R.
2003 *Worshipping Siva and Buddha; The temple art of East Java*. With Marijke J. Klokke and Lydia Kieven. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Klokke, Marijke J.

- 1994a 'The iconography of the so-called portrait statues in late East Javanese art', in: Marijke J. Klokke and Pauline Lunsingh Scheurleer (eds), *Ancient Indonesian sculpture*, pp. 178-201. Leiden: KITLV Press. [Verhandelingen 165.]
- 1994b 'L'art indonésien', in: Maud Girard-Geslan, Marijke J. Klokke, Albert Le Bonheur, Donald M. Stadtner, Valérie Zaleski and Thierry Zéphir, *L'Art de l'Asie du Sud-Est*, pp. 333-69. Paris: Citadelles & Mazenod. [L'Art en les Grandes Civilisations 24.]
- 1998 'Ornamental motif: The stylistic method applied to ancient Javanese temple art', *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists*, Berlin, 31 August-4 September 1998, Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Hull.

Krom, N.J.

- 1913 'Epigraphische aantekeningen', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 55:585-98.
- 1914a 'De Wisnu van Bĕlahan; Bijschrift bij de foto', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 56:442-4.
- 1914b 'Epigraphische aantekeningen', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 56:233-56.
- 1916 Epigraphische aantekeningen, *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 57:522-8.
- 1923 *Inleiding tot de Hindoe-Javaansche kunst*. Tweede herziene druk. Vol 2. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff. [First edition 1920.]
- 1931 *Hindoe-Javaansche geschiedenis*. Tweede herziene druk. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff. [KITLV, met ondersteuning van het Departement van Koloniën.] [First edition 1926.]

Moens, J.L.

- 1955 'Airlangga's rijksdeling', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 85:449-54.

Nihom, Max

- 1986 'Ruler and realm; The division of Airlangga's kingdom in the fourteenth century', *Indonesia* 42:78-100.

Notulen

- 1909 *Notulen van de algemeene en directievergaderingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 47:176-89.

Patt, Judith Ann

- 1979 *The use and symbolism of water in ancient Indonesian art and architecture*. [Unpublished PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley.]

Poerbatjaraka, R.M. Ng.

- 1926 'De Calon-Arang', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 82:110-80.
- 1941 'Strophe 14 van de Sanskrit-zijde der Calcutta oorkonde', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 81:424-37.

Putra, Gusti Agung Gede and David J. Stuart-Fox

- 1977 *The elephant cave; Goa Gajah Bali*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Kanisius.

- Resink, Th.A.
 1941 'Nog drie spuiersbeelden van Belahan terechtgebracht?', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 81:181-8.
 1967 'Bĕlahan; Of een mythe ontluisterd', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 123:250-66.
 1968 'Bĕlahan or a myth dispelled', *Indonesia* 6:2-37.
- Robson, Stuart (translator)
 1995 *Deśawarnaṇa (Nāgarakṛtāgama)* [of Mpu Prapañca]. Leiden: KITLV Press. [Verhandelingen 169.]
- Setya Wardhani, D.S.
 1982 Çri Jayawarsa Digwijaya Sastraprabhu, in: *Seminar Sejarah Nasional III. Seksi Sejarah Kuno I*. [Jakarta:] Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Schnitger, F.M.
 1934 'Enkele oudheidkundige opmerkingen over het tantrisme op Java', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 92:149-59.
- Slametmulyana
 1979 *Nāgarakṛtāgama dan tafsir sejarahnya*. Jakarta: Bhratara Karya Aksara.
- Soekmono, R.
 1974 *Candi; Fungsi dan pengertiannya*. PhD thesis, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.
 1995 *The Javanese candi; function and meaning*. Translated from the Indonesian and adapted by Donald E. Weatherbee. Leiden: Brill. [Studies in Asian Art and Archaeology 17.]
- Stutterheim, W.F.
 1926 *Cultuurgeschiedenis van Java in beeld*. Weltevreden: Java Instituut.
 1927 'Een belangrijke oorkonde uit de Kedoe', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 67:172-215.
 1929 *A Javanese period in Sumatran history*. Surakarta: De Bliksem.
 1931 'The meaning of the Hindu-Javanese candi', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 51:1-15.
 1934 'Oudheidkundige aanteekeningen', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 92:181-210.
 1938 'De beelden van Belahan', *Djawa* 18:299-308.
 1940 'Koning Tĕguh op een oorkonde', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 80:345-66.
- Weatherbee, Donald E.
 1968 *Aspects of ancient Javanese politics*. PhD thesis, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Zoetmulder, P.J.
 1982 *Old Javanese-English dictionary*. With the collaboration of S.O. Robson. s'-Gravenhage: Nijhoff. Two vols. [KITLV.]