



## How to read a chronicle

The *Pararaton* as a conglomerate text

Wayan Jarrah Sastrawan

To cite this article: Wayan Jarrah Sastrawan (2020): How to read a chronicle, Indonesia and the Malay World, DOI: [10.1080/13639811.2020.1701325](https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2020.1701325)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2020.1701325>



Published online: 08 Jan 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

2019 YOUNG SCHOLAR PRIZE



## HOW TO READ A CHRONICLE The *Pararaton* as a conglomerate text

Wayan Jarrah Sastrawan

### ABSTRACT

Traditional historical chronicles from island Southeast Asia are crucial sources for our understanding of the region's pre-modern history. These chronicles were produced in contexts of textual practice that are unfamiliar to modern historians, which can result in erroneous interpretations of their historical meaning. In this article, I present a method for reading the region's chronicles that treats them as conglomerate texts, which consist of fragments of earlier texts that have been combined into new wholes. I illustrate the usefulness of this interpretive approach by examining the *Pararaton*, one of the main sources for the history of the late medieval kingdom of Java with its capital at Majapahit. The key findings of this article are a revised textual history of the *Pararaton*, new data from six unpublished manuscripts of the text, and a re-evaluation of the dynastic chronology of the Javanese kingdom between 1389 and 1429. These findings show that reading chronicles as conglomerate texts not only sheds light on their textual evolution, but also improves our understanding of the historical realities they refer to.

### KEYWORDS

history; historiography;  
philology; chronicle; Java;  
medieval

## Introduction

The traditional historiography of Indonesia and Malaysia is a vital resource for the study of the region's pre-modern history. Texts written in Javanese, Malay, and a number of other regional languages constitute the bulk of sources for history before 1500. The histories of pre-modern states, such as the Javanese kingdom at Majapahit or the Malay sultanate at Melaka, play a central role in discourses of identity in their successor nation-states (Legêne and Schulte Nordholt 2015; Vickers 2019). This is why the study of traditional historiographies is of great importance, not only to historians of the pre-modern period, but to Indonesian and Malaysian communities in general.

However, these traditional sources present significant challenges of interpretation and analysis, because they are very different to what we expect of a modern historical narrative. They often lack a strong narratorial voice and do not usually identify their authors. They are stylistically heterogeneous, mixing detailed historical anecdotes with formulaic annals and lengthy genealogies. They are sometimes structured haphazardly. They draw on older sources in ways that are rarely clear to modern readers. All of these factors lead to uncertainty about the nature and purpose of traditional historiographies, their reliability as historical sources, and the appropriate scholarly tools for reading them.

This article presents an interpretive model that emphasises the conglomerate nature of the region's historical texts. A conglomerate text is one that results from the fusion of heterogeneous materials into a whole, while preserving the differences among its original sources. In the pre-modern period, historians of this region tended to freely incorporate the wording and substance of pre-existing texts into new works of history, rather than using quotation and commentary to establish a perspectival distance between their own historical writings and the sources from which they drew. This practice of conglomeration lends these texts an inherent polyvocality, which must be accounted for when reading them as historical sources.

I substantiate this model of the conglomerate text through a close study of a key source for Javanese history: the *Pararaton*. This text narrates the history of the royal dynasty that ruled much of Java and dominated the Indonesian archipelago between the 13th and 15th centuries. I show how the conglomerate text model explains crucial features of the evolution and form of the *Pararaton*. The model allows for better interpretations of the text as a historical source, as it can account for inconsistencies in the text that many scholars have either missed or tried to explain away. When applied to this text, the conglomerate model helps to advance our understanding of Javanese history.

The article is organised as follows. In the first section, I outline the model of the conglomerate text and explain how it can be applied to certain kinds of historical text. In the second section, I give an account of the textual history of the *Pararaton*, using the conglomerate model as a guiding framework. In the third section, I use the model to show that the genealogical passages interspersed throughout the text were originally created separately and at different times. In the fourth section, I explain the duplication of chronicle entries about a particular royal figure as a fusion of two conflicting versions of the same events. I argue, against prevailing scholarly opinion, that the duplicated references refer to a single individual. In the fifth section, I show how reading the text using the conglomerate model can help to clear up misconceptions about the transfer of royal power from an early 15th-century king to his daughter, thereby raising new questions about the dynastic chronology of this period.

## The conglomerate model of historical text

One of the most important tools of historical research is source criticism. In order to construct a plausible account of the past based on written sources, it is necessary to understand how those sources evolved as texts. It has been said of the *Anglo-Saxon chronicle* that 'the process of "reading" the *Chronicle* is thus always a process of reading the textual history of the *Chronicle*' (Bredehoft 2001: 147). This sentiment applies equally to the historical texts of island Southeast Asia.

This article proposes a distinctive way of reading historical texts, by means of a theoretical model of the conglomerate text. I borrow the term 'conglomerate' (*Dictionary of Geography*, 2008) from geology, where it refers to a rock composed of pre-existing fragments that have been deposited in a fluid environment and then cemented together. The conglomerate rock metaphor aptly describes texts that are formed by the reorganisation of older text fragments into a new fixed whole, where the differences between those fragments are preserved. A conglomerate text is one that experiences many stages of fluidity, consolidation, and fragmentation in its history, and as a result, ends up having a complex and heterogeneous form.

The conglomerate model allows us to describe the development of certain kinds of text and to analyse them in terms of that development. The model is best suited to texts that are copied, excerpted, and reconstituted in manuscript form over a long period of time. Such texts differ from the ideal of the self-contained historical treatise written by a single author-investigator, such as Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian war*.<sup>1</sup> The conglomerate model is better suited to texts of multiple authorship, governed by scribal norms that blend the roles of composer, copyist, and editor, such as the *Anglo-Saxon chronicle* (Jorgensen 2010). Much traditional historiography of island Southeast Asia belongs squarely in this latter category (Kouznetsova 2006; Caldwell 2008; Chambert-Loir 2017).

A strength of the conglomerate model is that it treats fluidity and solidity as complementary aspects of a text, rather than as opposites. Scholars tend to read texts by prioritising either fluidity or solidity. For example, philological approaches focus on how texts change and diversify over time, while formalist analyses often emphasise the coherence of a text as a static whole. The conglomerate model accommodates both styles of reading, because it conceives of the text as being subject to alternating states of fluidity and solidity. It draws attention to the internal diversity within a textual whole and accounts for the different histories of its parts, while at the same time treating the consolidation of texts as a meaningful and deliberate strategy on the part of compilers.

The benefit of using an abstract interpretive model, such as that of the conglomerate text, is that it helps us to be more systematic in our reading and analysis of historical sources. By identifying the processes of fragmentation and consolidation that have shaped a particular text, we are better able to perceive features that would otherwise escape our attention. For instance, it is common that textual fragments are not explicitly demarcated within a conglomerate whole, which means that conflicting accounts and inconsistencies within a single text can be easily overlooked. In the case study below, I show how reading the *Pararaton* as a conglomerate text allows us to detect the boundaries between dissimilar fragments that have become obscure in the newer whole.

## A textual history of the *Pararaton*

The *Pararaton* ('The monarchs')<sup>2</sup> is a chronicle of the Girindra dynasty<sup>3</sup> of east Java. It is a prose text in a late variety of the Old Javanese language.<sup>4</sup> The narrative begins with the career of Angrok, who founded the dynasty in the early 13th century. It goes on to tell of the dynasty's restoration by Angrok's great-grandson Vijaya at the end of the 13th century and concludes with a catalogue of events in the 15th century. The text has been

<sup>1</sup>Nancy Partner (1995) argued that this ideal type of a single-authored historical monograph, valorised by the modern discipline of history, has its roots in ancient Greek and Roman historiography. I would add that examples of this ideal type appear in certain genres of East Asian and Middle Eastern historiography, but that it is rare in other contexts.

<sup>2</sup>The word *pararaton* is formed from *pa-(ra)ratu-an*, with the base word *ratu* 'monarch'. The partial re-duplication of the first syllable *ra-* is a common morphological variation in late varieties of Old Javanese, possibly connoting plurality. I take the circumfix *pa- -an* in the sense of 'the grouping, the whole of' (*de verzameling, het geheel van*) (Zoetmulder 1983: 69).

<sup>3</sup>This dynasty is sometimes also called the Rājasa dynasty, after the regnal name of its founder.

<sup>4</sup>In this article I quote from a new text edition that I am preparing (Sastrawan 2019), which accounts for the numerous manuscripts discovered since the 1920 reprinting of the 1896 published text edited by J.L.A. Brandes (1896); Brandes et al. (1920). I indicate places in the text by reference to the page and line numbers of the Brandes' original edition, in the following format: (Brandes 1896, page:line). I outline my approach to the romanisation of Old Javanese writing in the appendix.

transmitted through the Balinese manuscript tradition and exists in many copies there, but no copy of Javanese provenance has been found.

The structure of the text is heterogeneous, consisting of a chronological list that serves as a skeleton, onto which genealogical information and personal biographies are attached. This skeleton consists of short discrete chronicle entries that are dated using chronograms<sup>5</sup> and ordered by year.<sup>6</sup> The *Pararaton* thus belongs to the chronogram annals genre, which is one of the oldest genres of Javanese historiography. Such chronogram annals are found in epigraphical texts, such as the Pucangan inscription issued on 6 November 1041, and they remained popular well into the 19th century.

It is likely that the *Pararaton* was not originally known by this title, as it does not appear anywhere in the main text. The first sentence after the invocation reads: ‘Thus follows the story of Ken Angrok’ (*nihan katuturanira Ken Angrok*).<sup>7</sup> *Katuturanira Ken Angrok* may have been the title originally applied to the text, or at least to the part of it that focuses on Angrok’s life. The title *Pararaton* is found in the colophons of only 7 of the 16 extant witnesses (see the appendix for details); the earliest colophon to bear this title is dated 3 August 1613. This shows that not every lineage of manuscript transmission referred to this text as the *Pararaton*. Nevertheless, since the text is now universally known by this title, and since the title *Katuturanira Ken Angrok* is too narrowly focussed on one person, I continue to refer to the text as the *Pararaton*.<sup>8</sup>

The text does not provide the name of its author or any explicit details about when and where it was first produced. The text’s heterogeneity and inconsistencies of detail show that it was not composed at a single time by a single author. Rather, pre-existing sections of text were combined at multiple stages, resulting in the text as we have it in the present day.<sup>9</sup> This textual history suggests that the conglomerate model may be useful in the interpretation of the *Pararaton*, because of the model’s capacity to describe the interplay between solidity and fluidity in textual transmission.

I discern four distinct processes (see [Box 1](#) below) at work in the production of the *Pararaton* that roughly correspond to successive periods: creation, compilation, copying, and printing. The correspondences between process and period are not strict. Copying may have occurred to varying degrees in all four periods, and new material may have been created during the second period. But the high degree of consistency

<sup>5</sup>A chronogram is a string of words that symbolise the digits of a year numeral, according to an established system of conventions (Noorduyn 1993, Teeuw 1998, Wieringa 2012). For example, the final event mentioned in this text is: ‘then the Watugunung eruption, in Śaka bodies-sky-oceans-tail, 1403’ (*tumuli guntur Pawatugunung, i śaka, kāya-ambara-sagara-ikū, 1403*) (Brandes 1896: 32, line 26). Here the words of the chronogram ‘bodies-sky-oceans-tail’ represents the digits in the year numeral 1403 in reverse order: bodies = 3, sky = 0, oceans = 4, tail = 1.

<sup>6</sup>The *Pararaton* uses the Śaka era, which ran on average 78 years and 11 weeks ahead of the Common Era (CE) during the period covered by the text (Proudfoot 2007: 110). In this article I convert all Śaka years to CE years by adding 78 years, and I use an asterisk to indicate the discrepancy between the starting dates of the Śaka year and the CE year. For example, I write \*1222 to refer to the year 1144 Śaka, which ran from the new moon in March 1222 CE to the new moon in March 1223 CE.

<sup>7</sup>Another prose text of similar age to the *Pararaton* introduces its title with identical phrasing: ‘Thus follows (*nihan*) the Sang Hyang Tantu Panggĕlaran’ (Pigeaud 1924).

<sup>8</sup>The title *Sĕrat Pararaton*, which first appeared in Brandes’ edition, seems to have been inspired by the *sĕrat* texts of later Javanese literature. There is no good reason to refer to the *Pararaton* as a *sĕrat*, as that term does not appear in the text itself or in any of its witnesses’ colophons.

<sup>9</sup>These features of the structure and composition of the *Pararaton* were first mentioned by Brandes (1896: 2). They were discussed at length in N.J. Krom’s (1921) article ‘The composition of the *Pararaton*’, to which C.C. Berg (1962) gave an extensive response. J.J. Ras (1986) studied the *Pararaton*’s heterogeneous form and plural authorship in the course of his preparation of a new critical edition, which has not been published.

between the extant manuscript copies of the text suggests that very little new composition or compilation occurred in the third or fourth periods, after the appearance of the first dated manuscript in \*1600.<sup>10</sup> The fourth period involves the publication of printed text editions based on one or more manuscripts, but also the transcription of printed copies back into manuscript form.

**Box 1.** Four dominant processes in the production of the *Pararaton*.

Dominant Process	Period
Creation of new written material	Early 13th – late 15th century
Compilation of material in order	Late 15th – end of 16th century
Copying of manuscripts	Start of 17th – late 20th century
Editing and printing of text	End of 19th century – present day

The first period, in which the creation of new material seems to have been most prominent, ended sometime after the date of the final event narrated in the text: a volcanic eruption in 23–29 September 1481, during the week of Watugunung. The earliest material, concerning Angrok's childhood, cannot have been written before his birth in \*1182.<sup>11</sup> As will be discussed below, a number of textual inconsistencies indicate that different parts of the text were composed at different times during this period: chronogram annals, biographies of royal leaders, and concise dynastic genealogies.

The second period of the *Pararaton*'s textual history involved the compilation of the various texts created during the first period. In the second period, the materials were organised in ascending chronological order, as reflected in the extant text.<sup>12</sup> This period lasted from after the last recorded event in 1481 until before the first recorded act of copying in \*1600, although it is possible that older material had been compiled before newer material was created.

The compilation process involved a certain degree of textual fluidity, since the existing content had to be reordered and recontextualised in order to achieve chronological order in the new whole. However, the original wording and style of the source texts was maintained; the compiler(s) neither attempted to homogenise the content of the sources, nor adopted a well defined authorial position with respect to them. In this way, solidity was maintained at the micro level of the text, but the compilation process introduced fluidity at the macro level. To return to the geological metaphor, this process is analogous to the deposition of solid clasts in a fluid environment, which is the precursor of the formation of conglomerate rock.

The single *Pararaton* text that resulted from the compilation process was subsequently copied many times; this copying process happened in the third period of its textual history. All of the known manuscripts produced during the third period have Balinese provenance, but internal evidence from the text suggests that it existed in eastern Java

<sup>10</sup>This is recorded in the colophon of witness C; see the appendix.

<sup>11</sup>Berg (1962: 158) suggested that Prapañca, the author of the *Deśavarṇana* (dated 30 September 1365), had access to an early copy of the Angrok part of the *Pararaton* and drew on it for his account of the 13th century. While there is no direct evidence that Prapañca himself used such a 'proto-*Pararaton*', it is not impossible that some parts of the extant *Pararaton* text may have existed in written form during the 14th century.

<sup>12</sup>Only 4 of the 68 dated entries in the text appear out of chronological order. Of these, only the entry dated \*1440 (Brandes 1896: 32, line 3) appears to be genuinely out of order, while the other three are likely to have been in order originally but had their values changed due to errors in the later copying process.

during the first<sup>13</sup> and second<sup>14</sup> periods. This implies that one or more copies of the text were transported from eastern Java to Bali at some point between the second and third periods.<sup>15</sup> There are no clues in the text as to when and in what context this may have occurred, but it must have happened before the end of the 16th century, since copies were proliferating in Bali throughout the 17th century.<sup>16</sup>

Variation between the extant manuscripts exists only at the clause and word levels, not at higher discourse levels. Such variation is generated by the copying process and indicates that very little material was created or compiled during the third period. In geological terms, the *Pararaton* had solidified by the 17th century, with its diverse component parts maintaining their heterogeneity while being fixed within the whole. Acts of copying this new whole were sometimes recorded in colophons appended to the end of the text.<sup>17</sup>

In the appendix, I list all the extant manuscripts of the *Pararaton* that are publicly accessible and known to scholarship. Colophons dating before 1700 are rare in the Balinese manuscript tradition, so the presence of three independent 17th-century colophons among these manuscripts indicates that the *Pararaton* had an unusually wide distribution in Bali during the third period. The early colophons do not imply that all the extant manuscripts derive from one of these three 17th-century prototypes, because there may have been other prototypes of similar age which either had no colophons or the colophons were discarded in later copies. The colophons and distribution of variant readings give some suggestion of filiation between certain witnesses, but it is not yet possible to construct a full picture of the manuscript transmission of this text.

The fourth stage of the *Pararaton*'s textual history began with J.L.A. Brandes' publication of a critical edition in romanised script and Dutch translation in 1896. This edition was based on three manuscripts (witnesses A, B, and C) held in the collection of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences. Brandes' copious historical and philological commentary quickly established this text as an authoritative source for pre-Islamic Javanese history. Brandes' edition was reprinted in 1920 by a team led by N.J. Krom; this reprinting included additional commentary and seven more manuscripts in its critical apparatus.<sup>18</sup> Almost all subsequent printed editions of the *Pararaton* are based on Brandes' original critical edition, while furnishing their own translations into English or

<sup>13</sup>Thomas Hunter (2007: 44–45) showed that the *Pararaton* uses *sira* as a third-person pronoun in the narrator's voice but as a second-person pronoun in quoted direct speech. From this, he argued that the *Pararaton* exhibits an incipient 'process of literization' of Middle Javanese, and that it therefore must have occurred in the context of 'the everyday use of some form of spoken Javanese by a sizeable linguistic community'. This implies that the creation process of the first period must have occurred in Java and not in Bali.

<sup>14</sup>The text's exclusive focus on the Girindra royal dynasty suggests that the compilation period may have occurred in a context where records pertaining to this dynasty were easily accessible; this is more likely to have been somewhere close to the dynasty's centre of power in eastern Java, rather than in Bali.

<sup>15</sup>If the compilation was done around the Majapahit or Daha courts sometime in the late 15th or early 16th century, then the text may have moved eastward to Bali shortly thereafter. This hypothesis is broadly consistent with later traditions about Majapahit court texts and customs being brought to Bali in the early 16th century (Vickers 2012: 76), but it remains purely speculative for lack of direct evidence.

<sup>16</sup>The earliest evidence that the *Pararaton* was copied in Bali is the colophon dated 3 August 1613, found in witnesses B and F. The earlier \*1600 colophon of witness C gives no geographical information. See the appendix for further details.

<sup>17</sup>These colophons were sometimes copied into new manuscripts, which means that a colophon does not necessarily refer to the production of a particular manuscript but may instead refer to the copying of any of its predecessors in a line of transmission.

<sup>18</sup>In his preface to this reprint, Krom stated that 'the text is also entirely the old one, aside from a few corrected printing errors' (*De tekst is eveneens geheel de oude daargelaten een paar verbeterde drukfouten*, Brandes et al. 1920: xiv). What is original in this second edition is the expanded apparatus prepared by H. Kraemer (including all the manuscripts of the

Indonesian (Pitono Hardjowardojo 1965; Padmapuspita 1966; Phalgunadi 1996; Kasdi 2008). Agung Kriswanto's (2009) recent publication is not based on Brandes' edition but is a diplomatic transcription and Indonesian translation of witness C.

The printed edition of the *Pararaton* had a direct impact on the manuscript tradition, because in several instances, it was transcribed back onto palm leaves. Manuscript and printed copies of the text thus exerted an influence on each other. By comparing a number of variant readings, it is possible to identify several manuscripts as direct transcriptions of Brandes' edition; these are listed under a separate heading in the appendix. Their existence shows that the printing of the *Pararaton* did not supersede the manuscript tradition but provided new sources for manuscript transmission in the 20th century.

The history of the *Pararaton* as a conglomerate text has left traces in its structure and form. This is particularly true of the second period, when the compilation process was dominant. The next three sections of the article examine particular features of the extant text through the model of the conglomerate text, in order to advance our understanding of the *Pararaton* as a historical source. These sections analyse two important phenomena that emerged due to the compilation process: the embedding of genealogical passages throughout the text and the fusion of conflicting annals for the \*1389–\*1429 period.

## Embedded genealogies

The *Pararaton* contains many discrete passages of genealogical information, which follow a standard format: the title of a single progenitor (male or female), followed by a list of that progenitor's children, each item of which includes their own titles and the titles of their spouses. Each passage thus contains information about two generations only, rather than a vertical lineage of many generations. As a result, most of these passages are quite short, averaging around forty words each.

There are a number of stylistic variations among the genealogical passages, which suggest that they originally belonged to separate documents written at different times. The first of these variations is the nomenclature used to identify dynastic figures. In the passages set in the 13th century, these figures are referred to by unique identifiers: either by a noble title plus a personal name (e.g. *ken Angrok*), or by their *pañji*, which is a type of honorific (e.g. *sang apañji Tohjaya*, 'the one with the Tohjaya honorific'). By contrast, in the passages set in the 14th and 15th centuries, dynastic figures are referred to as the ruler of a particular palace (e.g. *bhaṭāra i Daha*, 'the ruler at Daha', usually abbreviated to *bhre Daha*). These palace references are not unique identifiers, because multiple individuals assumed rulership over a palace in succession, and an individual might transfer from palace to palace during his or her life.<sup>19</sup>

The use of non-specific palace references, without any effort to disambiguate previous and current holders of those positions, suggests that these passages were intended to describe the situation at the time of writing. A document about contemporary politics

---

*Pararaton* held by the Leiden University Library at that time), and the additional commentary by Poerbatjaraka and J.C.G. Jonker, based on their own studies of the text.

<sup>19</sup>For example, *Sūraprabhāva* is stated to have been promoted to successively higher-ranked palaces: 'The ruler at Paṅḍan Salas began to reign at Tumpəl, and then became the sovereign' (*bhre Paṅḍan Salas ariñēng ing Tumpəl, anuli prabhu*, Brandes 1896: 32, line 21).

would not need to specify the personal identity of each *bhaṭāra*, because palace references would always refer to the current incumbent without ambiguity.<sup>20</sup> Only after these originally separate documents were conglomerated into the whole *Pararaton* text did there emerge any ambiguity about the personal identities of various *bhaṭāra*.

Comparison of the titles used in the *Pararaton* with those found in royal inscriptions suggests when these original documents may have been written. The *pañji* identifier is most common in inscriptions of the 12th and 13th centuries, while the use of the *bhaṭāra* title by living royal figures is found only in inscriptions of the late 14th and 15th century.<sup>21</sup> If we assume that the language of genealogical passages in the *Pararaton* reflects usage that was current when those passages were first written, then the shift from personal identifiers to generic palace references may indicate that the earlier passages were written before the mid 14th century, while the later passages were written after this time.<sup>22</sup>

By comparison with inscriptions, it is possible to personally identify many of the *bhaṭāra* mentioned in these genealogical passages, and these identifications in turn allow us to further specify when the passages were written. For example, the various titles applied to the 15th-century sovereigns Suhitā (r. \*1429–\*1447) and Kṛtavijaya (r. \*1447–\*1451) allow us to place temporal bounds on some of the later genealogical passages. In all the genealogies that occur in the text before the report of Suhitā's death in \*1447, she is referred to by the title 'sovereign queen' (*prabhu strī*). This is consistent with the general convention of the text to refer to dynastic figures by their final and most senior title (Noorduyn 1978: 217). In these sections, Kṛtavijaya is referred to only as *bhre Tumapēl*, despite the fact that he became the sovereign (*prabhu*) after Suhitā's death, and so should have been referred to as such if the passages had been written during his reign. This suggests that the genealogical passages occurring before the \*1447 entry were written during Suhitā's reign, while those occurring after the \*1447 entry must have been written after her death.<sup>23</sup>

The placement of genealogical passages within the chronological frame of the *Pararaton* provides evidence for how these separate text-blocks became part of the conglomerate whole. The passages do not contain any internal chronological information; neither the

<sup>20</sup>The only instance in the text of an explicitly disambiguated palace reference is that of the two *bhre Lasēm* of the late 14th century, who are referred to by their nicknames *bhre Lasēm sang ahayu* ('the ruler at Lasēm, the beautiful one') and *bhre Lasēm sang alēmu* ('the ruler at Lasēm, the fat one'). Noorduyn (1978: 267–268) argued convincingly that this duplication was due to two individuals from rival branches of the dynasty contesting the position of *bhre Lasēm*. This example shows that the *bhaṭāra* palace terms refer uniquely to the incumbent at the time of writing, and when two people held the same title concurrently, they are explicitly disambiguated with an extra specifier.

<sup>21</sup>My word searches for *pañji* and *bhaṭāra* in the published corpora of inscriptions find *pañji* being used occasionally for officials in the 9th and early 11th centuries, frequently for both officials and kings in the 12th and early 13th centuries, and infrequently for officials in the 14th century. The first use of *bhaṭāra* to refer to the palace of a living ruler seems to be in the Kuśmala/Kandangan inscription (issued on 14 December 1350) where a *bhaṭāre Matahun* ('ruler at Matahun') is mentioned (van Stein Callenfels 1918). The *bhaṭāra* palace references are the standard way of referring to members of the royal family in the Waringin Pitu inscription, issued on 22 November 1447 (Noorduyn 1978).

<sup>22</sup>A similar argument could be made concerning a change in the term used for 'paramount ruler' in the text, with the term *ratu* more frequent in the early parts and *prabhu* more frequent in the later parts. Since these two words are nearly synonymous, the preference for one of them over the other may reflect the stylistic peculiarities of the original source materials that were later compiled in the *Pararaton*.

<sup>23</sup>The text is ambiguous on the question of Suhitā's year of death, as I discuss at length in the final section of the article. The evidence I present here offers some circumstantial support for Krom's theory that Suhitā died in \*1447, so for the meantime, I provisionally accept his chronology. Later I discuss some of the weaknesses of Krom's interpretation and argue that reading the text as a conglomerate can help to clarify the matter.

years of birth nor the relative ages of siblings and parents are given. This further supports my hypothesis that these passages were not written to describe the chronology of dynastic births and marriages, but rather, to provide a snapshot of contemporary kinship relations at a particular time.

The embedding of dateless genealogies into a chronicle frame results in anachronism. For example, a relatively long genealogical passage is placed between two chronicle entries: the death of a *bhre Tumapĕl* in \*1386 and the death of a *bhra Parameśvara* in \*1388. However, it is clear that the genealogy was written in later decades, because several of its details indicate a 15th-century context. The genealogy refers to Kṛtavijaya as *bhre Tumapĕl*, which only applies after he inherited the title in \*1427 (Noorduyn 1978: 236). Similarly, it refers to his consort Jayeśvarī as *bhre Daha*, which could only apply after the death of the previous *bhre Daha* in \*1416 (Noorduyn 1978: 214).

The anachronistic embedding of genealogical passages into the *Pararaton* has an important consequence for how the text should be read. It means that the identities of *bhaṭāra* in the genealogies are not necessarily the same as those in the surrounding chronicle entries. Returning to the example in the previous paragraph, the *bhra Parameśvara* who died in \*1388 is securely identified as Vijayarājasa (fl. \*1329–\*1388), thanks to contemporary inscriptions issued in his name. But in the genealogy that is embedded between these two dates, *bhra Parameśvara* refers instead to Ratnapaṅkaja (fl. \*1404–\*1446). Only by reading the genealogies as later pieces of text that were inserted anachronistically into the chronicle can we correctly identify the individuals they mention.<sup>24</sup>

### One or two *Wĕkas Ing Sukha*?

Among the most important historical events mentioned in the *Pararaton* are the deaths and abdications of the sovereign rulers of Java. Since inscriptions very rarely furnish the dates of rulers' death, the *Pararaton* is the sole source of this data from the mid 14th to the end of the 15th century. The text presents a major problem in this regard, because it describes several sovereigns as having vacated the throne twice in different years, due to either death or abdication.

Below are the conflicting chronicle entries concerning the death of a royal figure called *bhra hyang Wĕkas Ing Sukha* ('the deified ruler Highest-in-Joy'), who is identified in the text as the famous king Hayam Wuruk. The Old Javanese text in [Boxes 2a](#) and [2b](#) is based on my revised edition (Sastrawan 2019).<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup>Berg (2007: 95–97, 1962: 62–72), as part of the general theory of Javanese historiography that he developed in the 1950s and 1960s, argued the genealogies in the *Pararaton* do not refer to historical realities, but are variations of the same schematic pattern grounded in a Buddhist myth. He based this argument on certain structural similarities that he discerned between the family trees of successive generations in the dynasty, and so suggested that many of these genealogies had been fabricated to fit a set schema. I suggest that the conglomerate model used in this article, which explains the anachronistic placement of genealogies, offers a more plausible explanation for the peculiarities of the text rather than Berg's theory of deliberate fabrication.

<sup>25</sup>In the apparatus, I include variant readings only where they differ significantly from the majority of witnesses. Witnesses are indicated by capital letters. My preferred reading is given to the left of the double vertical bar, and alternative readings are given to the right of the double bar, separated by single bars. The null sign ø indicates that the witness supplies no reading for that variation unit.

**Box 2a.** Conflicting chronicle entries on Wēkas Ing Sukha.

Text	Translation
bhra yaṃ vkaṣ iṃ suka mokta, °i śaka, medinī <sup>26</sup> rūpa rāmeku, 1311, bhra yaṃ viśeṣa prabhu <sup>27</sup>	The deified ruler Wēkas Ing Sukha died, in Śaka earth-form-Rāmas-tail, 1311 [*1389]. The deified ruler Viśeṣa was sovereign.
[1320–1321:] bhra yaṃ vkaṣ iṃ suka haken apatiha <sup>28</sup> riṃ sira gajaḥ maṇuri <sup>29</sup>	[*1398–*1399:] The deified ruler Wēkas Ing Sukha ordered Gajah Manguri to become chief minister.
bhra yaṃ vkaṣ iṃ suka mokta, saṃ mokta <sup>30</sup> riṃ indrabhavana, °i śaka, janma <sup>32</sup> netrāgni <sup>33</sup> śitāṅśu, 1321, saṃ dhinaṛmma riṃ tajurṃ, <sup>34</sup> bhīṣekaniṃ dhāṛmma riṃ paramasukapura	The deified ruler Wēkas Ing Sukha died, the one who was released to the abode of Indra, in Śaka person-eyes-fires-moon, 1321 [*1399]. He was enshrined at Tajung; the name of the shrine was Paramasukhapura.

Historians have tried to resolve these contradictions by postulating the existence of two individuals with the same title: Wēkas Ing Sukha I who died in \*1389 (Hayam Wuruk) and Wēkas Ing Sukha II who died in \*1399 (someone else). This suggestion was first made by Brandes (1896: 151) and was then elaborated by Krom (1931: 427–428); it was subsequently accepted as fact by most historians (Schrieke 1957: 31; Berg 1962: 118–120; Weatherbee 1968: 438, Noorduyn 1978: 268). The second Wēkas Ing Sukha was identified as the grandchild of the first, on the basis of a single genealogical statement (Box 2b below).

**Box 2b.** Genealogical statement about Wēkas Ing Sukha.

Text	Translation
sira saṃ aṅambī <sup>35</sup> bhre <sup>36</sup> lasēm <sup>37</sup> saṅ ahayu <sup>38</sup> , haputra mijil bhra <sup>39</sup> yaṃ <sup>40</sup> vkaṣ iṃ suka <sup>41</sup>	It was he who took as wife the ruler at Lasēm, the beautiful one, having a child: the deified ruler Wēkas Ing Sukha

The subject of this sentence (‘he who took *bhre Lasēm* as wife’) is identified in preceding clauses as *bhra hyang Viśeṣa*. Since this *bhre Lasēm* was the daughter of Wēkas Ing Sukha I, it was assumed by Brandes (1896: 150) and later historians, that her child was named after her father.

The hypothesis of two individuals called Wēkas Ing Sukha is hard to accept. The genealogical statement above is directly contradicted by another passage listing the children of *bhra hyang Viśeṣa*: *bhre Tumapël* (no personal title given), the Sovereign Queen (Devī Suhitā), and another *bhre Tumapël* (Śrī Kṛtavijaya) (Brandes 1896: 30, lines 3–5). No-one called Wēkas Ing Sukha appears in this list of children. Brandes (1896: 147) and Noorduyn (1978: 268) tried to account for this absence by assuming that Wēkas Ing Suka II was

<sup>26</sup>*medinī* DGILQ || *medini* BCEFKMP | *modinirī* N

<sup>27</sup>*prabhu* CDGILMPQ || *ratu* BF | *prabhū* EK | *prabu* N

<sup>28</sup>*apatiha* CDGIKLMQ || *apatihha* E | *apatih* NP

<sup>29</sup>This whole passage, from *bhra yaṃ* to *gajah maṇuri*, is omitted in BF

<sup>30</sup>*saṃ mokta* BCDEFGIKLMPQ || ∅ N

<sup>31</sup>*bhavana* BCDFGIKLMQ || *bhavanā* E | *bvaṅnā* N

<sup>32</sup>*janma* CEFGIKLPQ || ∅ B | *janmā* DMN

<sup>33</sup>*netrāgni* CDGIKLMQ || *netragni* BEF | *netraghni* N | *netryagni* P

<sup>34</sup>*tajurṃ* BCDEFGIKLMPQ || *tajurṃ* N

<sup>35</sup>*aṅambī* BCDEFIKLMPQ || *ambī* N

<sup>36</sup>*bhre* BCDEFIKLMPQ || *bhrem* N

<sup>37</sup>∅ CDEIKLMNPQ || *sara* BF

<sup>38</sup>*ahayu* CDILMQ || *ayu* BFNP | *aha* ∅ EK. Witnesses E and K omit the rest of this passage.

<sup>39</sup>*bhra* BCDFILMPQ || *bra* N

<sup>40</sup>*yaṃ* BCDFILMQ || *ya* N | *hyam* P

<sup>41</sup>*wkaṣ iṃ suka* DILMQ || *wkaṣ iṃ sukā* BFN | *wka suka* C | *wkaṣ* P

a child of Viśeṣa and *bhre Lasēm* who was significantly older than the other three, and hence was mentioned separately to them. This line of argument is unconvincing because elsewhere in the text, full siblings are always grouped together when they are listed as their parents' children.

The editors of Volume II of Indonesia's official national history offered a different explanation, which identified Wēkas Ing Sukha II with the elder *bhre Tumapel* (Sumadio et al. 1984: 440). But if the elder *bhre Tumapel* really did obtain the title Wēkas Ing Sukha later in life, it would have been mentioned in this list, as is the case with his younger brother, the *bhre Tumapel* who took the name Śrī Kṛtavijaya when he became the sovereign. Schrieke (1957: 31–32) suggested that the three younger siblings were not born to *bhre Lasēm* but to an unnamed secondary wife of Viśeṣa. This hypothesis is based solely on the fact that *bhre Lasēm* is not explicitly mentioned as the mother of the three younger children. But it is common practice in these genealogical passages for only one parent to be mentioned when a couple's children are listed. In fact, all secondary wives are explicitly referred to as such by the terms *rabi haji*, *rabi anom*, *rabi kṣatriya* and *bini haji* (Noorduyn 1978: 268). It is clear by looking at the other genealogical passages that an individual's children may be assumed to have been born of their primary spouse unless explicitly stated otherwise. Hence there is little reason to doubt that the two brothers called *bhre Tumapel* and their sister Suhitā were children of Viśeṣa by his primary wife *bhre Lasēm*, especially since both Suhitā and the younger *bhre Tumapel* (Kṛtavijaya) eventually became sovereigns.

The text's statement that Wēkas Ing Sukha was a child of *bhre Lasēm* and Viśeṣa remains problematic. It occurs in the middle of a sentence listing Viśeṣa as the eldest child of *bhre Pajang*, which means that Wēkas Ing Sukha appears there as her grandchild. This is highly irregular, because these genealogical entries follow a strict format, as described in the previous section: one parent, followed by a list of their children in age order and those children's spouses. Grandchildren are never included in a single list with their grandparents. This irregularity raises the possibility that the clause 'having a child: the deified ruler Wēkas Ing Sukha', may have been interpolated from another genealogy. Given the anachronistic insertion of genealogies discussed in the previous section, this is not unlikely.

Another reason to be sceptical that there were two individuals called Wēkas Ing Sukha is the historical implausibility of the powerful role attributed to the putative Wēkas Ing Sukha II. The text states that, sometime between \*1398 and \*1399, Wēkas Ing Sukha appointed a new chief minister (*patih*). Such an appointment, the highest in the Javanese government at the time, is more likely to have been made by the reigning sovereign than by a young royal.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, if Wēkas Ing Sukha II was indeed Hayam Wuruk's grandchild, they would have been impractically young to hold such power. Hayam Wuruk's daughter *bhre Lasēm* must have been born after his marriage to his primary wife Paduka Śōri in \*1357 and before the completion on 30 September 1365 of the

<sup>42</sup>Krom (1931: 427) acknowledged that it would have been a deviation from normal practice to have a non-sovereign ordering such an appointment. He offered an unconvincing argument that Wēkas Ing Sukha II wielded such authority because he was the 'only male descendant' (*eenige mannelijke afstammeling*) of Hayam Wuruk. In fact, the text gives no information about the gender of Wēkas Ing Sukha II. There are no known cases in 14th-century Java of a junior royal being given such great authority. Even Hayam Wuruk himself in \*1364, at the age of thirty and having already been sole sovereign for 14 years, could not appoint a new chief minister without the agreement of his parents, aunts, uncles, and other relatives (Pigeaud 1960: 55).

poem *Desavarṇana*, which describes this daughter as being below marriageable age (Pigeaud 1960: 6). The earliest that she could have given birth is therefore around the early 1370s, which would place her child, at the oldest, in their mid-twenties in \*1398. It is much more plausible that the Wēkas Ing Sukha who appointed a new chief minister was the 64 year old sovereign Hayam Wuruk, rather than his young grandchild.

Based on the points made above, I argue that it is much more likely that all instances of the title Wēkas Ing Sukha refer to the same individual: Hayam Wuruk.<sup>43</sup> The duplicated notices of his death can be explained by the mixing of two separate and conflicting traditions, one giving Wēkas Ing Sukha's year of death as \*1389, and the other giving it as \*1399. The theory of the existence of a Wēkas Ing Sukha II is supported only by a single and possibly interpolated statement that is contradicted elsewhere in the text. Despite this weakness, the theory was accepted by scholars because of their desire to read the *Pararaton* as a consistent whole. If we instead read the chronicle as a conglomeration of sometimes contradictory sources, we can arrive at a more plausible interpretation of the historical events it narrates.

### King Viśeṣa's premature retirement

The effect of integrating two conflicting chronologies into the *Pararaton* text is also apparent in its reporting of the early 15th century. The text and translation of the relevant passages are given in Box 3.

#### Box 3. Conflicting chronicle entries on the transition between the reigns of Viśeṣa and Suhitā

Text	Translation
bhra yaṃ viśeṣa sira bhagavān, ʾi śaka, netra pakṣāgni śitāṅśu, 1322, bhaṭārestri <sup>44</sup> prabhu <sup>45</sup>	The deified ruler Viśeṣa was a sage, in Śaka eyes-wings-fires-moon, 1322 [*1400]. The queen was Sovereign.
bhra yaṃ viśeṣa mokta, dhinaṛmmem lalaṅon, bhiṣekaniṃ <sup>46</sup> dharmma <sup>47</sup> riṃ paramaviśeṣapura, <sup>48</sup> bhra prabhu stri <sup>49</sup> mokta, ʾi śaka, rūpānilāgni śitāṅśu, 1351	The deified ruler Viśeṣa died and was enshrined at Lalangon; the name of the shrine was Paramaviśeṣapura. The Sovereign Queen died, in Śaka form-winds-fires-moon, 1351 [*1429].
bhra prabhu stri <sup>50</sup> mokta, ʾi śaka, nava rasāgni śitāṅśu, 1369 <sup>51</sup> , tuṅgal dhinaṛmmem siṅhajaya, tumuli bhre tumapēl haṅganteni <sup>52</sup> prabhu	The Sovereign Queen died, in Śaka nine-feelings-fires-moon, 1369 [*1447], and was enshrined together with [her husband] at Siṅhajaya. Then the ruler at Tumapēl replaced her as sovereign.

<sup>43</sup>The title Bhra Hyang Wēkas Ing Sukha appears in two other contemporary documents. The Walaṅḍit B inscription, issued on 21 June 1405, refers to *Bhaṭāra Hyang Wēkas Ing Suka* as the ruler who issued the earlier Walaṅḍit A inscription, whose date of issue is unclear, but may have been in late November or early December 1381 (Damais 1952: 78–79). The opening canto of the poem *Arjunavijaya* mentions the synonymous titles *Sang Hyang Wēkas Ing Sukha* and *Sang Pamēkas Ing Tuṣṭa*, which unambiguously refer to Hayam Wuruk as the sovereign at the time of the poem's composition, sometime in the final third of the 14th century (Supomo 1977: 4). In these cases, the title Wēkas Ing Sukha clearly refers to the paramount ruler of the kingdom, which rules out the young child of *bhre Lasēm*.

<sup>44</sup>*bhaṭārestri* DIGLMQ || *bhaṭārestri* BFKN | *bhaṭārestri* CP | *bhaṭari stri* E

<sup>45</sup>*prabhu* CDEGIKLMQP || *prabhū* BF | *prabu* N

<sup>46</sup>*bhiṣekaning* BCDEFGIKLMQP || *biseka* N

<sup>47</sup>*dharmma* BCDEFGIKLMQP || *dharma* G | *dinaṛmma* N

<sup>48</sup>*viśeṣapura* BCDEFGIKLMQP || *viśeṣa, śura* E | *viśeṣapura* N

<sup>49</sup>*prabhu stri* DILMQ || *prabhū stri* B | *prabhu* CGP | *prabhu histri* EK | *prabhu stri* FN

<sup>50</sup>*prabhu stri* IM || *pramestri* B | *prabhu histri* CNP | *prabhu stri* D | *prabhū histri* E | *pramaistri* F | *prabhu histri* KLO

<sup>51</sup>1369 BCDEFGIKLMQP || 1357 N

<sup>52</sup>*haṅganteni* BCDEFGIKLMQP || *haṅganyani* N

Viśeṣa is said to have become a sage (*bhagavān*) in \*1400, at which time Suhitā replaced him as sovereign. But this is immediately followed by an account of the Rēgrēg civil war<sup>53</sup> in \*1404–\*1406, in which Viśeṣa was a primary combatant as ruler of the western palace.<sup>54</sup> Suhitā is not mentioned in this account, despite supposedly being the incumbent sovereign, and the active involvement of her brother and her husband in this war. There follows another entry where Viśeṣa and Suhitā are stated to have died in the same year \*1429, but Suhitā's death is mentioned as happening a second time, in \*1447.

Scholarly interpretations of these problematic passages have generated much confusion. Brandes (1896) interpreted the act of Viśeṣa becoming a sage in \*1400 as an abdication,<sup>55</sup> but he struggled to reconcile this with the account of the Rēgrēg war that implies that Viśeṣa remained the sovereign of the western palace. Brandes' belief that Suhitā came to power in \*1400 led him to take the first report of her death in \*1429 to be correct (Brandes 1896: 163). This created another problem: the text reports no new sovereign (*prabhu*) until \*1447, so who ruled the kingdom for these 18 years? Brandes (1896) hypothesised that a *bhre* Daha ruled during the period \*1437–\*1447, using the title *prabhu strī* like Suhitā, but this still left the period \*1429–\*1437 unaccounted for.

Krom (1931) suggested that Viśeṣa's becoming a sage in \*1400 did not necessarily amount to a complete withdrawal from political life, supporting this claim by an analogy with the case of Airlangga's decision in 1042 to take on a priestly title *Aji Pāduka Mpungku* without fully relinquishing power.<sup>56</sup> Krom's account of Viśeṣa's assumption of a priestly title in \*1400 has become the standard interpretation, including his speculation that Suhitā's elevation as the nominal Sovereign may have been a cause of the Rēgrēg war (Krom 1931: 430, Sumadio et al. 1984: 440). He believed that the sovereign queen who died in \*1447 was Suhitā herself, and cautiously suggested that the earlier report of the sovereign queen's death in \*1429 may have been 'incorrectly inserted or moved from its place' and that 'there is still something wrong in the text'.<sup>57</sup>

Berg (1962: 69–70) suggested that the \*1429 entry 'the Sovereign Queen died' (*bhra prabhu strī mokta*), may have originally read 'the Sovereign Queen ruled' (*bhra prabhu strī añjēnēng*), but that it had been erroneously modified by a later scribe who was confused by the repetitive language of the text. Berg's emendation of this entry led him to agree with Krom on the chronology of Suhitā's reign. A different solution was offered by both Schrieke (1957: 29) and Slametmulyana (1976: 198), in proposing that the sovereign queen who came to power in \*1400 and died in \*1429 may have been *bhre* Lasēm, the daughter of Hayam Wuruk. This idea was less widely accepted.

<sup>53</sup>This conflict is usually referred to as the Parēgrēg, but that term is based on a linguistic misunderstanding. In the *Pararaton*, events are labelled by adding the prefix *pa-* to one or more keywords. For example, the Javanese attack on Malayu in Sumatra in \*1275 is called *pamalayu* (Brandes 1896: 24, line 31), the rebellion of Ranggalawe in \*1295 is referred to as *paranggalawe* (25, line 15), and the massacre of the Sundanese at Bubat in \*1357 is called *pasuṇḍabubut* (26, line 15). Hence the better translation of *parēgrēg* is 'the Rēgrēg event'.

<sup>54</sup>An entry dated 23 October 1407 in the Chinese annals *Tai-zong Shi-lu* (compiled in 1430), confirms that *hyang* Viśeṣa (楊威西沙) was the ruler of the western palace during the Rēgrēg war. At this time, *hyang* Viśeṣa was referred to as *Tumapēl* (都馬板 or 杜馬班) by the Chinese (Wade 2005).

<sup>55</sup>'*bhra hyang* Viśeṣa withdrew from the kingship' (*trekt Bhra Hyang wiṣeṣa zich uit de regeering terug*) (Brandes 1896: 150–151).

<sup>56</sup>Damais disputed Krom's claim that Airlangga became a priest at this time, arguing that the title *Aji Pāduka Mpungku* must have been a posthumous title for Airlangga because it only appears in a later copy of one of his inscriptions (Krom 1931: 428; Damais 1955: 184–185).

<sup>57</sup>*verkeerdelijk ingevoegd c.q. van zijn plaats geraakt [...] er toch iets in den tekst niet in orde is* (Krom 1931: 430).

It was Krom's interpretation of these events that proved most influential on subsequent generations of historians (Weatherbee 1968: 438; Coedès 1968: 242; Noorduyt 1978; Sumadio et al. 1984: 440; Miksic 2007: 358). However, his analysis involved special pleading with respect to two parts of the text. Firstly, it assumed that Suhitā's promotion to sovereign in \*1400 was merely nominal, unlike all other such events mentioned in the text. Secondly, it depended on the minority reading of only three witnesses (C, G, and P) that the person who died in \*1429 was 'the sovereign' (*prabhu*, referring to Viśeṣa) rather than 'the sovereign queen' (*prabhu strī*, referring to Suhitā). Krom himself was fully aware of the problems with his explanation, and it is hard to see how his solution can be improved as long as one assumes that this part of the text is a self-consistent whole.

If we instead view the *Pararaton*'s account as a fusion of two separate versions of events, then we can make better sense of the transfer of power from Viśeṣa to Suhitā. Supposing that this single event is narrated twice, first as occurring in \*1400 and second as occurring in \*1429, then it is not necessary to propose a self-consistent narrative that contains both dates. Given the conglomerate nature of the *Pararaton*, there is good reason to believe that the whole chronological skeleton of the text is a fusion of originally separate chronogram lists. The duplicated notice of Wēkas Ing Sukha's death and other chronological inconsistencies in the text support such a belief.<sup>58</sup>

There is no explicit evidence for which version of the duplicated events originated in which list, but it is possible to make some conjectures. It is striking that for each duplicated royal death or retirement, one of the reports states the place of enshrinement while the other does not. This may suggest that one of the original lists did not contain any information about enshrinement. Presuming that is the case, the two lists may have been as in [Box 4](#) below.

#### Box 4. Conjectural original lists of entries about the deaths of monarchs

With Shrines	Without Shrines
The deified ruler Wēkas Ing Sukha died, the one who was released to the abode of Indra, in Śaka person-eye-fire-moon, 1321 [*1399]. He was enshrined at Tajung and the name of the shrine was Paramasukapura.	The deified ruler Wēkas Ing Sukha died, in Śaka earth-form-father-tail, 1311 [*1389]. The deified ruler Viśeṣa was sovereign.
The deified ruler Viśeṣa died and was enshrined at Lalangon; the name of the shrine was Paramaviśeṣapura.	The deified ruler Viśeṣa became a sage, in Śaka eye-wing-fire-moon, 1322 [*1400]. The ruler queen was Sovereign.
The ruler Sovereign Queen died, in Śaka nine-feeling-fire-moon, 1369 [*1447], and was enshrined together with [her husband] at Simhajaya.	The ruler Sovereign Queen died, in Śaka form-wind-fire-moon, 1351 [*1429].

This grouping of the chronicle entries into two versions of events is entirely speculative and does not resolve all the contradictions in the text. Furthermore, my analysis of the *Pararaton* does not take a conclusive position on which version of the dynastic chronology is more likely to be correct. Making such a determination would require the discovery of new primary sources that shed more light on the dynastic chronology of the period

<sup>58</sup>Another important example of this kind of inconsistency is the year given for Jayanagara's accession. At one point in the text, this event is dated \*1335 (Brandes 1896: 25, line 2), given only in figures without an accompanying chronogram. This date occurs out of chronological order, falling between Raden Vijaya's accession in \*1294 and the Rangga Lawe incident in \*1295, suggesting that it may not have originally belonged to this sequence. The \*1335 date conflicts with a later statement that Jayanagara came to the throne two years before \*1311, i.e. in \*1309: 'King Jayanagara had reigned as sovereign for two years in Śaka fires-fires-hands-one, 1233' (*sira Aji Jayanagara anjēnēng prabhu rong tahun, i Śaka, api-api-tangan-tunggal, 1233*, Brandes 1896: 25, lines 27–28).

1389–1429. But in the event that such a discovery is made, the arguments above will have usefully reframed the historical question at stake. New data would serve to adjudicate between the two conflicting versions of events given in the *Pararaton*, rather than having to fit into a unitary narrative that is more a product of modern interpretation than an authentic feature of the text.

## Conclusion

I began this article by claiming that traditional historical texts of island Southeast Asia pose an interpretive challenge to historians because of their structural and stylistic features. I proposed a model for reading texts that treats them as conglomerates of other texts and argued that this was a particularly appropriate model for reading chronicles. To illustrate how the conglomerate model works in practice, I gave an account of how the Javanese chronicle *Pararaton* evolved through multiple processes of creation, compilation, copying, and printing. This textual history served as the basis for my analysis of certain parts of the text: the inserted genealogical passages and the duplicated reports of rulers' deaths and abdications. I showed that by reading the *Pararaton* as a conglomerate text, it becomes easier to detect where conflicting accounts may have been merged. This, in turn, leads us to question the conventional interpretations of this text as a source for medieval Javanese history.

The conglomerate model offers a general set of tools for reading narrative texts, especially those that have gone through multiple stages of fragmentation and reconstitution in their evolution, expressed by the metaphors of fluidity and solidity. Philological research has shown that many important sources for the history of pre-modern Indonesia and Malaysia belong to this category. They are therefore good candidates to be read as conglomerate texts, and to be reinterpreted as the *Pararaton* has been in this article. Such an approach to reading traditional chronicles could significantly improve our understanding of the region's history.

## Acknowledgements

I thank Professors Adrian Vickers, Peter Worsley and Arlo Griffiths for their guidance and feedback on my study of the *Pararaton*. I also thank Marine Schoettel and Dr Mekhola Gomes for reading this text with me and helping me to understand it better. I thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback and suggestions for further engagement with the scholarship. I am especially grateful to Hadi Sidomulyo for his feedback on this paper and for sharing his deep knowledge of Javanese history during my visits to East Java.

## Note on contributor

*Wayan Jarrah Sastrawan* is a PhD candidate at the University of Sydney. His doctoral research focuses on the historiography of late medieval and early modern Java. Email: jarrah.sastrawan@sydney.edu.au

## References

Behrend, Tim. 1998. Katalog induk naskah-naskah nusantara: Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia [Main catalogue of manuscripts from the Indonesian archipelago: National Library of the Republic of Indonesia]. Jakarta: Djambatan.

- Berg, C.C. 1962. *Het Rijk van de vijfvoudige Buddha* [The realm of the five-fold Buddha]. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Berg, C.C. [1959] 2007. The Javanese picture of the past. In Soedjatmoko (ed.), *An introduction to Indonesian historiography*. Singapore: Equinox Publishing (Asia).
- Brandes, J.L.A. 1896. *Pararaton (Ken Arok) of Het Boek der Koningen van Tumapël en van Majapahit* [Pararaton (Ken Arok) or the Book of the Kings of Tumapël and of Majapahit]. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Brandes, J.L.A. 1903. *Beschrijving der Javaansche, Balineesche, en Sasaksche Handschriften, aange troffen in de nalatenschap van H.N. van der Tuuk, en door hem vermaakt aan de Leidsche Universiteitsbibliotheek* [Description of the Javanese, Balinese, and Sasak manuscripts found in the bequest of H.N. van der Tuuk, and bequeathed by him to the Leiden University Library]. Vol. 2. Batavia: Landsdrukkerij.
- Brandes, J.L.A., N.J. Krom, J.C.G. Jonker, H. Kramer, and R.Ng. Poerbatjaraka. 1920. *Pararaton (Ken Arok) of Het Boek der Koningen van Tumapël en van Majapahit* [Pararaton (Ken Arok) or the Book of the Kings of Tumapël and of Majapahit]. Batavia: Albrecht ; The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Bredehoft, Thomas. 2001. *Textual histories: readings in the Anglo-Saxon chronicle*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Caldwell, Ian. 2008. Form criticism and its applicability to Bugis historical texts. In Y.A. Lander and A.K. Oglobin (eds), *Language and text in the Austronesian world: essays in honor of Ulo Sirk*. Munich: Limcom Europa, pp. 301–312.
- Chambert-Loir, Henri. 2017. The history of a history: variant versions of the Sulalat al-Salatin. *Indonesia* 104: 121–177.
- Coedès, Georges. 1968. *The Indianized states of Southeast Asia*. Translated by Susan Brown Cowing. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Damais, Louis-Charles. 1952. Études d'épigraphie indonésienne, III: liste des principales inscriptions datées de l'Indonesie [Studies of Indonesian epigraphy, III: list of the principal dated inscriptions of Indonesia]. *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient* 46 (1): 1–106.
- Damais, Louis-Charles. 1955. Etudes d'épigraphie indonésienne, IV: discussion de la date des inscriptions [Studies of Indonesian epigraphy, IV: discussion of the date of the inscriptions]. *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient* 47 (1): 7–290.
- Dictionary of Geography*. 2008. 'Conglomerate'. Edited by Susan Mayhew. 4th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Friederich, R. 1849. Voorlopig verslag van het eiland Balie [Provisional report on the island of Bali]. *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*. Jakarta: Lange & Co.
- Hardjowardojo, R. Pitono. 1965. *Pararaton*. Jakarta: Bhratarata.
- Hunter, Thomas M. 2007. The body of the king: reappraising Singhasari period syncretism. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 38 (1): 27–53.
- Jorgensen, Alice (ed.) 2010. *Reading the Anglo-Saxon chronicle: language, literature, history*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers.
- Kasdi, Aminuddin. 2008. *Serat Pararaton atawa Katuturanira Ken Arok: Kajian Historis sebagai Sastra Sejarah* [Serat Pararaton atawa Katuturanira Ken Arok: a historical study of it as historical literature]. Surabaya: Unesa University Press.
- Kriswanto, Agung. 2009. *Pararaton: Alih Aksara dan Terjemahan* [Pararaton: transliteration and translation]. Jakarta: Penerbit Wedatama Widya Sastra.
- Kouznetsova, Seda. 2006. The Javanese chronicle Serat Sejarah Demak: a provisional study and arising questions. In Willem van der Molen, Roy Jordaan and Korrie Korevaart (eds), *Milde regen: Liber amicorum voor Hans Teeuw bij zijn vijftienvijftigste verjaardag op 12 August 2006*. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers, pp. 118–141.
- Krom, N.J. 1921. De samenstelling van de Pararaton [The composition of the Pararaton]. *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 60: 86–103.
- Krom, N.J. 1931. *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis* [Hindu-Javanese history]. 2nd edn. 's-Gravenhage: KITLV Press.

- Legêne, S. and Schulte Nordholt H. 2015. Introduction: imagining heritage and heritage as imagined history. In Susan Legêne, Bambang Purwanto and Henk Schulte Nordholt (eds), *Sites, bodies and stories*. Singapore: NUS Press, pp. 1–32.
- Miksic, John N. 2007. *Historical dictionary of ancient Southeast Asia*. Lanham MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Noorduyn, J. 1978. Majapahit in the fifteenth century. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 134 (2–3): 207–274.
- Noorduyn, J. 1993. Some remarks on Javanese chronogram words: a case of localization. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 149 (2): 298–317.
- Padmapuspita, J. 1966. *Pararaton*. Jogjakarta: Penerbit Taman Siswa.
- Partner, Nancy. 1995. Historicity in an age of reality-fictions. In Frank Ankersmit and Hans Kellner (eds), *A new philosophy of history*. London: Reaktion Books, pp. 21–39.
- Phalgunadi, I Gusti Putu. 1996. *The Pararaton: a study of the Southeast Asian chronicle*. New Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan.
- Pigeaud, Th.G.Th. 1924. *De Tantu Panggëlaran: een oud-Javaansch prozageschrift* [The Tantu Panggëlaran: an Old Javanese prose text]. 's Gravenhage: H.L. Smits.
- Pigeaud, Th.G.Th. 1960. Javanese texts in transcription. In *Java in the 14th century: a study in cultural history*. Vol. 1. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Pigeaud, Th.G.Th. 1967. *Literature of Java: catalogue raisonne of Javanese manuscripts in the library of the University of Leiden and other public collections in the Netherlands*. Vol. 2. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Proudfoot, Ian. 2007. In search of lost time: Javanese and Balinese understandings of the Indic calendar. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 163 (1): 86–122.
- Ras, J.J. 1986. Hikayat Banjar and Pararaton: a structural comparison of two chronicles. In *A man of Indonesian letters*. Edited by C.M.S. Hellwig and S.O. Robson. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ricklefs, M.C., P. Voorhoeve, and Annabel Teh Gallop. 2014. *Indonesian manuscripts in Great Britain: a catalogue of manuscripts in Indonesian languages in British public collections*. Jakarta: Ecole Française d'Extreme-Orient.
- Sastrawan, W.J. 2019. Pararaton: revised text edition, translation, and analysis. Manuscript in preparation.
- Schrieke, B. 1957. *Indonesian sociological studies part two: ruler and realm in early Java*. The Hague and Bandung: W. van Hoeve.
- Slametmulyana. 1976. *A story of Majapahit*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Stein Callenfels, P.V. van 1918. De inscriptie van Kandangan [The inscription of Kandangan]. *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde* 58: 337–347.
- Sumadio, Bambang, Ayatrohaedi, M. Boechari, Edi Sedyawati, Edhie Wurjantoro, Hasan Djafar, Oei Soan Nio, Satyawati Sulaeman, Soejatmi Satari, and M.M. Soekarto K. Atmodjo. 1984. *Jaman Kuna* [The ancient period]. Edited by Marwati Djoened Poesponegoro and Nugroho Notosusanto. 4th edn. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Supomo, S. (ed.). 1977. *Arjunawijaya: a kakawin of Mpu Tantular*. Vol. 1. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Teeuw, A. 1998. An Old Javanese poem on chronogram words. In Mark Janse and An Verlinden (eds), *Productivity and creativity: studies in general and descriptive linguistics in honor of E.M. Uhlenbeck*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tuuk, H.N. van der. 1897–1912. *Kawi-Balinesesch-Nederlandsch woordenboek* [Kawi-Balinese-Dutch dictionary]. Edited by J.L.A Brandes and D.A. Rinkes. 4 vols. Batavia: Landsdrukkerij.
- Vickers, Adrian. 2012. *Bali: a paradise created*. 2nd edn. Rutland VT: Tuttle Publishing.
- Vickers, Adrian. 2019. The kingdom of Majapahit as the basis of Indonesia. In *Rewriting Indonesian history: the post-authoritarian nation*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Wade, Geoff (trans). 2005. Southeast Asia in the Ming Shi-lu: an open access resource. Asia Research Institute and the Singapore E-Press, National University of Singapore. <<http://www.epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/reign/yong-le/year-5-month-9-day-23-0>> Accessed 27 September 2019.
- Weatherbee, Donald. 1968. Aspects of ancient Javanese politics. PhD thesis, Johns Hopkins University.

- Wieringa, E.P. 2012. A monument marking the dawn of the Muslim era in Java: chronicles and chronograms in the Grand Mosque of Demak. In Dietrich Boschung and Corinna Wessels-Mevisen (eds), *Figurations of time in Asia*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, pp. 157–192.
- Witkam, Jan Just (compl). 2007–2017. Inventory of the Oriental Manuscripts of the Library of the University of Leiden. Leiden: Ter Lugt Press.
- Zoetmulder, P.J. 1983. *De Taal van het Adiparwa: een grammaticale studie van het Oudjavaans* [The language of the Adiparwa: a grammatical study of the Old Javanese]. 2nd edn. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

## Appendix

### *The romanisation of Old Javanese*

For the romanisation of Old Javanese in this article, I give transcriptions (mappings from source phonemes to Latin graphemes) in the body of the article, but transliterations (mappings from source graphemes to Latin graphemes) in the text boxes.

I use a dual system for transcription. On the one hand, I keep to the spelling of Sanskrit and other Indic-language words and loanwords according to the ISO 15919 standard for transliterating Indic scripts (e.g. *Kṛtavijaya* rather than *Kĕrtawijaya*). On the other hand, I adhere to the spelling of Old Javanese words of non-Indic origin according to the transcription convention used by Brandes in his 1896 text edition (e.g. *Wĕngkĕr* rather than *Vĕnkĕr*). This is done to maximise the consistency of the spelling of Indic-derived words with official standards, while minimising the discrepancy in the spelling of Javanese words from that of the original edition.

I justify this dual system for transcription by contending that the Indic phonemes brought into Old Javanese via loanwords were not yet assimilated into Javanese phonology during the first period of the *Pararaton*'s textual history (the creation process). Graphemes such as ⟨ś⟩, ⟨ṣ⟩, ⟨ṇ⟩, ⟨ph⟩, ⟨bh⟩ and ⟨th⟩ are used consistently in the manuscripts to represent their corresponding Indic phonemes. This shows that, in the *Pararaton*, these Indic phonemes have not been assimilated into the Javanese phonological system, which lacks these particular consonants. The maintenance of the distinction between Indic and Javanese phonemes in this text provides a reason to transcribe words of Indic origin differently to their Javanese counterparts.

The dual transcription system described above applies to the Old Javanese used in the body of this article. In the text boxes, by contrast, I directly transliterate the Balinese graphemes to Latin graphemes. This is in order to more faithfully reflect the distinctive spelling transmitted by the witnesses. Since Balinese writing belongs to the Indic family of scripts, I use the ISO 15919 standard for transliteration, augmented by the grapheme ⟨i̇⟩ to represent the *layar* grapheme and the degree symbol ° to distinguish *akṣara* vowels from diacritical vowels.

A consequence of my choices is a slight discrepancy between the spelling of transliterated words in the text boxes and transcribed words in the article; for example, the name transliterated as *wkas im suka* in the boxes is transcribed as *Wĕkas Ing Sukha* in the article.

**List of witnesses.** Since the 1920 reprinting of the *Pararaton* with an expanded apparatus, many manuscripts have entered public collections that were previously unknown to academic scholarship. This is largely due to the efforts of the Balinese Manuscript Project (known in Indonesian as *Proyek Tik*, the 'Typing Project'), begun by C. Hooykaas and I Gusti Ngurah Ketut Sangka in the early 1970s to produce typed copies of the contents of palm-leaf manuscripts. This project has continued to the present day under the management of Hedi Hinzler and I Dewa Gede Catra. Furthermore, high quality photographs of manuscripts held by the Pusat Dokumentasi in Denpasar have become available online at *The Balinese Digital Library*, thanks to the efforts of Ron Jenkins and his collaborators.

I have surveyed all the manuscripts of the *Pararaton* that are available in public collections, though there may be many more in private collections that are not readily accessible to scholars. In this appendix, I report on six witnesses that have not yet been included in any published text edition: Witnesses L to Q. These recently available witnesses provide new information about the

third period of the text's history and show that the *Pararaton* had a remarkably wide distribution in Bali from the early 17th century onwards. In the 1920 edition, the editors skipped the siglum J. I continue that practice here, so that witness I is immediately followed by witness K.

Because the 20th century introduced several new copying techniques, such as typing, photography, microfilming, word processing, and digital imaging, it is not practical to treat each new copy of the *Pararaton* as an independent witness to the text. I therefore define a witness as 'a manuscript copy that is available in the original or in non-manuscript copies' and group all non-manuscript copies of a witness together. For example, I label all of the following objects as 'witness M': the palm-leaf manuscript owned by Ida Bagus Rai Pidada of Klungkung, the set of photographs held by Leiden University Library as Or. 18.685, and the two typed copies produced for Proyek Tik as HKS 4124 and HKS 6231.

I use the following abbreviations for collections: PNRI for Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia in Jakarta, Leiden for the Universiteitsbibliotheek at Leiden University, Kirtya for the Kirtya Lieftrinck-Van der Tuuk in Singaraja, Bodleian for the Bodleian Library at Oxford University, HKS for the Hooykaas-Ketut Sangka collection produced by Proyek Tik, and Pusdok for the Pusat Dokumentasi in Denpasar. Information about each witness is gathered from my own inspection, from the introductions of the 1896 and 1920 text editions, and from catalogues of the manuscript collections of PNRI (Behrend 1998), Leiden (Brandes 1903; Witkam 2007–2017), Bodleian (Ricklefs et al. 2014), and Kirtya (Pigeaud 1967).

The purpose of this survey is to provide basic information for the textual history of the *Pararaton*. The provenance of manuscripts collected in the 19th century is often vague, while Proyek Tik typescripts usually identify the residence of the original owner. Internal data appear as colophons, which specify individual acts of copying, and as attached memoranda, which provide the historical context of these acts. More detailed information about the material properties of the witnesses can be found in the relevant catalogues.

### Witness A

<i>Original</i>	Palm-leaf manuscript (PNRI <i>Peti</i> 19, L 337)
<i>Publications</i>	Brandes 1896 (apparatus); Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus)
<i>Provenance</i>	Probably the copy studied by R. Friederich, obtained from Badung (Friederich 1849: 21)
<i>Colophon</i>	Unknown due to missing leaves
<i>Comment</i>	Incomplete; contains only the first half of the text, up to the story of the officer Pati-pati (Brandes 1896, 17:12).

### Witness B

<i>Original</i>	Palm-leaf manuscript (PNRI <i>Peti</i> 19, L 550)
<i>Publications</i>	Brandes 1896 (apparatus); Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus); Agung Kriswanto 2009 (apparatus)
<i>Provenance</i>	North Bali; acquired from the Resident of Bali and Lombok in 1889
<i>Colophon</i>	'Thus the <i>Pararaton</i> ' ( <i>iti Pararaton</i> ); copied at Icchasada at Selapĕnĕk (possibly Watu Tumpeng, Klungkung) on 3 August 1613 (Tuuk 1897–1912: s.v. pĕnĕk)
<i>Memoranda</i>	Renovation of port facilities in *1749 and April/May 1751

### Witness C

<i>Original</i>	Palm-leaf manuscript (PNRI <i>Peti</i> 19, L 600)
<i>Publications</i>	Brandes 1896 (apparatus); Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus); Agung Kriswanto 2009 (text)
<i>Provenance</i>	North Bali; acquired from L.Th. Majjer in 1889
<i>Colophon</i>	Untitled; copied in *1600

### Witness D

<i>Original</i>	Paper manuscript (Leiden Or. 4401)
<i>Publications</i>	Brandes 1903 (extract #823); Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus)
<i>Provenance</i>	Van der Tuuk bequest, acquired in 1896; originally 'from Klungkung' (Brandes 1903: 268)
<i>Colophon</i>	'Thus concludes the <i>Pararaton</i> ' ( <i>tĕlas iti Pararaton</i> ); undated
<i>Comments</i>	Contains marginal notes supplying variant readings from Witness C

## Witness E

*Original* Paper manuscript (Leiden Or. 4402)  
*Publications* Brandes 1903 (extract #824); Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus)  
*Provenance* Van der Tuuk bequest, acquired in 1896  
*Colophon* Untitled; copied on 30 January 1842

## Witness F

*Original* Paper manuscript (Leiden Or. 4403)  
*Publications* Brandes 1903 (extract #825); Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus)  
*Provenance* Van der Tuuk bequest, acquired in 1896  
*Colophon* 'Thus the *Pararaton*' (*iti Pararaton*); copied at Icchasada at Selapěněk (possibly Watu Tumpeng, Klungkung) on 3 August 1613  
*Memoranda* Renovation of port facilities in \*1749 and April/May 1751  
*Comment* Handwritten by Van der Tuuk in Latin script

## Witness G

*Original* Paper manuscript (Leiden Or. 4404)  
*Publications* Brandes 1903 (extract #827); Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus)  
*Provenance* Van der Tuuk bequest, acquired in 1896  
*Colophon* Unknown due to missing leaves  
*Comment* Incomplete; missing text from the middle of the \*1429 entry to the end

## Witness H

*Original* Paper manuscript (Leiden Or. 4405)  
*Publications* Brandes 1903 (extract #828); Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus)  
*Provenance* Van der Tuuk bequest, acquired in 1896  
*Colophon* Untitled; the date is incomplete due to the missing year  
*Comment* Incomplete; missing text from the genealogy of Kṛtanagara and Raden Vijaya (Brandes 1896: 18, line 6) to the end

## Witness I

*Original* Paper manuscript (Leiden Or. 3865/2)  
*Publications* Brandes 1903 (extract #826); Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus)  
*Provenance* Acquired from Batavia in 1896 or 1897 via Brandes  
*Colophon* 'Thus the *Pararaton*' (*iti Pararaton*); dated 21 January 1853  
*Comment* Annotations and corrections applied to the manuscript in blue pencil

## Witness K

*Original* Palm-leaf manuscript (Leiden Or. 3142/2 & Bodleian MS. Jav. a. 1)  
*Publications* Brandes et al. 1920 (apparatus, Leiden part only)  
*Provenance* Leiden part acquired from F.A. Lindeman and H.L. van Bloemen Waanders on 29 May 1890; Bodleian part purchased from Brill in 1896  
*Colophon* Untitled; copied on 14 August 1844  
*Comment* The manuscript appears to have been sent to the Netherlands in the late 19th century, where its leaves became separated. Only a handful of leaves entered the Leiden University Library collection via Lindeman and Van Bloemen Waanders, while the majority of leaves were sold to the Bodleian Library in Oxford. The contents of the Bodleian manuscript are not securely identified in existing catalogues (Ricklefs et al. 2014: 43). I have sorted the leaves of the manuscript and can identify among them a near-complete copy of the *Pararaton* (this witness), one or more copies of the Balinese history *Babad Dalem*, and a text of the Massacre of the Sundanese story (either the *Tatwa Sunda* or a version of the *Kidung Sunda*).

## Witness L

*Original* Palm-leaf manuscript (Leiden Or. 22.008)  
*Copies* i) Typescript (Proyek Tik HKS 3809)  
 ii) Photocopy (Leiden Or. 18.397)

- Provenance** This manuscript seems to have changed hands several times in the 1980s. It is recorded as belonging to Dewa Ketut Oka of Jero Amlapura in Karangasem on 15 September 1983 when the typescript was made by Proyek Tik (HKS 3809), but when a photocopy was purchased by Leiden in October 1984 (Or. 18.397), it was in the possession of Dewa Gde Ngurah of Jero Kanginan in Sidemen, Karangasem. When the palm-leaf manuscript itself was acquired by Leiden in May 1989, it is listed by Witkam (under catalogue entry 'Or. 22.008') as coming from Puri Anyar in Klungkung.
- Colophon** 'Thus the *Pararaton*' (*iti Pararaton*); copied by Ghora Yowana at Smarajayapura (Klungkung) on 1 September 1930
- Comment** Despite the uncertain provenance, it is clear that the two copies were made directly from the original palm-leaf manuscript, because the foliation of the text is identical in all three documents.

## Witness M

- Original** Palm-leaf manuscript; collection of Ida Bagus Rai Pidada, Griya Pidada, Klungkung
- Copies** i) Photocopy (Leiden Or. 18.685)  
ii) Typescript (Proyek Tik HKS 4124)  
iii) Typescript (Proyek Tik HKS 6231)
- Provenance** Griya Pidada, Klungkung
- Colophons** i) 'Thus concludes the *Pararaton*' (*tēlas iti Pararaton*); undated  
ii) 'Thus the *Arok*' (*iti Arok*); copied on 2 November 1924  
iii) Copied at Icchasada at Selapēnēk on 3 August 1613
- Comment** There are three separate colophons in this witness. The first, which is undated, is shared by witness D. The second is dated 2 November 1924. The third appears to be an inaccurate copy of the colophon dated 3 August 1613 of witnesses B and F, without the accompanying 18th-century memoranda. There is an additional note in Indonesian: 'The original is in a book, *Pararaton* No. 63, written by Ida Ny. Rai Pidada, 16 March 1978'. This indicates that the chain of transmission for this manuscript has been, at least: the 1924 palm-leaf copy, followed by the 1978 paper copy, followed by the present palm-leaf copy. The present-day copy must have been produced sometime before the first typescript was made on 26 December 1984. We can regard the 1613 colophon as a spurious addition, because it occurs out of chronological order and lacks the memoranda, suggesting that it may be an artefact of copying the colophon directly out of Brandes' printed text (which similarly lacks the memoranda).

## Witness N

- Original** Palm-leaf manuscript (Leiden Or. 20.031)
- Copies** a) Photocopy; Leiden Or. 18.407  
b) Typescript; Proyek Tik HKS 3642
- Provenance** Purchased in July 1986 from Ketut Menuh, Jadi, Kediri, Tabanan
- Colophon** 'The *Pamutēran Ing Kawi* concludes. Thus the *Ken Angrok*' (*tēlas Pamutēran Ing Kawi, iti nga Ken Angrok*); copied by Palos Nati at Banjar Wreda (uncertain toponym) on 5 May 1638 or 1 December 1638 (ambiguous date)
- Comment** The only known manuscript to bear this 1638 date of copying. It shares many unique readings with witness A, suggesting that these two witnesses may belong to a line of transmission that separated from the rest of the manuscript tradition at an early stage. The spelling is idiosyncratic; for example, this witness frequently gives *saka* where other witnesses spell *śaka* ('Śaka year'), *moktaḥ* where others spell *mokta* ('died'), and *bra* where others spell *bhra* ('ruler').

## Witness O

- Original** Palm-leaf manuscript; collection of Wayan Puja, Medahan, Kramas, Gianyar
- Copies** Typescript; Proyek Tik; HKS 3473
- Provenance** Wayan Puja, Medahan, Kramas, Gianyar
- Colophon** Unknown due to missing leaves
- Comment** Incomplete; missing text from the middle of the story of Raden Vijaya to the end (Brandes 1896: 21, line 15)

## Witness P

- Original** Palm-leaf manuscript; collection of Griya Tamansari, Intaran, Sanur
- Copies** Typescript; Proyek Tik; HKS 4960
- Provenance** Griya Tamansari, Intaran, Sanur
- Colophon** Untitled; copied by Gede Made Sidemen at Puri Denpasar on 31 January 1942 (date conversion uncertain)

## Witness Q

- Original** Palm-leaf manuscript (Pusdok index number 57)
- Copies** Digital image; *The Balinese Digital Library*; <https://archive.org/details/pararaton>

*Provenance* Jero Kanginan, Sidemen, Karangasem

*Colophons* i) 'Thus the *Pararaton*' (*iti Pararaton*); copied by Ghora Yowana at Smarajayapura (Klungkung) on 1 September 1930  
ii) Copied by Gusti Nengah Putu of Banjar Anggar Kasih in Padangkerta on 18 December 1989 (date conversion uncertain)

*Fragmentary witnesses not used for this article*

Palm-leaf manuscript (Kirtya 462)

Paper manuscript (PNRI Mix 3/95)

*Manuscript and typescript copies of Brandes' text edition*

Palm-leaf manuscript (Kirtya 483)

Typescript (Proyek Tik HKS 1603)

Typescript (Proyek Tik HKS 2865)

Typescript (Proyek Tik HKS 3085)

*Manuscript copies in private collections*

Palm-leaf manuscript; collection of Anak Agung Putu Oka Manek of Puri Pemecutan, Badung, Bali; copied in 1940 at Puri Gerenceng (Phalgunadi 1996: 3).