



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Candi, space and landscape : a study on the distribution, orientation and spatial organization of Central Javanese temple remains**

Degroot, V.M.Y.

### **Citation**

Degroot, V. M. Y. (2009, May 6). *Candi, space and landscape : a study on the distribution, orientation and spatial organization of Central Javanese temple remains*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13781>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13781>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## CHAPTER 2

---

### Presentation of the secondary sources

Printed sources used in the present study consist mainly of inventories written in Dutch and lists of temple remains more recently drawn up by Indonesian archaeologists (in Indonesian).

#### Dutch Sources

My main Dutch sources are the inventories written by N.W. Hoepermans, R.D.M. Verbeek, J.W. IJzerman, N.J. Krom and F.D.K. Bosch.

*N.W. Hoepermans' Hindoe-oudheden van Java*

N.W. Hoepermans carried out his researches in the 1860's, but his inventory was published only in 1913 in the *Rapporten van den Oudheidkundigen Dienst in Nederlandsch-Indië* (Hoepermans 1913). This inventory covers West and Central Java, including also Madiun and Kediri. However, Banten (in West Java) as well as the easternmost tip of the island were not surveyed.

Although the text has no introduction dealing with the methods used for collecting data, it is obvious from numerous passages that this Dutch scholar visited all the places mentioned in his inventory. He did not rely only on data given by local civil servants: his information was first-hand. Hoepermans often describes the approaches leading to the remains, the perspectives of the sites, and his difficulties in attaining his goal or the opinions of local people concerning some of the ruins.

A clear example of this can be read on p. 152:

From Magelang, after having crossed the Progo River, one goes to Bandongan, 2 ½ *paal* away, via a very good road. From this place, there is a secondary road that runs through the hills and the valleys that form, so to say, the foot of Mount Sumbing. One finally arrives at Silogrio, where stands a temple named "Batoe roema" by the natives. Although this temple must have another name, we have not been able to dig it up, as no Javanese people, not even the Wedhono of this district, gives it another names or knows about it.<sup>1</sup>

N.W. Hoepermans describes the antiquities he encountered province by province, district by district, including temple remains as well as sculptures, metallic finds and private collections.

It is interesting to note that numerous Dutch civil servants appeared to have already gathered quite large collections of Javanese antiquities by that time. In Magelang alone, N.W. Hoepermans lists 30 pieces in front of the house of the Regent (district head) along with 22 smaller antiques inside, while 73 other sculptures would

---

<sup>1</sup> "Van Magalang, gaat men na de rivier de Progo, overgestoken te hebben naar Bandongan 2 ½ *paal* langs eene zeer goede weg, echter van af deze plaats ligt eene binnen weg die over heuvelen en dalen loopt en welke om zoo te zeggen de voet van het gebergte Soembing uitmaakt, tot dat men eindelijk komt te Silogrio, waar zich eene tempel bevindt, door de inlanders Batoe roema genaamd; hoewel deze tempel eene andere naam moet dragen, heeft men dezelve niet kunnen opdiepen, daar geen Javaan, noch de Wedhono van dit district, eene andere naam weet op te geven of bekend is." (Hoepermans 1913:152)

have been in front of the house of the Resident (*residentie* head).<sup>2</sup> The habit of collecting antiquities was not limited to civil servants. Hoepermans also mentions a certain Mr. Rivière, owner of an estate near Prambanan, who had more than 50 pieces in his domain (Hoepermans 1913:235). However, this interest in antiquities was very much limited to sculptures and the fate of temple stones did not attract much attention. While Dutch men built museums or decorated their houses with antiques, Javanese villagers moved stones from their original sites. Their motives were both secular and religious. Stones from *candi* Sieng-on (Prambanan area) were used to build water ducts (Hoepermans 1913:253), while temple stones, among them a *yonī*, were included in the base of a mosque in Brongkol village (Temanggung district) (Hoepermans 1913:173). However, ancient stones did not always have such mundane uses, and were also gathered in graveyards and used for tombs, as was the case in Mongsing-boemen village (Hoepermans 1913:173).

As the first witness to the state of preservation of many Central Javanese archaeological sites, Hoepermans' work is highly valuable, although his inventory is not always as systematic as one would have hoped.

Localization of the sites is certainly the main problem. As there is no map attached to his list, one has to rely on the administrative division. While *residenties* and districts are always given, sub districts are only occasionally mentioned. Sometimes, the Dutch scholar also includes names of nearby villages, but his use of notions as vague as "close to", "not far from" or "in the neighbourhood of" do not always help. Hoepermans' information concerning the localization of Pikatan, for example, is limited to the following passage (Hoepermans 1913:172):

Dessa Pikatan (District Temangong). Within the *dessa* there are traces of a foundation (...).<sup>3</sup>

Based on such a short note, it is rather difficult to find the village on a map (if it was ever mapped by the *Topografische Dienst*). Taking into consideration the order in which the sites are mentioned in the report may help, but only in a limited way. And when the village name is as common as "Tjandi/Candi" the task is often impossible. The only solution is then to compare Hoepermans' data with information coming from R.D.M. Verbeek's inventory (Verbeek 1891), which included an archaeological map. However, the sites mentioned by Hoepermans do not always figure on Verbeek's map.

#### *R.D.M. Verbeek's Oudheden van Java*

In 1891, R.D.M. Verbeek published the first official inventory of the antiquities of Java in the *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap*, under the title "Oudheden van Java. Lijst der voornaamste overblijfselen uit den Hindoetijd op Java met eene oudheidkundige kaart".

Although Verbeek's inventory has its downsides, it is certainly a highly valuable work. Not only for the up-to-date list of archaeological remains, but also for the map

<sup>2</sup> In Hoepermans' time, Java counted several *residentie*'s. Central Java was divided between the *residentie*'s of Pekalongan, Banjoemas, Bagelen, Kedoe, Semarang, Japara, Djocdjakarta and Soerakarta. Each *residentie* was further divided into districts. A district head was called Regent, while the highest civil servant of a *residentie* was a Resident. Magelang was the administrative centre of both the *residentie* Kedoe and the district of Magelang.

<sup>3</sup> "Dessa Pikatan (District Temangong). Binnen in de *dessa* vindt men sporen van een fundament (...)." (Hoepermans 1913:172)

that accompanies them. Verbeek was a geographer; he took care to plot most of the sites on his map, and he included sketches of the Prambanan area and the Dieng plateau. His work offers the first archaeological map of Central Java, even though its scale is too large to be really precise.

Verbeek's inventory deals with the whole island, including Banten and east Java. Like his predecessor, he lists all the places of archaeological interest, i.e. not only temple remains, but also sculptures, inscriptions and other small finds. His inventory is not descriptive: as mentioned in the title, it is a list. For example, the entry for *candi* Pawon is limited to:

**266. Tjandi Pawon.** A small temple, not far from Bara Boedoer.<sup>4</sup>

For further details, one has to refer to the bibliography (supplied with each entry).

Even though we know that Verbeek did travel to East Java, it is less clear to what extent he actually did field work in Central Java. In the introduction to his inventory Verbeek expresses lengthy gratitude to the civil servants and district heads who helped him. In a number of areas, he relied on their accounts alone. In some cases, mainly in the Magelang area, Verbeek states clearly that he had not visited the site. For *candi* Batur (Selogono), one finds the following note:

**259. Sela gana or Tjandi gana.** Two entirely collapsed temples, on the Soekarini hill, near *doekoeh* Ngoboran in *desa* Bawang. According to the *Controleur* Kruijsboom foundations can still be seen. Not visited by me.<sup>5</sup>

Under Kanggan, one can read:

**264. Kanggan.** A *desa*, approximately 1 kilometer to the west of Bara boedoer, along the main road to Salaman. Here stands a pedestal. Earlier a stone staircase led down to it; the staircase is now covered with earth. Communication of the *Controleur* of Moentilan, C.J. Hasselam.<sup>6</sup>

The quality of his information relies on the contributions of his informants and these varied in quality from place to place.

Furthermore, it is often impossible to distinguish data coming from written sources from first-hand information. This may partly be due to Verbeek's very impersonal style, but it might also be that, for some entries at least, he relied exclusively on written sources. I reproduce below R.D.M. Verbeek's text for *candi* Argakusuma.

**141. Tjandi Arga koesoema** (District Bodja, *afdeeling* Semarang). To the NNE of Medini; from Soesoekan, one goes eastwards to Kloerak (Kloewak on the topographical map); not far from this *desa* there is a hot spring called Argatapa and, near to it, the two collapsed temples [named] Arga koesoema. The first one used to be 7m large and 8 meter long, with the entrance on the northern side; the second temple was 6m by 7m. Earlier Friederich was still able to recognize the wall of [temple] n° 1. Higher in the mountains there must have been 3 other temples, but they were not

<sup>4</sup> "266. Tjandi Pawon. Eene kleine tempel, niet ver van Bara Boedoer." (Verbeek 1891: no 266)

<sup>5</sup> "259. Sela gana of Tjandi gana. Twee geheel vervallen tempels op den berg Soekarini bij doekoeh Ngoboran der desa Bawang. Volgens den Controleur Kruijsboom zijn fundamenten nog te zien. Niet door mij bezocht." (Verbeek 1891: no 259)

<sup>6</sup> "264. Kanggan. Een desa, ongeveer 1 kilometer ten westen van Bara boedoer aan den grooten weg naar Salaman. Hier staat een voetstuk, waarnaar men vroeger met een steenen trap afdaalde; de trap is nu met aarde overdekt. Mededeeling van den Controleur van Moentilan, C.J. Hasselam." (Verbeek 1891: no 264)

visited by Friederich. The sculptures coming from these temples have been brought to Bodja.<sup>7</sup>

The use of past tenses, unusual elsewhere in Verbeek's text, and the reference to "temples not visited by Friederich" lead in this case to the conclusion that information concerning the dimensions of the temples and the possible existence of further structures comes from Friederich's account alone – not much is known of the state of preservation in Verbeek's time.

Unfortunately, it is not always so easy to identify the source of the information. Telahap constitutes a good example of this difficulty:

**235. Telahap.** A large inscribed stone, in two pieces, found near the *paal* 28. Transported to the house of the *Controleur* in Magelang, now apparently lost. At Telahap, on the 23rd of April, further to a landslide on the banks of the Gandoel River, a stone staircase of 89 steps was discovered.<sup>8</sup>

Was the staircase still visible in Verbeek's time? This cannot be established. All this information could well have come from the written sources mentioned in the bibliography.

It appears that for the area of Magelang Verbeek's work is often based on second hand information and therefore not always of high standard. The most striking evidence is the case of *candi* Ngawen. Ngawen is a temple compound made of at least 5 temples, located between Borobudur and Muntilan, not far from *gunung* Sari. As it lies along a main road and in a flat area, the place is not difficult to reach. However, Verbeek did not visit *candi* Ngawen. In his inventory, he relies mainly on a communication made by a local civil servant, mentioning only briefly N.W. Hoepermans' description:

**298. Ngawen.** A fairly large, but damaged, statue, near the road to Muntilan. Communication of the *Controleur* Hasselman. According to Hoepermans there was once a temple as well.<sup>9</sup>

However, this description is biased: *candi* Ngawen is not limited to a statue and they was at the time clear evidence to associate Ngawen with a temple. When Hoepermans visited the site, a mound and many temple stones were visible, scattered all around the area. Either they disappeared (which is not likely, because the site is rather large and mentioned in early 20<sup>th</sup> century literature as a temple, see for example Krom 1914a: no 826) or Verbeek's informant simply did not care about temple stones and thought that only sculptures were worth mentioning. The result is that in Verbeek's inventory, Ngawen appears as a sculpture, rather than a temple.

<sup>7</sup> "141. Tjandi Arga koesoema (District Bodja, afdeeling Semarang). Ten N. N. O. van Medini; men gaat van Soesoekan oostwaarts naar Kloerak (op de topographische kaart Kloewak); niet ver van deze desa ligt eene warme bron, genaamd Argatapa, en daarbij de 2 vervallen tempels Arga koesoema. De 1e was 7 bij 8 meter breed en lang, ingang aan de noordzijde; de 2e tempel was 6 bij 7 meter. Bij N° 1 was voren door Friederich de muur nog te herkennen. Hooger in het gebergte moeten nog 3 tempels gelegen hebben, ook geheel vervallen, maar door Friederich niet bezocht. Beelden van deze tempels zijn naar Bodja gebracht." (Verbeek 1891: no 141)

<sup>8</sup> "235. Telahap. Een groote beschreven steen, in twee stukken, gevonden bij paal 28. Vervoerd naar de controleurswoning te Magelang, nu zoo het schijnt verloren. Bij Telahap is bij gelegenheid van eene aardstorting op 23 April 1866 aan de oevers der rivier Gandoel een steenen trap van 89 treden gevonden." (Verbeek 1891: no 235)

<sup>9</sup> "298. Ngawen. Een tamelijk groot doch geschonden beeld, dicht bij den weg naar Moentilan. Opgaaf van den Controleur Hasselman. Volgens Hoepermans had hier ook een tempel geweest." (Verbeek 1891: no 298)

As for the locality of the archaeological sites, Verbeek is not always very precise. The *residentie* is always mentioned, but the smaller administrative boundaries are not always given. As he himself emphasises in the introduction (Verbeek 1891:16), in the case of the *Gouvernements-landen*,<sup>10</sup> details of the relevant district and *afdeeling*<sup>11</sup> are provided, while for Surakarta, only *afdeelingen* are mentioned, and for Yogyakarta only *regentschap*.<sup>12</sup>

The correspondences between Hoepermans' and Verbeek's inventories are not always easy to establish. First of all, during the lapse of time that separates these researches, Central Java underwent administrative modifications. In Hoepermans' time, the area was divided into *residentie*'s and districts, and in some cases sub-districts. However, when Verbeek conducted his researches, the *afdeelingen* had been introduced, some ancient districts had disappeared, others were merged and some borders had been redefined. In the 1860's Ngadirejo was a district, but in the 1880's it is no longer mentioned as such and seems to have been integrated in the district Kedoe, *afdeeling* Temanggoeng. The sites of Jamoes/Kramat, Perot or Pringapoes, mentioned by Hoepermans under Ngadirejo, are to be found under Kedoe. Hoepermans' Temanggoeng district is divided into the districts of Djëtis and Soemawana, *afdeeling* Temanggoeng<sup>13</sup>. The sites of Pikatan, Brongkol and Kědoenglo, formerly in Temanggoeng district, were given in Verbeek's work either in Djëtis or in Soemawana. Further, certain district boundaries were modified and as a result some sites, formerly in one district, then found themselves in another. Borobudur and Pawon, formerly under the district of Probolinggo, are in the 1880's under the authority of the Minoreh district, *afdeeling* Magelang. These are but a few examples of the administrative changes that occasionally make it confusing to compare these two early inventories.

Another source of confusion is the changes in site names. This is a recurrent problem in Javanese archaeology. As the original names are not known, one has to rely on modern names. However, those names might change according to the conventions of the villagers, the fluctuation of the administrative boundaries, the system used to transcribe Javanese language or even the ear of the researcher. Fortunately, Verbeek gives at least some of the correspondences between names used in his inventory and those appearing in Hoepermans' work. For example, writing about Sumberwatu, he underlines that "he (Hoepermans) calls the statue of Ganeça "Batoe Capella" (...) "<sup>14</sup> (Verbeek 1891:172). Unfortunately, all the correspondences are not given. Sometimes, geographical information and/or phonetics give enough clues for the correspondences to be established. For example, "Kobla" is "Geblak" (Hoepermans 1913:253; Verbeek 1891:174), "Sijwoe 3" is "Asoe" (Hoepermans, 1913:266; Verbeek 1891:360), and "Kedatong" is "Ratoe Baka/Dawong" (Hoepermans 1913:252; Verbeek 1891:174). There are four archaeological sites showing temple stones that are mentioned by Hoepermans, but which I have not been able to trace in Verbeek's inventory: Tjandi (Semarang, Ungaran), Batu Kenteng

<sup>10</sup> That is to say, the entirety of the Javanese territory with the exception of the sultanates of Yogyakarta and Surakarta.

<sup>11</sup> These divisions are roughly equivalent to the modern *kecamatan* and *kabupaten* (sub-district and district).

<sup>12</sup> Name given to an *afdeeling* in the sultanate of Yogyakarta.

<sup>13</sup> Both districts existed already in Hoepermans' times but were not then as extensive.

<sup>14</sup> "Hij (Hoepermans) noemt het ganeça-beeld "Batoe Capella" (...) " (Verbeek 1891:172)

(Kedu, Ngadirejo), Tjandi (Kedu, Probolinggo) and Salakan (Kedu, Probolinggo) (Hoeperman 1913:202, 159, 143 and 140).

Verbeek adds twenty-eight new temple remains to Hoepermans' list, most of them in the area of Prambanan. This had been made possible by the impressive work of another person: J.W. IJzerman.

#### *J.W. IJzerman in Prambanan*

Between 1885 and 1886, J.W. IJzerman, who then lived in Yogyakarta, started exploring the temple remains of the Prambanan area. Carefully and systematically, he visited the sites, described them and plotted them on a map. He returned to the Netherlands probably in the first half of 1887 and published parts of his archaeological investigations in the *Verslagen en mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen (afdeeling letterkunde)* under the modest title of "Iets over de tempelruïnen van Prambanan" (IJzerman 1887). Verbeek made ample use of this work in his own inventory.

In 1891, the same year that Verbeek published his *Oudheden van Java*, IJzerman finally had occasion to publish properly his own researches. His book, *Beschrijving der oudheden nabij de grens der residentie's Soerakarta en Djogdjakarta is a modèle du genre*, both scientific and readable, is well illustrated and accompanied by drawings and maps (IJzerman 1891). It is certainly the most precise and complete account concerning the archaeological remains of that area and one wishes IJzerman had had the time and opportunity to extend his work to other parts of the island.

#### *N.J. Krom and F.D.K. Bosch: Inventaris der Hindoe-oudheden*

The last inventory of Javanese antiquities made by the Dutch archaeological services was the work of N.J. Krom, F.D.K. Bosch and M.A. Muuses (Krom 1914a; Bosch 1915; Muuses 1923).

This work is certainly the most comprehensive and systematic inventory of Javanese antiquities ever published. It covers the whole island, listing sites of archaeological interest *residentie* by *residentie*, *afdeeling* by *afdeeling*, district by district. Administrative localizations are much more precise than in the former works. For the first time, photographs are referred to in the bibliography. However, the inventory does not include an archaeological map. Of course, one can still use Verbeek's map, but the new inventory adds no less than 71 temple remains to Verbeek's list. Fortunately, almost at the same time, in the early 1910's, the *Topografische dienst* of Batavia started to publish a series of topographical maps of Central Java, at scale 1:25 000 and 1:50 000. As administrative divisions are roughly the same as those given by Bosch and Krom, these maps can be used, to some extent, to plot the sites mentioned in the inventory. Nevertheless, as the maps do not include any index, it is a rather hazardous and lengthy process.

In the 23 years that separate Verbeek's list and the inventory of the *Oudheidkundige Dienst*, Central Java underwent some administrative changes. The former *residentie* Bagelen was integrated into the *residentie* Kedoe. In Kedoe, numerous districts changed names, especially in the *afdeelingen* Magelang and Temanggoeng. One searches in vain for *candi* Bradjanalan in the district Minoreh: it has become *candi* Banon, district Salaman. The former *candi* Goemboelan, district Ngasinan, is listed as Poetjang, district Grabag. Similarly, *candi* Goenoeng Pertapan, district Kedoe, is Bagoesan, district Parakan and *candi* Plikon, Soemawana, became Gandoelan, Kaloran. There are many other examples where both temples and district

(and sometimes even *afdeeling* and *residentie*) have changed names. Krom and Bosch were conscious of the problem: they took great care to give a list of the correspondences between new and old inventory numbers.

This new – and last – Dutch inventory of the antiquities of Java (published in 1915) is a remarkable piece of work, even if it is a little imprecise here and there. Maron (n° 1238) is described as “two *banaspati* brought to Karang-geneng”<sup>15</sup> (Bosch 1915: no 1238), whereas Verbeek mentioned that there were indeed two “*banaspati*” but also temple stones (Verbeek 1891:163). According to Bosch, “in the *desa* Pelem and Tampir there had been earlier two temples” (Bosch 1915:94).<sup>16</sup> There is no precision whatsoever about the state of preservation in 1915.<sup>17</sup> But Krom and Bosch’s work was a compilation of existing materials, and they did not have the means to check their information, or to raise doubts about it. On that point, the interpretation of the reliefs of *candi* Abang is significant. Bosch follows the opinion that the reliefs are Buddhist (although he mentions the presence of a *lingga*) (Bosch 1915:43). This statement is taken from Verbeek (Verbeek 1891:169), who, in his turn, based himself on IJzerman (IJzerman 1878:289; 1891: 123-124). However, whereas Verbeek presents it as a fact, J.W. IJzerman expresses it as mere opinion. The latter actually wrote that the seated male figure of the central niche was in “usual Buddha pose”<sup>18</sup> and that he was dressed like a *bodhisattwa* (i.e. not as a monk). IJzerman added that the sculpture could represent Awalokiteswara. As Verbeek did not check his information by fieldwork, he could not have known that the *lingga* was directly excavated out of the natural rock in front of the so-called Buddhist figure and that, in the northernmost of the three niches, were clear *śaiwa* reliefs (i.e. Durgā, Agastya and two *dwārapālas*). As a result, the association of *candi* Abang with Buddhism should be treated with care.

Sometimes Dutch inventories tend to overestimate the role of Buddhism in classical Java. In the absence of clear evidence, some sites or sculptures are presumed to be Buddhist: the case of *candi* Loro Jonggrang is well known<sup>19</sup>. This approach is found particularly frequently in early works and has been translated into the archaeological vocabulary itself. Hoepermans, for example, frequently uses the term “boedhakop” to designate what is now known as a *kāla*.<sup>20</sup> Simultaneously, there is a tendency to avoid the word “yoni”, which is replaced by “voetstuk” (pedestal). Mention of such “pedestals” in the cases of *candi* Keblak and Kanggan, or the presence of a “linga met voetstuk” in *candi* Ijo makes it clear that we are dealing with *yonis* rather than simple, unspecified pedestals.

<sup>15</sup> “Twee *banaspati*’s overgebracht naar Karang-geneng”

<sup>16</sup> “Bij de *desa*’s Pelem en Tampir hebben vroeger twee tempels gestaan” (Bosch, 1915:94, *candi* Pahingan).

<sup>17</sup> Actually, one of the two temples is still clearly visible today.

<sup>18</sup> “Gewone Boeddha houding”.

<sup>19</sup> Before the cleaning of the temple by IJzerman, it was common place to associate Loro Jonggrang with Buddhism (Brumund 1868:12; Leemans 1855:420, 23). For a recent discussion on the possible Buddhist background of Loro Jonggrang, see Jordaan 1993.

<sup>20</sup> This is rather clear on p. 148, where Hoepermans mentions “een monsterachtige boedhakop met slangtanden (van boven de ingang eener temple)”. Such a sculpture is unmistakably a *kāla* (Hoepermans 1891:148). The *kāla* is also known as *banaspati* or *monsterkop*. See, for example, Verbeek 1891:136, n°237; Vogler 1949.



## Indonesian Sources

In recent times, the National Centre for Archaeological Research and the National Heritage Institute have also made inventories of sites and artefacts. However, in contrast to their Dutch predecessors, these inventories are mainly non-standardised, unpublished lists of remains. Descriptions are most of the time absent and certain areas, especially in the province of Jawa Tengah, are poorly covered.

In the area that constitutes the focus of the present study, three institutions have carried on surveys: the *Suaka Peninggalan Sejarah dan Purbakala Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta* (SPSP DIY), the *Suaka Peninggalan Sejarah dan Purbakala Jawa Tengah* (SPSP JT)<sup>21</sup> and the *Balai Arkeologi Yogyakarta*,<sup>22</sup> a local office of the National Archaeological Institute (*Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Arkeologi Nasional*).

### SPSP DIY

The SPSP DIY has made two inventories of two types, one dealing with the movable archaeological artefacts, the other listing temple sites.

The inventory of the movable archaeological artefacts covers the whole province of Yogyakarta. Each artefact, sculpture, loose temple stone or metallic object, is given an inventory number, measured and often photographed. Its administrative location is given. Data is gathered in various series of lists according to *kabupaten* or *desa*. The main series are: *Hasil pengumpulan data kepurbakalaan*, *Laporan inventarisasi benda cagar budaya*, *Laporan peninjauan situs kepurbakalaan* and *Laporan inventarisasi kepurbakalaan*. One has to emphasise that these lists do not include *in situ* temple remains and, although they are of high interest, they can be difficult to use. Artefacts are listed according to inventory number/discovery date and not according to location. Artefacts found in the same village are not specifically listed together, so that it is difficult to get an idea of the site in its totality and to propose a correct interpretation of it (that is, whether it has been dismantled or not).

Actually, besides these small-scale lists of antiquities, the SPSP DIY possesses a general inventory of the province, named *Daftar peninggalan sejarah dan purbakala benda bergerak di propinsi DIY*. However, it was made in 1985 and is today rather incomplete, so that one has to go through all the smaller lists to find reliable information.

As a parallel project with the artefact inventories, the SPSP DIY is now in the process of building up a new list, including only temple remains.

### SPSP JT

In the province of Jawa Tengah, the situation is more confused. The extent of the area makes any inventory a much more difficult enterprise. However, some districts have been the object of in-depth surveys by the SPSP JT, surveys that ended up in inventories such as *Daftar inventaris peninggalan purbakala Jawa Tengah*, *Karesidenan Semarang*, or *Laporan hasil pengumpulan benda-benda purbakala di*

<sup>21</sup> Since the fieldwork was carried out, both SPSP have changed names. They are now the *Unit Pelaksana Teknis Balai Pelestarian Peninggalan Purbakala DIY* and *JT* (UPT BP3 DIY and UPT BP3 JT).

<sup>22</sup> At the time of writing, the new name of the *Balai Arkeologi* is *Unit Pelaksana Teknis Balai Arkeologi* (UPT Balar).

*daerah Klaten*. For other areas, like *kabupaten* Magelang, only brief lists of antiquities exist and they do not really give any details concerning the finds, their dimensions and nature. In some cases, like the Boyolali area, the best information does not emanate from the central office of the SPSP JT, but from the various *kepala desa*, who generally hold a list of the antiquities found within their village limits.

### *Balai Arkeologi*

While the two SPSP officially deal with the conservation and restoration of the archaeological remains, another institute is in charge of archaeological research: the Balai Arkeologi, a branch office of the Pusat Arkeologi (national archaeological service).

Its researches concerning the so-called marginal sites on one hand and the brick architecture in the Magelang area on the other have led the Balai Arkeologi to produce a series of local inventories, covering mainly west Central Java and the *kabupaten* of Magelang.

The inventory of west Central Java first appeared in a series of unpublished works by B.D. Tjahjono (Tjahjono 1994; 1995; 1997; 1998). The data was later gathered in a single volume, published by the Balai Arkeologi in 2000, as part of the collection *Berita penelitian arkeologi*, under the title *Budaya marginal masa klasik di Jawa Tengah* (Tjahjono 2000). This highly valuable work gives a list with administrative localizations and description of all the archaeological remains (including sculptures and architecture) in the *kabupaten* Kulon Progo (DIY), Purworejo, Kebumen, Cilacap, Banyumas, Purbalingga, Banjarnegara, Kendal, Batang, Pekalongan, Pemalang, Tegal and Brebes. It is accompanied by a few photographs and a map at scale 1:1 500 000. Unfortunately, the more precise maps (at scale 1:200 000) that were present in the earlier reports have been omitted in the later publication.

A list of temple remains of the *kabupaten* of Magelang appeared in another work of B.D. Tjahjono (Tjahjono 2002: table 1). This list includes the temple name, its administrative localization, geographical coordinates, place (village, field, graveyard...) and the state of preservation. Unfortunately, the data included in this table may differ from the data mentioned within the text, so that it is sometimes difficult to determine which version is the correct one. For instance, on p. 16, one reads concerning *Situs Tempurrejo*, that it is located in *dusun* Semirejo II, *desa* Tempurrejo, *kecamatan* Tempuran, with coordinates 7° 34' 22" S, 110° 10' 72.8" E. In table 1, the same site is located in *dusun* Kemirirejo II at 7° 34' 57" S, 110° 10' 53" E. We can see here that not only do the *dusun* and the coordinates differ, but that, in the first case, the coordinates are not properly written.<sup>23</sup> Similar mistakes are visible on p. 14-15 for the coordinates of Gombong, Candi, Samberan, Sigentan and Dimajar. Furthermore, on p. 7, the coordinates mentioned for *candi* Wurung are 7° 37' 18" – 110° 12' 25", while in the table they are 7° 35' 23" – 110° 07' 08". 110° 12' 25" corresponds with a place around Borobudur, while Wurung is located several kilometres to the west of the prestigious Buddhist monument.

Furthermore, as administrative boundaries as well as some temple names have changed over the time, it is often difficult to establish a correlation between Dutch and Indonesian inventories.

<sup>23</sup> 110° 10' 72.8" is an impossible number, but even if one converts this decimal number into seconds, it gives 43.7" and does not correspond to the coordinates given in the table.

**Fieldwork data**

Previous inventories provided me with highly valuable information, allowing glimpses of the past that can no longer be observed. However, since the last published inventory of Java (1915), archaeologists, both Dutch and Indonesian, have done an amazing amount of work and brought new sites to light. After almost one century of archaeological research, a revised inventory is badly needed.

Furthermore, previous inventories suffered from several shortcomings: absence of information concerning the method of data gathering, confusion between first hand and second hand data, absence of a reliable archaeological map and problems of locating the site (due either to a lack of precision or to modification of the administrative boundaries).

My examination of the existing inventories led me to the conclusion that my research could not treat these as absolute authorities. Above all, I needed to sift through them in order to extract only the information that would be valuable to me, i.e. temple remains.

Based on the drawbacks of the available inventories, I drew a list of the points that should be treated with care in order to have a practical, user-friendly inventory. In short, if I wanted to avoid as far as possible my predecessors' weaknesses, I had to be systematic and precise, but I also had to find a way to avoid the difficulties linked to modification of administrative boundaries. Although the inventory should remain succinct, it had to be descriptive to be really useful, especially to non-archaeologists. Furthermore, a clear distinction should be maintained between second-hand information and first-hand data, in order to provide the reader with a clear idea of what once existed and what still remains at the date of the inventory.

The result is found in the appendixes: a new inventory of Central Javanese temples in the special region of Yogyakarta and in the districts of Magelang, Semarang, Klaten and Boyolali.