

# PAÑJI AND CANDRAKIRANA LOST IN SEPARATION – THREE ANCIENT EAST JAVANESE SCULPTURES

Lydia Kieven

*The Department of Southeast Asian Studies, University Bonn, Germany, Berrenrather Str. 315c 50937 Köln, Jerman  
lydia.kieven@gmail.com*

**Abstrak. Pañji dan Candrakirana, Hilang karena Terpisah – Tiga Arca Kuno Periode Jawa Timur.** Makalah ini membahas tiga arca, satu arca lelaki dan dua arca perempuan, yang berasal dari periode Jawa Timur (sekitar 1450 M). Arca lelaki yang biasa ditemukan sebagai tokoh mitologis, yaitu Raden Pañji, dalam penggambaran aslinya didampingi oleh arca yang menggambarkan Putri Candrakirana sebagai pasangannya. Arca ini sudah hilang. Sebuah arca perempuan lain yang masih ada juga diyakini sebagai representasi Candrakirana. Berdasarkan metode ikonologi yang digunakan di dalam penelitian ini, tulisan ini membahas ikonografi, gaya dan perbandingan penggambaran tiga figur ini, serta mendiskusikan tempat pembuatan, asal-usulnya, dan kisah hidupnya. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa setidaknya terdapat dua pasang penggambaran Pañji dan Candrakirana, dan kemungkinan masih banyak lagi yang belum ditemukan. Pemujaan Pañji dan Candrakirana sebagai semi-manusia dan semi-dewa adalah bagian religiusitas spesifik dalam zaman Majapahit.

**Kata Kunci:** Jawa Timur, Majapahit, Pañji, Candrakirana

*Abstract. This paper discusses three sculptures, a male and two female ones, dating to the East Javanese period (c. 1450 AD). The male image which is commonly identified as the depiction of the mythological Prince Pañji, originally was accompanied by a statue depicting his female counterpart Princess Candrakirana, this statue being lost today. Another female statue, still extant today, is argued to represent another depiction of Candrakirana. Based on the method of iconology, this study investigates the iconography, style, and the comparison of these images, and it raises questions of workshops, provenance and life history. The conclusion suggests the existence of at least two pairs of sculptures depicting Pañji and Candrakirana, and possibly a larger – so far – unknown number. The cult of worshipping Pañji and Candrakirana as semi-divine deities makes part of the specific religiosity during the Majapahit time.*

**Keywords:** East Java, Majapahit, Pañji, Candrakirana

## 1. Introduction

An ancient Javanese statue representing a male figure (fig. 1) is kept in the Fine Arts Library of the Technical Institute of Bandung (ITB). It displays a body in a soft shape and wearing a cap as headgear. The original place of the sculpture is the site of Candi Selokelir on the slopes of Mount Penanggungan in the district of Mojokerto in East Java. It is dated to the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century. A female figure (fig. 6, 7) which is lost today, is known from two photos (OD-2190, 2191) taken in 1915 at the site of Selokelir. The headless statue stands next to the male figure.

It displays a body in a soft shape. An ancient Javanese statue representing a female figure (fig. 8) is kept in the National Museum in Jakarta (inv. no. 310). It displays a body in a soft shape. The label mentions Mojokerto as its original place.

My suggestion imparts that the two female sculptures both represent Princess Candrakirana who is the beloved of Pañji in the East Javanese Pañji stories. These stories were popular during the Majapahit period (c. 1300-1500) and were carved in stone reliefs on a number of temples of this period. In my earlier research (Kieven 2013:

Naskah diterima tanggal 25 Februari 2016, diperiksa 11 Maret 2016, dan disetujui tanggal 2 April 2016.

327-37)<sup>1</sup>, I interpreted the depiction of Pañji in the temple reliefs to have the symbolic function of an intermediary between the mundane and the supramundane world, the reunion of Pañji and Candrakirana symbolizing complete harmony. The Pañji statue from Selokelir would have expressed this symbolism, enhanced through its semi-divine appearance. My new findings on the female figures provide a broader look at the sculptural tradition of the Pañji depictions in the Majapahit period. Based on the fact that there are two Candrakirana statues of roughly the same size, I raise the question if depictions of the couple in three-dimensional sculptures were common practice. This issue has never been considered in the past. The reunion of Pañji and Candrakirana is manifest in their semi-divine sculptural depictions.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Research Methods

For my argument I draw back on Panofsky's methodology of iconology for the analysis of meaning and symbolism of visual art.<sup>3</sup> This method is based on iconographical data which implies that the motifs are seen as carriers of a meaning. In the so called iconological phase, the work of art is considered in the context of the principle attitudes of religious or political convictions of an era, of a class. Other forms of art and their styles, as well as forms of literature are to be taken into account. Following this schema, I collect iconographical data of the objects under discussion and present an iconographic comparison between each other. The iconography of other contemporary images of similar styles will be taken into account, as well as other related forms of art, i.e. the depictions in temple reliefs, followed by their comparison. The further analysis draws back on

1 Indonesian edition Kieven 2014a: 383-94.

2 At an earlier stage of my investigation (Kieven 2014b), I suggested the two extant figures (in ITB and in the National Museum) to form a couple originating from the same site: Candi Selokelir. However, after having found evidence through OD-photo no. 2190/2191, I had to revise my interpretation, since another Candrakirana had already taken her place.

3 Panofsky 1955; later revised editions.

my earlier research results on the depictions of Pañji and their symbolism, and on other earlier scholarly research, in particular in the fields of history, archaeology, philology.

## 3. The Results of Research and Discussion

The result of the research imparts that the cult of worshipping the mythological Pañji was not only restricted to Pañji as has been the state-of-the-art of archaeological discussion in the past, but did comprise the worship of his union with Candrakirana. This conclusion is based on the suggestion that at least two pairs of sculptures depicting the couple were extant, and possibly a larger number which today are lost. The study imparts a contribution to a new understanding of specific aspects of religiosity and religious practice during the Majapahit time.

### 3.1 Iconography

#### 3.1.1 Iconographical description, analysis, and comparison of the statues

##### a. The male image at ITB<sup>4</sup>

The statue, 125 cm high, carved in three dimensions without a backslab, depicts a body, standing on a lotus cushion. The figure has a long loincloth and bare chest. The left arm hangs straight down; the right arm, partly broken, holds a lotus bud in the shape of a *padma* in front of the body beneath the chest. The head is slightly bent down. The figure is adorned with simple jewelry and with a caste cord (*upawita*). The whole body is characterized by rounded forms: the chest and the lower part of the belly are bulging. The back of the body is straight.

The face and in particular the lips look very soft. The eyes are half closed, with high eyebrows. Short side whiskers are visible on the cheeks close to the ears. Long earrings reach down to the shoulders. The hair consists of thick curls, two of them are protruding on the forehead. The top of the hair is covered by a cap which, seen from the side, displays a crescent moon-

4 See also Kieven 2013: 316-9.



**Fig. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.** (Left to right) Male statue from Candi Selokelir, ITB Bandung. Height: 125 cm (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2006); Measures of the Pañji sculpture from Selokelir, ITB Bandung (Source: Pindi, photo taken in 2015); Statue from Selokelir: Look at the left side of the body (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2014); Statue from Selokelir: Feet and lotus cushion (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2006); Statue from Selokelir: lotus (*padma*) bud held by the right hand (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2014)

like shape. Between the hair and the edge of the cap a small kind of ribbon is placed. The neck has three wrinkles. The head and the half closed eyes give the impression of somebody who is in deep stillness or in meditation. The large size of the head does not fit the proportion of the body. The bare chest is rounded. An elaborate neckless covers the forechest. A caste cord (*upawita*) falls down from the left shoulder in a loop below the belly, grasped by the left arm. The right arm is broken, only wrist and hand are complete. The armpits show hair. The long loincloth, having flat pleats, covers the lower part of the body from the waist. It is kept tight around the waist by a broad girdle whose one end hangs down on the front of the body, its tip being a tassel. On the left side of the body, the cloth is bulged in seven elaborately carved pleats.

The right hand holding a lotus bud (*padma*) is placed in the middle of the body between girdle and chest (fig. 5). Though partly damaged, the bud can be identified to consist of a lower and an upper semi-circle of leaves. The refined slightly bent fingers have three rings: little finger, forefinger, and thumb. The tips of the fingers are damaged, it seems that the fore- and the middlefinger originally held the lotus flower. A large bracelet on the arm wrist is still extant, same as on the left arm. The left hand seems to be decorated with rings in the same way

as the right hand. This arm is quite coarse and anatomically not correct. The lower edge of the loincloth falls in softly curved folds down to the foot wrists, the feet being decorated with jewelry of triangular shape. The bare feet and the toes are rather coarse, compared to the delicately shaped hands.<sup>5</sup>

The described features identify the image as a noble person. The lotus cushion and the caste cord are indications of the possible rank of a deity. However, a halo (*prabha*) which is another characteristic attribute of a deity is lacking. The hair in the armpits and the rather simple style of clothing are typical features of a human being. Considering the iconographic details altogether, imparts that the figure has to be considered as a human - and not a divine - being.

#### **b. The female image at the site of Selokelir**

The image is not extant. It is only known from the OD-photos 2190 and 2191 and from a description by Krom (Krom 1923, II: 405).<sup>6</sup> The photos show both, the Pañji figure and the female, next to each other leaning against fragments of stones. Both figures have no head. While the

<sup>5</sup> The unnatural way of depicting feet is a common trait in contemporary deity sculptures.

<sup>6</sup> Owing to the digitalization of OD-photos by Kern Institute and their access via the Special Collection of UB Leiden, research on ancient art has today become much more easy than in former times.





**Fig. 6 and 7.** (left): Torso of the female statue on the left, next to the torso of the Pañji figure, Candi Selokelir. Complete height of the female figure, including head and bottom, assumably c. 115 cm. Photo taken in 1915. (Courtesy University Library Leiden, Kern Institute OD-2191); (right): Detail of fig. 6

lotus cushion and the feet of the male figure are visible, the lower part of the female is covered by grass. The size - both height and width - of the female body is a bit smaller than the male body; it may have an original height of  $\pm 120$  cm.

Though not all details are clearly visible in the photos, the main features are detectable: The chest is rounded, maybe covered by a cloth, and decorated by a neckless. A cord falls down from the left shoulder in a loop below the belly. The left arm grasps the cord. The long loincloth seems to have a small girdle whose end hangs down on the front of the body, its tip being a tassel. The loincloth, carved in pleats, is slightly tucked up on the left side, which is common for depictions of female. The girdle or part of the cloth is bulged in elaborate pleats on the left side; however, due to the perspective of the photo, the arrangement of the garment is not clearly visible. The right hand holds a lotus bud in front of the chest. The refined slightly bent fingers are decorated with three rings: little finger, forefinger, and thumb. A large bracelet covers the wrist, same as the left hand which holds the caste cord. The bottom of the figure is broken. The described features identify the image as a noble person.

### c. The female image at the National Museum<sup>7</sup>

The statue, 105 centimetres high, carved in three dimensions without a backslab, depicts a body, standing on a lotus cushion (fig. 8). The figure has a loincloth which covers chest and lower parts of the body. The right arm hangs straight down, the left arm is bent holding parts of the cloth. The figure is adorned with simple jewelry. The whole body and the face have a soft, rounded shape.

The face is partly damaged, in particular mouth and nose. The eyes are open wide, with high eyebrows. The shape of the earrings are partly damaged. The hair is flattened, two thick curls protrude on the forehead. From Groeneveldt's description (Groeneveldt 1887: 107) we know that the long hair falls down along the straight back of the figure (fig. 11).<sup>8</sup> The large size of the head does not fit the proportion of the body. The body has bulging

<sup>7</sup> The image has the inventory number 310, and is labelled as "female statue from Mojokerto,  $\pm 15^{\text{th}}$  century". It is placed in the large hall (rotunde), which amongst others houses sculptures of Wishnu, Shiwa, and Brahma from the Banon temple in Central Java, and the famous huge Bhairawa statue from Batang Hari.

<sup>8</sup> The figure is unfortunately placed close to the wall, so that the back is not completely discernable. Only if looked at from the right side, part of the long hair is visible.



**Fig. 8, 9, 10, and 11.** (Left to right) Female statue from Mojokerto, National Museum Jakarta, inv. no. 310. Height: 105 cm (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2015). Note: on the left side the figure of Semar (fig. 12, 13) is visible.; Statue from Mojokerto: Look at the left side of the body (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2014).; Statue from Mojokerto: Feet and lotus cushion (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2014).; Statue from Mojokerto: The right side of the body (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2015)

breasts, the right part being partly damaged, and a slightly bulging belly. A neckless with a brooch covers the forechest. A cord reaches from the right breast to the left part of the waist. The end of this cord is grasped by the two hands, the right arm being placed straight along the body, the left arm being slightly bent. The garment covering the front part of the body is completely plain, on the left side it is draped in elaborate pleats, which in the upper part look like deeply carved sun rays (fig. 9). This part is only visible when looked at from the left side of the figure. Another part of the garment, pleated in a similar way, falls in a loop around the upper left arm. Another small cloth grasped elegantly by both hands in front of the body, may be part of the pleated garment or of the cord along the breast.<sup>9</sup> The wrists of the arms are decorated with large bracelets. Due to erosion it is not clear if the fingers are adorned with rings. The lower edge of the loincloth covers part of the feet in a straight line (fig. 10). The feet are decorated with jewelry in triangular shape. The bare feet

<sup>9</sup> The delicate way of arrangement of the garment is not easily discernable. For comparison I quote Groeneveldt's (1887: 107) description of a few features of the figure: „The dress is fixed above the breasts and falls down to the feet, while the edge of the dress reaches up again in a border with strong pleats along the side and the back to the shoulders. A small cloth having lots of pleats (*slendang*) goes over the right breast and the left arm and is grasped in front of the body by both hands.”

and the toes are rather coarse, compared to the delicately shaped hands.

The described features identify the image as a noble person. The lotus cushion is a characteristic of a deity; the cord cannot be considered a caste cord, because of its placement on the right instead of the left shoulder. The long hair and the rather simple style of clothing and decoration characterize the figure as a human, and not a divine being.

#### **d. Iconographic comparison of the Sculptures**

The three figures have a number of iconographic features in common. All of them are characterized by soft body shape, refined appearance and posture, elegant details of garment, jewelry, and gestures, and displaying characteristics of deities as well as of human beings.

(A) Comparison of the two images from Selokelir (fig. 1, 3, 4, 5, fig. 6, 7), listing the details which are similar or the same:

- the arrangement of the cloth:
  - soft pleats of the loincloth on the belly, the pleats of the female falling towards the left part of the body, the pleats of the male falling straight

- elaborately carved pleats of the garment on the left part of the waist; the way and style of the carving
- cord respective caste cord and the arrangement of the tassel
- large bracelets
- refined hands and fingers and their elegant way of grasping the textile respectively the lotus bud
- bulged belly.

(B) Comparison of the Pañji image from Selokelir and the female from the National Museum (fig. 1, 3; fig. 8, 9, 10), listing the details which are similar or the same:

- the heads:
  - two protruding curls of hair on the forehead
  - high eyebrows
- the arrangement of the cloth:
  - soft pleats of the loincloth on the front part of the body
  - elaborately carved pleats of the garment on the left waist; the way and style of the carving
- caste cord of the male figure and the cord of the female
- large bracelets
- refined hands and fingers and their elegant way of grasping the textile respectively the lotus bud
- bulged belly
- anatomically not correct shape of feet and toes
- foot ornaments
- lotus cushion.

(C) Comparison of the two female statues (fig. 7 and fig. 8):

Similarities:

- the arrangement of the cloth:
  - elaborately carved pleats of the garment on the left side of the body
- large bracelets

- refined hands and fingers and their elegant way of grasping the textile
- slightly bulged belly

Differences:

- the arrangement of the cloth:
  - the statue in the National Museum: rather flat pleats of the loincloth on the front part of the body
  - the Selokelir statue: deeper pleats on the front part
- cord:
  - the statue in the National Museum: cord reaching from right shoulder down across the breast
  - the Selokelir statue: caste cord reaching from left shoulder down the body into a loop
- hands:
  - the statue in the National Museum: both hands holding the tip of the garment in front of the body
  - the Selokelir statue: right hand holding the lotus bud, left hand holding part of the garment.

(D) Comparison of the three statues

The Pañji statue and the female from the National Museum display iconographic features characteristic of deification images: the stiff posture of the body, standing on a lotus cushion, a lotus bud held in the hand, and the head slightly bent down, the eyes looking towards the tip of the nose, as if in meditation. Differing from deity images holding their hands in meditation gestures (*mudra*), the most common one being the *dhyanamudra*, Pañji only holds one hand in front of the body. Both images having only two arms, rather than the four arms of deity images, characterize them as human beings. The same applies to the simple garment and adornment of the Pañji statue and its cap. The hair under the armpit is not appropriate for a deity image. These comparisons impart that the Pañji image does rather represent a human being and not a



deity. The similarities with the deification images do, however, emphasize that Pañji had risen to a deity-like rank without being an actual divinity himself. The same holds true for the depictions of the two female sculptures under discussion.

In her study of ‘deified couples’, Marijke Klokke (1998) compares images of male and female deities.<sup>10</sup> Klokke bases her identification of two sculptures forming a couple on a detailed comparison of iconographic and stylistic features. Elements such as crown, hairdo, clothing, *upawita*, ornaments, jewelry and sashes, hand and feet are carved in exactly the same way in the male and the female image. I apply this concept to my comparison of the three statues under discussion. The male and the female image from Selokelir have identical significant iconographic details – in particular the postures of the hands, the cord, the lotus bud, the arrangement of the garment – which imparts the suggestion that they indeed display a couple. The image from the National Museum also shows intriguing similarities in a number of elements, however, the crucial features – postures of hands, placement of the cord – differ from each other.<sup>11</sup>

All of the three images show striking common traits, as described above. Before getting evidence about the female sculpture of Selokelir through the OD-photo, I was convinced that the Pañji sculpture and the National Museum female sculpture originally formed a couple, due to their significant iconographic similarities. The fact that the female does not hold a lotus bud, would not contradict this hypothesis, since it also occurs in the deity couples, investigated

by Klokke, that the king holds a lotus while the queen does not.

My study wants to give answers to the following questions:

- Was there a specific style of semi-divine images and couples and in particular of Pañji and Candrakirana?
- Did artists work in the same style at different workshops?
- Were the three statues carved in the same workshop?
- Can the female sculpture from the National Museum be considered as a depiction of Candrakirana?
- Should we assume the existence of a Pañji figure as her counterpart which is lost today?
- Did other images depicting Pañji and Candrakirana exist, which are lost today or not yet discovered?
- Were there more images of Pañji and Candrakirana having a lotus throne?
- Do other figures of the specific style, kept in museum depots or private collections, give further insight?

### **3.1.2 Iconography of narrative relief depictions of the 14th and 15th centuries, and comparison with the statues**

Narrative reliefs on ancient Javanese temples of the Majapahit period during fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are classified by two distinct styles. Narratives being based on the Old Javanese *kakawin* literature, which draws back on the Indic epics *Rāmāyāna* (e.g. at the Main Temple of Candi Panataran, mid-14<sup>th</sup> century), *Mahābhārata* (*Arjunawiwaha*) (e.g. at Candi Jago, mid-14<sup>th</sup> century), are depicted in a style which has been labelled as “wayang style”<sup>12</sup>. The bodies of the protagonists display stiff elongated arms; kings and other characters of high status have the headgear *supit urang* (the crab-claw style of the hair bent in two curves)

<sup>12</sup> For example Galestin (1959:14-8) and Claire Holt (1972:71) use this term.

<sup>10</sup> She argues that the case studies of six couples of the late Singhasāri and the Majapahit period do not represent historic kings and queens displaying individual features, but rather ‘deification images’ which symbolize the “king’s unification with the highest god after death” (Klokke 1998: 171). She draws back on Stutterheim’s (1936c) discussion of the so-called ‘portrait statues’, and her argumentation rejects his interpretation.

<sup>11</sup> In a personal discussion, Marijke Klokke (August 2014) indicated to me that the lower border of the loincloths of the images are different, while in the deification couples, this detail is always identical. Since the garments of the two images are not completely identical in their other parts either, I think that the difference of the lower borders of the textile does not contradict my assumption of the stylistic similarities.

and the *garuda mungkur* (the Garuda shape on the back of the head). This style is until today a common trait of Balinese *wayang* puppets. The protagonists wear refined and rich clothes and jewelry, for example Rama, Arjuna, and Krishna.

Another style is the one of depictions of *kidung* stories which are, different from the *kakawin*, an indigenous Javanese literary genre.<sup>13</sup> Pañji stories, belonging to the *kidung* genre, were very popular during the Majapahit time which is attested through their frequent depictions in temple reliefs (Kieven 2013: 25-38). The folklike character of these stories is mirrored in the simple style of depictions in reliefs. The males usually wear a plain loincloth with a girdle around the waist, and have bare chest. They never have the *supit urang* headgear; in many cases the male figure wears a cap. The earliest depictions of the cap mark commoners and royal servants (e.g. Candi Jago), later it became a distinct feature of Prince Pañji; examples are Candi Panataran, Candi Mirigambar, Candi Kendalisodo. The female usually wears a *kemben* (breast cloth), the long garment being softly pleated. People of noble status, such as Pañji and Candrakirana, are adorned by simple jewelry, such as earrings, bracelet, and necklace.<sup>14</sup>

The simple attire and iconographic details of the three-dimensional sculptures discussed in this paper resemble the style of the relief depictions of *kidung* stories. The specific kind of loincloth with the girdle, in combination with the cap, characterizes the male sculpture as Pañji (Kieven 2013: 316-23). The two female sculptures display the typical iconographic features of the young noblewoman in the reliefs which, in many cases depict the beloved of Pañji: long hair (in the case of the statue at the National Museum), long garment being tied up on one side,

simple jewelry. The specific kind of elaborate pleats in the side parts of the bodies of the three sculptures only occurs in the sculptures and not in any relief depiction. This may be due to the difference of three-respectively two-dimensional carvings, or it may deliberately indicate the higher status of the sculptures. There is no relief depicting a noble couple having deity-attributes, such as caste cord, lotus cushion, or lotus flower. The sculptures under discussion depict members of the nobility, however being of a higher status than the ones in the relief depictions.

### 3.1.3 Iconography and style of selected sculptures of non-deity status of the Majapahit Period, and comparison with the images under discussion

There is not a large number of sculptures of non-deity status which are apt for comparison. I discuss a selection of images of the Majapahit period which have iconographic and stylistic similarities with the three images under discussion. Most of them are on display in the National Museum in Jakarta, or are known from descriptions in Groeneveldt's (1887) catalogue of the collection of the then-called Museum Batavia.<sup>15</sup>

A sculpture assumed to represent Pañji (height: 63.5 cm), was documented by Groeneveldt (1887: 107) having inventory number 310a, and by Brandes (ROC 1902: 11, plate 5) (fig. 12, 13).<sup>16</sup> The whereabouts of this figure is unknown. It displays – same as the Selokelir figure – the cap-like headdress, two curls of hair on the forehead, three wrinkles on the neck. Hair and ears are adorned with simple jewelry, the other parts of the body display no jewelry. The figure wears a simple loincloth with a girdle. It is less elaborately worked than

13 The date of the earliest *kidung* is not known, they are supposed to have been composed since the 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> century (Kieven 2013:26). For broad discussion of the *kidung* genre see Robson 1971, Hunter 2007.

14 Compare Forge 1978 and his terminology of 'mythological stories' *kakawin* and 'post-mythological stories' *kidung*. See Kieven 2013: 51.

15 The former Museum Batavia merged into today's National Museum in Jakarta. Concerning depictions of females, I omit small gold and terracotta depictions of the Majapahit period which only have a little items in common. Most of these figurines depict women in a coy and erotic posture and attitude which lacks the stone sculptures under discussion.

16 Photos OD-258, OD-259.





**Fig. 12 and 13.** Statues from Grogol (Brandes ROC 1902: 11, plate 5; from left to right: Semar (no. 310b), height: 54 cm; Pañji (no. 310a), height: 63.5 cm; Kertolo (no. 310c), height: 66 cm. (Source: OD 258–259, courtesy Kern Institute, University of Leiden)

the Selokelir figure: it lacks the lotus cushion, the *upawita*, and the rich adornments. The whole appearance corresponds more to the simple style of the Pañji depictions in reliefs. Originally this image made part of a group of three sculptures from Grogol in the district of Sidoarjo (Groeneveldt 1887: 107). Each of the figures stands on a pedestal, the one of the Pañji figure having the inscription 1334 Śaka (= AD 1413). The two statues with inv.no. 310b (height: 54 cm), 310c (height: 66 cm) represent Kertolo and Semar and are on display in the National Museum in Jakarta;<sup>17</sup> their iconography is similar to depictions in Pañji stories in temple reliefs. Typical traits of Kertolo are the bun of curly hair on top of the head, and the moustache; Semar has the coarse body and face characteristic for the *panakawan*. The complete group from Grogol is a three-dimensional version of the typical scheme of relief depictions of Pañji stories.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> There is no evidence, if the Pañji statue was ever on display in the museum or if it was kept in the storage room, or if it was later taken to another place. Today, the Kertolo figure stands next to the female figure inv. no. 311; the Semar figure stands next to the female figure inv. no. 310. We may assume that this placement corresponds with the original arrangement of the Dutch Museum Batavia. Stutterheim (1935: 142 and Poerbatjaraka (1968: 406-9) discussed the figures in comparison to the relief from Gambyok – supposed to depict a scene from the story Pañji Semarang, considering the cap as an indicator of Pañji.

<sup>18</sup> A head is on display in the National Museum (inv. no. 223d),

A sculpture with inv. no. 310d is on display in the National Museum, however is not mentioned in Groeneveldt's inventory. It is likely that this object was taken to the museum after 1887. It is still an unsolved question why the inventory number is connected to images inv. nrs. 310a-c. It has been identified as Bima or Kertolo. Its provenance is unknown.<sup>19</sup> Iconography and style have no similarity with the Grogol group. I agree with scholars who identify it as Bima.<sup>20</sup>

Another figure with a cap, assumed to represent Pañji, is on display in the Museum of Prambanan (Fig. 14).<sup>21</sup> The image is reported by Stutterheim (O.V. 1936: 17) to have its

having the label: "A head. It's probably fragment of guardian statue. Origin Unknown, Century +/- 14-15 AD". However, I identify it with one of the kadeyan - Kertolo or another companion of Pañji (due to curly hair and moustache).

<sup>19</sup> Following *NBG* 1910: XXIII, and other sources.

<sup>20</sup> The figure has been identified as a representation of Bima by Stutterheim (1956: 109), as Kertolo by Fonteijn (1971: 63; Nr. 20). Munandar (2009: 116) identifies it as Brajanata, the elder brother of Pañji; following his argument that Brajanata is the icon of Gajah Mada, he concludes that image inv. no. 310d symbolizes Gajah Mada. The label in the National Museum says: "Pañji Kertolo. The brother of Pañji Kudawanengpati, King Jenggala's son from step-mother. In Mahabharata epic, Pañji Kertolo is likened to Bima". Further research is required.

<sup>21</sup> I am grateful to Hadi Sidomulyo (alias Nigel Bullough) to bring this sculpture to my attention and for pointing out Blom's reference in Van Romondt (1951: 11) where the inventory numbers of figures from Mount Penanggungan being taken to the Prambanan Museum in 1941 are listed (by email and SMS in August-September 2015). My gratitude also to Yoses Tanzaq who opened the glass vitrine and allowed me to take pictures of the sculpture in Prambanan Museum.



Fig. 14. Pañji figure from Mount Penanggungan (Kunjoro), Museum Prambanan, reg. no. 891. Height: 50 cm. (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2015)

provenance in Koendjoro (= Kunjoro) near Belahan. The location of Belahan in the district of Bangil is in the neighbourhood of the district of Sidoarjo, on the northeast side of Mount Penanggungan. This small image (height: 50 cm) has a backslab with sunrays, typical of Majapahit deity sculptures, which makes it different from the two other discussed Pañji figures. Dress and adornment are a bit more elaborate than the Grogol Pañji, but still less refined compared to the Selokelir Pañji. The stout body shows a stiff posture similar to the East Javanese deification images; the coarse shape of the arms and feet are not anatomically correct. The figure stands on a plain pedestal.

The existence of three three-dimensional Pañji figures gives evidence that the worship of Pañji during the Majapahit period was maybe more wide-spread than has been assumed so far. Amongst this group, the Selokelir figure is the most outstanding one. All of the three images originate from Mount Penanggungan, a mountain of conspicuous religious meaning at the time.

I select a few more images from Groeneveldt's inventory of the collection of Museum Batavia which are apt for comparison.<sup>22</sup> Groeneveldt classifies the stone images and objects into categories according to their identification. Relevant for my study is category XII.c) which lists unknown images of a deviating type ("*afwijkend type*"), including inv. nrs. 308-320 (Groeneveldt 1887: 105-9). His definition of "*afwijkend type*" is:

*"(...) being very distinct from the usual Hindu-Javanese types. Some of them are probably fantasy images, others probably date to a later period when, due to the decrease or the end of immigration from India, culture and art had degenerated and the indigenous element increased and through its influence the original Javanese or later modified forms of deities had become more prominent."*<sup>23</sup>

In this statement, Groeneveldt follows the contemporary scholarly attitude which valued Hindu-Javanese art and culture in comparison to the Indian model, considering the art of the East Javanese period as a degeneration of the earlier Central Javanese art.

A female sculpture in the National Museum (fig. 15), inv. no. 311, height: 84 cm, is labelled as "A noblewoman sculpture of unknown origin, 15<sup>th</sup> century".<sup>24</sup> The image shows a woman of a simple appearance, characterized as a noblewoman through some delicate parts of dress and adornment. The style is the same as of the two female images under discussion,

<sup>22</sup> A few of the objects are on display in the National Museum. The whereabouts of the others are not known. Some of them may be kept in the storage room of the Museum, some seem to be completely lost.

<sup>23</sup> All quotes from Groeneveldt 1887 in this article are translated from the Dutch into English language by Lydia Kieven. Same holds for the quotes of Krom 1923 and Stutterheim 1936a, b.

<sup>24</sup> Groeneveldt (1887: 108) gives the following detailed description: "Unknown image (deviating style). Representing a woman who is placed on a high pedestal, without backslab and nimbus. The adornments are rich and of modern character. Above the forehead a diadem is placed with elaborate adornments behind and above the ears, her hair is bound and falls down along the back; bracelets on the upper and the lower arms, necklace and decorated girdle. The dress covers the breast and falls down to the feet. The left hangs close to the body, the right hand is placed in front of the breast. Limestone. Height 84."



**Fig. 15.** Female sculpture, National Museum Jakarta inv. no. 311. Height: 84 cm. Note: The Kertolo figure from Grogol (inv.no. 310c) is visible on the left. (Source: Kieven, photo taken in 2015)

though less refined and elaborate. Similar are the refined posture of the bent right hand in front of the breast, the slender fingers, the upper arm rings, the upper part of the loincloth around the waist with a more simple kind of pleats, the feet. The headgear, consisting of an ornamented headcloth, is distinct. The whole appearance is more stout than the other statues. Another artifact inv. no. 312 – the present whereabouts are unknown - seems to have traits similar to inv. no. 311: “*Idem*. Broken head, in character and ornamentation similar to the aforementioned image. Height: 24 cm.” (Groeneveldt 1887: 108). It would be enlightening to know more about the complete image.<sup>25</sup> A complete work-up of the

<sup>25</sup> In Groeneveldt’s descriptions of category XXII.b) there are also a few similar traits; however they are not significant enough, and moreover the images are not extant. Thus they do not provide much insight. Still, I want to mention them for future research: the female images inv. no. 296 a (sitting posture), 297 (lying posture), 298, 299 (sitting posture) are mentioned as “zonder achterstuk en glorie” (= without backslab and halo), and thus represent females of non-deity status. Groeneveldt classifies them as having the “usual style” of the earlier period.

inventory of Groeneveldt is beyond the range of this article, it is still to be done in the future.

All sculptures discussed in this article are manifestations of the simple, naturalistic style - the so-called “*afwijkend stijl*” (deviating style) - applied to three-dimensional carvings. I conclude that a large uncertain number of female and male sculptures existed which were carved in this style and are not extant any more. Further research is necessary to draw more conclusions about the function of such sculptures. Relevant for the questions of this study is the fact that only few images are known which present human beings in a deity-like way, namely the three sculptures under discussion and the Prambanan Pañji. Even if there is no proof for the female at the National Museum to depict Candrakirana, it is, due to the lotus cushion, evident that she represents a human deity-like figure. I think it is reasonable to assume that the two figures at Selokelir form the couple of Pañji and Candrakirana, and that the female figure from the National Museum once was the counterpart of a lost Pañji figure. We might assume that the Grogol group originally also had a Candrakirana figure. The Pañji stories always end with the reunion of the two lovers, and so do – in most cases – the relief depictions, as I will elaborate on in the following chapter. Thus, it makes sense, that the union would also be depicted in two sculptures forming a couple.

### 3.2 My earlier research on the symbolism of depictions of Pañji<sup>26</sup>

The Pañji stories relate the love story of Prince Pañji from the kingdom of Jenggala and of Princess Candrakirana from Kaḍiri. There exists a large number of variations of the story, there are also different names of the protagonists. The plot is always the same. Pañji and Candrakirana are betrothed to each other, but are separated due to various circumstances. They search for each other, pass adventures, wars, other lovestories, and all

<sup>26</sup> Kieven 2013: 327-37 (Indonesian edition Kieven 2014a: 383-94); see also the discussions of single sites in Chapters VII, IX, X of the book.



kinds of hindrances, before in the end they meet again and marry. The stories symbolize loyalty, steadiness in mastering hindrances, simpleness and modesty, and harmony. As mentioned above, the folklike character of the Pañji stories which are indigenous Javanese, differs from the Indian based stories of *Rāmāyana* and *Mahābhārata*. They are a typical example of the uniqueness of the creativity of Majapahit's culture.

In my study on the relief depictions of Pañji stories I suggested that, in addition to the mentioned symbolic aspects of the literary versions, the visual versions encompass a spiritual meaning. Pañji acts as an intermediary for visitors and pilgrims to the temple, to indicate the way from the mundane world to the supra-mundane, sacral world. Seeking religious advice from hermits, crossing water as a means of ritual purification, and the union of male and female are frequent elements in the relief series, which I consider to convey the message of the Tantric path.

Pañji formed part of the local genius of Javanese tradition which developed independently of the old Indian tradition, and he had increasingly become an object of worship. The Selokelir statue is an extraordinary example: it represents the climax of the increasing rate of worship of Pañji in the late Majapahit period. The lotus bud, held in front of the lower part of the chest adds another specific symbolic meaning. This part of the body corresponds to the position of the *Anandakanda-padma* cakra, the seat of the *ishtadewata* (the personal deity of the practitioner of yoga), in the Tantric Kundalini path.<sup>27</sup> Pañji points to this very *cakra*, indicating the Tantric Kundalini path. This is emphasized by the meditative posture of the figure, given that meditation is an essential element in Tantric practice. Zoetmulder's findings support my argument: "Concentrating the mind (...) is a form of preparation for the meditation which

concentrates solely upon the god in the heartlotus [*anandakandapadma*]" (Zoetmulder 1974: 183, 184).<sup>28</sup> The fact that the Pañji figure was located on Mount Penanggungan enhances its symbolism, considering that this mountain was a major place of sanctuaries and caves for meditation practice and esoteric teaching by hermits (*rsi*) (Munandar 1990; Santiko 1990, 1998).

### 3.3 Provenance and Life History of the Sculptures

Research on material culture has 'traditionally' been conducted on the background of history, art history, iconography, intertextuality. During recent years, the disciplines of archaeology and art history have increasingly been considering and researching the "life history" of material culture. The approach of life history provides new insight into the perceptions and the values ascribed to the specific object by researchers, collectors and other actors. It reflects the attitude of individual or of common sense towards specific forms of art, of history, and in a broader sense of culture.

The life history of the Pañji figure from Selokelir is well documented, whereas the female figure from Selokelir has never been investigated; neither have the origins and the journeys of the female figure in the National Museum been sufficiently traced back so far. Starting in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century under the auspices of Raffles and continued by Dutch archaeologists, many artifacts were moved to other places. Most of the objects were documented and recorded in Dutch publications; in many cases the move of artifacts was, however, not documented. Artifacts were stolen from their original place, kept by locals and by colonial officers, sold and bought by collectors, destroyed, and so on. In many cases it was only after a long winded track that artifacts have become known to the public. An invaluable work was done by the exhibition "The discovery

<sup>27</sup> These statements are based on Zoetmulder 1974: 183-4. See also Kieven 2013: 321-2.

<sup>28</sup> For example Lowenthal 2001; Karlström 2009: 191-8; Hardiati and Pieter ter Keurs (eds.) 2005: 6-32.

of the past” which traced back the life history of a large amount of objects held in Dutch and Indonesian museum collections.<sup>29</sup> The Pañji sculpture from Selokelir went the journey of being well documented, while the track of the female sculpture from the National Museum seems to belong to the more winded roads and requires some intricate research, same as the Selokelir female which is only documented in two photo and a short mention by Krom.

The specific collections of artifacts, their display in museums or private collections, and in storages reflect the value ascribed to them. This value may change in the course of time, reflecting preferences and needs of experts, agents, collectors and other interested parties.<sup>30</sup> As mentioned above, around 1900 the art of the Central Javanese period was appreciated to a higher degree compared to the East Javanese art since the latter was considered as a deviation of the original Indian models. Thus, more research was conducted on the earlier period imparting a large corpus of scholarly publications. It has only been in more recent time that the East Javanese art has attracted an increasing attention, and even the more due to the rise of interest in Majapahit history in national and international circles. My paper contributes to these developments. A broad analysis of the issue of valuation of ancient Javanese art and its reflection in the way of collecting and doing research in a chronological perspective still needs to be conducted in the future.

#### **a. The statues on the site of Candi Selokelir**

The remains of Candi Selokelir are located on the southwestern slope of the hill Sarahklopo, which is the southwestern of the eight hills surrounding the peak of Mount Penanggungan. This mountain has for centuries been considered

as a holy mountain, due to its mandala-like shape, having one peak surrounded by eight lower hills which makes it a copy of Mount Meru, the seat of the gods in Indian mythology. More than a hundred sanctuaries,<sup>31</sup> including holy water places, small terraced temples for worship, and hermitages, were built between the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century (Jolotundo 977 AD) and the early 16<sup>th</sup> century. One of these sites is Candi Selokelir.<sup>32</sup>

In 1900 the site was paid a one-day-visit by the Dutch official Broekveldt which he documented in 1904. The local people called the site Watoe Kelir.<sup>33</sup> Broekveldt mentions the ruins of two terraced sanctuaries and of another building. He describes the place as having an extraordinarily beautiful view.<sup>34</sup> He mentions reliefs with mythological depictions, but no statues. The Oudheidkundige Dienst, interested in the site, gave the order to Leydie Melville to conduct more excavation of Candi Selokelir (O.V. 1914, IV: 203). Melville did investigation at the site in 1915 (O.V. 1915, I: 2). According to him, the sanctuary seems to have originally consisted of six buildings. Same as Broekveldt, he mentions reliefs, but no sculpture. Amazing, however, are photos taken by him during the visit in 1915,<sup>35</sup> which show fragments of the two

31 During the last decade Sidomulyo (2007) has been conducting meticulous research on Mount Penanggungan. The number of sites he found highly exceeds the one documented earlier by Romondt (1951), listing 81 sites. In July 2016 a total of more than 130 sites were reported. Future publications on Penanggungan by Sidomulyo are to be expected. An information center on Mount Penanggungan has been opened in 2016 at Ubaya Training Center, Trawas.

32 A recent restoration by the Indonesian Archaeological Service presents the terraced structure, typical of East Javanese mountain sanctuaries, in a conspicuous way.

33 Watu (Indonesian) or selo (Javanese) means ‘stone’. Kelir (screen) refers to the screen in the wayang performance. Thus Watukelir/Selokelir means ‘screen of stone’, relating to the relief carvings in stone. Remains of reliefs in situ and a few kept in the Museum Majapahit in Trowulan show the simple and natural kidung-style and others in the wayang style. The existence of both styles in one temple is common for East Javanese temples and indicates the process from the mundane world (simple style of kidung-stories) to the supra-mundane world (wayang style of Indic based stories). A photo, taken by Claire Holt in 1931 (P-045114 in Digital Collection of UB Leiden), shows a scene depicting Bhima. See Duijker (2010: 173, figs. 61, 167).

34 This gave Rouffaer (1909: 182) the idea that this site was perhaps identical with the hermitage of Pañji’s legendary aunt Kili Suci.

35 OD-2090, OD-2091 (both not being published). OD-2092 showing remains of the site, has been published in Krom 1923,

29 The exhibition, conducted in Jakarta in 2005 and in Amsterdam in 2006 was a cooperation between the Indonesian National Museum and the Dutch National Museum of Ethnology Leiden.

30 Campbell’s thesis (2013) on the collection of Traditional Balinese Paintings in the Forge Collection of the Australian Museum in Sydney, discusses such processes of valuation of art.

sculptures (fig. 7, 8).<sup>36</sup>

Krom (1923, II: 401-6) takes up the earlier research results and presents additional information on the layout and the architecture of the temple complex, and he describes statues and relief carvings. Examples of reliefs are Tantri fables such as the popular story of 'crocodile and bull'. He mentions a Garuda-Wishnu carving of the old classical type, while the headgear of Wishnu is typically Majapahit style, same as a Parwati statue in the typical Majapahit sunrays-aureole. "Selokelir is in a worthy way linked with the art of the heyday of Majapahit" (Krom 1923, II: 404).<sup>37</sup> Krom emphasizes the development of art and the expression of something new. It is remarkable that Krom, different from earlier archaeologists, presents his objective art-historical statements without valuing the "more free and naturalistic style". Krom (1923, II: 405) presents the two sculptures of the male and the female as examples of this evolution:

*A couple of these figures lie on the ground. Long bodies wrapped in loincloth falling heavily down to the feet, the pleats of the cloth are only indicated by a few lines, no body adornment besides necklace and bracelets (the heads are broken); a single flower in the right hand which is held in front of the breast; [...] the shapes of the bodies are in the same sober kind as the other parts of the figures, briefly speaking a character of simpleness and naturalness which is the complete opposite [...] of the stiff straight images in the Majapahit aureoles. Of course, this new concept did not emerge out of nowhere, and it is possible to indicate a few older pieces as predecessors, but now that they stand in a ready way in front of us, they are evidently a product of a reaction, of a regeneration, of a detachment of the rigidification which leads to death.*

III: pl. 102).

36 In my earlier investigation of the Pañji sculpture from Selokelir, this crucial photo slipped my attention, so that I did not incorporate it in my reasoning; the same holds true for the short report by Krom (1923, II: 405).

37 Dutch original: "(...) dat Selakelir zich of waardige wijze bij de kunst uit het Madjapahitsche bloeitijdperk aansluit."

Krom (1923, II: 405) considers and discusses the three statues from Grogol as examples of predecessors of the new style: "[...] in the striving for sober, not stylized depictions you feel more of the old artists' spirit than in all the glamour of the deity figures in their aureole." In his comparison of the styles of the sculptures from Selokelir with the ones from Grogol, Krom does not identify either of them as depictions of Pañji and companions.

Stutterheim (1936a) reports the 'discovery' of the male sculpture from Selokelir.<sup>38</sup> The body was found during an expedition of A. Gall and W.F. Stutterheim on Mount Penanggungan in the second half of the year 1935. They visited the site of Selokelir and stated that the remains known from the photos of 1915 were nearly completely overgrown with high grass (*glagah*). At first sight they considered the torso to be part of a female image, due to the rounded form of the belly (Stutterheim 1936a: 330). On a second visit the head was discovered and realized to match the torso.<sup>39</sup> The element for identifying the Selokelir statue as Pañji was the cap which Stutterheim (1935: 139-43) had already earlier recognized as the characteristic Pañji feature. Stutterheim (1936a: 335) dates the figure to the mid-fifteenth century, referring to dated stones from the Selokelir site (around AD 1450).<sup>40</sup> His enthusiasm about the finding is mirrored in the following quote of his report. It also reflects Stutterheim's attitude towards the East Javanese art: he was indeed one of the first archaeologists who - explicitly opposing earlier scholarly concepts of degeneration - appreciated the specific style of the East Javanese period as a

38 So far, scholars, including myself, have usually considered Stutterheim and Gall as the discoverers of the sculpture. Actually, in his report, Stutterheim (1936a: 330) refers to the photos taken in 1915 and mentions the torso without head. It seems that the fragment had stayed in situ in the course of 20 years. The female which is visible in the photos, is however not mentioned by Stutterheim.

39 Stutterheim (1936a: 332) notes the height of +/- 150 cm, which I took on and only recently verified to be wrong. The correct height is 125 cm, as mentioned above.

40 A short report is also given in the journal *Djawa* (Stutterheim 1936b: 195-6).



new creativity in art:

*“Although not everybody will be in the state of appreciating the full beauty of the image intended by the artist – one should have internalized the ideal of beauty of the Javanese people of that time - it is still through the expressive simpleness and refinement of style, through the mastership in working the ornaments, each line and each surface, for those who are able to recognize the hand of a real artist even in a foreign work, possible to appreciate and enjoy our piece according to its value.”*  
(translated by Kieven)

Why did Stutterheim not mention the torso of the second sculpture, since he knew the OD-photos from 1915, and must have known the description of the two statues by Krom (1923, II: 405)?<sup>41</sup> Obviously the female image was not *in situ* any more in 1935; still there is the question why he did not look for it or reflect upon its whereabouts. There is no clear evidence of the exact or the original location of the two statues; it seems that – following Krom’s description – they were placed in the ruins of the main temple of the complex.

In his comprehensive book on Penanggungan, Romondt (1951) gives a meticulous description of the architecture of Selokelir and lists the fragments and objects found on the site. Besides mentioning the Pañji sculpture by giving reference to Stutterheim 1936, he mentions the smaller figure of the same style without a head which was found next to the former one, by referring to OD-2190, 2191, but he does not give any further details nor identification.<sup>42</sup> J. Oey-Blom (Romondt 1951: 10-12) notes that a group of images and fragments from Penanggungan (nrs. 875-919) were taken to Prambanan in 1941; she mentions explicitly that the Pañji

sculpture from Selokelir which was also kept in Prambanan, did not make part of the above mentioned and inventarized group of sculptures (Romondt 1951: 11, footnote 6). In 1953 the Pañji statue was taken by Romondt, at the time professor at ITB Bandung, to the library of the Fine Arts of ITB, the same location where it is still kept today.<sup>43</sup> Since Romondt’s notes, no more report is known about the female statue from Selokelir. The image does not make part of the group in Prambanan.

#### **b. The female Sculpture in the National Museum**

The old brass label of the sculpture says: “Female Statue; Origin: Mojokerto, Jawa Timur (East Java); Century: 14-15 M / AD; No. inv. 310.” In 2014, the old labels in the National Museum were replaced: The new plastic label says: “Female Statue; Origin: Mojokerto, Jawa Timur (East Java); Century: ± 15 M / AD; No. Inv. 310.”

From the year 1876 on, all objects given to the Batavia Museum were catalogued by Groeneveldt (1887). Groeneveldt draws back on a catalogus by R. Friederich, published in 1850. Many objects in Friederich’s inventory lack information on their place of provenance, some were later added by his assistant Hoepermans. The entry for object inv. no. 310 says: “Unknown image (*deviating type*)”, followed by the iconographical description, “Height 105. – Fr. 165” (Groeneveldt 1887: 107).<sup>44</sup> No information is given on the provenance. It is not known who was the person to ascribe Mojokerto as place of origin.

Above, the question was raised about the connection between inv. no. 310 and the numbers 310a, b, c, d. Definitely the female statue did not make part of the Grogol group, since their

<sup>41</sup> Was he really ignorant of the fact? Did he want to keep the “discovery” as his own merit instead of a “re-discovery”?

<sup>42</sup> Romondt (1951: 25) mentions four other images, one of them (photo OD-2188) in the contemporary style having the Majapahit aureole. Is this the supposed Pañji-figure now housed in Prambanan? OD-2188 is not accessible via the Digital Collection of UB Leiden.

<sup>43</sup> The National Museum in Jakarta is about to make a replica of the statue (personal communication with Intan Mardiana Napitupulu on 5-Oct-2015) to be used for public display.

<sup>44</sup> “Fr. 165” means the reference to Friederich’s (1850) inventory number 165 which also does not mention the place of origin.

styles – though all of them having the simple naturalistic style – do not fit with each other, as discussed earlier. We do not know why the inventory numbers 310a, b, c, d were inserted. This question is open for future research. The provenance of the preceding inventory numbers 308 and 309, which are spout figures supposedly from the 10<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> century in the early East Javanese style, are reported from Mojokerto, same as number 310. Is it possible that all the three of them were collected from Mojokerto at the same time and taken to Batavia? I can only hypothesize on these ideas; again, there is still much research to be done.

#### 4. Conclusion

This study raises the question if three specific sculptures of the Majapahit period - a male and two female images – form part of two different depictions of the couple Pañji and Candrakirana, the protagonists of the Pañji stories. Moreover the question is if such depictions were common practice in Majapahit art.

By applying the method of iconology, which means collecting data of iconography, style, symbolisme, and provenance of the sculptures under discussion, and the comparison with related forms of art and literary traditions, and by making use of earlier research and the outcomes of my own former research on the Pañji reliefs, I suggest that the worship of Prince Pañji during the Majapahit period was inextricably connected to the reunion with Princess Candrakirana. Although there is no clear evidence of this worship in the textual medium, it is definitely manifest in the visual medium of relief depictions of Pañji stories, and the cult had even risen to the worship of Pañji and Candrakirana as semi-divine beings in the visual medium of three-dimensional sculptural shape. Through their union they conveyed the message of being intermediaries between the mundane and the supra-mundane world.

The investigation of the single statues imparts that the male and the female images from the ancient site Selokelir represent the couple Pañji and Candrakirana. The existence of another female figure in the shape of a semi-divine being, which I interpret as a depiction of Candrakirana, suggests that a male counterpart originally matched her, not being extant today. From these findings, I conclude that even more couples of Pañji and Candrakirana sculptures may have existed, which are lost today. In particular, there is evidence that a conspicuous style was developed for sculptural depictions of the semi-divine couple.

The case of the group of the Grogol statues, displaying Pañji in a simple style without any deity-like traits, gives evidence that the Pañji cult was also practiced on a folklike level closer to common people. I assume that this group marks an earlier stage of the development of the Pañji worship, considering their different dating.

It is remarkable that all of the Pañji and Candrakirana figures discussed in this paper originate from Mount Penanggungan or the neighbourhood. This fact emphasizes the interrelation of the religious meaning and function of both the statues and this sacred mountain. The couple Pañji and Candrakirana prepared the adept for the encounter with places of worship, meditation and religious teaching by hermits (*rsi*). Mount Penanggungan and the Pañji theme seem to have been an inextricable union.

Due to the attitude of archaeologists, art collectors, and locals, who in the past had a low esteem of East Javanese art, a large number of the Pañji and Candrakirana sculptures may have vanished. Thus we are ignorant of the dimension of spread of the cult during the Majapahit time.

#### Acknowledgement

I want to express my gratitude to the Pusat Penelitian Arkeologi Nasional (the editor of the journal Amerta) and to the editorial board for publishing this article. I am grateful to Dr.

Pindi Setiawan, the head of the library of Fine Arts at the Institut Teknologi Bandung, for providing valuable data on the Pañji figure stored in the library, to Hadi Sidomulyo for sharing his knowledge on specific data concerning his findings related to Mount Penanggungan, and to Yoses Tanzaq who allowed me access to the Pañji figure in the museum of Prambanan. Last but not least, I express my high appreciation for Ibu Prof. Dr. Hariani Santiko for contributing her comments which helped to state my arguments more precisely.

### Bibliography

- Brandes, J.L.A. (1902). “Driemandelijksch rapport over het 2e kwartaal 1902”, *ROC (Rapporten van den Commissie in Nederlandsch-Indie voor Oudheidkundig Onderzoek op Java en Madoera)*: 3-15.
- Broekveldt, F.L. 1904. “Ontdekking van Selokelir; Mededeeling Aan Het Bataviaasch Genootschap.” In *NBG (Notulen van de Bataviaasch Genootschap): Bijlage III: XXIII-XXVII*.
- Campbell, S. 2013. *Collecting Balinese Art: the Forge Collection of Balinese Paintings at the Australian Museum in Sydney*. PhD Thesis. University of Sydney.
- Duijker, M. 2010. *The Worship of Bhima; The Representations of Bhima on Java during the Majapahit Period*. Amstelveen: Eon Pers.
- Fontein, J. Soekmono, and Satyawati Suleiman. 1971. *Ancient Indonesian Art of the Central and Eastern Javanese Periods*. New York: Asia Society.
- Forge, A. 1978. *Balinese Traditional Paintings*. Sydney: Australian Museum.
- Friederich, R. 1850. “Javaansche Oudheden.” In *Verslag van den Staat der werkzaamheden van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen 1849-1850*, Chapter 14. edited by S.A Buddhing.
- Hardiati, Endang Sri and Pieter ter Keurs. 2005. *Indonesia The Discovery of the Past*. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers.
- Galestin, Th. P. 1959. *Iconografie van Semar*. Leiden: Brill.
- Groeneveldt, W.P. 1887. *Catalogus der Archeologische Verzameling van he Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten En Wetenschappen*. Batavia: Albrecht.
- Holt, C. 1972. *Art in Indonesia; Continuity and Change*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press.
- Hunter, Th. 2007. “The Body of the King; Reappraising Singhasari Period Syncretism.” *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 38(1): 27–53.
- Karlström, A. 2009. *Preserving Impermanence. The Creation of Heritage in Vientiane, Laos*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universiteit.
- Kieven, L. 2013. *Following the Cap-figure in Majapahit Temple Reliefs. A New Look at the Religious Function of East Javanese Temples, 14th and 15th Centuries*. Leiden: Brill Publisher.
- . 2014a. *Menelusuri Figur Bertopi dalam Relief Candi Zaman Majapahit. Pandangan Baru Terhadap Fungsi Religius Candi-Candi Periode Jawa Timur Abad Ke-14 dan ke-15*. Jakarta: EFEO dan Gramedia Kepustakaan Populer. [Translation of Kieven 2013].
- . 2014b “Pañji dan Candrakirana.” In *Arca: Sepilihan Teks dan Foto Tentang Seni Arca Klasik*, edited by Kris Budiman. Yogyakarta: Sangkring Art Space.
- Klokke, M.J. 1994. “The so-Called Portrait Statues in East Javanese Art.” In *Ancient Indonesian Sculpture*, edited by Klokke, M.J. and P. Lunsingh Scheurleer Leiden: KITLV.
- . 1998. “Deified Couples and Meditation; On the Iconography of the so-called Portrait Statues in Ancient Javanese Art.” In *Southeast Asian Archaeology 1994*, edited by P.-Y. Manguin, 171–179. Hull: Centre for South-East Asian Studies, University of Hull.
- Krom, N.J. 1923. *Inleiding tot de Hindoe-Javaansche Kunst*. Three vols. ‘s-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.
- Lowenthal, D. 2011. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Revised edition of 1985].



- Lunsingh Scheurleer, P. 2000. "Skulls, Fangs and Serpents: A New Development in East Javanese Iconography." In *Southeast Asian Archaeology 1998*, edited by W. Lobo and S. Reimann, 189–204. Hull: Centre for South-East Asian Studies, University of Hull.
- Munandar, Agus Aris. 1990. *Kegiatan Keagamaan di Pawitra*. Depok: Universitas Indonesia.
- . 2009. *Gajah Mada: Kuasa, Cita-Cita dan Prahara*. Bogor: Akademia.
- NBG (Notulen van de Bataviaasch Genootschap). 1904. lihat Broekveldt 1904.
- NBG (Notulen van de Bataviaasch Genootschap). 1910. Bijlage III: XXIII-XLIII.
- O.V. (Oudheidkundig Verslag). 1914. Vol. 4: 203-4: Notes on Mount Penanggungan.
- O.V. (Oudheidkundig Verslag). 1915. Vol. 1: 2-6: Notes on Candi Selokelir.
- O.V. (Oudheidkundig Verslag). 1936. 17: Notes on the Pañji Image from Kunjoro.
- Panofsky, E. 1955. *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Later edition: Chicago University of Chicago Press 1982. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Poerbatjaraka, R.M.Ng. 1968. *Tjerita Pandji dalam Perbandingan*. Jakarta: Gunung Agung.
- Robson, S.O. 1971. *Wangbang Wideya; A Javanese Pañji Romance*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Romondt, V.R. van. 1951. *Peninggalan-peninggalan Purbakala di Gunung Penanggungan*. Jakarta: Dinas Purbakala Republik Indonesia.
- Rouffaer, G.P. 1909. NBG 47:180-2. [Laporan tentang prasasti Calcutta].
- Santiko, Hariani. 1990. "Kehidupan Beragama Golongan Rsi di Jawa." In *Monumen; Karya Persembahan untuk Prof. Dr. Soekmono*, edited by Sedyawati, Edi, et al., 156–71. Depok: Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia.
- . 1998. "Religious Life of Rsis in the Majapahit Era." In *Southeast Asian Archaeology 1996*, edited by Klokke, M.J. and Th. De Bruijn, 237-47. Hull: Centre for South-East Asian Studies, University of Hull.
- Sidomulyo, Hadi (alias Nigel Bullough). 2007. *Mengenal Situs Purbakala di Gunung Penanggungan*. Surabaya: Universitas Surabaya.
- Suleiman, Satyawati. 1978. *The Pendopo Terrace of Panataran*. Jakarta: Proyek Pelita Pembinaan Kerpurbakalaan dan Peninggalan Nasional.
- Stutterheim, W.F. 1935. "Enkele Interessante Reliefs van Oost-Java." *Djawa* 15: 130–44.
- . 1936.a "Een Pandji-Kop uit de 15e Eeuw." *Maandblad voor Beeldende Kunsten Jg.* 13: 329–35.
- . 1936.b "Voorloopig Bericht omtrent Enkele Vondsten op den Penanggoengan in 1935." *Djawa* 16: 194–200.
- . 1936.c. "De Dateering van eenige Oost-Javaansche Beeldengroepen." *TBG (Tijdschrift van de Bataviaasch Genootschap)* 76: 249-320.
- . 1938. *The Exploration of Mount Penanggungan, Eastern Java. Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology for the Year 1936*. Vol. XI. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1956. "An Ancient Javanese Bhima Cult." In *Studies in Indonesian Archaeology*, 104–43. Leiden: KITLV. [Translation of the Dutch version in *Djawa* XV 1935: 37-64].
- Zoetmulder, P.J. 1974. *Kalangwan; A Survey of Old Javanese Literature*. The Hague: Nijhoff.