

10-31-2021

Rethinking the name; The problem of the name *Candrakiraṇa* in the oldest Javanese prosody

Zakariya Pamuji Aminullah
Universitas Gadjah Mada, zakariyapamuji12@ugm.ac.id

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/wacana>



Part of the [Other Arts and Humanities Commons](#), and the [Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Aminullah, Zakariya Pamuji (2021) "Rethinking the name; The problem of the name *Candrakiraṇa* in the oldest Javanese prosody," *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*: Vol. 22: No. 3, Article 2.
DOI: 10.17510/wacana.v22i3.996
Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/wacana/vol22/iss3/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Humanities at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia* by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Rethinking the name

The problem of the name *Candrakirana* in the oldest Javanese prosody

ZAKARIYA PAMUJI AMINULLAH

ABSTRACT

The oldest written text in Javanese literature is *Candrakirana*, one of its parts, the *Amaramālā*, mentions “Indra” as a king of the Śailendra dynasty. This work is essential because it includes various elements of prosody which the authors of *kakawin* needed to compose their literary work. For many years, some Javanese scholars had been debating the proper name of this text, using only one manuscript, LOr 4570, a copy of the incomplete *gebang* manuscript from the PNRI, which does not have a prologue or an epilogue mentioning its precise name. However, reading L 298, a lontar in the Merapi-Merbabu Collection, this manuscript clearly demonstrates that the name of this oldest text is *Candrakirana*. This begs the question: Is there any relationship between the name and the content itself? This article presents pertinent arguments indicating that the name proposed can be accounted for both factually and conceptually.

KEYWORDS

Indra; name; *Candrakirana*; prosody; L 298.

1. INTRODUCTION; *CANDRAKIRANA*, THE HERITAGE OF KING INDRA IN *MĀTARAM*¹

Almost one and a half centuries have passed since J.L.A. Brandes’ research was published in 1888 and we still do not have the precise name for the text containing the guidelines needed to compose *kakawin*, a poem written in Old Javanese. C.C. Berg (1928: 46) considered this to have had the same meaning

¹ This article is adopted and developed from a section from my thesis (Aminullah, 2019a).

ZAKARIYA PAMUJI AMINULLAH was born in Nganjuk, 12 November 1992. He obtained his master’s degree from École Pratique des Hautes Études (EPHE), PSL University, Paris, in 2019 with a thesis entitled *Candrakirana: Présentation du texte avec étude de sa première partie consacrée entre autres aux structures métriques*, supervised by Arlo Griffiths and Andrea Acri. Since May 2020, he has officially been a lecturer at Javanese Literature Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada. Zakariya Pamuji Aminullah may be contacted at: zakariyapamuji12@ugm.ac.id.

as the literary genre *kāvya* in the Sanskrit tradition.² Brandes proposed the name *Caṇḍakiraṇa* and this was the name adopted for an extended period, more than a hundred years. This classical text which serves several important functions consists of five parts: (1) metres; (2) poetics; (3) list of synonyms; (4) list of Old Javanese-Sanskrit words; and (5) the divine origin in scripts. The parts, which can be considered complete, reveal that this Old Javanese text marks an important milestone in the development of the long and complicated history of Javanese literature.

It goes without saying that one can expect texts which occupy an essential role in the historiography of Javanese literary history would mention the identity of the writer, or, at least, a paratext or pseudonym in its colophons. Unfortunately, this is not the case because none of the codices in *Candrakiraṇa*³ contains the name of the writer or any of its compilers. It is possible of course that this literary guide is a compilation of various writings by different writers who lived and worked in different times, indeed even in another era. At some point, someone or some group of scholars decided to compile these texts because they realized the significance of their contents. Alternatively, perhaps the *Candrakiraṇa* is a compilation by different scholars living in the same period under the patronage or rule of a particular king. A more profound study of the language and text is essential if this question is to be answered properly. Inevitably the compass of this article will not be enough. Leaning aside the arguments of language and text studies, Andrea Rizzi and John Griffiths (2016: 210) have suggested that this anonymous work should be studied, not only because its title but also about the sponsor and the context itself.

Although at the moment we have to be satisfied with accepting that *Candrakiraṇa* was the work of an anonymous compiler, it is fortunate that a piece of critical information has been obtained which gives an indication about the approximate time of the compilation of the text. It corresponds to a Javanese king with the regnal name Jitendra, mentioned as one of the members of the Śailendra family. What is unusual is that the name is not cited in the colophon but at the beginning of the third part of *Candrakiraṇa*, called *Amaramālā*, or the part containing the list of Sanskrit words and their translation into Old Javanese. Similar to Indian *Kośa*, the words are not organized alphabetically but mnemotechnically. The lines concerned are to be found in manuscript

² Even though *kakawin* do indeed share various interconnections with Sanskrit *kāvya*, more recent scholarship claims that they have their own unique aesthetics which are equal to those in any other literary tradition. *Kakawin* were not written just to tell a story, their creation was linked to morality, notably that of the brahmana and hermits, by priestly and yoga themes. These descriptions confirm the idea that the composition of *kakawin* metre was a religious ritual. The ritual itself involved a manipulation by brahmana of magical power from scripts and metre (see Rubinstein 2000: 168-172).

³ I shall use the title *Candrakiraṇa* throughout this article when mentioning the eighth-century text, as I contend that that the pertinence of using this name needs to be proved. This step is necessary because the assignment of an unclear name could lead to reading problems, inefficacy, and confusion if we use a longer term "text offering guidance for writing *kakawin*". It is important to remember that other, similar texts, such as *Wr̥ttasañcaya* (see edition of Kern 1875), *Wr̥ttāyana*, *Wr̥ttā Candākapaṛwa*, *Candākṣara*, and *Canda Wargākṣara* also still exist.

L 298, one of the Merapi-Merbabu manuscripts in the PNRI collection.⁴ Below is a critically rendered reading of the royal name in the opening of *Amaramālā*.

*Ya tika sampun hīnāriṣṭaknanira,⁵ śailendrānvayapuṅgavaḥ, sira ta pinakottuṅganiḥ
Śailendrawaṅśa, jayati, amānaḥ ta sira, śrī mahārāja samaṅkaṅātīśayanira, sira ta śrī
mahārājā Jitendra saṅjñānira.⁶*
(L 298, fol. 18v)

‘They (the enemies) are utterly miserable when conquered by him, the bull of the Śailendra dynasty. He is the best among the descendants of Śailendra, Jayati, gaining the victory. Such is the eminence of the illustrious king. He, who is ordained as Śrī Mahārāja Jitendra.’

The name and royal family in the text above lead us to assume that the king himself was the sponsor of this writing and was respected by the writer (or the writers). According to Krom (1924: 203), the mention of Jitendra determines that *Candrakiraṇa* – could only apply to *Amaramālā* – a “text” compiled around the eighth century. It makes *Candrakiraṇa* the oldest text, apart from stone and metal inscriptions (Poerbatjaraka 2020: 2).

The term *Śailendrawaṅśa* in Javanese written sources is not restricted to *Amaramālā*. There are at least three inscriptions in Java which mention this term. In chronological order they are: the Kalasan (778 CE), Kelurak (782 CE), and Abhayagiriwihāra Inscriptions (792 CE). Apart from these three Inscriptions, mentions of the Śailendra dynasty have also been discovered in inscriptions outside Java, notably the Ligor B and Nālandā Inscriptions (mid-ninth century) and the King Coḷa Inscriptions (1044 and 1045 CE), which are preserved in the library of Leiden University. These sources from outside Java show that from the mid-ninth century, the Śailendra dynasty also ruled in Śrīwijaya (Boechari 2012: 198). On the basis of this fact, the author will try to connect Jitendra with the names of the king mentioned in these three inscriptions,⁷ laying the foundation for further future studies about the

⁴ This manuscript was also used as one of the base editions for my master’s thesis. However, the edition is limited to the first part. A more complete edition, which includes other manuscripts, is being prepared for a more profound framework study.

⁵ The form *hinariṣṭaknanira* in L 298 is difficult to interpret if it is normalized as *inariṣṭaknanira*. The irrealis *-a* after suffix *-akən/-kən* should not normally be preceded by passive infix *-in-*, because the irrealis suffix *-akəna/-kəna* itself already states the passive indicative, so that the passive infix *-in-* is superfluous. To solve this problem, the author offers the reading *hīnāriṣṭaknanira* consisting of two words, *hīnā* and *ariṣṭaknanira* (see Appendix A).

⁶ In order to avoid confusion caused by variations in orthography in quotes from various hand-written sources in two languages (Old Javanese and Sanskrit), the author offers the critical rendering of the lines quoted in the discussion and all edited quotes from Old Javanese have been standardized according to the system used in OJED (*Old Javanese-English dictionary*) compiled by Zoetmulder (1982), with slight changes as follow: the *e-pepet* is rendered as *a*, not *ě*, and *ṛ* becomes *n*; while the Sanskrit orthography follows IAST (International Alphabet of Sanskrit Transliteration). See Appendix B of this article for the diplomatic transliteration from the text used as quotes in discussion.

⁷ The transliterated fragment of the three inscriptions used in this article is taken from the edition proposed by Himansu Bhusan Sarkar (1971) in his book entitled *Corpus of the Inscriptions*

identity of Jitendra. It stands to reason that the naming and the composition of a literary work composed in an ancient Javanese kingdom could be related to the background of the patron or the king ruling at the moment. This is why the *maṅgala* part frequently contains important information, especially about the relationship between the king and the poet.⁸

In connection with the first inscription, Poerbatjaraka (2020: 2) has stated that the mention of Jitendra in *Amaramālā* is identical with the king referred to in the Kalasan Inscription, whom Krom (1931: 135) identified as King Panangkaran. Unfortunately, this supposition has not yet been able to be backed up by strong argumentation. The idea of Jitendra as Panangkaran ignores the religious background, in both the *Candrakiraṇa* and the Kalasan Inscription. The composition of *Candrakiraṇa* was generally related to the worship of Śiwa as Aṣṭatanu. At the same time, the Kalasan Inscription leans much more towards Mahāyana, since the intention of its composition was for the king's gurus to worship one of the embodiments of Dewi Tārā. Going by these facts, it is possible that Panangkaran was a follower of Mahāyana, but the probability that he was also a devoted adherent of Śiwa cannot be ruled out. If he were definitely a Shivaite, his role in protecting all the gurus of Mahāyana would be a political responsibility, not a religious one. However, this opinion needs to be proved by supplying various relevant pieces of information and this article has not been written to analyse this problem. This kind of situation probably occurred long before the Majapahit era, which was known for its harmonious spiritual life despite its plethora of different religious devotees (see Munandar 2008: vii-viii).

What is more interesting in *Amaramālā* is the positioning of Jitendra as *ratu pinakacūdāmaṇi* or 'king who is regarded as a jewel' in the opening part. The more general metaphor is found in the fifth stanza of the Kalasan Inscription, written using *Āryā* metre.

rājye pravarddhamāne rājñāḥ śailendravaṃśatilakasya |
śailendrarājagurubhis tārābhavaṇaṃ kṛtaṃ kṛtibhiḥ ||

'As the kingdom of the king, the ornament of the Śailendra dynasty, was flourishing, the Tārā temple was constructed by the accomplished preceptors of the Śailendra-king.' (Sarkar 1971: 35-38; see Zakharov 2012: 2-3)

On the basis of this translation, Sarkar and Anton O. Zakharov have presumed that the compound word *śailendravaṃśatilakasya* 'ornament of the Śailendra dynasty' was an attribute of the *rājñāḥ* 'king' who was none other

of Java (*Corpus Inscriptioni Javanicarum*): up to 928 A.D. However, the Kelurak Inscription is the most difficult to read as most of its text has been rendered illegible by damage.

⁸ This assertion is proved, for example, by the composition of *Kakawin Sumanasāntaka* by Mpu Monaguna. In the epilogue of this *kakawin*, he says that he far outshone by Śrī Warṣajaya. The king was the guru of all gurus specialized in literature, who had generously consented to take him as a student, (*nīhin śrī Warṣajaya prasiddha guruniṅ guru laḡhu sira hantusakānāmuruk*) (Worsley et al. 2013: 21).

than Panangkaran.⁹ If this point can be proved, the use context of the term *pinakacūḍāmaṇi* in the *Candrakiraṇa* can to be compared to the use of the term *śailendravaṃśatilaka*, since both describe the figure of the king as an ornament.

Furthermore, one of the most interesting facts found in the Kelurak Inscription is the designation of the king. Sarkar (1971) identifies the king's name as Indra; its full version being Dharaṇīndra (*dharaṇīndranāmnā*) who was installed as Śrī Saṃgrāma Dhanañjaya. The word "Indra" as the name of a king in this inscription actually comes close to the name Jitendra in the *Amaramālā*. The name Jitendra can also be read as a *bahuvrīhi* and translated as 'He who conquered kings' (literally: 'he by whom kings were conquered') or 'He who conquered Lord Indra'.

Here, the word *jita* is apparently an element essential to Indra, since the writer of *Amaramālā* praises the king by adding the epithet *jayati* to the end of the opening part. Unfortunately, it will be a useless exercise to try to look the theme of victory or conquest in the content of the Kelurak Inscription, apart from the title Dhanañjaya and *vairivaravīramardana* as the cognomen of the Indra, which was translated by Zakharov (2012: 4) as 'destroyer of the best heroes of enemies'. The cognomen seems to prove there was a relationship between the king's appellation and the words *jita* and *jayati* in the *Candrakiraṇa* and *viravairimathana* in the Kelurak Inscription. The epithet suggesting the conquest of enemies which accompanies the Śailendra king's appellation apparently has a politico-historical background, recording the victory of the king over a particular enemy. Here, if it is assumed that the king identified is the "victor" mentioned in the three sources: *Candrakiraṇa* and the Kalasan and Kelurak Inscriptions, in all three of which it refers to Panangkaran (see Jordaan 2003: 11). If properly established this fact confirms Poerbatjaraka's (1958) hypothesis that the Indra of Mātaram once conquered Śrīwijaya. However, we must admit that the description of a king as "a destroyer of his enemies" is an extremely common laudatory term in *praśasti* literature. It might indeed hint at a historical reality or, instead, be historically insignificant and used to meet the requirements of the literary genre.

Looking more closely at Poerbatjaraka's theory, on Ratu Boko the name of Śailendra is mentioned in the Abhayagiriwihāra Inscription and is related to the name Samaratuṅgadewa,¹⁰ a king's name also found in another inscription, the Kayumwungan Inscription from the 824. The latter mentions Samaratuṅga as the successor to King Indra. Jordaan (2003: 11) adduced a convincing hypothesis that Samaratuṅga was Rakai Panaraban. This is based on a written proof in the Wanua Tengah III Inscription, which states that Rakai Panangkaran or the "Indra" ruled between 746-784 M, while his successor, Rakai Panaraban, ruled between 784-803,¹¹ which is approximately within the time range of the

⁹ In his article entitled *Śailendras Reconsidered* Zakharov (2012: 4) emphasizes that there was only one king mentioned in Kalasan Inscription and he was called Dyāh Pañcapaṇa Paṇaṃkaraṇa.

¹⁰ Initially, De Casparis (1950: 21-22) read it as Dharmmatuṅga, although eventually he preferred Samaratuṅga as the correct reading (De Casparis 1961: 245). Jordaan (2003: 6) verified this on the basis of his direct observation that the correct reading is Samaratuṅga.

¹¹ The Wanua Tengah III Inscription commences with a mention of Rahyaṅta i Hara, the younger brother of King Sañjaya, who built a monastery / temple. Then, King Rakai Panañkaran granted

Abhayagiriwihāra Inscription. He also thought that Rakai Panaraban was the same person who is also called Rakai Panuṅgalan, mentioned in the Mantyasih I Inscription. This argument overlooks Kusen (1994) and Jan Wisseman Christie's (2001) hypotheses about the historical reconstruction of the kings of the Śailendra dynasty.

Using these data, we have no difficulty in adducing convincing proof that Krom's (1931) argument that the Jitendra mentioned in the *Candrakirāṇa* was most likely Rakai Panangkaran, also known as Indra in the Kelurak Inscription. This can be considered the starting point for future research, notably on how literacy developed during the Panangkaran era or under the contemporary Mātaram kings. Therefore, the author strongly believes that *Kakawin Rāmāyaṇa* was not suddenly compiled by the *kaui* in the entourage of the Mātaram kings. Before this masterpiece, there is a strong possibility that the literary tradition initially began with the adoption of the theories of *kāvya* from India. Alternatively, the process of conceptualizing poetical theories in Java progressed apace with the process of composing the first *kakawin* in Java. This research needs to be taken further with a more profound footing in the future. Before proceeding, we need to resolve the problem of choosing a name for this oldest prosody; a topic which has been debated for centuries.

2. WHY RETHINK THE NAME *CANDRAKIRĀṆA*?

Even though a mention of the Śailendra dynasty in *Candrakirāṇa* provides evidence that it was compiled around the eighth century, some scholars have not been entirely in agreement with this assertion. D. van Lennep (1969) and J. Schoterman (1981) have doubted that the whole text of the *Candrakirāṇa* was composed in the ninth century, because its language shows similarities to that in other texts such as some *Kṛtabhāṣās* (from Skt. *Samskṛtabhaṣa*), dictionaries or encyclopaedias listing Sanskrit words with the Old Javanese translations (Schoterman 1981: 425-426). On the basis of this fact, Schoterman (1981: 440, in his endnote no. 16) points out that the *Candrakirāṇa* dates seem more likely to have been eleventh or twelfth century on the grounds of the relative chronology of the *Kṛtabhāṣās* and the use of Middle Javanese expressions. On the other hand, Hunter (2009: 52) does not support this argument in his footnote no. 46, arguing that these dates seem too early for the use of Middle Javanese. He agrees that the period in which *Candrakirāṇa* was compiled should be situated as early as possible because the description at the beginning of the *Amaramālā* section of *Candrakirāṇa* is proof that at least the *Amaramālā* might be dated as early as the ninth century.

The most crucial fact to note is that, even if the *Amaramālā* section is considered the oldest part, it is still one of the many parts of the *Candrakirāṇa*. The Javanese tradition provides at least three *Candrakirāṇa* manuscripts (two manuscripts from the Merapi-Merbabu mountain tradition and one manuscript from Mount Ciburuy). This fact proves that *Amaramālā* is not considered

the benefice of a rice-field in Wanua Tengah village to the monastery as *sīma* (Boechari 2012: 467).

the sole text. On the other hand, the Balinese tradition has *Kṛtabhāṣā* which resembles the *Amaramālā*. It is possible that it could have been transmitted from the Javanese tradition – but more in-depth research still needs to be done to prove the latter hypothesis. Nonetheless, the consensus that *Candrakiraṇa* is a whole unity of texts on composing *kakawin* must be reached before continuing the discussion on whether or not to decide the name is worth discussing.

The next question which arises is why does the issue of its naming need to be discussed? What is the importance of the following studies? Moreover, does the decision about its naming about guidance in the composition of *kakawin* have any significance to studies of Old Javanese literature?

Writing of the importance of identifying a name, Arlo Griffiths (2013) has countered some scholars, M. Boechari, Claude Jacques, and Waruno Mahdi, who have identified *Javā* in various epigraphy sources in South-East Asia as a place in the Malay Peninsula. He uses several Khmer inscriptions to prove that that name refers to the island of Java. Besides this evidence, he presents other written evidence from Java to demonstrate the way Javanese people addressed foreign people. After ascertaining that the name *Javā* or *Yavadvīpā* in several written sources in South-East Asia refers to the island of Java, A. Griffiths (2013: 76) interpreted that the name Satyawarman in some sources as probably the name of a king who ruled in South Campā at around 800 CE. This has become the key to subsequent studies about the history of international politics which involved Campā, Khmer, Cham, and Javanese people during the eighth and ninth centuries.

Building on this foundation, our next step is to examine the literature of Old Sundanese and to explore the *Bhīma Swarga* text edited by Aditya Gunawan (2019). There is a moment at which Bhīma and Bhaṭāra Guru are having a discussion and arguing with each other. Bhīma enumerates the names of his manifestations since he was in his mother's womb. He also mentions the other names of Bhaṭāra Guru in Malayu, Tañjuṅpura, Jambudwīpa, Bali, and Java (Gunawan 2019: 52, 54). Bhīma did this in an attempt to teach Bhaṭāra Guru about the origin of the world; this gives grounds to claim that name is linked to cosmogeny, enriching it with aspects of space and time.

On the basis of these two previous studies, the identification of names becomes essential in order to seek textual and historical relationships between different written sources. It is highly likely that, in the future, a piece of information which reveals that the name *Candrakiraṇa* as a designation of a form of prosody has a link to Pañji stories, notably the name of the character who becomes the fiancée of a prince of Kahuripan, Panji Inu Kertapati. The lady in question was Dewi Candra Kirana, a princess of the kingdom of Daha (see Mu'jizah and Ikram 2019: 192). It is also possible that the name *Candrakiraṇa*, beyond the *Amaramālā*, is a form of prosody which correlates with the forerunners of the Pañji stories. These first emerged in the *Kakawin Smaradahana* (see Poerbatjaraka 1931). If these assumptions are correct, Schoterman's argument about the correlation between *Candrakiraṇa* and works composed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries should be re-examined,

certainly on the assumption that the parts which were compiled later were separate from *Amaramālā*.

As yet these suppositions do not have much evidence to support them. Therefore, subsequent research will need to be done more thoroughly. This article is limited to the problem of naming a form of prosody about which debates have raged for the last one hundred years. If it is possible to establish the precise meaning of the name, it will be possible to conduct other, different research as the name represents elements of space and time interconnected, directly or indirectly, with other works composed in the same period or in the same place.

3. SCHOLARLY ATTENTION PAID TO THE NAME *CANDRAKIRAṆA*

Before continuing this discussion about the name *Candrakiraṇa*, it is necessary to explore previous studies about this theme. It should be noted that the discussion about the name of this prosody has never been comprehensively attempted and some of the studies were not carried out in a specific research framework. As sources, previous researchers, such as K.F. Holle (1867), Brandes (1888), N.J. Krom (1924), J. Ensink (1967), I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa (1978), Lokesh Chandra (1997), and R. Rubinstein (2000), have always used manuscript LOr 4570 as their primary source. However, the manuscript kept in the Library of Leiden University is actually a copy of Manuscript *gebang*¹² L 631 which can still be accessed directly in the manuscript room of Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia (PNRI).¹³ It is doubtful if they ever made any direct approach to examine L 631 or were just satisfied with its copy LOr 4570 and the two other manuscript copies in the Library of Leiden University.¹⁴ In this copy, the title *Candatarāṇa* is found in the colophon.¹⁵ Etymologically, it can be translated as ‘crossing the moon’, however it has still elicited many hypotheses from scholars about other titles considered to be more reasonable. These will be discussed in this article. In a nutshell, the title of this text has been hovering in limbo for more than a century.

¹² The use of the term *gebang* instead of *nipah* as the material of manuscript in the West Javanese tradition has been thoroughly discussed by Gunawan (2015) in his article “Nipah or Gebang? A philological and codicological study based on sources from West Java” in *BKI* 171.

¹³ L 631 manuscript originated from the scriptorium or *kabuyutan* of Ciburuy, Garut Regency, and was most probably compiled in the pre-Islamic era (see Aciri and Darsa 2009). Van Lennep (1969: 24) states that the manuscript was initially found in a village located in the Cikurai Mountains, West Java. Raden Saleh somehow obtained the manuscript and two others, L 630 dan L 632, from the Galuh area, east of the Priangan area (Cohen Stuart 1872; Holle 1867). Later, in 1866, these three manuscripts were handed to *Bataviaasch Genootschap* (now known as PNRI) by Raden Saleh as heritage material (NBG 1867: 155).

¹⁴ This doubt is based on the fact that the script used in L 631 is the Buda or mountain script, and not many people could read it before the studies about Merapi-Merbabu manuscripts or Ciburuy scripts were commenced quite recently.

¹⁵ Unfortunately, the latest verification of L 631 shows that leaf 55 containing this colophon no longer exists. There is the possibility that the leaf was still available when the manuscript was being copied as LOr 4570 and LOr 4571. We would like to express our gratitude to two of our colleagues at PNRI, Agung Kriswanto and Aditia Gunawan, who helped us to access photographs of this manuscript.

The use of one source has been the main drawback in previous research. We think it is important to read other manuscripts. L 298 manuscript actually mentions the name *Candrakiraṇa* consistently from the beginning to the end of the text. This fact is grounds for examining this text in greater detail. In order to achieve the agreement that the name *Candrakiraṇa* is indeed the correct title of this guidance written in all corpora, the author distinguishes the working stages into three parts: (1) re-observation of the titles proposed by previous scholars and their arguments; (2) description and proof that L 298 is the only complete codex and mentions the name *Candrakiraṇa* at the beginning and the end of the text; (3) reveal the meaning of *Candrakiraṇa* and explain its relationship to the content of the text. The eventual goal of the research is the hope that, if the naming is precise and final, this will undoubtedly help future studies to be more focused on other more specific topics in the *Candrakiraṇa* rather than simply trying to reach a consensus time and again.

This part explains the previous assumptions about the supposed titles, whether those which used *Candrakiraṇa* as their primary research object or just as a complement to other research, plus various studies which used the supposed titles. This type of approach to literature reviews is the instrument we need to clarify and understand the basic arguments of previous studies about how the manuscript was used. In short, our purpose is demonstrating as far as possible that the manuscript used in this article has never been discussed in any of the previous studies. There are at least some scholars whose arguments which deserve to be discussed in greater detail, among them Brandes (1888), H.H. Juynboll (1907), Krom (1924), Poerbatjaraka (1933), Gonda (1952), Hooykaas (1955), Sarkar (1966), Ensink (1967), Sugriwa (1978), Schoterman (1981), Lokesh Chandra (1997), Rubinstein (2000), and Tom Hunter (2009). As the list reveals, it has been twenty-two years since the title was last discussed. Therefore, our hope is that this article can contribute new insights.

Caṇḍakiraṇa 'keen rays' was the title first proposed by Brandes (1888: 130). Later his suggestion was followed by Juynboll (1907), Poerbatjaraka (1933), Gonda (1952), Sarkar (1966), Ensink (1967), and Schoterman (1981). The title *Caṇḍakiraṇa* was suggested because of the reading title on the three copies of L 631 preserved in Leiden (code LOr 4570, LOr 4571, and BCB prtf. 80)¹⁶ is *Candakarāṇa*, however, this is presumably a corruption. What the present author found during a direct verification of the three copies in the Library of Leiden University is that the word *Candakarāṇa* should be read as *Candatarāṇa*. Unfamiliarity with the script caused this collective "mistake" by the previous researches: *ta* and *ka* in *-tarāṇa* and *-karāṇa*. Alternatively, perhaps these researchers made secret emendations without reporting them. Krom (1924: 203-204) and Sugriwa (1978: 8) realized that the text title of LOr 4570 was definitely *Candatarāṇa* but still proposed *Candakarāṇa* as the title. The

¹⁶ The details are as follows: (1) LOr 4570 is a copy in Javanese script, prepared for K.F. Holle (see Brandes 1915: 3.202 no. 1182); (2) LOr 4571 is a copy in Balinese script, prepared for Van der Tuuk (see Brandes 1915: 3.203 no. 1183; Juynboll 1907: 1172 no. 4571); and (3) BCB prtf. 80 is a copy in Latin script from LOr 4570, finished by Soegiarto (Lokesh Chandra 1997: 140).

argument that these scholars tried to establish is that the words *Caṇḍakiraṇa* and *Candakarāṇa* are closer to the word *Chandaḥkiraṇa* ‘rays of metres’ or *Chandaḥkarāṇa* ‘production of metres’, meanings which relate to the content of the text. The term *chandaḥ* in the title would seem to be very important and representative since it is used in general context of an essay or book of instruction on metre and regulations about prosody.

Unhappy with both *Caṇḍakiraṇa* and *Candakarāṇa*, Hooykaas (1955: 17) offered *Candravyākaraṇa* as the original name of this manual. His argument is based on a manual of Sanskrit grammar entitled *Candravyākaraṇa*, written by Candragomin, an Indian writer. However, this Indian composition was given its title because the author was called Candra. It seems very unlikely that the author of *Candrakiraṇa* would have entitled his text *Candra’s Metres* if this was not his name. In addition to these scholars, Lokesh Chandra is the only other person to have succeeded in making a contribution by publishing the complete edition. In his edition, he suggests the title *Chandakarāṇa*, ‘the making of metres’ (Lokesh Chandra 1997: 141). However, again this edition is based on the three copies kept in the Library of Leiden University, and his edition unfortunately lacks in an editorial. The Lokesh Chandra’s suggestion was followed by Gunawan (2015: 276) in his discussion of the *gebang* manuscripts. In discussing research about texts offering prosodic guidelines, Rubinstein (2000: 138) simply states that all corpora on guidance for composing *kakawin* correlate directly or indirectly with *Candrakiraṇa*, as *Chanda*. Nevertheless, it is doubtful if she was the first to propose this term. When using these *Chanda* manuscripts, Rubinstein used Balinese manuscripts and also LOr 4570. Finally, the study by Hunter (2009: 52) agrees with the title proposed by Lokesh Chandra, with slight alteration to *Chandaḥkārāṇa*.

4. CANDRAKIRAṆA AS A NAME IN L 298 AND THE PROBLEM OF ITS MEANING

Before progressing further, we have to reach an agreement about *Candrakiraṇa* manuscripts. By this term I am referring to those manuscripts containing all content elements enumerated in the first section, with the exception of the manuscripts which are damaged or lost. This is an essential cautionary note as several texts, notably those originating from Bali, have contents similar to the parts of *Candrakiraṇa*, especially the first part. These examples have been clearly enumerated by Rubinstein (2000: 136) and include (1) K791 *Aji Canda*; (2) K279 *Candākṣara*; (3) K31 *Guru-Laghu*; (4) HKS VI-7 *Canda Wargākṣara*; (5) HKS2122 *Kakawin Canda*; (6) HKS3285 *Aji Canda*; (7) HKS3585 *Canda*; and (8) HKS3590 *Kakawin Canda*. These eight texts are not the main focus of this article, and the historical relationship between these texts and *Candrakiraṇa* in the context of Java-Bali literature will be discussed in more depth in another study.

With the agreement reached above in place, we now have only three *Candrakiraṇa* manuscripts, those coded L 241, L 298, and L 631 and preserved in PNRI. The first two manuscripts are palm-leaf (*Borassus flabellifer*) manuscripts originating from the Merapi-Merbabu tradition, whereas the last is a *gebang* manuscript from the West Java tradition. The simplified table below presents

the condition of these three manuscripts, on the basis of the catalogues by Cohen Stuart (1872), Poerbatjaraka (1933), Behrend (1998), and Kartika Setyawati, I. Kuntara Wiryamartana and Willem van der Molen (2002), as well as personal direct observation.

Kode	Title in Colophon	Condition of the leaves
PNRI L 241 - Peti 33	-	Incomplete (missing leaves: 1-3, 5-8, and several leaves beginning from leaf 41); black spots visible on the sides of the leaves; most of the leaves damaged and perforated.
PNRI L 298 Peti 33	<i>Candrakiraṇa</i> (47r)	Complete (1r-49r); in good condition.
PNRI L 631 - Peti 15	-	Incomplete (missing/damaged leaves: 1-4, 8, 10*, 11, 32*, 35, 36, 50* and 55*); Damage and perforation found, some leaves in fragments.

Note:

* When L 631 was copied to become LOr 4570, LOr 4571, and into CS 154 in 1870 by R.M. Samsi (see Juynboll 1907: 172) and Br 648, the leaves were still available (see edition by Lokesh Chandra 1997). However, the present condition is that some of these leaves have been lost or perhaps have become detached and are now kept in a different place.

Table 1. *Candrakiraṇa* Manuscripts in PNRI Collection.

Table 1 shows that only manuscript L 298 is in good, complete condition. Therefore, this study has used only manuscript L 298, particularly as the colophon is still well preserved.



Figure 1. Manuscript of *Candrakiraṇa* (Old Javanese, cod. PNRI L 298).

The colophon of L 298 contains several important pieces of information about the title, authorship, place and time of compilation. The citation below is a reading with critical rendering and its translation.

Iti Candrakiraṇa, samāpta tālas cinitra ri jəñiñ ra sañ hyaṅ Giri Damaluñ, imbañ pacima, gaḡəriñ Jayalakṣaṇa, riñ panəpenipun. Sinarwi ababakal, paryantusakna hala hayuniñ sañ hyaṅ Śāstra. Kaya cinakariñ pakṣi arañ akrəp panəmut gatəl, tan patut iñ tata praga paruṅgunikañ guru laghu, parokṣa sumamburat sawaṅ pragalbha śatñah lawan pjah. Kurañ lwihnya sapraweśaa matuñtañ. Rehiñ sañ maniñ anurat sakaruñ ta mañapuraa, denira sañ śudhya maca muwah sañ adṛbya. Kapuraa deniñ antumpak guwa, agaṇa, samitwksaniñ gul, mapan deśeñ tāmasa ñ anurat. Dharma olihiñ asisinau, sep wuruke. Kaluwusaniñ anirat Tumpək Wageniñ Kurantil, Aṣṭaniñ Yama, Nawa, Wara, Kulus, Śaḍwaraniñ Paniron, Triwara, Byantarya. Wulan Śrawaṇa, taṅgal piñ lima. I śakala, warṇa, gaṇa, margha, siti. Om, śrī śrī śrī Sañ Hyaṅ Śāraśwati ya nāma swaha.
(L 298, 47r-47v)

'Thus is (the text of) *Candrakirāṇa*, rendered in full. It was compiled at the foot of Mt. Damalung (or Merbabu), on the west side, on the mountain-ridge called Jayalakṣaṇa, in the hermitage situated there. I am complete novice, so please accept the state of the letters, as if by a bird, now with too much space, now too narrow, just rows of ants, with no attention for the rules of penmanship and without putting the signs for long and short properly in place, invisible, going in all directions, vague or bold to the extreme, depending on just how much the point penetrated. Therefore, if someone is going to make another copy, please make up for what is lacking, on behalf of the reader or the owner. (I hope this writing) can be forgiven by the scribe who lives in a cave, in a group, (under) tall *kapok* trees, in villages, or in the dark places.¹⁷ It is the holy duty of the pupil to study but he is still green. The writing was finished on the day of Tumpek (Saturday), Wage, Wuku Kurantil. Yama is its *Aṣṭawāra*. Kulus is its *Nawawāra*. Paniron is its *Ṣaḍwāra*. Byantarya is its *Triwāra*. Month Śrawaṇa, fifth day. Year: *warṇa, gaṇa, marga, siti* (1564 year Merapi-Merbabu). Prosper! Prosper! Prosper! Praise to Goddess Śaraśwati in Heaven.'

Apart from its mention here, the toponym Jayalakṣaṇa has not yet been discovered in other Merapi-Merbabu manuscripts.¹⁸ Furthermore, L 298 reveals that the copier from the foothills of Merbabu understood that the text he copied was entitled *Candrakirāṇa* 'rays of moon'. Another interesting note is the way the year is given. In her PhD thesis, Kartika Setyawati (2015: 50) has reminded researchers that the Merapi-Merbabu manuscripts meticulously observe the use of chronograms and years, whether the Śaka year or Merapi-Merbabu year. If the year 1564 is seen as a Śaka year, the conversion of 1642 CE could be considered as *terminus ante quem*. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there are some local distortions of the standardized Śaka year, namely Tengger (Tengger Pasuruan and Tengger Malang), Banten, Palembang, et cetera. Therefore, we have to tread carefully in deciding the date (see Van der Molen 1983; Proudfoot 2007).¹⁹

Besides its appearance in the colophon of the manuscript, the title *Candrakirāṇa* is also implicitly mentioned at the beginning of the text, written in half a sloka of Sanskrit.

*kīraṇaḥ viyaktiḥ candraghniḥ, dvijodaḥ koviḥ marutaraḥ*²⁰

As in other Old Javanese texts which cite Sanskrit sloka, the language of the *Candrakirāṇa* sloka is difficult to decipher because there are problems with declension, conjugation, the law of sound and unclear words. The author has offered an emendation, but it is not yet perfect.

¹⁷ Actually, the line *kapuraa deniḥ antumpak guwa, agaṇa, śamīwrksaniḥ gul, mapan deṣeṇ tāmāsa ṇ anurat* is unintelligible, so that the translation above is open to discussion.

¹⁸ The author would thank Rendra Agusta who has done some field-research and informed him personally that Jayalakṣaṇa could be an old name of actual hamlet of Gejayan, located in Banyudisi village, Magelang, that is, on the west foothills of Merbabu.

¹⁹ In connection with the dating in the Merapi-Merbabu manuscripts, Abimardha Kurniawan (2019) had recently succeeded in devising a method of reading *sengkalan Dihyang*.

²⁰ Compare to the *Cantakaparwa* edition by Ensink (1967), in which we found a similar fragment of stanza: *kīraṇa viyati candāgni*.

kirāṇo vyaktiś candrāgneḥ, dvijānām kavir uttamah

'A ray of light is the manifestation of moon-fire, (likewise) a poet is the best among the brahmins.'

The context of the words *kirāṇa* and *candra* in their relationship to *Candrakirāṇa* in this sloka is still rather difficult to comprehend. The possibility is that the first part of the sloka is a metaphor for the second part. A ray of light (*kirāṇa*) can be personified as the *kavi*, whereas moon-fire (*candrāgneḥ*) links to brahmins (*dvijānām*). The compound *candrāgneḥ* can be regarded as *tatpuruṣa* and *dvandva*. However, the choice of *dvandva* is impossible since the word should be declined as *candrāgnibhyaṃ* or *candrāgnyoh*. During the process of giving meaning, admittedly struggling, the author has come up with the interpretation of 'moon-fire' by placing the word *candra* and *agni* as a noun, even though it is possible to consider *candra* an adjective so that *candrāgni* could be translated as 'sparkling fire'. The interpretation 'moon-fire' is quite confusing since fire (Agni) in the Hindu mythology is always identified with the sun (Sūrya). Nevertheless, some mythologies do link Candra and Agni.

In the cosmological hierarchy recorded in the *R̥g-Veda*, Candra (or Soma) and Agni, as well as Bṛhaspati, are the gods who live on earth (*bhūr*). All three are the most important temporal gods. Agni, in its pure form, is explicitly purifying fire. It is he who escorts the dead to Yama's realm, to the sovereign of the death, transposing and purifying all offerings to the realm of the Gods. The mythology of Agni gives the idea that the fire is hidden within the world and awakened by the fuel-sticks which kindle him. Meanwhile, Candra or Soma resembles Agni. Soma is the god who mediates the affairs between a human and the gods and is considered the link between the human and the divine, the sky pillar, and the bearer of blissfulness and understanding about the realms of the divine. Soma is indeed identified with Agni and with the moon which holds the eternal nectar (*amṛta*). Moreover, there is a similarity between the mythology of Soma and Agni. Agni, who hides in the water in which he was born, was found by the gods and agreed to deliver offerings to them. As Agni had been, Soma was hidden by the gods of the upper mountain but was captured by Indra who was riding his eagle. There is a striking similarity between Agni and Soma and the story of Prometheus in Greek mythology who can be regarded as a cultural bearer; the matters which distinguish the human world from the natural world (Flood 1996: 45-46).

A look at this mythology shows that *agni*, *candra*, and *kirāṇa* correlate with one another. The word *kirāṇa* conveys the meaning that the light is in its gentle/soft aspect, a radiance. It is not as hot as fire but it can be felt, so it is compatible with the essence of divinity. In other words, a brahman would be compatible with the essence of divinity if he was able to master the criteria necessary to become a poet. The position of a brahman who is also a poet is considered higher than who is only a performer of rituals. He is more than a ritual fire; he is the one who connects the world to the divine. In contrast to *kirāṇa*, it radiates serenity, shelter, and warmth. It is, perhaps, what the sloka above has tried to convey.

5. CANDRAKIRAṆA IN THE SENSE OF CREATING KAKAWIN

The name *Candrakiraṇa* in L 298 is mentioned at both the beginning and the end of the text. However, the opening part discloses the name only indirectly because it is written in half a sloka of Sanskrit. The name *Candrakiraṇa* itself also raises a question and, when it is compared to the previous names proposed by other scholars, these names would indeed seem to have been more suitable to the textual content. Therefore, this section will be an explanation of the meaning of *Candrakiraṇa* in the context of composing *kakawin*.

The word *Candrakiraṇa* has been long known in Javanese and Malay literature, but not in the context of composing *kakawin*. Instead, it is the name of the female protagonist in Pañji stories, usually in its longer version, Galuh Candrakirana (Rassers 1922). We have not yet been able to decide whether or not the name of this character has any links to the *Candrakiraṇa* text - and it is not the purpose of this study to link them to each other. In its elaboration of the meaning of *Candrakiraṇa*, this article will use only the contents of the L 298 manuscript. Below is one of the stanzas, the thirty-eighth, of the description about the metres in the text of *Candrakiraṇa*, which happens to mention the word of *kiraṇa* and *wulan*, a synonym of *candra*.²¹

<i>kirāṇa pinakasuluh in loka, wulan amuhara sukhaniṅ citta, sakala kirāṇa hati saṅ prajñā, wuwusira ya madhugulāmṛta. (L 298, 8r-8v)</i>	Its beams are the torches of the world, the moon makes the mind happy. The beams of the heart of the wise man become visible, his words are honey, sugar, and nectar.
--	---

Before discussing the relationship between *kiraṇa* and *wulan* (*candra*) on the basis of the citations in the poem, it is very interesting to take a look at its structure. The poetry above uses the *madhugulāmṛta* 'honey, sugar, and nectar' metre with the pattern/scansion ~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ - | ∅ and eleven syllables in each line. It is worth noting that, as Willem van der Molen has astutely pointed out to the author, the poem could be claimed to be the oldest *pantun* in Southeast Asia, far older than any of which we have known so far. This claim is based on the facts: (1) it contains four lines of eleven syllables; (2) each line rhymes *a a a a*; and (3) the first pair of two lines of the poem is the introduction (*sampiran*) to the second pair of lines, which contain the actual message. A study of the *pantun* in the Javanese tradition, specifically in the Old Javanese tradition, and its relationship with other traditions should be more highlighted in future research.

In *Candrakiraṇa*, the lines above are one of the ninety-six illustrations of metre explained, (see Chapter 13b in Appendix B). One stanza represents one metre and the name of the metre is always mentioned in the last line or in a

²¹ The 38th stanza is written in the chapter on metre illustration. Unfortunately, this stanza is only found in L 298, but not in either L 241 or L 631 because it seems to have been written on the lost leaf. As a consequence, this stanza is not found on all the copies of L 631.

certain line in which the patterns are not arranged into four lines. The contents of each stanza which illustrate the metre are mostly concerned with divine appraisal or a general theme. However, each stanza conveys its own meaning which is discrete from the other stanzas.

As said, the lines above are an illustration of the metre *madhugulāmṛta*; hence, the themes of sweetness, happiness and serenity are illustrated in verse. On the basis of the description of the pantun, *kirana* and *wulan* (*candra*) are “the complementing two lines. In this case the word *kirana* in the first line belongs with figurative suggestions” to *candra* and *kirana hati* in the third line corresponds with *wuwus*. The poet’s assumption is that, when a person can write or say words similar to honey, sugar and nectar, that person will be wise and the beams of the heart become visible; his mind so blessed will become happy and serene. This analogy takes as its model the moon and its light. Therefore, the function of *Candrakirana* is implicitly revealed in the stanza and, sure enough, the name of *Candrakirana* itself is an expression of knowledge which a poet must have to facilitate his creativity in composing *kakawin*.

This type of metaphor can also be found in part of *Amaramālā*. This part gives the reason for comparing *Amaramālā* with a sunbeam.

[...] *nihan ta upamanikañ Amaramālā, kadyaṅganiñ teja sañ hyaṅ Āditya sumuluh iñ patala, apan wənañ amintonakəñ arthaśabda, ya ta mañkana tekiñ Amaramālā an suluhniñ śabda [...]*

(L 298, fol. 19r)

[...] if one were to compare the *Amaramālā*, it would be like this: like the brightness of the sun illuminating the Earth because it reveals the sounds and meanings. In this sense, this *Amaramālā* is the torch of words [...]

Looking at the explanation in *Amaramālā* inferred in the sentence above, it is even more apparent that the metaphor of word *teja* ‘brightness’ actually refers to the words presented in *Amaramālā*, or in every part of *Candrakirana*. The difference is that these words are metaphor for a sunbeam (*Āditya*), providing an illuminating explanation and relieving the mind of foolishness or darkness. In the previous text, we see that “rays of moon” are the metaphor for words which bring happiness (*sukhaniñ citta*); the meaning corresponding to the spiritual aspect. In other words, *kakawin* composed by the poets should confer at least two benefits: (1) literature which shares knowledge and enlightens the mind and frees it from ignorance; and (2) a reading which imbues happiness, serenity, and comfort in the readers. Besides these two benefits, Aminullah (2019b: 228-229) states that the composition of *Candrakirana* also had another purpose. He argues that it is more than a technical guide to assist poets in their compositions; it is also to guide poets in composing *kakawin* which could be chanted in rituals. This suggests this text played an indirect role in the transition from an oral to a written tradition.

These words definitely link to the convention of prosody and poetry, specifically those relating to synonyms or vocabulary. S. Supomo (1977: 9)

mentions that the manipulation of synonyms is one of the most characteristic features of Old Javanese poetry, which is based on the metrical rules of Sanskrit prosody. If this perspective is taken into account, the most significant part of *Candrakirana* is its vocabulary. In *Candrakirana*, the third and fifth parts are directly related to vocabulary. The inference is that the *kawi*, as composer of a *kakawin*, was obliged to master *śabda* or words and manipulate them so that knowledge could be appropriately transferred and the contents could soothe the readers' hearts.

Another exciting fact has been noted at the end of the fifth part: the mention of words which are the synonyms of the word *candrakirana*: *candrikā*, *kaumudī*, and *jyotsnā*.²² These three words convey the same meaning as *candrakirana*, that is, 'moonlight'. The term *kaumudī* is used to mention a manual of modern Sanskrit grammar, a simplification of the complicated Pānini grammar. This simplified grammar is the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, compiled by Bhaṭṭoḥjī Dīksita in the seventeenth century. His pupil, Varadarāja, simplified it yet again into *Laghukaumudī* (Dowson 2000: 181, 303). Moreover, the term *jyotsnā* also has a place in the grammatical (*vyākaraṇa*) context and prosody (*chandas*). *Jyotsnā* is identified as the name of a commentary by Rāmacandra, possibly dating to the eighteenth century, on the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* and, the name of a commentary on Nāgeśa's *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* by Udayamakara Pāṭhaka of Vārāṇasi in the eighteenth century (Abhyankar 1961: 151). Furthermore, in the second context, *jyotsnā* is one of a *catuṣpadi* "four lines metre consisting of 13 *mātrās*' syllabic measure" in each of its four lines (Velankar 1936: 57).

The fact that the word "moonlight" is used in the context of the naming of works related to grammar, prosody, and poetry lends yet more credence to the argument that moonlight is an allegory for a work which simultaneously bestows enlightenment and sublimity. Other Sanskrit treatises (in various fields) also have the word "light" (in terms of "shedding light" on a particular topic) in their titles. In other words, this literary device is not limited to descriptions of "moonlight". See, for example, Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka* 'a light on suggestion', Mammata's *Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa* 'a light on poetry', and so forth.²³

The same can be said about *Candrakirana*, a manual whose contents were hoped to endow enlightenment on any poet wishing to compose a *kakawin*. Perusing it, the words could enlighten its readers, so their minds and hearts could be as if filled with moonlight (*kasuluhān jyotsnā jwala katon*). This is why, as an essential guide, *Candrakirana* was to be found in religious centres in the foothills of mountains, for instance, Merapi-Merbabu and *kabuyutan* Ciburuy. Only in these places could the *kawi* immerse themselves, studying religion, prosody and poetry in a hermitage, until they had reached the point at which

²² It is unfortunate that these three words in L 298 (fol. 44r) were corrupted as *candraka*, *mudhī*, and *jotsvah*, therefore, the author has made an emendation based on L 631.

²³ I would like to thank Danielle Chen Kleinman for this information and for her kindness in reviewing this article.

they could create a literary work.²⁴ It is not surprising that the two of the three *Candrakirana* manuscripts which we can read today are in a damaged condition, since we can assume that the manuscripts were so thoroughly used their physical condition was severely impacted. If the validity of this assumption is tested, P.J. Zoetmulder's (1974) argument about the redundancy of prosody and poetical works of Old Javanese and *Wṛttasañcaya* can be refuted. Bujangga Manik's testimony in his account of his expedition can be used as the point of departure for the time being. In his account, it is said that Mount Damalung (Merbabu) was a religious place (Noorduyn and Teeuw 2009: 499), in which the propagation of knowledge between religious leaders was assiduously practised. Therefore, it is not surprising that *Candrakirana* and other texts were found in *kabuyutan* Ciburuy and were also present in the foothills of Merapi-Merbabu.

6. CONCLUSION

Commencing with textual data compiled in the introduction, it is evident that at least one of the parts of *Candrakirana*, *Amaramālā*, was probably compiled during the reign of Rakai Panangkaran or Raja Indra. From this statement, it can be concluded that the *Candrakirana*, or *Amaramālā* to be specific, was compiled no later than the eighth century. This is the oldest date at which the Javanese had begun to espouse and broaden their knowledge of the science of prosody and poetry. There is a possibility that parts other than the *Amaramālā* were inserted at the later period with the intention of perfecting the manual itself. The upshot was that the *Amaramālā* never became an independent work. The work was then copied into different manuscripts, but some were damaged and never did, or now do not, contain a colophon, therefore the name of this compilation remains unknown. However, based on the information recorded in L 298, one of the manuscripts in the Merapi-Merbabu collection, it is clear that the name of this work is *Candrakirana*. The synonym encompassed in the term *candrakirana* or moonbeams in other sources dealing with grammar, prosody, and poetry demonstrates that *Candrakirana* was intended to enlighten both the poet and reader of *kakawin*; in short, the benefits usually expected to be bestowed by many manuals.

To conclude this article, the author would like to cite what has been stated by Helen Creese (2001: 19) who has said that in the future the study of Old Javanese, particularly by the present generation, will face more significant challenges. Currently, hundreds of monographs, articles, and books can be accessed only by specialized groups. The study of Old Javanese needs to be liberated from other fields and stand by itself so that the general public can

²⁴ Bujangga Manik, a Sundanese religious figure, was said to have visited and subsequently lodged on Mount Damalung. Here, he was given very thorough religious instruction and became a disciple to the hermit so as to be able to follow the teachings of the great teachers and wisemen (Noorduyn and Teeuw 2009: 192). There is a possibility that this statement might reveal that there was a scientific connection between the hermits who inhabited the foothills of different mountains in Java, therefore it is not surprising that the *Candrakirana* manuscript was found in scriptoria as far apart as Ciburuy (L 631) and Merapi-Merbabu (L 241 dan L 298).

access the results of its studies. Meeting the methodological challenge will no doubt be strenuous and the effort required to become multi-disciplined will be an undeniable struggle. Therefore, the author realizes that what has been written here will still be addressed to enthusiasts of Old Javanese studies. However, it is hoped that a more profound study of the *Candrakirana* in the future will open a communication channel between Javanese and foreigners who have chosen to adopt the cosmopolis of Sanskrit culture.

ABBREVIATIONS

BCB	Bundels C. Berg, Leiden University Library
BKI	<i>Bijdragen tot de Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde</i>
fol.	folio
NBG	Notulen van de Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen
PNRI	Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia
L	Lontar (PNRI Collection)
LOr	Leiden Oriental
prtf.	portofolio

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev. 1961. *A dictionary of Sanskrit grammar*. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Acri, Andrea and Undang Ahmad Darsa. 2009. "Situs Kabuyutan Ciburuy; Collection description", *Retrieving heritage: rare Old Javanese and Old Sundanese manuscripts from West Java*. [Endangered Archives Programme (EAP) 280, http://eap.bl.uk/database/overview_project.a4d?projID=EAP280; accessed in February 2020.]
- Acri, Andrea and Arlo Griffiths. 2014. "The Romanisation of Indic Script used in Ancient Indonesia", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 170(2-3): 365-378.
- Aminullah, Zakariya Pamuji. 2019a. "Candrakirana; Présentation du texte avec étude de sa première partie consacrée entre autres aux structures métriques". MA thesis, École Pratique des Hautes Études, PSL University.
- Aminullah, Zakariya Pamuji. 2019b. "Peran Candrakirana dalam tradisi tulis dan lisan Jawa Kuno; Sebuah tinjauan awal", in: Tular Sudarmadi and Saeful Anwar (eds), *Sekar Rinonce: artikel persembahan 70 tahun Prof. Dr. Marsono, S.U.*, pp. 220-231. Yogyakarta: Program Studi Sastra Jawa FIB UGM.
- Behrend, T. E. 1998. *Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia. Jilid 4: Katalog induk naskah-naskah Nusantara*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Berg, C.C. 1928. *Inleiding tot de studie van het Oud-Javaansch (Kidung Sundāyana)*. Soerakarta: De Bliksem.
- Boechari, M. 2012. "Kerajaan Matarām sebagaimana terbayang dari data prasasti", in: Ninie Susani, Hasan Djafar, Edhie Wurjantoro, Arlo Griffiths

- (eds), *Melacak sejarah kuno Indonesia lewat prasasti*, pp. 183-196. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Brandes, J. L. A. 1888. "Een Jayapattra of acte van eene rechterlijke uitspraak van Śaka 849", *TBG* 32: 98-149.
- Brandes, J.L.A. 1915. *Beschrijving der Javaansche, Balineesche en Sasaksche handschriften aangetroffen in de nalatenschap van Dr. H.N. van der Tuuk. Volume III*. Batavia.
- Casparis, J.G. de. 1950. *Inscripties uit de Çailendra-tijd*. Bandung: Nix.
- Casparis, J.G. de. 1961. "New evidence on cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in ancient times", *Artibus Asiae* 24: 241-248.
- Cohen Stuart, A. B. 1872. *Eerste vervolg catalogus der bibliotheek en catalogus der Maleische, Javaansche en Kawi handschriften van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van kunsten en wetenschappen*. Batavia/'s-Gravenhage: Bruining en Wijt/Nijhoff.
- Creese, Helen. 2001. "Old Javanese studies; A review of the field", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 157(1): 3-33.
- Christie, Jan Wisseman. 2001. "Revisiting early Mataram", in: Marijke J. Klokke and Karel R. van Kooij (eds), *Fruits of inspiration; Studies in honour of Prof. J.G. de Casparis*, pp. 25-57. Groningen: Forsten.
- Damais, L.C. 1958. "I. Études d'épigraphie indonésienne, V: Dates de manuscrits et documents divers de Java, Bali et Lombok", *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 49(1): 1-257.
- Dowson, John. 2000. *A classical dictionary of Hindu mythology and religion; Includes indexes*. Second impression. New Delhi: D.K. Printworld.
- Ensink, J. 1967. *On the Old-Javanese Cantakaparwa and its tale of Sutasoma*. 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Flood, Gavin. 1996. *An introduction to Hinduism*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gonda, Jan. 1952. *Sanskrit in Indonesia*. Nagpur: The International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Griffiths, Arlo. 2013. "The problem of the ancient name Java and the role of Satyavarman in Southeast Asian international relations around the turn of the ninth century CE", *Archipel* 85: 43-81. [<https://doi.org/10.3406/arch.2013.4384>.]
- Gunawan, Aditia. 2015. "Nipah or Gebang?; A philological and codicological study based on sources from West Java", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 171(2-3): 249-280. [<https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-17101004>.]
- Gunawan, Aditia. 2019. *Bhīma Svarga; Teks Jawa Kuno abad ke-15 dan penurunan naskahnya*. Jakarta: Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Holle, K.F. 1867. "Vlugtig berigt omtrent eenige lontar-handschriften afkomstig uit de Soenda-lande", *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 16: 450-470.
- Hooykaas, C. 1955. *The Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin; With special reference to the problem of interpolation in kakawins*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.

- Hunter, Tom. 2009. "Yati; A structural principle in Old Javanese versification", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52: 15-66.
- I. Kuntara Wiryamartana. 1990. *Arjunawiwaha; Transformasi teks Jawa Kuna lewat tanggapan dan penciptaan di lingkungan sastra Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Jordaan, Roy E. 2003. "Wanua Tengah III and the problem of the origin of the Śailendra dynasty". [Paper, the International Conference on Indonesian Art, New Delhi (IGNCA), 4-6 March.]
- Juynboll, H. H. 1907. *Supplement op den Catalogus van de javaansche en madoereesche handschriften der Leidsche Universiteits-Bibliotheek. Deel 1, Madoereesche handschriften, oudjavaansche inscripties en oud- en middeljavaansche gedichten*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Kartika Setyawati. 2015. *Kidung Surajaya; Suntingan teks, terjemahan dan analisis makna isi teks*. PhD thesis, Leiden University.
- Kartika Setyawati, I. Kuntara Wiryamartana, and Willem van der Molen. 2002. *Katalog naskah Merapi-Merbabu; Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Kern, H. 1875. *Wṛtta-saṅcāya, oudjavaansch leerdicht over versbouw in Kawi-tekst en nederlandsche vertaling*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Krom, N.J. 1924. "Over het Śiwaïsme van Midden-Java", *Med. Kon. Ak.* 58 (Series B): 199-225.
- Krom, N.J. 1931. *Hindoe-Javaansche geschiedenis*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Kurniawan, Abimardha. 2019. "Səngkalan Dihyang dan upaya menafsirkannya". [Paper, Saṅcaya Sari: Untaian Adikarya Stuart Robson, Malang, 16-17 November.]
- Kusen. 1994. "Raja-raja Mataram Kuna dari Sanjaya sampai Balitung; Sebuah rekonstruksi berdasarkan Prasasti Wanua Tengah III", *Berkala Arkeologi* 14: 82-95. [<https://doi.org/10.30883/jba.v14i2.721>.]
- Lenep, D. van. 1969. "Some observations on the nipah leaf kropaks from West Java, with an analysis of content and historical relevance of the Manggala to the Old-Javanese Amaramala". BA honours thesis, University of Sydney.
- Lokesh Chandra. 1997. "Chanda-karaṇa; The art of writing poetry", *Cultural Horizons of India* Vol. 6: 140-185. [International Academy of Indian Culture and Aditya Prakashan.]
- Molen, W. van der. 1983. *Javaanse tekstkritiek; Een overzicht en een nieuwe benadering geillustreerd aan de Kunjarakarna*. Foris Publications Holland.
- Mu'jizah and Achadiati Ikram. 2020. "Transformation of Candra Kirana as a beautiful princess into Panji Semirang; An invincible hero", *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia* 21(2): 191-213.
- Munandar, Agus Aris. 2008. *Ibukota Majapahit, masa jaya, dan pencapaian*. Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu.
- Noorduyn, J. and A. Teeuw. 2009. *Tiga pesona Sunda Kuna*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Poerbatjaraka. 1931. *Smaradahana; Oud-Javaansche tekst met vertaling uitgegeven*. Bandung: A.C. Nix. [Bibliotheca Javanica 3.]

- Poerbatjaraka. 1958. "Çrīvijaya, de Çailendra- en de Sañjayavamça", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 114: 254-265.
- Poerbatjaraka. 2020. *Kepustakaan Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Narasi.
- Proudfoot, Ian. 2007. "Reconstructing the Tengger Calender", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 163: 123-133.
- Rassers, W.H. Pollock. 1922. *De Pandji roman*. Antwerpen: D. de Vos-van Kleef.
- Rizzi, Andrea and John Griffiths. 2016. "The Renaissance of anonymity", *Renaissance Quarterly* 69: 200-212.
- Rubinstein, Raechelle. 2000. *Beyond the realm of the senses; the Balinese ritual of kakawin composition*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Sarkar, H.B. 1966. "The migration of Sanskrit grammar, lexicography, prosody, and rhetoric to Indonesia", *Journal of the Asiatic Society* 8(2): 81-99.
- Sarkar, H.B. 1971. *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java (Corpus Inscriptioni Javanicarum), up to 928 A.D.* Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay.
- Schoterman, J. 1981. "An introduction to old Javanese Sanskrit dictionaries and grammars", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 137: 419-442.
- Sugriwa, I Gusti Bagus. 1978. *Penuntun pelajaran kakawin*. Denpasar: Sarana Bhakti.
- Supomo, S. 1977. *Arjunawijaya; A kakawin of Mpu Tantular*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Velankar, H.D. 1936. "Apabhramśa Metres II", *Journal of the University of Bombay*, Vol. V/III: 41-93.
- Worsley, P., S. Supomo, Thomas M. Hunter, and Margaret Fletcher. 2013. *Mpu Monaguna's Sumanasāntaka; An Old Javanese epic poem, its Indian source, and Balinese illustrations*. Leiden/Boston, MA: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Zakharov, A.O. 2012. "The Śailendras reconsidered", *Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre Working Paper Series* 12 (Aug): 1-38.
- Zoetmulder, P.J. 1974. *Kalangwan; A survey of old Javanese literature*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Zoetmulder, P. J. 1982. *Old Javanese-English dictionary*. 's-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff.

APPENDIX A

In this appendix, the diplomatic transliteration of the partial text of L 298 is presented, because the author has used its critical rendering in his discussion. With some modifications the transliteration conforms to the system proposed by Aciri and Griffiths (2014) for the romanization of the various types of Indian script used in South East Asia. The author has marked the independent vowels by placing a circle with superscript (°) before the given vowel: °a, °i, °u, °e, °o, °ə, °r, and °l. Since there is no vowel equivalent of a *pepet* in the scripts supported by ISO 15919, the author has adopted Damais' suggestion (1958) that it be transliterated using *ə* and *ē* instead of the traditional romanizations *ě* and *ö*. The grapheme marking the length of the vowel of the preceding akṣara is transliterated by a colon (:). Turning to the consonants, the grapheme *v* is preferred to *w*; the *anusvāra m̐* is distinguished from the basic consonant *m̐*; to highlight the difference between *repha* and the basic consonant *r*, the author has respectively adopted *r̐* for *repha*, following Van der Molen on this point (1983: 294); the author distinguishes the *visarga ḥ* from the basic consonant *h*. The *virāma* is represented by a midpoint (·). For punctuation (*pada lingsa*) in manuscripts, the comma “,” is used, while all fleurons (*pada lungsi*), regardless of their form, are represented by a bold point (·).

a. Designation of Jitendra in *Amaramālā*

[18] ... *ya tika sampun hinaristaknanira, śelendranvaya:puṅgavaḥ, sīra ta pinakottuṅga, niṁ śelendravanśa, ja:yati hamna ta sira, śrī maha:rajasa maṅkaṇa tisayanira, sira tata śrī maha:raja: jitendra saṅṅanira, ...*

b. Illustration of *Madhugulāmṛta* in a stanza

[8r] ...
kiraṇa pinakaśuluhim̐ loka,
vulan amuhara śukaniṁ ccitta [8v],
śakala kiraṇa hati saṁ praṅga,
uvusira madu ya vula:mṛtta

c. Definition of *Amaramālā*

[19r] ... *nihan ta °upamanikaṁ amaramāla, kadyaṅganiṁ teja saṅ hyaṅ haditya sumuluh im̐ patala, °apan · vnaṁ hamintonakən artha śabda, ya ta maṅkaṇa tekiṁ amaramala han suluhniṁ śabda ...*

d. Colophon

[47r] ... *°itiḥ candrakiraṇa, samapta talas · cinitra, ri jəṅṅim̐, ra saṁ hyaṁ giri damaluṁ, himbaṁ pacimma, gəgərim̐ jayalakṣaṇa, riṁ panəpenipu, siṅṅarəwōi hababhakal ; paṛvayantusaṅka hala hayuniṁ saṁ hyaṁ śastra, kaya cinakar̐ him̐ pakṣi haram̐ hakṛp panəmut gatəl ; tan patutim̐ tata praga: paruṅgunikaṁ guru laghu, haroksa śulambhuṛran sawaṁ pragalba: śatṅṅaḥ lawan · pjaḥ, kuraṁ lwihnya sa-[47v]-praweṣya hama tuṁta, reḥhim̐ saṁ manim̐ hanurat sakaruṁ ta makaṁ puraha, denira saṁ sudya maca: muwaḥ saṁ hadṛbe, kapuraha denim̐ ham̐thumpak guwa, hagaṇa, ham̐(w)uksaniṁ gul ; mapan · deṣeṁ tama saṁ hanurat ; dharm̐ma holiḥ hiṁ asisinnahu, sep · wuruke ø kahuwusanim̐ṅ anirat · tumpək · wagenim̐ kurantil ; haṣṭhaniṁ yama, nawa, wara, kulus ; sadyaranim̐ paniron ; triwara, byantarya // Or̐ // wulan · śrawaṇa, taṅgyal piṁ limma // Or̐ // °i śakala, warṅna, gaṇa, maṅgha, siti // Or̐ // \ / °omi, śrī śrī śrī saṁ hyaṁ śa: raśwati ya namma śyahaḥ ...*

APPENDIX B

The table below consists of the detailed content of *Candrakirāṇa* based on three manuscripts in the Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, elaborated by Aminullah (2019a: 18-19) in his master's thesis.

Chapter	Title	Folios			
		L 631	L298	L241	
PART I					
1	Introduction	-	1r	-	
2	Origin of <i>kakawin</i> metres	-	1r	-	
3	Long syllable	-	1r-2r	-	
4	<i>Aṣṭagaṇa</i>	-	2r-2v	-	
5	<i>Ārya</i> metre	-	2v	-	
6	Words with ṇ	-	3r	-	
7	Words with n	-	3r-3v	-	
8	Words with ś	5r	3v	4r	
9	Words with ṣ	5r-5v	4r	4r-4v	
10	Words with s	5v	4v	4v	
11	<i>Sūtrasandhi</i>	5v-7r	4r-4v	4v	
12	Metaphor arms of <i>akṣaras</i>	7r-7v	4v-5v	-	
13	Chandas (metres)				
	a	Name of metres based on the number of syllables	7v-8r	5v	-
	b	Illustration of metres in the stances	8r-17r	6r-13r	9r-13v
	c	<i>Kakawin</i>	17r-18v	13r-14r	13v-14v
PART II					
14	<i>Bhāṣapṛāṇa</i>				
	a	<i>Alaṃkāra</i>	18v-19v	14r-14v	14v
	b	<i>Nawarasa</i> (nine rasas)	19r-19v	14v-15r	14v-15r
	c	Merits for the composition of <i>kakawin</i>	19v	15r	15r-15v
	d	<i>Doṣa</i>	19v-22r	15r-15v	15v-16r
	e	<i>Mahāpṛāṇa</i>	22r-23v	15v-18r	16r-18v
PART III					
15	<i>Amaramālā</i>	23v-39v	18r-33v	18v-32v	
PART IV					
16	List of Sanskrit-Old Javanese Vocabularies	39v-54r	33v-46r	32v-40v	
PART V					
17	Divine origin in <i>akṣaras</i>	54r	46r-47r	-	
PART VI					
18	Colophon	-	47r-49r	-	