The Kanjuruhan Charter (682 Śaka)

Arlo Griffiths

Author of digital edition: Arlo Griffiths

Contributor: Arlo Griffiths

Identifier: DHARMA_INSIDENKKanjuruhan

Repository: Nusantara Epigraphy (tfc-nusantara-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSIDENKKanjuruhan.xml

Languages: Old Javanese [Script (unspecified)], Sanskrit [Script (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-11-09 08:51 (6580fa0), last modified 2026-09-09 14:27 (72454d8)

Edition

〈1〉 || svasti śaka-varṣātīta 682

1. Anuṣṭubh

〈2〉 || Āsīꜝt·!〈n〉 nara-patiꜝḥ!〈r〉 dhīmān
deva-siṁhaḥ pra〈3〉tāpavān·
yena gupt(ā) purī bhāti
pūtikeśva〈4〉ra-pāvitā

2. Anuṣṭubh

|| limvꜝaḥ a!〈o ’〉pi tanayaꜝḥ!〈s〉 tasya
gajayānꜝaḥ!〈a〉〈5〉 Iti smṛtaḥ
rarakṣa svar-ggate tāte
pura(ṁ) kāñjuruhan· mahat·

3. Anuṣṭubh

〈6〉 || limvasya duhitā jajñe
prada-putr(ā)sya bhūpateḥ
Utteja〈7〉n¡ā I!〈e〉ti mahiṣī
jananī yasya dhīmataḥ

4. Vasantatilakā

|| Ānandanaḥ kalaśa〈8〉-je bhagavat¡i A!〈y a〉gastye
bhakt¡aḥ!〈o〉 dvijāti-hita-kṛ¡t·!〈d〉 gajayāna[–˽]
〈9〉 pauraiḥ sa-nāyaka-gaṇaiḥ samakārayat· tat·
ramyam· maha〈10〉rṣi-bhavanam· valahājir (ī)ḍyaḥ

5. Vasantatilakā

|| pūrvvaiḥ kṛtām· tu sura-dāru-mayī(m·)〈11〉 samīkṣya
kīrtti-priyaḥ kalaśa-ja-pratimāṁ manasvī
Ājñā〈12〉pya śilpina¡m· A!〈m a〉ram· s¡aḥ c!〈a c〉a dīrgha-darśśī
kṛṣṇādbhutopala-ma〈13〉yīm· nṛpati¡ḥ!〈ś〉 cakāra

6. Sragdharā

|| rājñāgastyaḥ śakābde nayana-vasu〈14〉-rase mārggaśīrṣe ca māse
Ārdrarkṣe śukra-vāre pratipa〈15〉da-divase pakṣa-sandhau dhruve vā
ṛttvigbhi¡ḥ!〈r〉 veda-vidbhi¡ḥ!〈r〉 yati-vara〈16〉-sahitaiḥ sthāpakādyaiḥ sa-pauraiḥ
karmma-jñaiḥ kumbha-lagne sudṛḍha〈17〉-mati-matā sthāpitaḥ kumbhayoniḥ

7. Sragdharā

|| kṣetram· gāvaḥ supuṣṭāḥ mahiṣa〈18〉-gaṇa-yut¡āḥ d!〈ā d〉āsa-dāsī-purogāḥ
dattā rājñā maharṣi-pravara-caru-ha〈19〉vis-snāna-sammārjanādi-
-vyāpārārtham· dvijānām· bhavanam api vṛhat·〈20〉 danturam· c¡a A!〈ā〉dbhutam· ca
visrambhāy¡a A!〈ā〉tithīnām· yava-yavi〈21〉ka-śayyācchādanaiḥ suprayuktam·

8. Vasantatilakā

|| ye bāndhav¡āḥ n!〈ā n〉ṛpa-sutā¡ḥ!〈ś〉 ca〈22〉 sa-mantri-mukhyāḥ
dattau nṛpasya yadi te pratikūla-cittāḥ
nāsti〈23〉kya-doṣa-kuṭilāḥ narake pateyuḥ
n¡a A!〈ā〉mutra c¡a I!〈e〉ha ca gatim·〈24〉 [para]māṁ labhante

9. Vasantatilakā

|| vaṁśyā¡āḥ n!〈ā n〉ṛpasya rucit¡āḥ y!〈ā y〉adi datti-vṛddhau
Āstikya〈25〉-śuddha-matayaḥ kṛta-vipra-pūjāḥ

dānādya-puṇya-yajanāddhyayanā〈26〉di-śīlāḥ
rakṣantu rājya¡m· A!〈m a〉[niśa]m· nṛpati¡ḥ!〈r〉 yath¡ā E!〈ai〉vam·

Apparatus

〈4〉 limvaḥ C • Some predecessors have read this name as Liṣva, and this reading was hesitantly approved by Damais (1957, p. 640). But I believe that the context requires that we see in this name the Javanese word *limva*. See the translation below. Note that the name is recorded as Limva, not Liṣva, in Damais 1970, p. 734. — 〈4〉 gajayānaḥ ◇ *gajayāna* C • The *visarga* is clearly visible after the curve of the stone.

〈5〉 pura(ṁ) C • One expects *puram·*, but for this there seems to be too little space. The stone is damaged here.

〈6〉 prada-putr(ā)sya C • The stone is damaged here, so the presence of *ā* cannot be verified.

〈7〉 jananī yasya ◇ *jananīyasya* C.

〈8〉 gajayāna[–˽] C • Damais 1955, p. 204, n. 5: "Nous nous étions demandé dans *Ep. Aant.*, VIII : 2 5, ligne 1, si les deux syllabes non transcrites par De Casparis à la fin de la ligne 8 (elles ont disparu dans la brisure de la pierre) ne seraient pas *rājā*. Nous venons de vérifier le passage sur la stèle elle-même. Seule la partie gauche du premier des deux aksara manquants est encore visible avant la brisure et il nous paraît certain qu'il ne peut s'agir d'un *rā*."

〈10〉 valahājir (ī)ḍyaḥ ◇ *v(a)lahājiri(dh)yaḥ* C • De Casparis admitted his inability to interpret his reading. Damais 1952, p. 23, n. 3 proposed the alternative *valahājiriḍyaḥ* but says nothing about how he interprets this. Long and short *i/ī* are in many cases barely distinguishable in this inscription. Emend *valahāśirīḍyaḥ* (for expected *valahāśīrīḍyaḥ*) or *valahājid īḍyaḥ*? — 〈10〉 -mayī(m·) ◇ *-mayīṁ* C.

〈14〉 Ārdrarkṣe ◇ *Ārdrarkṣye* C • The correct reading was proposed by Damais (1952, p. 23, n. 3).

〈16〉 sa-pauraiḥ C • Based on inspection of the stone, and comparing this word to the graphic appearance of *pauraiḥ* at the beginning of line 9, Damais (1952, p. 23, n. 3) found De Casparis' reading unacceptable and proposed *sahoraiḥ* as alternative.

〈19〉 -sammārjanādi C • Sarkar (1970, n. 30) argued unconvincingly for the reading *samvarddhanādi* of De Casparis' predecessors. Both the traces of the *akṣara*s and the sense plead for De Casparis' reading.

〈20〉 visrambhāya ◇ *viśrambhāya* C.

〈21〉 -śayyā° ◇ *-cayyā°* C • De Casparis' reading is obviously a misprint (for in the transliteration system he used, ç corresponds to *ś*). The double *yy* presumably does not make position (*śayā* is needed for the meter).

〈24〉 vaṁśyāḥ ◇ *vaṁcyāḥ* C • Again, De Casparis' reading is an obvious misprint.

〈26〉 A[niśa]m· ◇ *A[tula]m·* C • The alternative restoration adopted here was suggested to me by Dániel Balogh.

Translation

〈1〉 Hail! The elapsed Śaka year 682.[1]

1.

There was a king, the wise and valorous Devasiṁha, protected by whom shines (or: shone) the city purified by Pūtikeśvara.[2]

2.

His son, Limva ("Swing"), known as Gajayāna ("having an elephant's gait"),[3] also protected the great city of Kāñjuruhan, when his father had gone to heaven.

3.

A daughter, giver of sons,[4] was born to this Limva, the wise king, whose chief queen 〈and the daughter's〉 mother was Uttejanā.[5]

4.

Delighting (because of this daughter's birth), and devoted to the pot-born lord Agastya, the 〈king named〉 Gajayāna, praiseworthy defeater of the Vala-Slayer (Indra), benefac-

[1]The first line, not comprising any Sanskrit grammatical morphology, is in Old Javanese. Many inscriptions that are entirely in this language start with dating formulae of the same structure.

[2]Note of Chatterjee; article by Stutterheim (?).

[3]On the meaning of *limva* = *limba* in Old Javanese, see Zoetmulder 1982, p. 1029. It seems that the Sanskrit name glosses the indigenous one.

[4]The compound *pradaputrā* is very unusual, for *putrapradā* is expected and would be metrically only slightly objectionable (yielding an iambic pattern that is avoided only in the most pure form of *anuṣṭubh* meter). The grammatical irregularity seems more drastic than would have been the slight metrical transgression, so meter cannot evidently be invoked to justify the form. Possibly it was intended as proper name (Pradaputrā) rather than as adjective. See also the discussion in de Casparis 1941, pp. 504–505, which does not sufficiently emphasize the irregularity of the compound.

[5]The fact that they did not acknowledge the word division here (*jananī yasya*) explains why De Casparis and some other precedessors postulate a figure called Jananīya in translating this stanza.

tor of the twice-born (Brahmins), had the charming abode of the great sage built by citizens along with several foremen.

5.

And that sensible king, fond of fame, who saw had longevity in view, but who had seen the cedar-wood image of the Pot-born (Agastya), made by the ancestors, carefully[6] instructed a sculptor, and had an image of astonishing black stone prepared.

6.

In the Śaka year ⟨denoted by⟩ eyes-Vasus-flavors (682), in the month of Mārgaśīrṣa, on Friday, under the lunar mansion Ārdra, on the *pratipad* day, at the juncture of the fortnights,[7] and (*vā*) in the Dhruva (conjunction), with Aquarius (*kumbha*) in the ascendant (*lagna*), the Pitcher-born (Agastya) was caused to be built by the king, of firm intellect, at the hands of priests, versed in the Vedas, together with the best of ascetics, and together with citizens among whom architects etc.[8]

7.

Land, well-fed cows, together with herds of buffaloes and preceded by male and female servants, were given by the king in order for the twice-born to execute *caru* (oblation of boiled rice), *havis* (oblation of melted butter), ablutions, anointments etc. for the best of great sages, as well as a great lodge, storeyed (?, *dantura*) and astonishing, for guests to rest, well furnished with beds ((i.e. mattresses)) made of barley straw and covers.

8.

If (in the future) the relatives and sons of the king, together with their chief ministers, shall be of adverse mind in relation to this donation of the king, they shall, perverted by the sin of heterodoxy, fall into hell and neither in this world nor in the next do they attain the highest destination.

9.

In case the descendants of the king are inclined to the augmentation of the donation, may they, with their intellect purified by orthodoxy, having worshiped the twice-born and being accustomed to meritorious deeds like donations, and to worship, study, etc., always protect the whole kingdom in the same way as does the (present) king.

[6] Or take *aram* with *cakāra*, as does Chatterjee?

[7] See note Damais who argues that this must have been the *pratipad*, i.e.\ first day of the waning fortnight.

[8] See Damais 1952, p. 22, n. 2 on the interpretation of the calendrical parameters. Damais read *sahoraiḥ* instead of *sapauraiḥ* and interpreted *hora* as meaning "astrologer", though admitting that this meaning "ne semble pas exister en sanskrit « classique »".

Commentary

A unique feature is the nearly consistent absence of sandhi, sometimes even against the meter, so that numerous normalizations are called for in editing this inscription. Exceptions where vowel sandhi is applied are *prada-putrāsya* (st. III, this reading is, however, somewhat uncertain) and *rājñāgastyaḥ* (st. VI).

Bibliography

This, the oldest dated inscription of East Java, is of great historical interest and has been edited several times. After the discovery of the main fragment, a posthumously published provisional transcription by J. L. A. Brandes (1913), and a more thorough study by F. D. K. Bosch (1916, with numerous corrections and additions in Bosch 1923), discovery of further fragments necessitated a revised edition by Bosch (1924). However, the most reliable, indeed virtually flawless, edition is that of J. G. de Casparis (1941). Thirty years later, H. B. Sarkar (1971–1972), and also in an article published separately, just one year earlier (1970) pretended to give a more reliable interpretation than that of his predecessors, but at least his decipherment is not more reliable at all.[9] A photo of an excellent inked estampage, showing large parts of lines 10–21, was included as plate 1 in Brandes & Krom 1913; both of Bosch' publications also photographic reproductions, but De Casparis (1941, p. 498, n. 7) has warned that they are often misleading. A useful photograph of the main fragment is available as OD 743. Moreover, the stone is accessible at the National Museum in Jakarta (stone D.113), where I was able to verify the published readings on 6 July 2011. Only variant readings from De Casparis' edition are systematically noted in my apparatus, and I have also recorded all the philological observations made by L.-Ch. Damais (1952). I refer for the sake of convenience only to Sarkar's 1970 publication, not to the one of 1971.

Primary

Brandes, Jan Laurens Andries & Nicolaas Johannes Krom. 1913. *Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden: Nagelaten transcripties*. Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen 60 (parts 1 and 2). Batavia; 's-Hage: Albrecht; Nijhoff. [URL]. Item I, pages 1–2, plate 1.

Bosch, Frederik David Kan. 1916. "De Sanskrit-inscriptie op den steen van Dinaja (682 Saka)." TBG 57, pp. 410–444.

[9] Sarkar's readings normalize the spelling and are unreliable especially in the matter of final consonants (notably *ṁ/m*).

Bosch, Frederik David Kan. 1924. “Het Lingga-heiligdom van Dinaja.” TBG 64, pp. 227–286.

Poerbatjaraka. 1926. *Agastya in den Archipel*. Leiden: Brill. [URL]. Pages 51–55.

Chatterjee, Bijan Raj & Niranjan Prasad Chakravarti. 1933. *India and Java, part II (Inscriptions)*. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Greater India Society Bulletin 5. Calcutta: [M.C. Das, Prabasi Press]. [URL]. Pages 35–40.

[C] de Casparis, Johannes Gijsbertus. 1941. “Nogmaals de Sanskrit-inscriptie op de steen van Dinojo.” TBG 81, pp. 499–513.

Sarkar, Himanshu Bhusan. 1970. “The stone of Kañjuruha (Dinaja) 682 Śaka.” In: *R. C. Majumdar felicitation volume*. Edited by Himansu Bhusan Sarkar. Calcutta: K. L. Mukhopadhyay, pp. 262–268.

Sarkar, Himansu Bhusan. 1971–1972. *Corpus of the inscriptions of Java (Corpus inscriptionum Javanicarum), up to 928 A. D.* 2 vols. Calcutta: K.L. Mukhopadhyay. Volume I, pages 25–33, item IV.

Secondary

Bosch, Frederik David Kan. 1923. “De Sanskrit-inscriptie op den steen van Dinaja (verbeteringen en aanvullingen op Tijdschrift Bat. Gen. Dl. LVII, 1915, p. 410 vlg.)” OV (Bijlage C), pp. 29–35.

Damais, Louis-Charles. 1949. “Epigrafische aanteekeningen.” TBG 83, pp. 1–26. Pages 24–25.

Poerbatjaraka. 1952. *Riwajat Indonesia, djilid I*. Djakarta: Jajasan Pembangunan. Pages 61–65.

Damais, Louis-Charles. 1952. “Études d’épigraphie indonésienne, III : Liste des principales inscriptions datées de l’Indonesie.” BEFEO 46 (1), pp. 1–105. DOI: 10.3406/befeo.1952.5158. [URL]. Pages 22–23, part A, item 3.

Damais, Louis-Charles. 1955. “Études d’épigraphie indonésienne, IV : Discussion de la date des inscriptions.” BEFEO 47, pp. 7–290. DOI: 10.3406/befeo.1955.5406. [URL]. Page 204.

Damais, Louis-Charles. 1957. “Riwajat Indonesia, djilid I.” BEFEO 48 (2), pp. 607–649. [URL]. Pages 640–648.

Damais, Louis-Charles. 1970. *Répertoire onomastique de l’épigraphie javanaise (jusqu’à Pu Siṇḍok Śrī Īśānawikrama Dharmmotuṅgadewa): Étude d’épigraphie indonésienne*. Publications

de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient 66. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient. Page 43, item 8.

Nakada, Kōzō. 1982. *An inventory of the dated inscriptions in Java*. Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko 40. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko. Pages 72–73, part I, item 3.