Charter of Pucangan (1041-11-6)

Csaba Dezső, Arlo Griffiths and Eko Bastiawan

Authors of digital edition: Csaba Dezső, Arlo Griffiths, Eko Bastiawan

Contributors: Arlo Griffiths, Eko Bastiawan

Identifier: DHARMA_INSIDENKPucangan

Repository: Nusantara Epigraphy (tfc-nusantara-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSIDENKPucangan.xml

Languages: Old Javanese [Kawi], Sanskrit [Kawi]

Commit: 2026-11-09 08:51 (6580fa0), last modified 2026-09-19 07:35 (11cdae1)

Edition

〈Face A: Sanskrit Text〉 〈A1〉 // ⊖ // svasti //

1. Āryā

tribhir api guṇair upeto nr̥ṇāv vidhāne sthitau tathā pralaye
A-guṇa Iti yaḥ prasiddhas tasmai dhātre namas satatam· ⊙

2. Āryā

A-gaṇita-vikrama-guruṇā praṇamya-māna〈A2〉s surādhipena sadā
[A](p)[i] yas trivikrama Iti prathito loke namas tasmai ⊙

3. Āryā

yas sthāṇur apy ati-tarāy ya¿v?〈th〉epsitārtha-prado guṇair jagatām·
kalpa-drumam atanum adhaḥ karoti tasmai śivāya〈A3〉 namaḥ ⊙ || ⊙

4. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

kīrtyākhaṇḍitayātayā karuṇayā yas strī-paratvan dadhac
cāpākarṣaṇataś ca yaḥ praṇihitan tībraṅ kalaṅkaṅ kare
yaś cāsac-carite parāṅ-mukhatayā śūro raṇe bhīrutāṁ
svair doṣān bhajate gu〈A4〉ṇais sa jayatād erlaṅga-nāmā nṛpaḥ ⊙

5. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

Āsīn nirjita-bhūri-bhū-dhara-gaṇo bhū-pāla-cūḍā-maṇiḥ
prakhyāto bhuvana-traye 'pi mahatā śauryyeṇa siṁhopamaḥ
yenorvī suciran dhṛtāmita-phalā la〈A5〉kṣmīś ca no gatvarī
sa śrī-kīrti-valānvito yava-patiś śrīśāna-tuṅgāhvayaḥ ⊙

6. Vasantatilakā

tasyātma-jākaluṣa-mānasa-vāsa-ramyā
haṁsī yathā sugata-pakṣa-sadāvavaddhā
sā rājahaṁsa-mudam eva vivarddhaya〈A6〉ntī
śrīśānatuṅga-vijayeti rarāja rājñī ⊙

7. Vasantatilakā

mandākinīm iva tadātma-samāṁ samṛddhyā
kṣīrārṇavaḥ prathita-śuddhi-guṇāntarātmā
tāñ cākarot praṇayinīn nayanābhinandī
śrī-loka-pāla-nṛpatir nara-nātha-nā〈A7〉gaḥ ⊙

8. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

tasmāt prādur abhūt prabhāva-vibhavo bhū-bhūṣaṇodbhūtaye
bhūtānām bhava-bhāvanodyata-dhiyām bhām bhāvayan bhūtibhiḥ
Ābhiś cāpratima-prabhābhir abhayo bhāsvān ivābhyudyataś
śatrūṇām ibha-kumbha-kumbha-〈A8〉 dalane putraḥ prabhur bhū-bhujām· ⊙

9. Āryā

śrī-makuṭa-vaṅśa-varddhana Iti pratīto nṛṇām anupamendraḥ
śrīśāna-vaṅśa-tapanas tatāpa śa(t)r(ū)n pratāpena ⊙

10. Vasantatilakā

tasyādhipasya duhitātimanojña-rupā
mūrteva rā〈A9〉ja-guṇato yava-rāja-lakṣmīḥ
dvīpāntare 'pi subhagena babhūva pitrā
nāmnā kṛtā khalu guṇa-priya-dharmma-patnī ⊙

11. Vasantatilakā

Āsīd asāv api viśiṣṭa-viśuddha-janmā
rājānvayād udayanaḥ prathitāt prajātaḥ
tāṁ śrī〈A10〉matīv vidhivad eva mahendra-dattāv
vyaktāhvayo nṛpa-sutām upayacchate sma ⊙

12. Vasantatilakā

śreṣṭhaḥ prajāsu sakalāsu kalābhirāmo
rāmo yathā daśarathāt svaguṇair garīyān·
sambhāvitonnata-gatir ma〈A11〉hasā munīndrair
erlaṅga-deva Iti divya-sutas tato 'bhūt· ⊙

13. Vasantatilakā

śrī-dharmma-vaṁśa Iti pūrva-yavādhipena
sambandhinā guṇa-gaṇa-śra(va)ṇotsukena
Āhūya sādaram asau sva-sutā-vivāhan
drāk sarvathā〈A12〉 prathita-kīrttir abhūn mahātmā ⊙

14. Mañjubhāṣiṇī

Atha bhasmasād abhavad āśu tat-puram
puru-hūta-rāṣṭram iva – dya – ◡ –
kalinā khalena khalu kiṅkarair vinā
sa narottamena sahito vanāny agāt· ⊙

15. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

śākendre śaśa-lāñchanā〈A13〉[bdhi]-vadane yāte mahā-vatsare
māghe māsi sita-trayodaśa-tithau vāre śaśiny utsukaiḥ
Āgatya praṇatair janair dvija-varais s(āśvā)sam abhyarthitaś
śrī-lokeśvara-nīralaṅga-nṛpatiḥ (pā)〈A14〉hīty apātāṅ kṣitim· ⊙

16. Vasantatilakā

samrājya-dīkṣitam iman nṛpatin niśamya
śakty(ā) jitāri-nikaran nivaho ripūṇām·
Adyāpi tad-bhuja-bhujaṅga-talasya śaśvad
abhyasyatīha (capa)latvam abhūta-pūrvvam·〈A15〉 ⊙

17. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

bhūyāṁso yava-bhū-bhujo bubhujire pṛthvīv vipakṣe 'rthinas
sāmarthyān nṛpa-janmano na bubhujus taj(jā) narendrāsane

kintu śrī-jalalaṅga-deva-nṛpatir vaṁśyo 'dhirājāgraṇīr
bhobhuṅkte sa bhu〈A16〉[na]kti kevalam arin dvandvam bhraman bhūtale ⊙

18. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

bhū-bhṛn-mastaka-digdha-pāda-yugalas siṁhāsane saṁsthito
mantrālaucana-tat-parair ahar-ahas sambhāṣito mantribhiḥ
bhāsvadbhir lalanānvi〈A17〉to niviśate vīraiḥ parīto bhṛśaṁ
jyotis tasya parājaye vijayavac citrīyate santatam· ⊙
— enāsya / — air asya / — bhir yasya

19. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

putrān mām ativatsalo 'pi sahasā tyaktvā madīyaḥ patis
svarga-strī-gamano〈A18〉 ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ to h/py ājñā-vidheyas tava
khyātas tvam bhuvane dayālu-hṛdaya(ḥ stai)nyā pravṛttiḥ kathaṁ
hā rājan· kva kṛpety arer vanitayā rājāpy upālabhyate ⊙

20. Vasantatilakā

kaś cin mumukṣu-pa〈A19〉 ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – –
– vāptaye dhana-malāni mahān arātiḥ
kaś cit tri-viṣṭapa-mukhān nṛ-varasya mantrān
samprāpya śiṣya Iva tena kṛtas sa Āsīt· ⊙

21. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

tuṅgāsau bhuvana-traya〈A20〉sya maha – – – ⏑ – – ⏑so
kiṁ bandhāna cikīrṣayā kṣa ⏑ ⏑ – ṅ kiṁ tadyutesterasaḥ
kiṅ krīḍā-rasa-lipsayā rabhasuyā yasyo(ddha)tiḥ kīrttitā
kīrttiḥ śuddhi-karīndra〈A21〉dā dhavala – – mānyate 'har-niśam· ⊙

22. Vasantatilakā

Indro [na]reṣu [mati]-vāk-cariteṣu [dha]rmmo
vaśyeṣu (pāśa)bhṛd asau dhana-do 'rthi-sārthe
saṁhṛtya hanta [nṛpa]-r(ā)d iti loka-pālān
e〈A22〉ko bahum pra ⏑ ⏑ – v vriyate sma dhātrā ⊙

23. Vasantatilakā

Āsīn (n)ṛp(o) ⏑ ⏑ purī-pralayaṁ sa – –
viṣṇu-prabhāva iti tasya suto mahātmā
(tañ ca)ndra-bhūta-vadane śaka-rā〈A23〉ja-varṣa
Ekādaśī ⏑ daka – cu ⏑ phalguṇe (v)ā(n)· ⊙

24. Vasantatilakā

Anyaś ca kaś cid adhamaḥ parudābhidhānas
sākṣād daśānana Ivāvyathayaj jaganti
– – ◡ – sya ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ –〈A24〉 narendro
(rā)mātviramya-ca(ri)to nyavadhīt tam āśu ⊙

25. Pṛthvī

tataś ca tad-anantaran nṛpa-sutañ jigīṣu(r ga)tas
tad-ālayam aśeṣam eva sahasābhyadhākṣīn nṛpaḥ
punaḥ punar athāgni-bhū〈A25〉 ta-vadane śakābde gate
(varo) nara-patis tadīya-nagarāṇy adandahyata ⊙

26. Mālinī

Abhavad api bhuvi strī rākṣasīvogra-vīryyā
vyapagata-bhayam asyās saṅkaṭāṅ gām ayāsī〈A26〉t·
jala-nidhi-śara-randhre śāka-samvatsare 'smin·
nṛpatir abhinad e[tān tat-kṣa]ṇaṅ khyāta-kīrttiḥ ⊙

27. Mālinī

jvalana Iva narendro lelihāno dahat tān
diśam adhikam a(ja)yyān dakṣiṇān da〈A27〉kṣiṇatvāt·
dhanam atibahu labdhvā tac ca datvātmabhṛtye
dvijapatimunisaṅghe kīrttim evāharat saḥ ⊙

28. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

mānitvād atha śailabhūtalapane śākendravarṣe gate
bhadre〈A28〉 māsi sitatrayodaśatitho vāre budhe pāvane
udyuktair balibhir balair agaṇitair gatvā diśam paścimāṁ
rājānav vijayāhvayaṁ samajayad rājā jagatpūjitaḥ ⊙

29. Mālinī

[A]tha mu(kha)〈A29〉(śa)rarandhre śākavarṣe ṣṭamākhye
suragurusitipakṣe kārtike māsi tasmin·
nijabalanigṛhīto vaiṣṇuguptair upāyais
sapadi vijayavarm(m)ā pārthivo dyām aga〈A30〉cchat· ⊙

30. Mālinī

m(ukha)-śara-vivarākhye śāka-rājasya varṣe
hata-śaśi-guru-vāre kārtike pañcadaśyām·

ripu-śirasi mahātmā śrī-yava-dvīpa-rājo
jayati nihita-pād〈A31〉o ratna-siṁhāsana-sthaḥ ⊙

31. Vasantatilakā

pūrvvādi-dig-vijayinaṁ hata-sarvva-śatrum
ekāta-patram avaner jalalaṅga-devam·
nānyan nirīkṣitum alaṁ subhujopapīḍaṁ
gāḍham pariṣvajati sa〈A32〉mprati rāja-lakṣmīḥ ⊙

32. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

[nirjityātha ripūn parākrama-dhanāc chau[r]yyair upāyair api]
[śaktyākhaṇḍita]yā khalu bratitayā vā devatārādhanaiḥ
rantuñ jāta-mahā-(kra/śra)mas sa〈A33〉 [kurute puṇyāśramaṁ śrīmataḥ]
[pārśve pūgavato girer nara-patiś śrī-nīralaṅgāhvayaḥ] ⊙

33. Sragdharā

śṛṇvanto rājakīyāśramam asamam iman nandanodyāna-deśyaṁ
gaccha〈A34〉[ntas santatan te py ahamahamikayā vismayālolanetr¿ā?〈aḥ〉]
[mālābhiprīti-kārās] stuti-mukharamukhā mukhyam enan nṛpāṇām
mānīnam manyamānā manum iva mahasā〈A35〉 mānanīyav vruvanti ⊙

34. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

[sādhūnām pathi yātu paura-samitir dharmyā gatir ma]ntriṇām
bhūyād bhūta-hiteṣiṇo muni-janā Itthan na me prārthanā
yasmiñ jīvati rājñi ra〈A36〉[kṣati bhuvan dharmeṇa siddhyanti te]
[tasmāc chrī-jala]laṅga-deva-nṛ-patir dīrghaṁ sa jīvyād iti ⊙ // ⊙

〈Face B: Old Javanese Text〉 〈B1〉 // ⊖ // svasti śaka-varṣātīta 963 kārtika-māsa, tithi daśamī śukla-pakṣa, ha, va, śu, vāra vayaṁ-vayaṁ, c¡a!〈ā〉ra graha bāyabyastha, Uttarabhadravā〈da〉-nakṣatra, Ahirbudhna-devatā, bajrayoga, gara(ḍ)i-[ka]〈B2〉raṇa, bāruṇya-maṇḍala,

Irikā divaśany ājñā śrī mahārāja rakai halu śrī lokeśvara dharmmavaṅśa Airlaṅgānantavikramottuṅgadeva, tinaḍaḥ rakryān· mahāmantrī I hino śrī samaravijaya {dha〈B3〉ma} suparṇa(vā)haṇa tguh uttuṅgadeva, (Um)iṅ(so)r· I rakryān· kanuruhan· pu dharmmamūrtti (naro)ttama dānaśūra (k)umo(nak)ə(n) i(kana)ṁ ri pucaṅan·, Iṁ barahəm·, Iṁ bapuri, lmaḥniṁ varggāpi(ṅhe) ⟦[8+]⟧〈B4〉 ⟦[32+]⟧ susukən·, mapaknā pa(ṅ)adəganani dharmma karṣyan· śrī mahārāja,

sambandha, A[n·]〈B5〉 hana Iṣṭaprārthanā śrī mahārāja ri kālaniṁ pralaya riṁ yavad-

vīpa, (I)[r]i[kā]ṁ [śaka]k[āla] 939 ri pra(hāra) haji vura(va)ri An· vijil· saṅke lva rām·, Ek¡a!〈ā〉rṇava r¡u!〈ū〉panikāṁ sayavadvīpa rikāṁ kā〈B6〉la, Akveḥ sira vvaṁ mahāviśeṣa pjaḥ, karuhun· An· samaṅkana divaśa śrī mahārāja devatā pjaḥ lumāḥ ri saṁ hyaṁ dharmma parhyaṅan i vvatan·, riṁ cetra-māsa, śaka-kāla 939 sḍaṁ vāla〈B7〉ka śrī mahārāja Irikāṁ kāla, prasiddha na[m] blas· (tah)un· vayaḥnira, tapvan· dahat· kṛta-pariśramanireṁ saṁgrāma, makahet(u) rarainira, tapvan enāk· baṅətni denira rumə〈B8〉gəp· pasarikəpany āyudhanira, kunaṁ ri sākṣāt(n)niran· viṣṇumūrt(t)i, rinakṣaniṁ sarbvadevata, Inahākən tan ilva kavaśa deni paṅava(śaniṁ) mahāpralaya, maṅantīri himbaṁniṁ vanagiri, ma〈B9〉kasambhāsana saṁ tāpaśa suddhācāra, meriṁ lāvan· hulunira saṅ ek(ā)ntapratipatti manaḥniran· (dāśabhū)ta-tan¡u!〈ū〉pacāran· bhaktiprahva ri lbūni pāduka śrī mahārāja, pu narottama,〈B10〉 saṁjñānira, sirādini h(u)l[u]n· śrī mahārāja Ati¡sayeṁ!〈śayeṅ〉 dṛḍabhakti, tumūt tan sāḥ I saparān· śrī mahārāja, milu valkaladhara pinakarovaṁ śrī mahārāja makāhāra sāhā〈B11〉ra saṁ bhikṣuka vanaprastha, tātan· vismṛ¿d?〈t〉i śrī mahārāja ri kārādhanan· bhaṭāra riṅ ahorātra, nimittani mahābhāranyāsiḥniṁ sarbvadevata I śrī mahārāja, An· sira pi〈B12〉nratyayaniṁ sarbvadevata (ka)lpapādapa Umə:bana bhuvana, kumaliliranaṁ kulit kaki, makadrabyaṁ rājalakṣmī, muvahakna sāśvatā(niṁ) rāt·, munarjīvāknaṁ saṁ hyaṁ sarvvadharmma〈B13〉 humariṣṭākna hanituniṁ bhuvana, maṁkanābhamataniṁ sarbva(devata) I śrī mahārāja,

huvus ta śrī mahārāja kṛtasaṁskāra, pratiṣṭa riṁ siṅhāsana, mvaṁ An· kapadasthāniṁ pituṁ śrī ma〈B14〉hārāja haji devatā saṁ lumāḥ riṅ īśānabajra Ikanaṁ halu pinaka(ka)padasthān· śrī mahārāja, mataṅyan· rakai halu śrī lokeśvara dharmmavaṅśa Airla(ṅgā)nantavikram〈B15〉ottuṅgadeva saṁjñā kāstvan· śrī mahārāja, de mpuṅku sogata maheśvara mahābrāhmaṇa Irikāṁ śakakāla 941 (tā)tan· pahī(ṅan de) śrī mahārāja (luma)risakə〈B16〉n· sābhamataniṁ sarbvadevatā I sira, kapva kakal(imbaṅ ikaṁ) kriyā vāhyāntara denira, tan· kasalimur i kadamlaniṁ pūjā, [3+] prāyaścitta [6+] (ma)hābhā〈B17〉raniṁ kasiṅhe(śva)ranira, marava(śā)k(ə)n· sakveḥnik(āṁ ka)la(ṅka) satumuvuh i [2+] hyaṁ, sap(i)nakahani(t)uniṁ yavadvīpa, pra(bheda) [4+] dru(ha) [6+]〈B18〉ṅ inaranan· si (śuvuka)l·, (man)tu (ha)j(ī)nadgakn (iṁ) ka(ṭ)ula mvaṁ si la(ḍ)iṁ, nirava(ś)eṣa I [1+] (tta) s(ama) [2+] (n)ya de śrī mahārāja, ṅuni-ṅuni haji tṅaḥ [7+] sapuluḥ〈B19〉 tahun· An· paṁ(di)ri, pinakarovaṁ mad(v)andva yuddhaca(kra) [10+] (vv)at· pinja(han iṁ) vaṅuntur· mvaṁ saṅ ibu Irikāṁ śakakāla 95(1) [5+] lumampaḥ〈B20〉 ta śrī mahārāja dumon ikāṁ parad[āra]putra hyaṁ ma(ṅ)ṅadg (i v)uru tum(u)ṁgal (i) maddhyadeśaniṁ vurahan·, Atiśayeṁ mahābalapa(rākrama) sumorakən haji vəṅkər·〈B21〉 saṅa ta ha(jy a)n· pahaṟp=haṟpan· mvaṁ haji vaṅk(ə)r·, kavnaṅ ata Ikā (de) śrī mahārāja I(rikāṁ śaka)kāla 952 mvaṁ tinuluy (hani)hanitu[n]i [8+] tu〈B22〉miṅgalakən karājyanira (m)uvah akaḍatvan i Ḷca, tin(ū)tnikāṁ deśa galuḥ m(v)aṁ deśa barat·, A(n)· tinkān· sināhasan irikāṁ śakakāla 9(5)[3] [d]e (śrī)

mahārā〈B23〉ja, muvaḥ hana ta putra [haji] vaṅ[ka]r· ma(ṅ)adg i vur(u rt)u p(j)aḥ Ata Ikā de śrī mahārāja Irikāṁ śakakāla 954 sahanani vargga la(ṁ)ḍiṁ rāk·, mvaṁ hiṟṁ-hiṟṅan(·), (Iṁ)〈B24〉 maṁd(on·,) lāvan· sahananikāṁ makira-(k)i(rāpā)yāmutra hyaṅ amana(ḥnya) [8+] d[e] śrī mahārāja, haji vura(va)ri tuvi śrī mahārāja Ata maka〈B25〉puruṣa(kā)ra kahilaṁnira, (U)saṁ[ṅ-u]saṁ śrī mahārāja mvaṁ rakryān· kanuruhan· pu narottama, rakryān· kuniṅan pu nīti, ri kāla śrī mahārāja hane magəṁ ha〈B26〉 [2+] h(ī)ṅa(nyan·) śrī mahārāja [sa](ṅka)ni hilaṁniṁ sahanani han(i)ihanituniṁ yavadvīpa, kunaṁ kramani kahilaṁ haji vəṅkər· de śrī mahārāja, [mū]la kaḍatvani(ra) ri ka〈B27〉paṁ sira naṁ pratiniyata hinārohara deśanirāṅkən· Asujimāsa de śrī mahārāja, muvaḥ Irikāṁ śakakāla 95[7]7 [vvay a]ta, samaṁkana (ta)ta sirar kapa〈B28〉rājaya ri kapaṁ de śrī mahārāja, sirāmriḥ manusup amet· deśa durgga, matiṅgal· tanaya dāra t[ka riṁ rājadrabya rājavāha]na prakāra, ri kahləma〈B29〉nya Irikāṁ śakakāla 959 vaṟgg anusup· haji ri kapaṁ mvaṁ balanira samāsiḥ ri sira, kavnaṁ ta sira ri sa[rasa ratu] [1+] [vani pa] [1+] [paṅan·], ha [3+] pinakata〈B30〉pakan· (t)aṇḍasnira de śrī mahārāja Ar paliṅgiḥ moḍo(ḍa) [ri siṅhāsa](na),

sampun· saṁkṣipta ta Ikāṁ pralaya [ri yava](dvīpa)[, mat]l[asan ikā] saṁgrāma, ta〈B31〉 n (hana) [saṅśa]yani manaḥnikāṁ rāt· An· (p)paṅəb· maka¡pārāyana!〈parāyaṇa〉 (c)chā[yā]ni pāduka śrī mahārāja, mataṅ yar siddh[ākən·] [pratijñānira,] [madaməl]· yaśa pa〈B32〉tap[ān iṁ] pucaṅan· Inusa[n·-U]san· raghu, yāṅkən· mantras(t)avana-maskāra śrī mahārāja ri bhaṭāra sāri-sāri, mvaṁ paṁ[liṅgānanikāṁ] [rāt·, karuhun saṅ an]ā〈B33〉gataprabhu hlam i dlāhaniṁ dlāha, ri kramani de śrī mahārāja munarjīvākən· sāśvatāniṁ [sa]ya[vadv]ī[pa,] [Āpan· saṅ anādi prabhu sakveḥnira sinivi riṁ]〈B34〉 yavadvīpa, ka [3+] sa(dbhāva) [12+] han denira, t(kā)maṅgiḥ hay[unira] [kabeḥ riṅ anādi, tātan· maṅkana śrī mahārāja] [1+]〈B35〉 (s)ya(n)iṁ [26+] [nira mvaṁ] [abhimata] [śrī mahārāja mayva]〈B36〉 (th)ā(n)i [vat]ə[k]· [7+] (maṅaran i) h(i)no(,) [1+] dṟbya haji mā su 1 [2+] ni [20+] [nikāṁ]〈B37〉 [yaśa patapān]· I pucaṅan·, mantən· ta Ikāṁ lmaḥ ri pucaṅan·, I barahə[m·, I bapuri] [26+]〈B38〉 ya [10+]· saṁ hyaṁ yaśa patapān i pucaṅan· [[tan katamāna deniṁ]] [vinava saṁ māna [katrīṇi,]] [pa]〈B39〉[ṅkur·, tavan·, tiri]p·, mvaṁ (saṁ nāyaka)pratya[ya], piṅhai vahuta rāma, mvaṁ sakveḥ [saṁ maṅilala drabya haji m] [4+] [su]〈B40〉[khaduḥkha,] [sakve]ḥ lviranya [6+] [sahīṅani lma]ḥ saṁ hyaṁ yaśa pa[tapān i pucaṅan·] [8+]〈B41〉 [...] [[saṁ maṅilāla] drabya haji vulu-vulu mvaṁ] [...]〈B42〉 [siṅ ata lviranya,] [luməbu][ra] [2+] [saṁ hyaṁ yaśa patapān] i pucaṅan·, [yan· brāhmaṇa kṣatriya veśya, sudra, caṇḍāla, nāyaka, partyaya,]〈B43〉 piṅhai va[huta rāma] [14+] [umulah-u]laha kaśva[tantrān· saṁ hyaṁ dharmma patapān i pucaṅan· mvaṁ sahīṅaniṁ lmaḥni]〈B44〉 [1+] nanira [I hino] [6+] [saṁ hyaṁ yaśa patapān·, jaḥ tasmāt· kabvatkarmmāknanya, [bhukt]inira [pañca]mahā]〈B45〉pātaka [...] [citralekha I pāduka śrī mahārāja] [...] [sira] [...]〈B46〉 saṁ hyaṅ ājñā [haji praśāsti]

Apparatus

〈A1〉 nṛṇāv vidhāne • One expects *nṛṇāṁ vidhāne*. Of this idiosyncratic sandhi, of which several more examples will follow below, we have seen one other instance in the Campā inscription C. 167, st. IV (§1.3). See also Kern's remark (1917:87). ALSO BAN NAXONE LAOS

〈A2〉 [A](p)[i] ◇ *(A)pi* K • In fact only a part of the *p* is actually visible, but the shape of the lacuna certainly allows conjecturing *Api*. — 〈A2〉 yas sthāṇur ◇ *ya sthāṇur* K. — 〈A2〉 atitarāy • Norm. *atitarāṁ*. For this idiosyncratic sandhi see our note on *nṛṇāv vidhāne* in *pāda* b of stanza I. — 〈A2〉 ya¿v?〈th〉epsitārtha- ◇ *yathepsitārtha-* K • The *akṣara* in question quite clearly seems to be *v* and not *th*, but the two *akṣara*s are very similar and the latter was almost certainly intended, so we translate *yathepsita-*.

〈A3〉 °tayā ◇ *dhiyā* K • The reading included in Crawfurd 1816 seems to be *kayā* at this place.

〈A5〉 lakṣmīś ca no gatvarī ◇ *lakṣmīn dadhau gatvarī* K • We initially read *dorgatvarī*, because something that resembles a *repha/layar* seems discernible above the *ga*, but we are unable to come up with any justification for why the author would have invented a unique expression 'going from the arms' or 'going from arm to arm' to mean 'fickle'. It is more likely that he used *no*, a metrically conditioned equivalent of the negation *na* (cf *Raghuvaṁśa* 11.60: *diśo no babhūvur avalokanakṣamāḥ*). For *gatvarī* as an attribute of *śrī* (meaning 'riches' in this case), see *Kirātārjunīya* 11.21: *abhidroheṇa bhūtānām arjayan gatvarīḥ śriyaḥ* 'The man who amasses transient wealth by injuring creatures...' (tr. Peterson). — 〈A5〉 sadāvavaddhā ◇ *sahābhavadyā* K. — 〈A5〉 mudam K • The reading *sudam* in Kern 1917 is a misrepresentation of the original Devanāgarī edition.

〈A7〉 -vibhavo ◇ *-vi(śa)do* K. — 〈A7〉 -dhiyām bhām bhāvayan DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *-dhiyā kṣmām bhāvayan* K. — 〈A7〉 Ābhiś DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *śauriś* K.

〈A8〉 śa(t)r(ū)n ◇ *śubhram* K. — 〈A8〉 -rupā DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *-rūpā* K • It seems impossible to read here the metrically required long vowel *ū*. See another case of *rūpa* spelt *rupa* in line 5 of face B.

〈A9〉 rāja- ◇ *bhāva (?)* K.

〈A10〉 mahendradattāv • Regarding the idiosyncratic sandhi, see our note on *nṛṇāv vidhāne* in *pāda* b of stanza I.

〈A12〉 -rāṣṭram iva – dya – ◡ – ◇ *-rāṣṭram iva mudyutaṁ ciraṁ (?)* K; *-rāṣṭram avasādya taṁ ciram·* P • We have considered several possibilities to complete this line but none of them seemed satisfactory, e.g. *-m iva madyavādhitaṁ,* 'afflicted by intoxicating drinks'

(for another instance of writing *v* instead of *b* see stanza V. *-valānvito,* and stanza VI. *sadāvavaddhā*), *-m iva māndyasāditaṁ*, 'destroyed by indolence', *-mavasādya pārthivaḥ,* 'having ruined it, the king', etc. *Arjunavivāha* 1.3 might possible be related to this passage: (*daitya Nivātakavaca*) *sumyūhaṅ indrālaya* '(the demon Nivātakavaca) was about to destroy Indra's abode'. — ⟨A12⟩ kalinā khalena ◇ *talinā ~ lena* K; *kalinā jhalena* P • See Damais (1952: 90–91, n.1): "Nous dirons dans une étude consacrée à la stèle de Pucangan pourquoi il nous est impossible de lire avec Purbatjaraka un *jha*". Alas, Damais never published this study. — ⟨A12⟩ vinā P ◇ *viśi̯ā!⟨āṁ⟩* K. — ⟨A12⟩ narottamena sahito P ◇ *narottamair upahito* K.

⟨A13⟩ śaśalāñchanā[bdhi]vadane ◇ *tha ~ locanāgnivadane* K • The first syllable of line 13 is almost illegible in all sources available to us. For the middle chronogram word, the choice to read *bdhi* (4 oceans, *abdhi*) instead of *gni* (3 fires,*agni*) is made on the ground that the specified thirteenth *tithi* of the waxing fortnight of Māgha fell on a Monday (*vāre śaśini*) in 941 Śaka, while in 931 it did not; moreover, in line 15 on face B, the same episode is dated to 941. See on this verse and Damais' reading of the chronogram n. 4 (p. 66) in Boechari's article on the Mūla-Maluruṅ inscription = Boechari 2012: 430 n.4.

⟨A14⟩ (pā)hīty apātāṅ ◇ *pāhītyutāntāṅ* K • Other possibilities we have taken into consideration include: *pāhīty anantāṅ / adāntāṅ / aśāntāṅ kṣitim, pāyāt samantāṅ kṣitim, pāhi tvam asmatkṣitim, pāty adya śāntāṅ / dāntāṅ kṣitim*. None seemed satisfactory. — ⟨A14⟩ samrājya- • the intended word is *sāmrājya-*. But it is imaginable that for our author, *samrājya-* was an acceptable form. — ⟨A14⟩ śaśvad ◇ *bibhyad* K. — ⟨A14⟩ abhyasyatīha DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *abhyasyatīva* K. — ⟨A14⟩ (capa)latvam K ◇ *mukhalatvam* DamaisPucangan_01 • Other conceivable readings would be *kuśalatvam, mṛdulatvam* and *musalavam*. If we read *capalatvam,* it might be an allusion to the term *hastacapala*, found frequently in OJ inscriptions and sometimes in other textual sources. CHECK Boechari. *Pāṇicapala* is also found in *dharmaśāstra* texts, e.g. *Manusm ṛti* 4.177, where it refers to "someone conducting himself in a fickle manner with his hands" (cf. O livelle's translation p. CHECK). Here in the inscription, however, the meaning of this expression is probably more positive.

⟨A15⟩ pṛthvīv • Regarding the idiosyncratic sandhi, see our note on *nṛṇāv vidhāne* in *pāda* b of stanza I. — ⟨A15⟩ na DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *nu (?)* K. — ⟨A15⟩ bubhujus ◇ *bubhujas* Kern 1917 DamaisPucangan_01 • Damais writes an *u* above the *a* — ⟨A15⟩ taj(jā) K ◇ *ta - r* DamaisPucangan_01 • This reading is proposed by K in the note to his translation, where he observes that an appropriate reading would be *tuṣṭiṁ*, but that it cannot be adopted because no *u* is visible. It indeed seems hard to read a *tu*; for the following *akṣara*, something with *j* or *ṣṭ* would be possible, but these are not the only possibilities judging by what little remains identifiable of the *akṣara*. —

〈A15〉 kintu DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *tiktaṁ* K. — 〈A15〉 dhirājāgraṇīr ◇ *– irājāgraṇīr* DamaisPucangan_01; *dhi(nāthā)graṇīr* K. — 〈A15〉 bhobhuṅkte ◇ *bho caṅkte / bhaṅktve* DamaisPucangan_01; *bho aṅge* K.

〈16〉 -digdha- ◇ *– kta-* DamaisPucangan_01; *-(sa)kta* K • Cf. K. 263 C, st. XV = K. 669 A, st. VI, pāda a: *āsīd bhūpālamaulisphuritamaṇiśikhārāgadigdhāṅghrijaśrīr*. For a slightly different expression of the same idea in Old Javanese, see face B lines 29–30.

〈A16〉 -laucana- ◇ *-locana-* Kern 1917 DamaisPucangan_01 • The word *-locana-* is surely intended, but the stone shows *lau* instead of *lo*.

〈A18〉 to hy ājñāvidheyas ◇ *tāmpyājñavidheyas* DamaisPucangan_01; *–ājñāvidheyas* K. — 〈A18〉 -hṛdaya(ḥ stai)nyā ◇ *-hṛdayastenyā* Kern 1917 DamaisPucangan_01 • One of the problems with our reading is that this inscription elsewhere prefers the sandhi *-s st-*. — 〈A18〉 rājāpy upālabhyate ◇ *rājampyupālanyate* DamaisPucangan_01; *– – ◡ yā lapyate* K • The possibility of reading as we do was proposed to Arlo Griffiths by the late Abhijit Ghosh, when they discussed the stanza in January 2011. The UI estampage seems indeed to show these akṣaras.

〈A19〉 – vāptaye dhanamalāni K ◇ *– – ptapo vanasamāni* DamaisPucangan_01. — 〈A19〉 tuṅgāsau ◇ *tuṅgāho* DamaisPucangan_01; *tuṅgā* K.

〈A20〉 sya maha – – – ◡ – – ◡so • Maybe it is possible to read *... jijñā ◡ so*? — 〈A20〉 cikīrṣayā kṣa • Maybe it is possible to read *kṣi* or *kṛ*? Or *cikīrṣayārkṣi ...*? — 〈A20〉 rabhasuyā • K states in a note that the reading is unmistakable to him, but that what is expected is *rabhasayā*.

〈A21〉 śuddhikarīndradā ◇ *śuddhikarī ◡ dā* K. — 〈A21〉 [na]reṣu ◇ *mareṣu* K • The first syllable of this word is completely illegible on the UI estampage . — 〈A21〉 [mati]vāk- • K states in a note that he guesses the stone has *pṛthuvāk*. Our conjecture is based on the assumption that we must have here an expression of the triple 'thoughts, words and deeds'. An alternative would be to conjecture *[mata]*. — 〈A21〉 [dha]rmmo ◇ *dhṛṣṭo* K. — 〈A21〉 (pāśa)bhṛd ◇ *(bhā)gakṛd* K. — 〈A21〉 hanta [nṛpa]r(ā)d ◇ *hanta ◡ rarāḍiti* K • Kern notes that the syllable after *hanta* clearly bears a *u*, but supposes this has been misplaced, and believes the intended reading is *hantu mararāḍ iti*. To us, the *akṣara* supposedly bearing a *u* rather seems to be the one before *r(ā)*. Instead of *hanta*, we could also read *hasta*. Understand *-rāḍ*.

〈A22〉 nṛpo ◡ ◡ purīpralayaṁ sa – – ◇ *nṛ – ◡ ◡ ◡ – prala – ◡ – –* K. — 〈A22〉 viṣṇu- ◇ *bhīṣma-* K.

〈A23〉 tañ candrabhūtavadane śakarājavarṣa • this entire pāda, except the last three syllables, was unreadable for Kern. — 〈A23〉 ekādaśī ◡ daka – cu ◡ phalguṇe (v)ā(n)· ◇ *–*

– ◡ – ◡ ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – ◡ *lokāt* K. — 〈A23〉 adhamaḥ parudābh- ◇ *adhamāpanudābh-* K • Would *parujābh°* (including OJ word *parujar*) somehow be possible? — 〈A23〉 Ivāvyathayaj jaganti ◇ *vādhyadhamāṅgatantiḥ* K.

〈A24〉 narendro ◇ *nagendre* K. — 〈A24〉 (rā)mātviramyaca(ri)to nyavadhīt tam āśu • K only read from *nyavadhīt* onwards. Emend *rāmāti-*. Or is it possible that what looks like subscript *-v-* is actually an accidental scratch in the stone? — 〈A24〉 jigīṣu(r ga)tas ◇ *jigīṣur bhuvās* K.

〈A25〉 (varo) ◇ *varo* K • It would also be possible to read *gate* or *gato*.

〈A26〉 e[tān tatkṣa]ṇaṅ ◇ *etal lakṣaṇaṅ* K • As is clear from the Leiden estampage, Kern's reading must already have been partly conjectural. His interpretation of *lakṣaṇaṅ* as meaning 'prize' seems impossible, for one would then have expected *lakṣyaṅ* or *lakṣaṅ*. — 〈A26〉 a(ja)yyān ◇ *anāryyān* K • Neither *ā*-mātra on the second syllable nor *repha* above *y* are discernible.

〈A27〉 labdhvā ◇ *luṇṭaṁ* K. — 〈A27〉 -saṅghe ◇ *-madhye* K. — 〈A27〉 bhadre • Kern notes that *bhadre* is to be corrected to *bhādre*, but this is probably unnecessary. Damais reads *caitre*, but the estampages seem to favor Kern's reading; neither reading yields a Wednesday.

〈A28〉 -titho ◇ *-tithau* K • Of course one must understand *-tithau*.

〈A29〉 [A]tha mu(kha)- ◇ *(atha) muni-* K • What has been read as *mu* looks more like *pṛ* or possibly *pu*. Virtually no trace of the last syllable in this line is actually preserved. — 〈A29〉 vijayavarm(m)ā ◇ *vijayanāmā* K.

〈A30〉 m(ukha)- ◇ *maka-* K • See Kern 1917: 96 n. 4 for details. As Kern observed, the passage in line 29–30 of face B makes clear that the year in question was 959, and hence that the word we are dealing with here had to have the value 9.Judging by the visual material at our disposal, we doubt that the reading *maka-* was ever as "perfectly clear (*volkomen duidelijk*)" as Kern claimed. We find it likely that the same word with value 9 was used in stanza XXIX and XXX.

〈A31〉 nihitapādo • it seems that the *e-mātrā* of *do* stands at the end of line 30, but if this is correct, we probably have to assume that it was repeated by the stone carver, or that some other error was made at the beginning of l. 31, for there are traces of more signs than *dā* before *ratna-*. The hypothesis of redundant *e-mātrā* is to be preferred, for there is an analogous case in face B, lines 14–15. — 〈A31〉 -pīḍaṅ • We cannot distinguish the *ḍ* with certainty from a *d*. In all likelihood, the stone carver spelled *-pīdaṅ*.

〈A32〉 bratitayā DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *vratitayā* K. — 〈A32〉 devatārādhanaiḥ rantuñ

◇ *devatārādhanairantru/añ* DamaisPucangan_01; *devatā rādhanai rantuñ* K • A *pausa* form is expected at the end of pāda b. The Leiden estampage seems to show the expected visarga. — 〈A32〉 -mahā(kra/śra)mas ◇ *-mahā¿d?〈t〉vam¿u?〈a〉s* DamaisPucangan_01; *-mahānṛpas* K • The second *ma* seems relatively clear.

〈A34〉 -netr*¿ā?〈āḥ〉* • This was no doubt intended by Kern's *netrā(ḥ)*. — 〈A34〉 mālābhiprītikārās ◇ *[6+]rās* DamaisPucangan_01; *mālādiprītikārās* K. — 〈A34〉 enan DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *etan* K.

〈A35〉 na me DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *nṛpe* K.

〈A36〉 jīvyād • the supposed *ī*-sign is not clearly distinguishable from a short *i*.

〈B1〉 va, śu DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *pa, bu* B K; *va, śa* P. — 〈B1〉 caragraha • This term is anomalous. Elsewhere, one finds *grahacāra*. See Gomperts 2001: 107–110. — 〈B1〉 -Uttarabhadravā〈da〉-nakṣatra DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *-rabhadravānākṣatra* K; *-ra( )dratanakṣatra* B; *-rabhadrava(da) nakṣatra* P. — 〈B1〉 -budhna- Kern 1917 DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *-budha-* B P.

〈B2〉 gara(ḍ)i-: DamaisPucangan_01 • We tentatively follow D's suggestion for the name of the *karaṇa*; *dadhi-* P. B and K leave the syllables in question open. — 〈B2〉 rakai P DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *rake* B K.

〈B3〉 dhamasuparṇa(vā)haṇa tguh uttuṅga- ◇ *dhamma suparṇa – hana tahutuṅgadeva* B; *dhamma suparṇa – haṇata hutuṅgadeva* K; *dharmmasuparṇacaraṇa tguh uttuṅga-* P; *dh(ā)ma suparṇavāhaṇa tguh uttuṅga-* DamaisPucangan_01 • On the reading of the first element of the name, see Damais 1955: 66–7 n. 3. We reject Damais' conclusion that the reading must be *dhāma*, because we see no trace in the RTI of the *-ā* suspected by Damais at the end of line 2. Although we thus read *dhama* instead of *dhāma*, on the grounds that the intended meaning of the name may have been 'Viṣṇu (*suparṇavāhana*) in heaven (*dhāma*)', we suppose that *dhāma* may indeed have been intended. — 〈B3〉 dānaśūra DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *janaśūra* P • B and K leave these syllables blank. — 〈B3〉 Iṁ barahəm· • After *dharmmamūrtti* B leaves the syllables blank until *niṁ barahəm·*. K has *dharmamūrti [11+] kə [5+] maṅan, iṁ barahəm.* — 〈B3〉 bapuri DamaisPucangan_01 ◇ *śapuri* P; *basuri* B K.

〈B5〉 939 P ◇ *938 (928)* B; *928* K. — 〈B5〉 ri pra(hāra) ◇ *ri prahara* P; *mra?– –* K • B leaves these syllables blank. — 〈B5〉 An· vijil· B K ◇ *masə: mijil* P. — 〈B5〉 -r¡u!〈ū〉pa- ◇ *-rūpa-* B K P.

〈B7〉 vālaka P ◇ *vālajaka* B; *vāla, ka* K. — 〈B7〉 dahat· K P ◇ *dahat iṁ* B. — 〈B7〉 enāk B ◇ *enak·* K P. — 〈B7〉 baṅətni P ◇ *baṅəṅgi* B K. — 〈B7〉 rumə〈B8〉gəp· B K P • One detects what seems to be a character to the right of *mə*, which could theoretically be

a vestige of an *akṣara rə* or *Ṛ*, or else be a space filler such as one often finds in later inscriptions but never in original stone inscriptions from Airlangga's time. Although a form *rumərəgəp* could theoretically be justified, it is unattested. We hence believe that we must be dealing with an accidental scratch.

〈B8〉 pasarikəpany ◇ *pasariṅkəpany* B P; *sapariṅkəpany* K. — 〈B8〉 sākṣāt(n)iran ◇ *sākṣāt iran* B K; *sakṣātiran* P. — 〈B8〉 Inahākən B K ◇ *Innahakən* P. — 〈B8〉 kavaśa K P ◇ *livaśa* B. — 〈B8〉 paṅava(śaniṁ) P ◇ *paṅavananiṁ* B; *paṅavara niṁ* K. — 〈B8〉 maṅantīri ◇ *maṅanti ri* B K P. — 〈B8〉 -niṁ vanagiri B ◇ *-ni vanagiri* K; *-iṅ vanagiri* P.

〈B9〉 lāvan· K P ◇ *lavan* B. — 〈B9〉 saṅ e(kā)ntapratipatti ◇ *[4+]nta pradipatti* B; *[4+]nta pratipatti* K; *samekāntapratipatti* P. — 〈B9〉 (dāśabhū)ta-tan¡u!〈ū〉pacāran· bhaktiprahva ri ◇ *[3+] tanu - - n - - pra - ri* B; *- tanu [4+] n - - prahva ri* K; *Umaṅga tatan upakaran bhakti sraddha ri* P • For *-tanupacāran*, one must either understand *-tanūpacāran*, or emend *-tanupracāran*. We tentatively opt for the former. The whole passage from *ekāntapratipatti* to *pāduka śrī mahārāja* is reminiscent of the Adulengen charter, where we read in 2r1–3: *tan· kapālaṅalaṁ suṣṭubhakti I pāduka śrī mahārāja, lot kahudanan·, kapyayān·, An paṅekānta I pāduka śrī mahārāja* "they were undisturbed in their extreme loyalty to his Majesty the Great King, steadfast [despite being] exposed to rain and sun, as they had but one aim, [namely] his Majesty the Great King". — 〈B9〉 pu narottama K ◇ *saṁ narottama* B; *mpu narottama* P.

〈B10〉 sirādini K ◇ *sirādiniṁ* B P. — 〈B10〉 Ati¡sayeṁ!〈śayeṅ〉 K ◇ *Atiśayeṁ* B P. — 〈B10〉 tumūt P ◇ *hambak* B; *humbat (?)* K. — 〈B10〉 tan sāḥ ◇ *tansaḥ* B K; *tan sah* P. — 〈B10〉 saparān· ◇ *Ayunan* B K; *saparan* P. — 〈B10〉 makāhāra P ◇ *I[.]ā hāra* B; *maṅāhāra* K.

〈B11〉 vanaprastha B P ◇ *vanaprasṭha* K. — 〈B11〉 tātan· vismṛ¿d?〈t〉i ◇ *yataniviṣadi* B K; *tatan vismṛti* P. — 〈B11〉 ri kārādhanan· ◇ *rikā bhavanan·* B K; *ri kāradhanan·* P • The Sanskrit text on face A also uses the word *ārādhana:* see st. XXXII. — 〈B11〉 ahorātra K ◇ *ahoratra* B P.

〈B12〉 (ka)lpapādapa Umə:bana ◇ *Alpapādi padamə:lana* B; *-lpapādi padamə:lana* K; *kalpa-pādapa ṅahə:bana* P. — 〈B12〉 kumaliliranaṁ P ◇ *kumalilirana* B K. — 〈B12〉 makadrabyaṁ P ◇ *makadrabya* B K. — 〈B12〉 muvahakna sāśvatā(niṁ) ◇ *muvaḥakna haṣa nikanaṅ* B; *muvahakna harṣanikanaṅ* K P • The RTI clearly shows *sā* instead of *ha*. Cf. the parallel passage in line 33: *de śrī mahārāja munarjīvākən· sāśvatāniṁ sayavadvīpa*. The word recorded in OJED as *śāśvata* is intended in both passages. — 〈B12〉 munarjīvāknaṁ ◇ *munarjīvākna* P; *[5×]* B K.

〈B13〉 maṁkanābhamataniṁ ◇ *maṁkanābhimataniṁ* B K P • The reading of the previous editors suggests that an *-i* was visible to them in the reproductions they used. It

seems rather that none was ever engraved atop *bh*, and that it needs to be inserted by emendation. Another instance of the same scribal error occurs below in l. 16. — 〈B13〉 -devata K P ◇ *-devatā* B. — 〈B13〉 kapadasthāniṁ pituṁ ◇ *ka [2+] gə:ṅniṅ pitu* B; *kapūja(?) [2+] pitu* K; *kapadasthaniṁ pitu* P.

〈B14〉 haji devatā K P ◇ *haridevatā* B. — 〈B14〉 lumāḥ ◇ *lumāh* B K; *lumah* P. — 〈B14〉 īśānabajra K P ◇ *iśānabajra* B. — 〈B14〉 pinaka(ka)padasthān· ◇ *pinakakapratisthān·* B K; *pinakakapratiṣṭhān·* P.

〈B15〉 -vikramottuṅgadeva • the *e*-element (*taling*) of *mo* is written first at the end of line 14, and then redundantly repeated at the beginning of line 15. See identical case on face A, in st. XXX. — 〈B15〉 mahārāja, de B K ◇ *mahārāja de* P. — 〈B15〉 Irikāṁ ◇ *irikaṅ* B K P. — 〈B15〉 (tā)tan· pahī(ṅan de) śrī ◇ *tatan pahīṅan śrī* P; *I tan pahiṅan· śrī* B; *-tan pahīṅan· śrī* K • All previous editors ignore the presence of *de*.

〈B16〉 [luma]risakən· ◇ *[4+]kən* B K; *manarīrākən* P. — 〈B16〉 sābhamataniṁ • K and P have proposed the emendation *sābhimataniṁ* which underlies our translation. See the emendation *maṁkanābhamata* to *maṁkanābhimata* in l. 13. It is very curious that the same error is made twice; normally, this would impose taking the reading seriously as it is, but we see no other way than to assume that the word *abhimata* was really intended in both cases. — 〈B16〉 kapva kakal(imbaṅ ikaṁ) kriyā vāhyāntara ◇ *kapva kalimba - - kri phala - hyantara* B; *kapva kakal imban (?) iṁ kriyā vāhyāntara* K; *kapva kakalimbaṅ ikaṅ kriya vahyāntara* P • Several factors conspire to make the reading rather uncertain here. First, there is interference with the descender (itself rather unclear) of *ṅku* in the preceding line; what previous scholars have read, and what we read after them, as *mb* could possibly be *ṅk* or *jb*; the squiggle to its top left, which might be taken as *-ā* on *mb* pushed to the left by the descender from line 15, seems indeed to be an *-i* on the preceding akṣara, as previous editors assumed, and as we find confirmed by an apparently parallel passage in the Kamalagyan inscription, lines 21–22: *yāvat kavaṅunaniṅ yaśa donanya, an kapva kinalimbaṅ juga denira, sahana saṅ hyaṅ sarvvadharmma kabeḥ* ‘As many constructions of foundation as were his aim, they were all simply carried out by him, absolutely all holy foundations’. The *li* seems to be endowed with descender to make *-u* (*lu*), but this must be an accidental scratch. — 〈B16〉 denira, tan· kasalimur i kadamlaniṁ pūjā P ◇ *denira tan· kapalimura I dharmma dhi - jā* B; *denira tansalimur i kadharmmaniṁ prajā* K.

〈B17〉 [3+] prāyaścitta [6+] (ma)hābhāraniṁ kasiṅhe(śva)ranira ◇ *[9+] jro mrā nikaṅ siṅho [2+]nira* B; *[2+] mahārāja [1+] nika siṅho [2+] nira* K; *riṁ bhaṭara, deni kasiṅheśvaranira* P. — 〈B17〉 marava(śā)k(ə)n· P ◇ *mara [3+] ni* B; *mara [5+] ni* K. — 〈B17〉 sakveḥnik(āṁ ka)la(ṅka) satumuvuh i ◇ *sakveḥnikāṅ [2+] maṅhyaṅgadrabya* B; *sakveḥ nikāṅ [2+]* K;

sakveḥnikaṅ kalaṅka satumuvuh P • P's reading breaks off after this point. — 〈B17〉 [2+] hyaṁ • for the gap of two *akṣara*s, *satva* or *mata* would seem to be possible readings judging from the UI estampage and the RTI, but the resulting meaning in either case is not sufficiently persuasive to allow us to make a choice. — 〈B17〉 sap(i)nakahani(t)uniṁ ◇ *sapinakahanituni* B K. — 〈B17〉 pra(bheda) [4+] dru(ha) [6+] ◇ *prabheda [12+]* B; *prabheda [5+]* K.

〈B18〉 ṅ inaranan· B ◇ *ṅinarani* K • A possible restitution of the illegible *akṣara*s at the end of line 17 would be *salvirani*, to give the words *salviraniṅ inaranan*. — 〈B18〉 si (śuvuka)l·, (man)tu (ha)j(ī)nadgakn (iṁ) ka(ṭ)ula ◇ *[10+] nakekale* B; *[4+] kekale* K. — 〈B18〉 si la[ḍ]iṁ ◇ *si baḍiṁ* B K • Brandes' note indicates his hesitation between *sibaḍing* and *silaḍing*. — 〈B18〉 nirava(ś)eṣa K ◇ *naravaśeṣa* B. — 〈B18〉 I [1+] (tta) s(ama) [2+] (n)ya ◇ *ikā [6+]* B; *ikā [2+]* K. — 〈B18〉 de śrī mahārāja, ṅuni-ṅuni haji tṅaḥ [7+] sapuluḥ ◇ *de śrī mahā [16+]* B; *de śrī mahārāja ṅuni ṅuni haji [3+]* K.

〈B19〉 paṁ(di)ri, pinakarovaṁ mad(v)andva yuddha ca(kra)[10+](vv)at· pinja(han iṁ) ◇ *[15+]rika [5+]nasikanaṅ sarat pinjahaniṅ* B; *[2+]diri (?) [5+]rika [6+] ikanaṅ sarat pinjahan, iṅ* K. — 〈B19〉 vaṅuntur· mvaṁ saṅ ibu Irikāṁ ◇ *[3+] mvaṅ - - - irikāṅ* B; *[3+] mvaṅ irikāṅ* K. — 〈B19〉 95(1) [5+] ◇ *951 ri kanaṁ pitu* B K • Kern translates "in the seventh month". This corresponds to nothing in stanza XXIII (Phalguṇa is not the 7th month by any reckoning). The *akṣara*s in question can but by no means need to be read as B and K did.

〈B20〉 ikāṁ parad[āra]putra hyaṁ ma(ṅ)adg (i v)uru tum(u)ṁgal (i) maddhyadeśaniṁ ◇ *-ikaṅ parada [7+] guru tumaṁgal caddhya deśani* B; *-ikāṅ para [5+] guru tumaṁgal - ddhya deśa ni* K • We tentatively take *paradāraputra* as a tatpuruṣa compound, although a *dvandva* or sequence of two coordinated words is also a possibility (cf. *tanayadāra* in l. 28). We consider that a toponym is required after *hyaṁ*, and since we are reminded of the well-attested Vuru Tuṁgal (Damais 1970: 584–4), we read *(v)uru tum(u)ṁgal* where both B and K read *guru tumaṁgal*: the first consonant is extremely damaged, and can easily be read *v* or *g*; a faint trace of *-u* seems visible on the RTI below the *m*, but it must be admitted that the prima facie reading is *tumaṁgal*. — 〈B20〉 vurahan· ◇ *-ratan·* B; *vu?ratan·* K • See *Dharma Pātañjala* 314:4 (ed. Acri 2017), for an occurrence of *vurahan*, taken as 'confusion' by the editor but potentially a toponym, indicating the opposite of a *deśa rahayu*. — 〈B20〉 -pa(rākrama) sumorakən haji vəṅkər· • B and K left these syllables blank.

〈B21〉 saṅa ta ha(jy a)n· ◇ *sa[4+]n* B; *samāhvayan* K • A problem with our tentative reading is that we don't really expect sandhi to be applied to *haji An*. — 〈B21〉 vaṅk(ə)r· ◇ *vaṅkir·* B; *vəṅkər·* K • B's note "*vaṅkir-vəṅkər*" suggests the emendation he had in mind,

which was adopted by K into his text as such. It is possible to read *i* or *ə* on top of the *ṅk*, but there really is no vocalization sign on the *v*. In a damaged part of line 23, it seems the text may have had the spelling *vaṅkar*. — ⟨B21⟩ kavnaṅ ata ◇ *kavada ta* B; *kavaśa ta* K. — ⟨B21⟩ mvaṁ tinuluy (hani)hanitu[n]i [8+] ◇ *maṁkinakuyanahani [10+]ḥ* B; *maṅkin[2+] hanitu [2+]ḥ* K • The ostensible conjunct *yh* is hard to recognize and perhaps not so likely. If, as seems nevertheless quite likely, the passage is parallel to the one in line 26, we can fill in the first part of the gap with *(hani)hanitu[n]iṁ yadadvīpa*, leaving about 4 *akṣara*s unaccounted for.

⟨B22⟩ (m)uvah akaḍatvan i Ḻca, ◇ *ṅu – ha kaḍatvaniḺva* B; *mulih(e) kaḍatvan i – vā* K. — ⟨B22⟩ tinūtnikāṁ ◇ *bunutnikāṁ* B; *tinūt? nikāń* K. — ⟨B22⟩ sināhasan ◇ *sināhsan* B; *sināhāsan* K.

⟨B23⟩ [d]e (śrī) mahārāja ◇ *[2+] śrī mahārāja* B; *[3+] mahārāja* K. — ⟨B23⟩ muvaḥ hana ta putra [haji] vaṅ[ka]r· maṅadg i vur(u rt)u p(j)aḥ ◇ *[19+]ḥ* B; *[4+]ḥ* K. — ⟨B23⟩ vargga la(ṁ)ḍiṁ rāk· ◇ *va[1+] laṁ[3+]* B; *vargga la[3+]* K. — ⟨B23⟩ hiR̥ṁhiR̥ṅan(·), Iṁ ◇ *haR̥pi[3+], bu* B; *haR̥p[5+], [1+]* K.

⟨B24⟩ maṁdo(n)· lāvan· ◇ *b[5+]n·* B; *– – – – lāvan·* K. — ⟨B24⟩ sahananikāṁ makira(k)i(rāpā)yāmutra hyaṅ amana(ḥnya) [8+] ◇ *sahananikaṅ –* B; *sahana nikaṅ [8+]* K • Two epigraphic passages, both contemporary with our inscription, contain the sequence *amutra hyaṅ*. See Turun Hyang, face A, line 6: ... *nikanaṅ amutra hyaṅ kāvaḥ dūdu kika.... maṅabhayā manambu sarāt nakavāmaṇa rara bilṣani pāduka śrī mahā* ...; plate MNI E.91, verso, lines 6–7: *an tan dumaṇāta sira sumaṅgaha ikaṅ vaṅ sahayaniṅ amutra hyaṅ mvaṅ katibān tulis kaṅāśvāsa*. Alas, the published readings of these two inscriptions are insecure, and we are unable to translate them.

⟨B25⟩ makapuruṣa(kā)ra ◇ *makapuruṣa – –* B; *mako (?) puruṣa – –* K. — ⟨B25⟩ (U)saṁ[ṅu]saṁ ◇ *[3+]saṅ* B; *[3+]* K • The initial *akṣara* can easily be read as *U*, but could also be a vocalization -*e*. The entirely lost *akṣara*, indicated here as *ṅu*, may equally well have been another *U*. Whatever its precise spelling, we are unsure that the intended word here was *usaṅ-usaṅ* to begin with. If it was, then we guess that it is a so far unattested form of the word recorded as *usəṅ* in OJED. See our note on p.XX below.

⟨B26⟩ hane magəṁ ha – – ◇ *haneṁ matiha – –* B; *haneṁ magəhan (?) – –* K • The syllables tentatively represented here as *magəṁ* seem rather clear, but they are somewhat difficult to make sense of, even if we presume that they are the first element of a toponym. — ⟨B26⟩ h(ī)ṅa(nyan·) śrī mahārāja [sa](ṅka)ni ◇ *hiṅanya – – mahārāja maṅkana* B; *hīṅan ya – mahārāja, saṅkani* K • We feel quite uncertain about the readings *hīṅanyan·* and *saṅkani*, but believe the punctuation sign read by Kern cannot have been present if the text really contained both these words. However, there does seem to be enough

space for such a punctuation sign or even for a whole extra *akṣara* between the *ja* and the *akṣara* restored as *sa*. — 〈B26〉 hilaṁniṁ sahanani B ◇ *hilaṁ sahanani* K. — 〈B26〉 hanihanituniṁ ◇ *hanihanituni* B K. — 〈B26〉 kramani kahilaṁ K ◇ *kramanika hilaṁ* B. — 〈B26〉 [mū]la kaḍatvani(ra) ◇ *Iṅakaḍatvanira* B; *– sva?kaḍatvanira* K • Another possible reconstruction for the first word, whose initial syllable is lost, would be *[kā]la*. But since *kāla* is not used as conjunction elsewhere in this text, nor even recorded in that function in OJED, we tentatively prefer *mūla*.

〈B27〉 kapaṁ sira naṁ ◇ *tapa sira* B K. — 〈B27〉 pratiniyata ◇ *pratinayaka* B K. — 〈B27〉 hinārohara deśanirāṅkən· K ◇ *hina – ro – – deśani raṅkən* B. — 〈B27〉 [vvay a]ta, • the punctuation sign after *ta* was ignored by B and K; in the light of its undeniable presence, and of the likely presence of *ta* in the next sentence, B and K's reading *vvaya ta* in an area where the surface of the stone is now obliterated, is very suspicious. For in all occurrences known to us (see OJED s.v. *wwaya*), the sequence *vvaya ta* stands at the beginning of a sentence. For our tentative interpretation see note 257.

〈B28〉 (ta) sirar kaparājaya ◇ *ta sira – – rājaya* B; *ta sira [3+] (pa)rājaya* K. — 〈B28〉 kapaṁ ◇ *tapa* B K. — 〈B28〉 deśa K ◇ *de–* B. — 〈B28〉 rājavāhana B ◇ *rājavahana* K.

〈B29〉 vaṟgg anusup· ◇ *– rəp manusup* B K. — 〈B29〉 kavnaṁ ta sira B ◇ *kavnaṁ sira* K.

〈B30〉 ha – – – pinakatapakan ◇ *ha – – s panaka ta pa kan* B; *– – – pinaka ta pakan* K. — 〈B30〉 (t)aṇḍasnira ◇ *kaṇḍa sira* B K. — 〈B30〉 Ar paliṅ(g)iḥ ◇ *Apaliṅgiḥ* B K • The (g) in (ṅgi) has wrongly been carved as a full circle. — 〈B30〉 saṁkṣipta ta Ikāṁ ◇ *saṁkṣipta Ikāṁ* B K • Both previous editors have omitted the particle *ta*.

〈B31〉 tan (hana) ◇ *nhana* B; *(ta)n hana* K. — 〈B31〉 rāt· An· (p)aṅəb· makapārāyana (c)chā[yā]ni ◇ *[9+] pā – yanacchāyāni* B; *[5+] maka – – yan acchāyā ni* K. — 〈B31〉 mataṅ yar siddh[ākən][·] ◇ *mataṅya siddhākən* B K. — 〈B31〉 [pratijñānira] K ◇ *prājīnānira* B.

〈B32〉 Inusa[n·-U]san· raghu, yāṅkən· ◇ *[4+]san· rake yāṅkən·* B; *Ista – – s an· rake yāṅkən·* K • Both previous editors ignore the punctuation sign after *raghu*, which they misread as *rake*. Our restoration *Inusa[n·-U]san* (there seems to be too much space for restorting *Inusa[n·-U]san*) is based on the assumption that we have a typical Old Javanese-Sanskrit dyad and that *usan-usan* is a variant spelling for OJED's *usən-usən*. — 〈B32〉 mantras(t)avanamaskāra K ◇ *mantrasta – namastāra* B • Brandes' note "*( )namastāra-vana sangskāra*" reveals that he had really not understood the present passage. — 〈B32〉 śrī mahārāja ri bhaṭāra B ◇ *śrī bhaṭāra* K. — 〈B32〉 sārisāri ◇ *hari sāri* B K. — 〈B32〉 paṁ[liṅgānanikāṁ] ◇ *paliṅgānanikāṁ* B; *paliṅgānanikaṁ* K • Both previous editors ignored the first *anusvāra*, which is crucial to get the correct sense. We are dealing with an irrealis of the word *pañliṅgan*. Cf. Sumanasāntaka 37.3c: *pañliṅgāna savaṅsavaṅni hayunīdəmanira səmuniṅ varāpsarī* 'This was clear because the young girls, whose beauty

was on the point of blossoming, resembled divine nymphs' (ed. and transl. Worsley et al. 2013).

〈B33〉 anāgataprabhu B ◇ *aṅāgataprabhu* K. — 〈B33〉 hlam i ◇ *tkā ri* B K. — 〈B33〉 kramani de śrī K ◇ *kramani - śrī* B. — 〈B33〉 munarjīvākən· ◇ *munajikakən·* B K • Cf. line 12.

〈B34〉 yavadvīpa, ka [3+] sa(dbhāva) [13+] han denira ◇ *yavadvīpa [23+]nenira* B; *yavadvīpa [8+]nira* K. — 〈B34〉 t(kā)maṅgiḥ B ◇ *tkā, maṅgiḥ* K. — 〈B34〉 hayunira • B leaves open an amount of space between *hayu* and *nira*, implying that Brandes thought there were some illegible *akṣara*s in the gap. But K indicates no such gap.

〈B35〉 [abhimata] B K • the reading has become unverifiable, because the surface of the stone has been lost since their time. In view of the fact that the text twice showed *abhamata* instead of expected *abhimata* (lines 13 and 16), one may wonder if that is what was actually engraved here too.

〈B36〉 (th)ā(n)i [vat]ə[k] ◇ *nāni - ti -* B; *- - ni - - -* K • Our reconstruction is based on the occurrence of the sequence *thāni vatək* in other inscriptions of Airlaṅga, e.g. Terep I XX. — 〈B36〉 [6+] (maṅaran i) h(i)no(,) – (dṛ̥bya) ◇ *[12+]ti hino - madrabya* B; *[5+] hino madrabya* K. — 〈B36〉 ni • This *akṣara*, rather clear in the RTI, was not read by B and K, whose reading resumes with *nikāṁ* at the end of the line, where the surface of the stone has by now entirely peeled off.

〈B37〉 mantən· ta B ◇ *mantən· tā* K. — 〈B37〉 [bapuri] ◇ *basuri* B K • Even though these *akṣara*s have peeled off by now, we emend the reading of our predecessor by comparison with our reading of the same toponym in line 3.

〈B38〉 ya [10+]· saṁ • B and K were unable to read any *akṣara*s in the damaged stretch before *saṁ*. — 〈B38〉 [[tan katamāna deniṁ]] • The restoration was made by Kern (1917: 106: n. 1), while Brandes left open a gap for the illegibly damaged *akṣara*s.

〈B39〉 mvaṁ (saṁ nāyaka)pratya[ya] ◇ *mvaṁ - nāyaka, partyaya* B; *mvaṁ nāyaka, partyaya* K • The two words *nāyaka* and *pratyaya* are normally not separated by a punctuation sign (although see n. XX below), and are quite often preceded by *saṁ*, which we can faintly make out in the gap left open by Brandes that was ignored by Kern.

〈B40〉 m – – – – [sukhaduḥkha,] ◇ *- khaduḥkha,* B; *sukhaduḥkha,* K • In B's reading, line 39 ends with a substantial lacuna after *haji m*, while 40 starts with *khaduḥkha*; in K's, there is a lacuna of five *akṣara*s after *haji m* at the end of 39, while line 40 starts with *sukhaduḥkha*. In cases where it could be verified, we have seen that K's edition is not very precise in dealing with the distinction between preserved and conjectured text;

moreover, the amount of space before the first legible *akṣara*s on line 40 suggests that B's reading of the beginning of this line has a more plausible number of *akṣara*s. We therefore conjecture that the necessary *akṣara su* stood at the end of line 39. If we may otherwise rely on K's edition, it means the lacuna between *m* and *su* extends over four *akṣara*s. If this estimation is exaggerated, then we could conjecture a reading like *haji mvaṁ sukhaduḥkha*, inspired by OJO XLIX 2b.

〈B41〉 [...] [[saṁ maṅilāla] drabya haji vuluvulu mvaṁ] [...] ◇ *[...] [drabya haji vuluvulu mvaṁ]* B; *[8+] [[saṁ maṅilāla] drabya haji vuluvulu mvaṁ] [3+]* K • We are unable to confirm any of the sequences of *akṣara*s that our predecessors have discerned on this line. We see a fairly clear *ṅi* around the 12th position in the line, but what remains of the surrounding *akṣara*s cannot be matched with Kern's conjecture *maṅilāla*; three positions to the left of this *ṅi* stands a clear *na* which may also have been a *ne*. The number of illegible *akṣara*s indicated by Kern implies that there were only 25 *akṣara*s on this line which must be far off the mark as completely preserved lines higher up show around 55 *akṣara*s per line. But we are unable to propose an alternative estimate because we are unable to situate the string of *akṣara*s read by B and K anywhere on the line. Note that B's text suggests *mvaṁ* stood at the end of the line, whereas K's suggests a short lacuna stood between this word and the end of the line.

〈B42〉 [siṅ ata lviranya] ◇ *siṅa – lviranya* B; *siṅa ta lviranya* K • K's translation suggests that he was thinking of a word like *asiṅ*, an idea that receives some support from the Cane inscription, faces C and d, line 30: *kita kamuṅ hyaṅ yāvat ya hana umulahulaḥ ikeṅ sīma ri cane asiṅ lvirani kavvaṅanya jaḥ tasmat kabvat kārmmāknanya* ... But if this passage is indeed a relevant comparison, it also implies that Kern's word division is unlikely to be correct. This is why we tentatively divide the words as *asiṅ ata*. — 〈B42〉 [luməbu][ra] ◇ *luməbu* B K • It is tempting to conjecture further *luməburāta* or *luməbura ta*, and to assume no further loss of *akṣara*s before *saṁ hyaṁ*, but this issue depends on whether K's estimate of 3 lost *akṣara*s between *luməbu* and *saṁ hyaṁ* is reliable or not. — 〈B42〉 [nāyaka, partyaya,] B K • We are unable to verify any part of this sequence, but expect that the stone rather showed *pratyaya* before it got damaged, and that there was no punctuation sign separating this from *nāyaka*. See n. XX above.

〈B43〉 va[huta rāma] [14+] [umulahu]laha • Almost all of this line is now lost. While B, as usual, only leaves open a large gap, K estimates the lacuna between *rāma* and *umulahulaha* to extend over 7 *akṣara*s. Taking the expected entire number of *akṣara*s for this line into account, and estimating the distance between the *akṣara*s that are still preserved today, we estimate that the gap which was already present in our predecessors' time extended over at least 14 *akṣara*s.

〈B44〉 –nanira ◇ *[3+]nira* B K • It might be possible to read the first *akṣara*s as *sthā*, conjecturing *sthānanira*. But *ṅhananira* or *ṅkānanira* also seem to be possible readings.

〈B45〉 [bhukt]inira [pañca]mahāpātaka ◇ *caṇḍinira [2+]mahāpātaka* B K • The word *caṇḍi* in our predecessors' reading is so unlikely that we feel forced to reject it, and the word *pañca* cries out so hard to be read before *mahāpātaka* that we feel obliged to conjecture it. Although we have found no exact parallel for the wording we propose here, assuming that *nira* was correctly read by B and K, our conjecture is based among numerous other comparable passages on Baru (Cd, lines 39–40), Cane (C, 26) and Patakan (C, 26), where we read: *salvirniṅ pañcamahāpātaka bhuktinya*. — 〈B45〉 [mahārāja] B ◇ *mahāraja* K. — 〈B45〉 [...] [citralekha I pāduka śrī mahārāja] [...] [sira] [...] • K estimates a gap of 17 *akṣara*s between *pātaka* and *citralekha*, then gaps of 3 *akṣara*s each after *mahārāja* and *sira*. The total number of *akṣara*s on the line would thus be 41 *akṣara*s, which is far too few. We are unable to verify any *akṣara*s after *pātaka*, and so are unable to propose our own estimates for the three gaps.

Translation

1.

Eternal homage to the Creator (Brahmā), who, even though he is endowed with the three qualities (of *rajas, sattva* and *tamas*) in the creation, maintenance and destruction of men, is famous as being worthless — [or rather] as *free of qualities*![1]

2.

Homage to Him (Viṣṇu) who, though famous in the world to have (only) three acts of valour — [or rather,] *who is known as Three-Step*,[2] is always bowed down to by the chief of the gods, (i.e. Indra, who is) esteemed because of countless acts of valour!

3.

Homage to that Śiva, who, despite being an (immovable) stump — [or rather,] *being Sthāṇu, the Stable*,[3] with his qualities abundantly gives people whatever they wish for, and [thus] abases the huge *(a-tanu)* wish-yielding tree

4.

[1]The stanza contains an apparent contradiction (*virodhābhāsa*): two statements appear to contradict each other, and the contradiction is resolved by understanding one of them as a pun (cf. Gerow 1971: 268).

[2]This stanza, too, contains an apparent contradiction (*virodhābhāsa*). Cf. n. 10.

[3]Another *virodhābhāsa.* Cf. n. 10.

He who has an obsession for women — [or rather] *for feminine grammatical gender* by his fame of unimpeded progress [and] by compassion;[4] and who has severe disrepute in the matter of taxation — [or rather] a *sharp mark on his hand* caused by stretching the bow; and who has fearfulness by turning away as a hero in battle — [or rather] *apprehensiveness* by turning away from unbecoming behavior *in pleasure*: he partakes of (apparent) vices by his own good qualities. May that king called Erlaṅga[5] be victorious![6]

5.

There was a crest-jewel among kings, who defeated numerous hordes of (enemy) kings, famous throughout all three worlds, comparable to a lion by his great prowess, who long held the Earth, of unlimited fruits, as well as Lakṣmī (Fortune), not fickle [at all in his case]. He was the king of Yava (i.e. Java), endowed with fortune, fame and power, called Śrī Īśānatuṅga.[7]

6.

His daughter was like a she-goose: she was charming with her pure mind and attire *as a she-goose is charming when she stays at pure Lake Mānasa;*[8] she was always attached to the doctrine of the Buddha, *as the she-goose is always equipped with well-moving wings.* She, increasing only the joy of the king,[9] her he-goose, was radiant as queen Śrī Īśānatuṅgavijayā.

7.

And then the king Śrī Lokapāla,[10] elephant among kings, who caused pleasure to the

[4]The words for fame and compassion are both grammatically feminine. The at first sight paradoxical meaning of this *pāda* is produced by misleading the reader into understanding *kīrtyā khaṇḍitayātayā akaruṇayā*, 'with reputation of impeded course and with lack of compassion', and thinking that *strīparatvam* is a vice.

[5]On the name Erlaṅga, see Stutterheim 1929 CHECK PAGE

[6]The poetic figure here is *parisaṁkhyā* or *niyamavat śleṣa,* in which a double-entendre is explicitly limited to its further or irregular sense (Gerow 1971: 298). The stanza thus becomes a *nindāstuti* or *vyājastuti*, praise which appears to be criticism.

[7]This is King Sindok, also called Śrī Īśānavikramadharmottuṅgadeva. His inscriptions are dated to the first half of the tenth century and come from the lower, middle and upper Brantas Valley. For a summary of colonial-period research, see Cœdès 1975: 128. For more up-to-date information, see De Casparis 1988.

[8]On *rājahaṁsa* see Vogel 1962:10; on *mānasa, ibid.* p. 3.

[9]Her husband, who is identified in the next stanza.

[10]We assume, with Krom 1914, who argued that the Kancana inscription, internally dated to 782 Śaka and issued by a king called Śrī Mahārāja Śrī Bhūvaṇeśvara Viṣṇusakālātmaka Digvijaya Par¡a!〈ā〉kramotuṅgadeva Lokap¡a!〈ā〉lal¡a!〈ā〉ñcana, must in fact be dated to 872 Śaka, and that the king intended in that inscription could thus be the same one as the one intended here. We would oppose to Damais' argument (1955: 26) that the dating elements that he took to confirm the date in 782 Śaka may well have been calculated a posteriori for that year, once the inversion 872/782 had been made, intentionally or unintentionally. For details, see Griffiths 2020: 133–135.

eyes, made her his wife: he, a milk-ocean[11] whose inner self was famous for its quality of purity; she, like the Mandākinī (i.e. the Ganges), equal to himself in prosperity.

8.

In order for an earth-ornament (i.e. a king)[12] to appear, a son arose from him, whose wealth constituted his majesty and who generated with riches (*bhūti*)[13] the splendor of those living beings whose minds were disciplined in meditating on Bhava (i.e. Śiva). And by these [riches] of incomparable radiance he had become undauntedly prominent, like the sun *having risen benevolently*, (a king) able (*prabhu*) to shatter the frontal globes of the elephants of enemy kings as if they were pots.[14]

9.

Known as Śrī Makuṭavaṁśavardhana, an incomparable chief (*indra*) of men, sun in the lineage of Śrī Īśāna, he scorched the enemies with his splendor.

10.

The extremely beautiful daughter of that king was, thanks to the king's virtues, like the embodied royal fortune of Java, even though on another island; she was clearly made by her fortunate (i.e. happily married) father "the lawful wife of the one who is fond of virtues" by her name.[15]

11.

There was also that Udayana, of distinguished and pure birth, born from a famous

[11]We are not certain why the poet refers here to the milk-ocean, unless he means the regular ocean by *kṣīrārṇava.* On the other hand, the conventionally white colour of the Gaṅgā matches the color of the milk-ocean.

[12]For *bhūbhūṣaṇa* referring to kings, cf. e.g. Kṣemendra's *Daśāvatāracarita* 1.48b: *śauryotsāhamahodayāḥ kva bata te bhūbhūṣaṇaṁ bhūmipāḥ* 'Those kings, the ornaments of the earth, who had the pre-eminence of valour and energy — alas, where are they?'.

[13]This might also allude to the sacred ashes (*vibhūti*) used by Śaiva ascetics.

[14]The stanza is a virtuosic example of *anuprāsa* (alliteration, see Gerow 1971: 102ff).

[15]This probably means that her father gave her the name Guṇapriyadharmapatnī, and thus he made her the person denoted by that name, that is the future wife of a virtuous king, already when she was born. Other interpretations of this verse are also possible, e.g. "The extremely beautiful daughter of that king was like the royal fortune of Yava (i.e. Java) incarnate thanks to her royal virtues, even though her father was fortunate (i.e. by being happily married) on another island. She was clearly made by him Guṇapriyadharmapatnī by name." Guṇapriyadharmapatnī could be interpreted as "the lawful wife of one who is fond of virtues" or "a lawful wife who is fond of virtues", or even "the wife of Dharma, who is fond of virtues", Dharma being shorthand for Dharmodayanavarmadeva? Inscriptions of Guṇapriyadharmapatnī and Dharmodayanavarmadeva are known from Bali from around the turn of the first millennium (see Damais 1952: 86–7); an inscription of Dharmmodayana Warmmadeva alone is dated to 1011 CE (cf. Damais 1959: 682, Coedès 1975: 129).

royal lineage. True to his name,[16] he married that illustrious princess Mahendradattā (= Guṇapriyadharmapatnī) with proper rites.

12.

From him was born a divine son called Erlaṅgadeva, as Rāma was born from Daśaratha. He was the best among all people, delightful because of the arts [he mastered], even more venerable than him because of his good qualities, whose exalted career was predicted by the best sages because of his majesty.[17]

13.

When the previous king of Java called Śrī Dharmavaṁśa, his in-law,[18] who delighted in hearing of his many virtues, invited him respectfully to the wedding of his daughter, he quickly became famous in all respects *as Śrī Dharmavaṁśa,*[19] a man of noble nature.[20]

14.

Then his (Dharmavaṁśa Təguh's) city suddenly turned to ashes, ... like the kingdom of Indra. Clearly because of the rogue Kali (Age), he went to the forest without servants, together with Narottama.[21]

15.

In the elapsed[22] Śaka year 941, in the month of Māgha, on the 13th day of the waxing

[16] Udayana might have been *vyaktāhvaya* because his name was well-known from the *Bṛhatkathā*. Or because *udayana* means 'rising', he might have had an 'explicit name', a name that corresponded to his rising in status by marrying the Javanese princess.

[17] The poetic figure in this verse is *antādika yamaka* (Gerow 1971: 225): the repeated elements are the last half of the first pāda and the first half of the second. If we pronounced the name of the son as Airlaṅga, we would get another *antādika yamaka.*

[18] If Dharmavaṁśa intended to give his daughter to Erlaṅga in marriage, the word *sambandhin* could be interpreted as "future in-law". Another possibility is that Dharmavaṁśa was the husband of another daughter of Makuṭavaṁśavardhana. Then his daughter was Erlaṅga's cousin.

[19] Since Dharmavaṁśa was the name of both Təguh and Airlaṅga, we have translated *śrīdharmavaṁśa iti* twice. Cf. line 2 in the Old Javanese part of the inscription.

[20] The verse could be, and indeed has been, interpreted in two different ways: Dharmavaṁśa invited Erlaṅga to marry his daughter, or he invited him simply as a guest to the wedding of his daughter marrying someone else. See discussion in Boechari 1962: 78–79 n. 43 = 2012: 79–80, n. 24. One might think that the former meaning would have been expressed with a different, clearer construction, e.g. with an infinitive or an *Artham*-construction ("to marry his daughter"), and perhaps our poet would have been capable of finding a less ambiguous solution to express this. On the other hand this verse might continue the parallelism with Rāma, who was invited to Sītā's *svayaṁvara* by Janaka.

[21] Airlaṅga went to the forest just as Rāma did, both with just a few companions: Rāma with Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa, Airlaṅga with Narottama. Or did Airlaṅga also take his wife with him? Was that wife the daughter of Dharmavaṁśa? The stanza does not seem to allude to this.

[22] *yāte* ◇ here translated as though equivalent to the term *atīta* which is a standard element of Old

fortnight, on Monday, having been approached by zealous people who bowed down, Śrī Lokeśvara, king Nīralaṅga was requested by the best of brahmins in a way that inspired confidence: "Protect the unprotected earth."[23]

16.

The multitude of enemies, having heard that this king, after being consecrated to emperorship, had defeated by his power the horde of foes, here even today constantly study the unprecedented swiftness of the palm of his serpent-like arm.

17.

Very many kings of Java enjoyed / ruled the earth while being petitioners / beggars with respect to their opponents / enemies (indebted to their enemies?). By force of their royal birth their sons enjoyed [the earth] in succession (reading *anububhujus*) on their thrones. But his Majesty, king Jalalaṅgadeva who was born in a good family and is the foremost of emperors, does very much enjoy [it]. Only that enemy (reading *arir ddvandvam*) experiences strife / fight wandering on the surface of the earth.

OR

Their sons did not enjoy [it] by force of their royal birth on the royal throne.

OR

Very many kings of Java ruled the earth while being supplicants with respect to their opponents, by force of their royal birth. Their sons did not rule on the throne. But his Majesty, king Jalalaṅgadeva, who was born in a good family and is the foremost of emperors, does very much rule. Only that enemy (reading *arir ddvandvam*) experiences fight as he wanders on the surface of the earth.

madvandva yuddha occurs in face B, l. 19, in the meaning 'meet in battle'

18.

He is seated on the throne, while his pair of feet are smeared by the heads of kings. Every

Javanese dating formulae. See also *gate* in stanzas XXV and XXVIII. Kern in all these instances translates as locative absolute with the participle indicating little more than 'in'. This was also how French scholars interpreted similar dating formulae in Cambodia inscriptions (K. 50/589 ś., *ISC*, p. 73; K. 154/656 ś., *IC* II, p. 123).

[23] As de Casparis pointed out (de Caparis 1992:490, n. 16), the last line of this verse is reminiscent of verse 4 (line 8) in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta (fourth century CE), where Candragupta I addresses Samudragupta with the words *nikhilāṁ pāhy evam urvvīm iti.* CHECK REF Another parallel, also noticed by de Casparis, is the case of Harṣavardhana (seventh century CE), who, according to Xuanzang, was exhorted by the ministers to become king (Great Tang Record, p. 123f.) CHECK

day he converses with his ministers who are engaged in reflecting upon counsel.[24] Accompanied by women and surrounded by splendid heros, he often takes a seat. In a defeat just as in victory, his effulgence incessantly causes wonder.

Bhaṭṭikāvya 17:64

tato 'citrīyatāstraughair dhanuś cādhūnayan mahat

rāmaḥ samīhitaṁ tasya nācetan sve na cāpare

comm. āścaryībhūtaḥ, citram āścarye

19.

"My husband, though he is very tender / affectionate, suddenly left our sons [and] me, ... going to the women in heaven ... obeying your command. You are known in the world to have a compassionate heart, how can you behave like a thief? (read *dayāluhṛdayas stainyapravṛttiḥ*, "practice of theft"; or does he use stenya / stainya as an adjective?) Ah, king, where is [your] mercy?" Thus the enemy's wife reproaches even the king.

COMMENTARY

svargastrīgamana suggests death in battle, cf. Harivaṁśa 77:23–24, Raghuvaṁśa 7:51.

One would expect *stainyapravṛttiḥ*, a tatpuruṣa compound, because *stainya* does not seem to be used in an adjectival sense.

or *stainyapravṛttiḥ* is a bahuvr. from karmadhāraya: (you) having the practice which is theft

stainyā+ sg meaning lowly, vile + vṛtti in compound

stainyātmavṛttiḥ ?

D and K read *dayāluhṛdayas te nyā pravṛttiḥ kathaṁ*, how can your behaviour be different?

20.

One great enemy ... striving for liberation ...to achieve ... the dirt of riches / forest fruits, another one obtained the king's spells / counsels that face heaven / the chief of which is heaven / beginning with heaven / which are the source of heaven, was made by him a pupil, so to say.

Xāvāptaye

tadāptaye / tasyāptaye

[24] Or "in counsel and discussion".

mumukṣur ... jahāti mukteḥ / so vāptaye dhanamalāni ? vanaphalāni?

from the mouth of the king? which is (like?) heaven?

21.

a, cannot end in o ; jijñāsita, jijñāsaka, jijñāsayā, jijñāsanaṁ, jijñāsavaḥ

-sya maharovi X jī(ba/jñā)sa

-sya maharo vi – ⏑ jijñāsayā

kiṅ — — bhuvanatrayasya mahato viśvasya jijñāsayā

b, kiṁ sandhānacikīrṣayā kṣitibhujas tībradyutes tejasaḥ (if it were bandhāna, a nonexistent form anyway, we would expect kim), "why would a king, whose splendour is fierce because of his majesty, wish to make peace / form alliances?" (tīvradyuti also means the sun)

c kiṅ krīḍārasalipsayā rabhasayā yasyoddhataiḥ / yasyodyataiḥ kīrtitā

d kīrtiḥ śuddhikarīndubhādhavalabhās sammānyate harniśam

What is the use of strong desire to obtain the pleasure of play for someone whose

purifying fame, which is celebrated by proud people and has a lustre white like moonbeams, is honoured day and night?

kiṅ krīḍāraṇa ? kiṅ śrī ?

22.

'Indra unto men (= *narendra*, king), *dharma* unto thoughts, words and acts

Varuṇa unto those who are to be subjected, Kubera unto supplicants — having assembled the world guardians, saying "Behold the ruler of kings!", he was uniquely chosen by the creator to ... many.'

c, hanta yavarāḍ ? nṛparāḍ? bhṛgurāḍ? hasta?

d, pra...tuṁ ? inf.

cf. RV 2:75cd

narapatikulabhūtyai garbham ādhatta rājñī

gurubhir abhiniviṣṭaṁ lokapālānubhāvaiḥ |

17:76

pañcamaṇ lokapālānām

17:79

indrād vr̥ṣṭir niyamitagadodrekavr̥ttir yamo 'bhūd

yādonāthaḥ śivajalapathaḥ karmaṇe naucarāṇām |

pūrvāpekṣī tadanu vidadhe kośavr̥ddhiṁ kuveras

tasmin daṇḍopanatacaritaṁ bhejire lokapālāḥ ||

cf. Manu 7

rakṣārtham asya sarvasya rājānam asr̥jat prabhuḥ 3

indrānilayamārkāṇām agneś ca varuṇasya ca

candravitteśayoś caiva mātrā nirhr̥tya śāśvatīḥ 4

yasmād eṣāṁ surendrāṇāṁ mātrābhyo nirmito nr̥paḥ

tasmād abhibhavaty eṣa sarvabhūtāni tejasā 5

23.

There was a king ... the annihilation of the city ... his eminent son was called Viṣṇuprabhāva. Him in the Śaka year 951 ... eleventh day ... in phālguṇa ...

% if śuklapakṣa: 16 Feb 1030, Monday; if kr̥ṣṇapakṣa: 3 March 1030, Tuesday

% http://www.cc.kyoto-su.ac.jp/~yanom/pancanga/

On this stanza, see Boechari 1968: 13: n. 8.

ekādaśībadi

ekādaśīśudi

24.

Another one, a very vile man called Paruda, tormented the people like an actual Ten-Faced (Rāvaṇa). The king, ..., whose conduct was more pleasurable even than that of Rāma, slew him quickly.

25.

Immediately after that the king, who wished to defeat the king's son, went from there and at once burnt down his whole residence. Then, again and again, when the Śaka year 953 had elapsed, the excellent king burnt his cities (*nagara*) completely.

26.

There was also on the earth a woman, as terrible in might as a female *rākṣasa.* Without fear, he went to her narrow / dangerous territory. In this Śaka year 954 the king, whose fame is well-known, pierced her instantly.

EAST ?

Connection with Calon Araṅ in note of 1917 to transl. Kern.

27.

Like a constantly licking fire, the king burnt that southern region, which had been utterly unconquerable, because he was able. Having obtained lots of riches and having given them to the community of chief brahmins and sages which was supported by him, he only took fame [for himself].

SOUTH

distributing all the loot: like Raghu

Note on strange expression dvijapatimunisaṅgha: is there a connection with Māheś-varas/Mahābrāhmaṇas mention in l. 15 of the OJ face?

28.

Then, because he was proud, in the elapsed Śaka year 957, in the month of Bhādra, on the 13th day of the waxing fortnight, on an auspicious Wednesday, the king, who is worshipped by the world, went together with zealous, strong, innumerable forces in the Western direction and defeated the king called Vijaya.

% 19 Aug 1035, but this was a Tuesday !!

% kṛṣṇapakṣa 13 bhadra 957 = 3 Sep 1035, Wed; māsy asita ?

% 957 māgha śukla 13 would be 14 Jan 1036 Wed

%WEST

29.

Then in the Śaka year 959, on the 8th of the waxing fortnight of the month of Kārtika, on Thursday, seized by his own forces by the stratagems of Viṣṇugupta, king Vijayavarman at once went to heaven.

% Reading the data as mukhaśararandhra, the date is verifiable: 20 Oct. 1037, Thursday. With Kern's reading muniśararandhra, the weekday is a Sunday.

% need note on Viṣṇugupta's = Kauṭalya's stratagems (sāman, dāna, bheda, daṇḍa)

AŚ 2.10.47ff.

On this stanza, see Boechari 1968: 13: n. 8.

NORTH ?

30.

In the Śaka year 959, on the 15th of the waning fortnight of Kārtika, on Thursday, having placed his foot on the head of his enemy, the illustrious king of the island of Java is victorious, sitting on the bejewelled lion-throne.

% 10 Nov 1037, Thursday

31.

Royal Majesty is now unable to look at anyone else as, pressing with her fair arms, she tightly embraces Jalalaṅgadeva, who has conquered the directions beginning with the East, who has killed all his enemies, and who is the single parasol-bearer of the earth.

digvijaya starting in the East: like in the Raghuvaṁśa

32.

Having defeated his (wordly) enemies by heroic acts and also by stratagems, (flowing forth) from the wealth of his valour, (as well as the spiritual ones) by observance of vows unimpaired thanks to his power or by worshipping deities,[25] to enjoy himself when a great weariness is born in him, His Majesty, the king called Nīralaṅga, founds a holy hermitage on the flank of the majestic Pūgavat mountain / which has betel-nut trees.

33.

Those who hear about this peerless royal hermitage, which resembles the Nandana grove, they too, going there continuously, vying with each other, their motionless / fixed with wonder, causing joy with garlands, their mouths shouting praises, considering him to be the foremost of kings, the lord of the high-minded / highly esteemed — they say he is to be venerated as Manu because of his majesty.

34.

May the collective of citizens walk on the path of good people, may the course of ministers be dharmic, [may] the sages desire the welfare of beings — I do not pray like this. They succeed as long as that king lives and protects the earth righteously, therefore may the king His Majesty Jalalaṅgadeva live long!

[25]Cf. st. XVI on śaktipāta.

〈1–2〉 Hail! Elapsed Śaka year 963, month of Kārttika, tenth *tithi*, waxing fortnight, (day in the 5-day week being) Hariyaṅ, (in the 6-day week) Vagai, Friday, (the Vuku being) Vayaṅvayaṅ (i.e., the 6th of November 1041 CE), the *caragraha* residing in the North-West, the lunar mansion Uttarabhadravāda, the deity Ahirbudhna, the conjunction Bajra, the *karaṇa* Garaḍi, the *maṇḍala* being western.[26]

〈2–4〉 That was the time that the decree of the Great King Raka of Halu (named) Śrī Lokeśvara Dharmavaṅśa Airlaṅga Anantavikramottuṅgadeva was received by the lord Great Minister of Hino (named) Śrī Samaravijaya Dhāmasuparṇavāhana Təguh Uttuṅgadeva, coming down to the lord of Kanuruhan (named) *pu* Dharmamūrti Narottama Dānaśūra, ordering with regard to Pucaṅan, Barahəm [and] Bapuri, that the lands of the *varga apiṅhe*[27] … be demarcated, for them to be proper to serve as the location of the Great King's foundation for hermits.

〈4–13〉 The occasion was that the Great King had had a prayer in view of a desire at the time of the disaster on the island of Java in the [year of the] Śaka era 939, due to the attack of the king of Vuravari who came out of Lva Rām. At that time, the whole of Java resembled one great sea. Many distinguished men died. First and foremost did die at that time the late Great King who rests at the holy temple foundation in Vvatan. It was in the month of Caitra of the [year of the] Śaka era 939. The Great King was still a child at that time. In fact he was sixteen years of age. He was not very experienced in battle, because he was still young. He was not at ease at quickly grasping the ways of handling his weapons. But because he was manifestly an incarnation of Viṣṇu, he was the protégé of all the gods, destined not to be among those who succumbed to the force of the great disaster, as he stayed on the slope of the Vanagiri, conversing with the ascetics of pure conduct [and] being accompanied by his servant, whose mind had focused dedication as his bodily services were skilled [and] as he was bowed in devotion to the dust on slippers of the Great King. His name was Pu Narottama. He was the foremost of the servants of the Great King extraordinary in the steadfastness of his

[26] On the conversion of this date, see Damais 1955: 66–67 and Eade & Gislén 2000: 75, 146–147. Damais converted the date to Friday the 6th of November 1041. There is no indication of any problems under the entry for this inscription itself, but we learn much further on in his study (1955: 184) that to arrive at his result, he had to assume the occurrence of intercalation in the Śaka year 963. For reasons about which we are in the dark, Damais failed to mention this important fact under the inscription in question. The chart shown by Eade & Gislén shows that all calendrical and cyclical elements are in place if one assumes intercalation which implies that the inscription's 'Kārttika' may be equated to 'Mārgaśīrṣa' in the Indian *pañcāṅga* 'calender with five elements' based on the Sanskrit astronomical treatise *Sūryasiddhānta* (De Casparis 1978: 7, 23, 53).

[27] The term *(a)piṅhe* is discussed by Boechari 2012: 41–42, who shows that it is a synonym of *patih*; he mentions that the Kamalagyan inscription (959 Śaka) uses *varga patih* where we have *varga apiṅhe*, but does not give any interpretation of what *varga apiṅhe/patih* would mean. Boechari refers to Pigeaud, 1960–63, III, p. 149; IV, p. 385; 468). CHECK.

devotion, who followed inseparably to the Great King's every destination, wearing bark garments like the Great King, and accompanying him in taking all the types of food[28] of monks and forest-dwellers. The Great King was never negligent in the propitiation of the gods by day and by night. It was the reason of the great weight of the love of all the gods for his the Great King, so that he became their confidant [in the form of] a wish tree to give the world shade, to succeed to his paternal lineage (*kulit kaki*) in owning Royal Fortune, to refresh the constant well-being (*sāśvatā*) of the world, to restore all holy foundations, [and] to destroy the evil powers (*hanitu*) of the world. Such was the intention of all the gods concerning the Great King.

〈13–15〉 The Great King had already undergone due rites, was installed on the lion throne, and, insofar as it was the appanage (*kapadasthān*) of the Great King's great-great-grandfather (*pituṅ*), the deified king (*haji devatā*) who rests at Īśānabajra, Halu (also) was the appanage of the Great King,[29] which was why the title Lord (*raka*) of Halu Śrī Lokeśvara Dharmavaṅśa Airlaṅga Anantavikrama Uttuṅgadeva was accorded to the Great King by the masters of the Buddhists, Śaivas and Mahābrāhmaṇas in [the year of the] Śaka era 941.

〈15–20〉 The way in which the Great King carried out all intentions of all the gods with regard to him knew no limits. All together the external and internal rites were performed by him.[30] His attention was not diverted from the performance of worship, ... expiation ..., the great weight of his Lion-Lordship. He subdued all of the stains that grow on ... of the gods, [and] all of the evil powers that the island of Java has. Division ... foe ... called Śuvukal, the royal son in-law (*mantu haji*) established at Kaṭula, and Laḍiṅ ... complete ... by the Great King, all the more so the king(s) (*haji*) of the middle[31] ... ten years that he reigned, and were his companions (or: opponents) when meeting in battle formations ... killed in the outer courtyard together with his/their mother(s) in [the year of the] Śaka era 951 ... the Great King went to seek out the sons of other wives (*paradāraputra*) of the deified one who used to reign at Vuru Tumuṅgal in the middle country of Vurahan.[32]

〈20–26〉 Exceedingly powerful and brave, he defeated the King of Vəṅkər. Nine were the kings who faced him together with the King of Vəṅkər. Still (*ata*) they were defeated

[28] Or: 'taking the same types of food...'.

[29] On *pitu/pituṁ*, see Boechari 1962: 79, n. 44, and pages 80–82. Like Boechari, Kern (VG VII, p. 114) also suggests connection of the toponym Īśānabajra with Sindok. Kern already refers to the colophon in Saṅ Hyaṅ Kamahāyānikan lontar, and to Deśavarṇana 20.1, but it seems he doesn't discuss the issue that Sindok seems here to be associated with Halu, whereas elsewhere he is associated mainly/only with Hino.

[30] See our lexicographical notes on the base *kalimbaṅ*.

[31] It is tempting to connect these *haji* ***tṅaḥ*** 'kings in the middle' with the *parad[āra]putra hyaṁ ma(ṅ)adg (i v)uru tum(u)ṁgal (i)* ***maddhya****deśaniṁ vurahan* who appear in line 20.

[32] Maybe Vurahan = Vuravan (as in the Sima Anglayang inscr., Mula-Malurung) = Vuravari?

by the Great King in [the year of the] Śaka era 952 and immediately the evil powers of ... left his kingdom and again settled a palace in Ləca,[33] being followed by the country of Galuh and the country of Barat, when they were assailed and attacked in [the year of the] Śaka era 953, by the Great King. And there was a son of the King of Vəṅkər who reigned at Vuru Rətu (?). He died due to the Great King. In [the year of the] Śaka era 954,[34] all of the people of Laṅḍiṅ Rāk and of Hirəṅhirəṅan, due to their attacking (? *iṅ maṅdon*), along with those who were plotting for death and the next world of the gods[35] ... hitting with arrows (?) ... by the Great King. The king of Vuravari too, even his demise was orchestrated by the Great King orchestrated. The Great King resisted tenaciously together with the lord of Kanuruhan, Pu Narottama (and with) the lord of Kuniṅan, Pu Nīti, at the time that the Great King was in ... In short, the Great King was the cause of the demise of all the evil powers that Yavadvīpa had.

〈26–30〉 As for the manner in which the King of Vəṅkər perished because of his the Great King, originally his palace was in Kapaṅ. He *naṅ* (?),[36] his land was consistently (*pratiniyata*) disturbed by the Great King every month of Asuji.[37] And in [the year of the] Śaka era 957, he was completely dissolved, when he was defeated at Kapaṅ by the Great King.[38] He tried to hide, looking for an unassailable country, abandoning sons, wives, even royal property, royal vehicles and suchlike. Subsequently, in [the year of the] Śaka era 959, the king of Kapaṅ had enough of hiding along with all of the troops loyal to him. He was allowed to ...,[39] ... His head was the Great King's footstool (*tapakan*) when he was seated with pendant legs on the Lion Throne.

〈30–44〉 The disaster on the island of Java has been summarized. The war ended. There was no doubt in the minds of the people, as they took shelter, using as refuge the shadow of the sandals of the Great King. This is the reason why he fulfilled his

[33]The suspected subject of this sentence is the king of Vəṅkər.

[34]We presume that the date 954 goes with what follows, because the Sanskrit text (st. XXVI) dates to the same year an event involving a woman, who can hardly be identified with the *putra* mentioned in the clause before that which opens with *pjaḥ*.

[35]On the words used here, and the problem of what they mean, see n. 187.

[36]We don't understand the word *naṅ* unless it can be a functional equivalent to *ta*.

[37]TRY TO CONFIRM KERN'S CLAIM (V.G. VIII: 109 n. 4) THAT THIS IS AN ALLUSION TO THE DRY SEASON, SUITABLE FOR WARFARE. See email from Jiri.

[38]The reading and the word division of the sequence vvayata is very uncertain. If indeed it must be read and divided vvay ata, the basic meaning is 'just water', and we would imagine a connection with the metaphor for destruction implicit in the word *pralaya* used elsewhere in this text for Airlaṅga's own troubles.

[39]We translate *kavnaṅ* here differently from the occurrence in line 21, because in the present situation the subject of the verb form is already *kaparājaya* 'defeated' (lines 27–28). The passage that follows after *kavnaṅ ta sira* up to *pinakatapakan* cannot be interpreted, but the fact that Brandes and Kern read *ratu* suggest that the King of Vəṅkər was given the privilege of becoming Airlaṅga's vassal king — could an expression like *ratu sāmanta* (= Sanskrit *sāmantarāja* 'vassal king', see OJED s.v. *sāmanta*) be restored in the problematic passage?

promise[40] by quickly, swiftly carrying out the meritorious work (*yaśa*) [of founding] the hermitage at Pucaṅan. It was like the Great King's permanent homage with mantras and eulogies to the Lord and was to be evidence for the people, first of all the future kings, thereafter in the future's future, regarding the specifics (*krama*) of the manner of Great King's reviving the constant well-being of the whole island of Java. For all of the former (*anādi*) kings were served on the island of Java ... character ... by them, and they obtained all of their merit (*hayu*) from the past. The Great King was not like that at all ... and the Great King's intention that be beautiful[41] the villages of the group ... called Hino ... royal property: 1 *suvarṇa* of gold. ... of the meritorious work [of founding] the hermitage at Pucaṅan. The lands of Pucaṅan, of Barahəm (and) of Bapuri, cease ... The holy hermitage foundation at Pucaṅan may not be entered by the servants of the three dignitaries — Paṅkur, Tavan, Tirip — nor by the dependents of chiefs,[42] [such as]: Piṅhais, Vahutas, elders, and any one who enjoys usufruct of royal property ... ... fines on offenses,[43] of whatever kind ... up to the limits of the lands of the holy hermitage foundation at Pucaṅan ... those who enjoy the usufruct of royal property: the Vulu-vulus and ... whatever be their kinds. The holy hermitage foundation at Pucaṅan would be wiped out if Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, outcasts, dependents of chiefs, Piṅhais, Vahutas, elders ... would meddle with the independence of the holy hermitage foundation at Pucaṅan along with [everything] up to the limits of the lands of the ... of Hino ... the holy hermitage foundation.

〈44–46〉 So therefore they will undergo the consequences of their action. The (consequences of the) Five Major Sins are their lot. ... calligrapher to his Majesty the Great King ... the holy royal decree (in the form of an) edict.

[40] See comparable passage re. *pratijñā* in the Baru and Terep inscriptions.

[41] We are unable to verify the reading *mayva* published by Brandes and Kern. Taking this uncertain reading at face value, we see no other way but to interpret it as a form derived from *hayu*, though it will be surprising if our text really spells *maywa* for what would be *mahayva* in contemporary texts. See the Baru inscription, face A, line 16: *yāvat sṛa!〈ā〉dhanāniṅ amahayvaṅ bhuvana donanya* 'insofar as the means for realizing the beautification of the world was its aim'.

[42] On the meaning of *nāyakapratyaya*, see De Casparis 1956: 19. Although the Dutch scholar did not interpret it as a compound, the close conjunction with the term *hājipratyaya* in the Old Malay inscription he was studying suggests that *nāyakapratyaya* could be a compound as well; the fact, mentioned in our note above (n. XX), that the words are not normally separated by a punctuation sign points in the same direction.

[43] On the *sukhaduḥkha*, see Boechari 2012: 39–41, esp. p. 40: "*sukhaduḥkha* bukanlah 'suka dan duka', melainkan diterangkan dengan *hala hayu*, ialah segala perbuatan yang buruk dan yang baik yang terjadi dalam masyarakat, atau seperti yang dimaksudkan di dalam setiap prasasti, yang terjadi dalam lingkungan daerah perdikan. Bahkan sebenarnya hanya perbuatan yang jahat saja yang dimaksudkan. Dengan perkataan lain, *sukhaduḥkha* ialah segala tindak pidana (yang terjadi di dalam lingkungan daerah perdikan) yang harus dikenai hukuman denda." Boechari seems to allude to a normative text that gave the explanation *hala hayu*, but we haven't yet been able to identify the text in question. For translations of the individual terms, see Boechari 2012: 309–310 (Indonesian) and 510 (English).

Bibliography

…

Primary

[K] Kern, Johan Hendrik Caspar. 1885. “Sanskrit-inscriptie ter eere van den Javaanschen vorst Er-Langa.” BKI 34, pp. 1–21. DOI: 10.1163/22134379-90000352. [URL].

[B] 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 62, pages 137–140.

[K] Kern, Johan Hendrik Caspar. 1917. “De steen van den berg Pĕnanggungan (Surabaya), thans in ’t Indian Museum te Calcutta, met Sanskrit-inscriptie en Oudjavaansche inscriptie van 963 Çāka; ter eere van vorst Er-Langga.” In: *Verspreide geschriften, zevende deel: inscripties van den Indischen archipel, slot; de Nāgarakṛtāgama, eerste gedeelte*. ’s-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, pp. 85–114. Pages 85–114.

[P] Poerbatjaraka. 1941. “Strophe 14 van de Sanskrit-zijde der Calcutta oorkonde.” TBG 81, pp. 424–437. Pages 424–437.

DamaisPucangan_01

Secondary

Kern, Johan Hendrik Caspar. 1885. “Pûgawat of Putjangan (mededeeling van Dr. H. van der Tuuk).” BKI 34, p. 563. DOI: 10.1163/22134379-90000366. [URL].

Verbeek, Rogier Diederik Marius. 1891. *Oudheden van Java: Lijst der voornaamste overblijfselen uit den Hindoetijd op Java, met eene oudheidkundige kaart*. Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen 46. Batavia; ’s-Hage: Landsdrukkerij; Nijhoff. [URL]. Pages 9, 224–225, item 441.

NBG 1909. *Notulen van de Algemeene en Bestuurs-vergaderingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen: Deel XLVII — 1909*. Batavia; ’s-Gravenhage: Kolff & Co.; Nijhoff, 1909. Pages 177, 180–182.

NBG 1911. *Notulen van de Algemeene en Bestuurs-vergaderingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen: Deel XLIX — 1911*. Batavia; ’s-Gravenhage: Kolff & Co.; Nijhoff, 1911. Page 142.

No name. 1912. *Rapporten van de Commissie in Nederlandsch-Indië voor Oudheidkundig Onderzoek op Java en Madoera 1911*. Batavia; 's Gravenhage: Albrecht & Co.; Nijhoff. Page 55, item 548.

Krom, Nicolaas Johannes. 1911. "Gedateerde inscripties van Java." TBG 53, pp. 229–268. Page 249.

Krom, Nicolaas Johannes. 1913. "Epigraphische aanteekeningen, I: Erlangga's oorkonde van 963; II: De dateering van de platen van Kendal en van de steen Museum Batavia D. 21; III: De vorst, die te Tirtha is bijgezet." TBG 55, pp. 585–598. Pages 585–591.

Kern, Johan Hendrik Caspar. 1913. "Een Oud-Javaansche steeninscriptie van koning Er-Langga." BKI 67, pp. 610–622. DOI: 10.1163/22134379-90001803. [URL].

OV 1913. *Oudheidkundige Dienst in Nederlandsch-Indië: Oudheidkundig Verslag 1913*. Weltevreden; 's Hage: Albrecht & Co.; Nijhoff, 1913. [URL]. Page 8, item 1514.

ROD 1915. *Rapporten van den Oudheidkundigen Dienst in Nederlandsch-Indië 1915: Inventaris der Hindoe-oudheden op den grondslag van Dr. R. D. M. Verbeek's Oudheden van Java samengesteld op het Oudheidkundig Bureau — Tweede deel*. Edited by Frederik David Kan Bosch. Weltevreden; 's Gravenhage: Albrecht; Nijhoff, 1918. Pages 251–254, item 1834.

OV 1918. *Oudheidkundige Dienst in Nederlandsch-Indië: Oudheidkundig Verslag 1918*. Weltevreden; 's Gravenhage: Albrecht & Co.; Nijhoff, 1918. [URL]. Pages 80, 82–83.

KKrom1931_01

Stutterheim, Willem Frederik. 1937. "Oudheidkundige aanteekeningen, XLVI: De oudste inscriptie van Oost-Java?; XLVII: De Batoe pĕlambean bij Karang bajat; XLVIII: Waar lag Erlangga's kluizenarij van den Pucangan?; XLIX: Het rijk Gadjah-Mada; L: Wat deed Ayam Wuruk te Kalayu?" BKI 95, pp. 397–424. DOI: 10.1163/22134379-90001362. [URL]. Pages 406–410.

Berg, Cornelis Christiaan. 1938. "De Arjunawiwāha: Er-Langga's levensloop en bruiloftslied?" BKI 97, pp. 19–94. DOI: 10.1163/22134379-90001331. [URL]. Pages 49–64.

No name. 1941. *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen: Deel LXXXI, 1941*. n.p. Pages 424–437.

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 64–65, item A. 141.

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]. Pages 66–67, item A. 141.

Muhammad Yamin. 1962. *Tatanegara Madjapahit jaitu risalah sapta parwa berisi 7 parwa hasil penelitian ketatanegaraan Indonésia tentang dasar dan bentuk negara Nusantara bernama Madjapahit, 1293-1525. Parwa I*. Djakarta: Prapantja. Pages 189–204.

Boechari. 1968. "Sri Maharaja Mapanji Garasakan: A new evidence on the problem of Airlangga's partition of his kingdom." MISI 4 (1-2), pp. 1–26. Pages 7, 10, 12–15.

Nurhadi Magetsari, A.S. Wibowo, Hasan Djafar, I Gusti Agung Ayu Ratnadi, Ayu Ratnadi, Siti Kusparyanti Budhiono, Sumarti Nurhadi & Ayatrohaedi. 1979. *Kamus Arkeologi Indonesia 2*. Jakarta: Proyek Penelitian Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Pages 213–214.

Boechari. 1990. "The inscription of Garamān, dated 975 Çaka: A new evidence on Airlangga's partition of his kingdom." In: *Monumen: karya persembahan untuk Prof. Dr. R. Soekmono*. Edited by Edi Sedyawati, Ingrid Harriet Eileen Pojoh & Supratikno Rahardjo. Seri Penerbitan Ilmiah 11 (Edisi Khusus). Depok: Lembaran Sastra, Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia, pp. 125–142. Page 129.

Eade, J. C. & Lars Gislén. 2000. *Early Javanese inscriptions: A new dating method*. Handbuch der Orientalistik. 3. Abt., Südostasien 10. Leiden: Brill. Pages 75–36.

Budi Santosa Wibowo. 2001. "Prasasti-prasasti di Jawa Timur." Trowulan, p. 44. Page 4.

Ninny Susanti Tejowasono. 2003. "Airlangga: Raja pembaharu di Jawa pada abad ke-11 Masehi." Thesis, Program Pasca Sarjana Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya Universitas Indonesia. Depok. Pages 406–418, 445–456.