Sri Manggala III (796 Śaka)

Arlo Griffiths

Author of digital edition: Arlo Griffiths

Contributor: Arlo Griffiths

Identifier: DHARMA_INSIDENKSriManggalaIII

Repository: Nusantara Epigraphy (tfc-nusantara-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSIDENKSriManggalaIII.xml

Language: Old Javanese [Kawi]

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

Edition

〈1〉 svasti śaka-varṣātīta 796 cetra〈2〉māsa dvitīya śukla-pakṣa haryyaṁ kalivuAn· vuddha-vāra tithi nakṣa〈3〉tra kṛtikā tatkāla saṁ pamagat· [h]i[no] (p)u Apus· manusuk·〈4〉 sīma lmaḥ dharmmanira I saliṁsiṅan· paṅidulnya ḍpa 44 paṅavai〈5〉tan-nya ḍpa 6␣7 pinanusukkakannya savaḥ śrī maṅgala lān· 1 paṁhli rika〈6〉naṁ lmaḥ dharmmanira paknanikanaṁ savaḥ kavaduĀ-humān· I saliṁsiṅan· sākṣī〈7〉 rāmanta patiḥ kalaṁ gusti vinkas· variga parujar· tuha banuA marhyaṁ sthāpaka〈8〉 Upakalpa k¡a!〈ā〉yastha (saṁ daivaka?)rmma I vanuA poḥ kapuA vinaiḥ vḍihan· Ama〈9〉ṅan· Asiṁ Umulaḥ-Ulaha Ikaṁ dharmma mahāpāpa duḥkha lara tamūnya hila(ṁ)〈10〉 I mahāprītanaraka □

Apparatus

〈2〉 tithi • This word is misplaced both here and in the parallel text of Sri Manggala II. On the latter inscription, Damais 1955, p. 31, n. 2 commented as follows: “Stutterheim

fait remarquer (*TBG*, 74, 1934 : 86, note 6) que le mot *tithi* n'est pas à sa place normale (c'est-à-dire après *cetramāsa*) et il suppose qu'il aura été déplacé par suite d'une erreur de lecture dans le manuscrit (donc de Brandes). Mais sur la pierre, le mot *tithi* se trouve bien gravé après *budhawāra*. Il se peut qu'il s'agisse d'une erreur de la part du graveur lequel, ayant remarqué qu'il avait omis ce mot à sa place normale, l'aura gravé à l'endroit où il en était de son travail, soit entre *budhawāra* et *nakṣatra*." The fact that our text shows the same anomaly reveals that the misplacement must have occurred in the template from which both texts have been copied onto stone.

Translation

〈1–3〉 Hail! Elapsed Śaka year 796, month of Caitra, second *tithi* of the waxing fortnight, Haryaṅ (of the 6-day cycle), Kalivuan (of the 5-day cycle), Wednesday, lunar mansion Kṛttikā (i.e., on 24 March 874 CE).

〈3–6〉 That was when the offical of Hino (called) *pu* Apus demarcated as a *sīma* the land of his foundation at Saliṅsiṅan. Its extent from south to north: 44 *ḍpa*; its extent from east to west: 67 *ḍpa*. 1 *lān* paddy field of Śrī Maṅgala was delimited by it (i.e., by the land, for him) as replacement for the land of his foundation.[1] The purpose of the paddy field was as place for the field laborers (*kavaduā-humān*)[2] in Saliṅsiṅan.

〈6–9〉 The witnesses were the elders, the *patih*s, the *kalaṅ*s, the *gusti*s, the *vinəka*ses, the *varigа*s, the *heralds*, the village headmen, the custodians, the priests, the officiants,

[1]The form *pinanusukkakannya* is problematic. On the face of it, we have a *p-in-anusukakan-nya*, so a passive form with pronominal agent suffix *-nya*, derived from *panusukakən* which is itself a *paN-...-akən* derivation from *susuk*. Such forms normally have benefactive meaning. Moreover, since in the context honorific *-nira* is used a pronominal suffix with reference to *pu* Apus, *-nya* must refer to something or someone else, of lower status. This means that Sarkar's translation "was marked out by him (i.e., by *pu* Apus)" of the parallel passage in Sri Manggala II cannot be accepted; equally problematic is Stutterheim's translation "het afgebakend worden door hem" (i.e., "the fact of being delimited by him"), which implies the interesting idea that *-nya* could here serve to nominalize the verb, as in Indonesian, but then still takes *-nya* as expressing the agent, again in contravention of the fact that this text refers to *pu* Apus with *-nira*. Anyhow, I don't remember having seen any clear evidence of the existence of such a nominalizing construction with *-nya* in Old Javanese. Since in *paṅidulnya* and *paṅavetannya*, the suffix *-nya* refers to the *lmah dharmanira*, and since it is most likely that *pinanusukkakannya* literally means "was demarcated on behalf of so. by it/him/her", I assume that *-nya* in *pinanusukkakannya* has the same references as in *paṅidulnya* and *paṅavetannya*, while the beneficiary is not explicitly expressed but seems to have been *pu* Apus.

[2]In Sri Manggala II, the reading is *kavaduA-hummā*, which seems to be an error. The base is obviously *vadvā huma*, which in turn must be an otherwise unattested equivalent to the more common term *vadahuma*, glossed in Zoetmulder 1982 as "a category of functionaries (inscr.)". The spelling *vadvā huma* makes it transparent that the expression probably had a meaning like "field laborers".

the scribes, the temple workers in village Poh. They were all given *vəḍihan* cloth and ate.

〈9–10〉 Whoever disturbs the foundation will meet with great sin, suffering and pain, and disappears in the Mahāprīta hell.

Bibliography

First edited in Titi Surti Nastiti 2018. This digital edition, from photogrammetry, is based on the new edition in Titi Surti Nastiti *et al.* 2024.

Primary

[TSN] Titi Surti Nastiti. 2018. "*Watu sīma* in Java: Marker stones as boundaries of privileged domains." In: *Writing for Eternity: A Survey of Epigraphy in Southeast Asia*. Edited by Daniel Perret. Études thématiques 30. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient, pp. 189–221. Pages 196–197.

Secondary

Titi Surti Nastiti, Churmatin Nasoichah, Andri Restiyadi, Hedwi Prihatmoko, Arlo Griffiths, Wayan Jarrah Sastrawan, Adeline Levivier & Tyassanti Kusumo Dewanti. 2024. *Survei prasasti zaman Hindu-Buddha di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta dan Provinsi Jawa Tengah, tahun 2023*. Jakarta: KPG (Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia); Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional (BRIN), Organisasi Riset Arkeologi, Bahasa dan Sastra; École française d'Extrême-Orient. [URL]. Page ???, section 2.4.2.