Wurudu Kidul

Arlo Griffiths

Author of digital edition: Arlo Griffiths

Contributor: Arlo Griffiths

Identifier: DHARMA_INSIDENKWuruduKidul

Repository: Nusantara Epigraphy (tfc-nusantara-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSIDENKWuruduKidul.xml

Language: Old Javanese [Script (unspecified)]

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

Palaeographic description

Pepet takes shape of ulu with two dots inside; Ornamental counterclockwise top flourish as -ā as in kilalān (1r4, 1r6, etc.), lāvan; and in ñā (tinañān). By contrast, tarung on l takes shape of clockwise stroke at bottom right in vuruḍu lor·.

Edition

〈Page 1r〉 〈1r1〉 || svasti śaka-varṣātīta 844 baisākha-māsa, tithi sāṣṭi kr̥ṣṇa, vā, va, ś¡(ā)!〈a〉,〈1r2〉 vāra, Irikā divasa saṁ dhanadī vvaṁ Iṁ vuruḍu kidul· vatək· halaran· vinaiḥ surat· jaya〈1r3〉pātra kmitananya,

sambandha saṁ dhanadī Inujar· samgət· maṁhuri maṅaran· vukajana, sina〈1r4〉ṅguḥ, vka kilalān· I maṅhuri, kunaṁ An· pabyavāhāra ḍataṁ ta ya I saṁ tuhān· I paḍaṁ〈1r5〉 Iṁ *pakaraṇān· makabaihan· tlas· rumuhun· ri saṁ pamgət·, kinonakan· svavargā〈1r6〉 saṁ dhanadī kabaiḥ petan· sigi-sigīn· yan· hana *lava-lava An· vka kilalān· ri maṁ〈1r7〉huri *kavvī-bvītan· saṁ dhanadī, kakinya, *kvinya, mvaṁ yan· hana

vvaṁ Udāśīna vka-vkaniṅ ¡v!aṁ yukti〈1r8〉 vnaṅa *manarimākna saṁ dhanadī An· tan· vka kilalān· kavvī-bvītanya ṅūni, ri saṁ Atīta-prabhu,

〈1r9〉 kunaṁ I ḍataṁni svavarganya kabaiḥ, lāvan· Ikāṅ ¡v!aṁ Udāśīna, I griḥ, I kahuri-pan·, I〈1r10〉 paniṁlaran·, tinañān· ya de saṁ pamgət· mvaṁ saṁ tuhān·, tan· mevəḥ sahurnya ka⌜〈1r11〉baiḥ vnaṅa manarima kosapāna, An· tan· hana lava-l¿ye?〈a〉va mātra An· {tan·} vka kila〈1r12〉lān· I maṁhuri saṁ dhanadī, kakinya kvinya puyut·nya ṅūni riṅ ¡a!〈ā〉sīt·kāla vvaṁ〈,〉 yukti Ataḥ tuha〈1r13〉-tuha ⊔saṁ dhanadī, maṅkana līṁnikanaṁ Udāśīna ṅunivaiḥ svavarganikā saṁ dhanadī mvaṁ Ikaṁ rāma Iṁ ¡b!uruḍu sapa〈1r14〉suk vanva rarai matuha〈,〉 ya ta mataṁnyan· vineḥ surat· pagə⊔-pagəḥ kmitananya de saṁ pamgat· I paḍaṁ pu bha〈1r15〉dra mvaṁ samgət· lucəm· pv ānanta tuhāniṁ kanayakān· pu sumiṁ juru lampuran· rake roṅga, nāhan· si〈1r16〉ra mavai〈ḥ〉 jayapātra, yathānya tan· hanāvuvusa riṁ dl¡a!〈ā〉haniṁ dl¡a!〈ā〉ha (Ā)pan· huvus· mabu(ṅaḥ) (kavive?)〈Page 1v〉〈1v1〉(nā?)ṇy[.],

tatra sākṣī saṁ hadəAn· Apatiḥ saṁ kiraṭā, vahuta maraṅin· saṁ bābru, pagər ruyuṁ saṁ ka〈1v2〉ṇḍyu⊔l·, rāma tpi siriṁ I griḥ saṁ tyanta, saṁ kranti, saṁ ñuṅul·, saṁ vrati, I vuruḍu lor· saṁ kavat· saṅ a〈1v3〉bi, ⊔I kahuripan· saṁ guha, mvaṁ rāmanta I halaran· sapasuk· vanva grāma bihāra kabikuAn·, vinkas·〈1v4〉 Irika kāla saṁ manata, saṁ gaḍya, saṁ mandu, saṁ baliku(ḥ), saṁ caki, saṁ by¡u!〈ū〉ha, tuha kila saṁ kiṅi⊔l·,〈1v5〉 parujar· si panait·, rāma kabayan· sa(ṁ) ⊔surat· sa(ṁ) vantər· tuhān·n i patiga saṁ jaluk·, saṁ rodaya, saṁ para〈1v6〉gul·, saṁ goma, saṁ padhara, nāhan· sira hana Irika kāla(,) likhita-pātra saṁ hadəAn· citralekha saṁ ha〈1v7〉dəAn· bajra

‖ svasti śaka-varṣātīta 844 jyaiṣṭa-māsa, tithi saptam¡i!〈ī〉 śukla-pakṣa, vu, ka, so, vāra, Irikā〈1v8〉 divaśa saṁ dhanadī vinaiḥ surat· jayapātra kmitananya de samgət· juru I maḍaṇḍar·,

samvandha hana sa(ṁ) pāmāriva ṅa〈1v9〉ranya Inanugrahān· de samgat· juru Irikā vanuA I maṁhuri(,) makon ta rasikā k(u?)milalā Ikā kəkəra〈1v10〉n· I maṁhuri, *Andān· kadi rakuA ya tumuduḥ Ikā saṁ dhanadī, sinaṅguḥnya vka kmir·, kunaṁ saṁkā ri nāgata rasikā〈1v11〉 dinaliḥ tan· ri ś¡i!〈ī〉lanya dadi ya manambaḥ I saṁ tuhān· I pakaraṇān·, mājaɹr· ya I padār¿m?〈th〉anikā vuvus·〈1v12〉 kinirim· Ikā saṁ kinon·kon· surat· kinon· mājara I prastutanikā vuvus·, vkasan· tad¡i!〈ī〉ya-gṛha〈1v13〉-sthāna, tan aṅgā tkā I pakaraṇān·, mapiṇḍuA maṅkin ta kinirim· surat· kinon· marā, tan aṅgā Ataḥ, ya ta〈1v14〉 mataṅ yan· vinaiḥ Ikā saṁ dhanadī surat· pagə-〈pa〉gəḥ kmitananya yathānya tan· vuvusa tkā I dlāhaniṁ dlāha,

〈1v15〉 tatra sākṣī saṁ tuhān· I pakaraṇān· makabaihan·, samgat· jambi katrīṇi, sandiḥ, vikrami, savit·〈1v16〉 paṅkur· samgat· pamratan·, samgat· tālan·, makalaṅkaṁ samgat· dhusan· ḍaṅ ācāryya beṣṇa, makudur·〈1v17〉 saṁ vaḍiṅin· madihati dyaḥ paduruṅan·

citralekha samgat· tiruAn vəḶ, samgat· paṅaruhan· saṁ ra〈1v18〉turus·, patiḥ vaśaḥ saṁ kulumpa, kuci saṁ parahita pisor· hya(ṁ) si sḍ(u)⊔t·,

likhita-pātra citra〈1v19〉lekha saṁ yidī || ✤ || □ ___ likhita-t¡a!〈ā〉mvra Arthahetoḥ ⊔ḍaṅ ācāryya I griḥ prāmodyajā〈〈ta〉〉〈1v20〉 □ (⊖) □ _____ □ tha □

Apparatus

〈1r1〉 sāṣṭi WFS1 B ◇ *ṣaṣṭhī* WFS2 HBS. — 〈1r1〉 ś¡(ā)!〈a〉 WFS1 B ◇ *śa* WFS2 HBS • I am unable to confirm or reject the presence of the *tarung* implied in Stutterheim's original reading and indicated also in Boechari's, although it is unexpected in this abbreviation for *śani/śanaiścara*. Stutterheim's revised and normalized reading, followed by Sarkar, of course polished away the irregularity.

〈1r2〉 vatək· WFS2 HBS B ◇ *vatik·* WFS1.

〈1r4〉 pabyavāhāra WFS1 ◇ *pavyavahāra* WFS2 HBS; *pabyavāhārā* B.

〈1r10〉 tinañān· WFS1 WFS2 HBS ◇ *tinañan·* B.

〈1r14〉 vineḥ B ◇ *vinaiḥ* WFS1 WFS2 HBS.

〈1r15〉 mvaṁ WFS1 WFS2 HBS ◇ *vmaṁ* B. — 〈1r15〉 tuhāniṁ WFS1 ◇ *tuhāni* WFS2 HBS B.

〈1r16〉 dl¡a!〈ā〉haniṁ dl¡a!〈ā〉ha ◇ *dlāhaniṁ dlāha* WFS1 WFS2 HBS; *dlāhaniṁ dlaha* B. — 〈1r16〉 (kavive?)〈Page 1v〉〈1v1〉(nā?)ṇy[.], ◇ *kavive〈Page 1v〉〈1v1〉(k)āṇya,* WFS1 B; *kavive〈Page 1v〉〈1v1〉kānya,* WFS2 HBS • The reading *kavivekāṇya* might make sense if we can understand it as *ka-viveka-an-nya*, where *kavivekān* could mean "adjudication". However, the spelling *ṇ* for *n* (silently changed in Stutterheim's second edition, followed by Sarkar), would be surprising in this inscription, where the two consonants are not otherwise interchanged. Furthermore, previous editors have ignored the large space that is left open for a descender from this akṣara in the next line, which seems to mean that there once was another subscript part to the akṣara that has become illegible. The original akṣara may theoretically have been *ṇyu* or *ṇyū*. Is it at all possible that the reading was *ṇyū* and that the use of this idiosyncratic pronominal suffix reflects a usage particular to such closing fornulae, of which we would have another instance in *tmū-nyū* in the Wanua Tengah III inscription?

〈1v1〉 kiraṭā, vahuta ◇ *kiraṭā vahuta* WFS1 WFS2 HBS B • The punctuation sign was omitted by previous scholars. In its place, one could also read *visarga*, which would yield *kiraṭāḥ*. — 〈1v1〉 pagər ruyuṁ WFS1 WFS2 HBS ◇ *pangərruyuṁ* B. — 〈1v1〉 ka〈1v2〉ṇḍyu⊔l·

WFS1 ◇ *ka⟨1v2⟩ṇḍyal·* WFS2 HBS B • It seems that Stutterheim himself in 1935 overlooked his 1925 corrigenda (where he corrected *ṇḍya* to *ṇḍyu*), and that Sarkar and Boechari did the same.

⟨1v2⟩ ñuṅul· WFS1 WFS2 HBS ◇ *nanul·* B. — ⟨1v2⟩ saṅ a⟨1v3⟩bi WFS2 HBS B ◇ *saṅ a⟨1v3⟩vi* WFS1.

⟨1v3⟩ sapasuk· WFS2 HBS ◇ *saṁ pasuk·* WFS1 B. — ⟨1v3⟩ bihāra ◇ *vihāra* WFS1 WFS2 HBS B.

⟨1v4⟩ baliku(ḷ) ◇ *baliku* WFS1 WFS2 HBS B. — ⟨1v4⟩ tuha kila B ◇ *tuha kila(ṁ)* WFS1 WFS2 HBS.

⟨1v5⟩ si panait· WFS2 HBS B ◇ *sipanaik·* WFS1. — ⟨1v5⟩ sa(ṁ)⊔surat· sa(ṁ) vantər· ◇ *sasurat· savantər·* WFS1 WFS2 HBS; *sa surat· sa vantər·* B. — ⟨1v5⟩ tuhān·n i WFS1 WFS2 HBS ◇ *tuhān· si* B.

⟨1v7⟩ jyaiṣṭa-māsa WFS1 B ◇ *jyeṣṭa-māsa* WFS2 HBS.

⟨1v8⟩ samgət· WFS2 HBS ◇ *pamgət·* WFS1 B.

⟨1v9⟩ juru Irikā vanuA WFS1 WFS2 HBS ◇ *juru Ikā vanuA* B. — ⟨1v9⟩ makon ta rasikā k(u?)milalā Ikā kəkəran· ◇ *makon ta rasikā kamilalā Ikā kitəran·* WFS1; *makon ta rasikā ta milalā Ikā kikəran·* WFS2 HBS; *makon ta rasikā ta, milalā Ikā kitəran·* B • The *u* in *kumilalā* is invisible on the photo available to me, and probably also very faint on the plate, if any trace of it remains visible at all, but it was almost certainly engraved. The verb form in question is not common in epigraphy, where one normally finds *maṅilala*, and so it was not recognized by previous scholars. The reading *kəkəran* was proposed but not adopted by Stutterheim, who could not yet benefit from the lexical data on this word, assembled in OJED.

⟨1v10⟩ Andān· WFS1 WFS2 HBS ◇ *Andan·* B. — ⟨1v10⟩ dhanadī, sinaṅguḥnya vka kmir·, kunaṁ ◇ *dhanadī sinaṅguḥnya vka kmir·, kunaṁ* WFS2 HBS; *dhanadī sinaṅguḥnya vka kmir· kunaṁ* WFS1 B • Both punctuation signs can be detected on the photograph.

⟨1v11⟩ padār¿m?⟨th⟩anikā ◇ *padārmanikā* WFS2 HBS; *padharmanikā* WFS1 B • The akṣaras *tha* and *ma* are very easily confused in this script. Although comparison with *thā* in line v14 and *rtha* in v19 suggests that the scribe did indeed engrave *rma* here, attempts to explain *padārman* as *padhārman* and to translate accordingly fail to convince because the word *padhārman* is not otherwise attested, whereas *padārtha* is well attested and fitting in the context.

⟨1v12⟩ mājara B ◇ *mājar* WFS1 WFS2 HBS. — ⟨1v12⟩ -gṛha⟨1v13⟩-sthāna WFS1 WFS2

HBS ◇ *graha*〈*1v13*〉*stāna* B. — 〈1v12〉 pakaraṇān·, mapiṇḍuA ◇ *pakaraṇān· mapiṇḍuA* WFS1 WFS2 HBS B.

〈1v14〉 pagə-〈pa〉gəḥ ◇ *pagəgəḥ* WFS1; *pagəḥ-pagəḥ* WFS2 HBS; *pagə pagəḥ* B. — 〈1v14〉 vuvusa WFS1 B ◇ *vuvus·* WFS2 HBS.

〈1v15〉 tuhān· I pakaraṇān· WFS1 WFS2 HBS ◇ *tuhān· pakaraṇān·* B. — 〈1v15〉 jambi katrīṇi, sandiḥ, vikrami, savit· ◇ *jambika trīṇi sandiḥ vi(tra)mi, sa(ṁ) vit·* WFS1; *jambi katriṇi, sandiḥ vikrami savit·* WFS2 HBS; *jambi katriṇi, sandiḥ, vikrami savit·* B.

〈1v16〉 pamratan· WFS1 WFS2 HBS B • Correct *pamvatan·*? — 〈1v16〉 dhusan· WFS2 HBS ◇ *pusan·* WFS1; *pasan·* B. — 〈1v16〉 makudur· WFS2 HBS B ◇ *matudur·* WFS1.

〈1v17〉 saṁ ra〈1v18〉turus· WFS1 ◇ *sura*〈*1v18*〉*t urus·* WFS2; *sura*〈*1v18*〉 *turus·* HBS B.

〈1v18〉 hya(ṁ) si sḍ(u)⊔t· ◇ *hya(ṁ) si sḍat·* WFS1; *hyasiṣṭat·* WFS2 HBS; *hyasiṣṭat·* B.

〈1v19〉 yidī WFS1 WFS2 HBS ◇ *yiḍī* B. — 〈1v19〉 likhita-t¡a!〈ā〉mvra ◇ *likhita-tambra* WFS1 B; *likhita tāmra* WFS2 HBS. — 〈1v19〉 prāmodyajā〈〈ta〉〉〈1v20〉 □ (tha) □ _____ □ tha □ ◇ *prāmodyajāta*〈*1v20*〉 □ *da* □ _____ □ *tha* □ WFS1 HBS; *prāmodyajāta* □ ○ □ □ *da* □ B • Stutterheim's second edition does not represent the end of the text, which is interpreted somewhat differently in the other three editions. In my interpretation, the original layout concept involved a final line without text but with □ *tha* □ in left and right margin (the symbols between the daṇḍas have been read as akṣaras by previous editors); having reached the end of line 19, the scribe found he needed space for one more syllable, and hence he engraved the final *ta* of the text before the closing symbols on line 20.

Translation

〈1r1–3〉 Hail! Elapsed Śaka year 844, month of Vaiśākha, sixth *tithi* of the waning 〈fortnight〉, Vās, Vagai, Saturday. That was the time that *saṅ* Dhanadī, native of Vuruḍu South, *vatək* Halaran, was given a letter (*surat*), 〈namely〉 a victory-document (*jayapattra*) to be kept hy her.

〈1r3–8〉 The occasion: *saṅ* Dhanadī was spoken about by the officiant of Maṅhuri, named Vukajana, and was considered to be an unfree (*kilalān*) native of Maṅhuri. Now, as she disputed 〈this〉, she came before the headmen of Paḍaṅ in the Secretariat (*pakaraṇān*), foremost among them the officiants. An order was given regarding all members of *saṅ* Dhanadī's own family that it should be found out 〈and〉 investigated whether there were any indications (*lava-lava*) that the ancestors of *saṅ* Dhanadī — her grandfathers, her grandmothers — were unfree natives of Maṅhuri, and whether there

are any uninvolved people, descendants of free (*yukti*) people, who would be able to guarantee for *saṅ* Dhanadī that her ancestors did not use to be unfree natives under previous kings.

〈1r9–1v1〉 Now when all her own family members came, together with persons uninvolved from Grih, Kahuripan, Paniṅlaran, they were questioned by the officiants and the headmen. They all responded without difficulty that they would be able to accept 〈the record〉 to be cleared, as there were no indications whatsoever that *saṅ* Dhanadī, her grandfathers, her grandmothers, her great-grandparents in the past, were unfree natives of Maṅhuri. *Saṅ* Dhanadī's ancestors were nothing other than free people. Thus spoke the ones who were uninvolved, all the more so *saṅ* Dhanadī's family members and the elders of Vuruḍu, junior and senior, with all the constituent villages. That is why a confirmatory letter, to be kept by her, was given to her by

- the officiant of Paḍaṅ, (called) *pu* Bhadra
- and the officiant of Lucəm, *pu* Ananta,
- the headman of *kanayakān* (called) *pu* Sumiṅ,
- the foreman of bards (*lampuran*) (called) *rake* Roṅga.

Those are the ones who gave the victory-document, in order that there be no one who shall say it 〈again〉 into the future's future. For the [...] is already clear.

〈1v1–3〉 The witnesses to it were:

- *saṅ hadəan apatih* (called) *saṅ* Kiraṭā,
- the *vahuta maraṅin* (called) *saṅ* Bābru,
- the *pagər ruyuṅ* (called) *saṅ* Kaṇḍyul
- the headmen of neighboring villages: at Grih, *saṅ* Tyanta, *saṅ* Kranti, *saṅ* Ñuṅul, *saṅ* Vrati; at Vuruḍu North, *saṅ* Kavat, *saṅ* Abi; at Kahuripan, *saṅ* Guha,
- and the elders of Halaran, and of all of the constituent villages, of the Vihāra(s) 〈and〉 of the Kabikuan(s).

〈1v3–6〉 The *vinəkas*es at the time were *saṅ* Manata, *saṅ* Gaḍya, *saṅ* Mandu, *saṅ* Balikuh, *saṅ* Caki, *saṅ* Vyūha. The *tuha kila* was *saṅ* Kiṅil. The *parujar* was *si* Panait. The elders of the *kabayan* were *saṅ* Surat 〈and〉 *saṅ* Vantər. The headmen of *patiga* were *saṅ* Jaluk, *saṅ* Rodaya, *saṅ* Paragul, *saṅ* Goma, *saṅ* Padhara. Those were the ones present at the time.

〈1v6–7〉 The document was drafted by *saṅ hadəan*; the engraver was *saṅ hadəan* 〈called〉 Bajra.

〈1v7–8〉 Hail! Elapsed Śaka year 844, month of Jyeṣṭha, seventh *tithi* of the waxing fortnight, Vurukuṅ, Kalivon, Monday. That was the time that *saṅ* Dhanadī was given by the officiant leader (*saṅ pamgət juru*) of Madaṇḍər a letter, 〈namely〉 a victory-document to be kept hy her.

〈1v8–14〉 The occasion: There was one called *saṅ* Pāmāriva, to whom that village of Maṅhuri had been granted by the officiant leader 〈of Madaṇḍər〉. He ordered 〈him〉 to enjoy the usufruct of the territory of Maṅhuri. He was reportedly (*kadi rakva*) about to classify the aforementioned (*ikā*) *saṅ* Dhanadī as being of Khmer descent. But because she was apprehensive of being accused improperly, it happened that she (first) paid her respects to the headmen in the Secretariat 〈and〉 informed of the contents (*padārtha*) of the words. That (?) messenger was presented with a letter 〈and〉 ordered to inform of the opening (*prastuta*) of the words, 〈and〉 to conlude with (informing of) his dwelling place. He was unwilling to come to the Secretariat, and so he was presented with a letter a second time 〈and〉 ordered to go. He was still unwilling. That is why a confirmatory letter, to be kept by her, was given to the aforementioned *saṅ* Dhanadī, in order that (such) words not 〈occur again〉 down into the future's future.

〈1v15–18〉 The witnesses to it were:

- all the headmen in the Secretariat
- the three officiants of Jambi, (called) Sandih, Vikrami and Savit,
- the *paṅkur*s (namely) the officiant of Pamratan (Pamvatan?) and the officiant of Tālan,
- the *makalaṅkaṅ* (namely) the officiant of Dhusan, master Beṣṇa,
- the *makudur* (namely) *saṅ* Vaḍiṅin,
- the *madihati* (namely) *dyah* Paduruṅan,
- the calligraphers (namely) the officiant of Tiruan (called) Vələ, 〈and〉 the officiant of Paṅaruhan, (called) *saṅ* Raturus,
- the *patih* of *vasah* (called) *saṅ* Kulumpa,
- the 〈*patih* of 〉 *kuci* (called) *saṅ* Parahita,
- the *pisor hyaṅ* (called) *si* Sḍut.

〈1v18–19〉 The document was drafted by the scribe *saṅ* Yidī; the copper was engraved by the master of Grih, 〈whose name mentioned here only〉 for practical necessity 〈is〉 Prāmodyajāta.

Commentary

The protagonist, *saṅ* Dhanadī, was presumably a woman. There is no other indication in the text itself than the suffix *-ī*, whose presence becomes all the more remarkable if one lists all the rather numerous occurrences of a, presumably male, figure called *pu* Dhanada, who is often associated with the place name Halaran:

- Kasugihan (829): saṅ halaran pu dhānada anak vanua i paṇḍamuan vatak ayam təas
- Mantyasih I (829): maraṅkapi halaran pu dhanada vanua i paṅḍamuan sīma ayam təas
- Mantyasih III (presumably 829): maṅraṅkappi halaran pu dhanada vanua iṅ paramuan śima ayam təas
- Rukam (829): maṅraṅkapi saṅ halaran pu dhanada anak banua i paṇḍamuan sīma vadihati
- Poh (827): maṅrangkappi saṅ halaran pu dhanada anak vanua i paṅramvan sīma vadihati
- Rongkab (823): maṅrakappi saṅ halaran pu dhānada anak vanwa i paṇḍamuan vatak vadihati
- Luitan (823): maṅraṅkapi halaran saṅ dhanada
- Rongkab (823): juruniṅ lapuran pu dhanada kapva anak vanva i turai
- Kurungan (807): pu dhanada

Important toponyms: Halaran, Grih, Kahuripan, Vuruḍu.

Role of Buddhists and Buddhist Monasteries: scribes (Bajra, Prāmodyajāta) have very suggestive names; use of term *arthahetoḥ* (Griffiths 2020).

The first witness of the original proceedings was also the scribe.

〈1r5〉 *pakaraṇān*: see useful comments Stutterheim 1935: 449. The term also occurs in Kubu-kubu (1v3), SugihManek (B5), Sangguran (B5) and in several Sindok-period charters (e.g. Alasantan 2r12).

〈1r7〉 *lava-lava*: the meaning indicated in OJED is "every part, every detail?". Among the examples quoted there, SH 25.24: *vinarah ri lavā-lavānikaṅ rahasya* "instructed in the finer points of the secret doctrine" and RY 13.41 *ike mahārāja matakvan iṅ naya / lavā-lavānuṅ viniveka saṅ prabhu* "this great king is asking about policy, the finer points which a king distinguishes", support a meaning "details" but, contextually, I think "traces, indications" suits better. The word occurs again, in surprisingly corrupt form, as *lavalyeva* in line 11.

〈1r8〉 *manarimākna*: none of the meanings in OJED seem precisely suitable. Cf. Mantranaya 37 *hurip tuvi tinarimakan ri ḍaṅ guru* "even (his) life is pledged to the guru".

〈1v3〉 *bihāra kabikuan*: are these one or two establishments? Absence of other co-occurrences of the two words tends to suggest the latter option.

〈1v12〉 *prastuta = prastuti*? the function of Ikā before saṁ kinonkon here may mean that ikā saṁ dhanadī need to not be translated "the aforementioned D."

〈1v13〉 *mapiṇḍuA maṅkin*: tentatively translated "and so a second time", but perhaps the meaning is rather "a second time and yet again"?

〈1v17〉 The two calligraphers mentioned here were perhaps those who had written the aforementioned letters.

〈1v18〉 *vasah kuci*: see Stutterheim on Palebuhan inscription. The *patih*s called *vasah* and *kuci* co-occur also in a few inscriptions of the Sindok period, e.g. Alasantan 2.16-17 *patiḥ juru kāliḥ vaśaḥ saṁ śabda, kuci saṁ makāra, mā 5 vḍihan· yu 1 sovaṁ-sovaṁ, parujarniṁ patiḥ vaśaḥ piṅsor hyaṁ saṁ pakudān· mā 2 ku 2 vḍihan· hlai 1 sovaṁ-sovaṁ, parujarniṁ patiḥ kuci paskaran· saṁ caitya mā 2 ku 2 vḍihan· hlai 1 sovaṁ-sovaṁ*.

〈1v19〉 *arthahetoḥ prāmodyajāta*: see Griffiths 2020: 127-129.

Bibliography

First transcribed by W. F. Stutterheim (1925, with extensive corrigenda on p. 187); a corrected and partly normalized edition was then brought out, with Dutch translation, by the same scholar (Stutterheim 1935), and these were reused by H. B. Sarkar for his publication with English translation (1971–1972); the plate was transcribed again by Boechari (1985–1986, obviously without taking Stutterheim's corrigenda into account). Re-edited here, with a new translation, by Arlo Griffiths based on B.-Ph. Groslier's photos of the plate. I cite readings from Stutterheim 1925 with application of the relevant corrigenda.

Primary

[WFS1] Stutterheim, Willem Frederik. 1925. "Transscripties van twee Jayapattra's." OV (Bijlage D), pp. 57–60. Pages 59–60, 187.

[WFS2] Stutterheim, Willem Frederik. 1935. "Epigraphica, I: Een oorkonde van koning Pu Wagīçwara uit 927 A. D.; II: De oorkonde van Rake Lokapāla uit het Zuidergebergte; III: Een Javaansche acte van uitspraak uit het jaar 922 A. D.; IV: Nog eens Siṇḍok Dynastieke positie; V: Inscriptie no. 3 (8) van Soekoeh." TBG 75, pp. 420–467. Pages 444–456.

[HBS] Sarkar, Himansu Bhusan. 1971–1972. *Corpus of the inscriptions of Java (Corpus inscriptionum Javanicarum), up to 928 A. D.* 2 vols. Calcutta: K.L. Mukhopadhyay. Volume 2, pages 198–206, item 90.

[B] Boechari. 1985–1986. *Prasasti koleksi Museum Nasional, Jilid I*. Jakarta: Proyek Pengembangan Museum Nasional, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. [URL]. Pages 120–122, item E.63.

Secondary

No name. 1926. *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen: Deel LXVI, 1926*. Batavia; Den Haag: Albrecht & Co; M. Nijhoff. Pages 714–715.

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 54–55, part A, items 100, 101.

Damais, Louis-Charles. 1955. "Études d'épigraphie indonésienne, IV : Discussion de la date des inscriptions." BEFEO 47, pp. 7–290. DOI: 10.3406/befeo.1955.5406. [URL]. Page 53.

Damais, Louis-Charles. 1970. *Répertoire onomastique de l'épigraphie javanaise (jusqu'à Pu Siṇḍok Śrī Īśānawikrama Dharmmotuṅgadewa): Étude d'épigraphie indonésienne*. Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient 66. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient. Page 53, items 161, 162.

Nakada, Kōzō. 1982. *An inventory of the dated inscriptions in Java*. Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko 40. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko. Pages 98–99, part 1, items 114, 115.

Eade, J. C. & Lars Gislén. 2000. *Early Javanese inscriptions: A new dating method*. Handbuch der Orientalistik. 3. Abt., Südostasien 10. Leiden: Brill. Page 133.[1]

Sukarto K. Atmodjo, M. M. 1975. "The pillar inscription of Upit." BKI 131 (2), pp. 247–253. DOI: 10.1163/22134379-90002667. [URL]. Pages 251–252.

Griffiths, Arlo. 2020. "Rediscovering an Old Javanese inscription: Mpu Mano's donation in favor of a Buddhist dignitary in 888 Śaka." *Archipel: Études interdisciplinaires sur le monde insulindien* 99, pp. 107–141. DOI: 10.4000/archipel.1976. [URL]. Pages 127–129.

[1]The book does not seem to contain a discussion of this inscription's date.