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Rediscovering an Old Javanese Inscription: Mpu Mano’s Donation in Favor of a Buddhist Dignitary in 888 Śaka

1. Introduction

Of the inscription that will occupy us in these pages, so far only the opening paragraphs are known to scholarship in the form of the first of what must have been a set of copper plates on which the inscription, originally issued in 888 Śaka (966 CE), was reissued in the Majapahit period. The remaining plates of this set have never been found, nor has any trace been discovered of the
original inscription that must have been issued on stone or copper-plate in the 10th century.²

Although the publication of an edition with translation was announced by H. Kern (1908: 51), this plan never materialized (Kern 1917b: 185 n. 2). Rather, it is among the transcriptions left by J.L. Brandes after his death and edited by N.J. Krom in 1913 under the title Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden (OJO) that we find the only edition ever published. In that collection, it is item no. LV. To my knowledge, no integral translation has ever been published.

In his introductory note, as editor of Brandes’ work, Krom explains that the reading of the inscription had been done on the basis of a set of rubbings. He refers to the Notulen van de Algemeene en Bestuursvergaderingen van het Bataviasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen (NBG) vol. XXXVI (1898), pp. 102, 153, 181, and quotes at length from pages 122–123, where Brandes had summarized the contents of the plate noting its connections with what is known to scholarship today as the Sobhamerta inscription dated to 861 Śaka.³ A religious master named Mpuṅku i Nairārjana figures in both, as does the term podgālika. Brandes also remarked that both inscriptions, dated within 27 years one from the other in the 10th century ce, show a script form that appears considerably younger than the period to which they are dated, in other words that both would be later reissues of grants originally issued in the 10th century, and refers in this connection to the evidence from the Deśavarṇana that reissuing of earlier grants took place on a large scale during the reign of Hayam Wuruk in the 14th century.⁴

Krom (OJO, p. 116) states that the plate was said to have been found at Trowulan. It was held by Haji Doolkarim, a resident of Kepanjen near Malang, when it was first mentioned in the scholarly literature in 1898.⁵ Subsequently, it came into the hands of a certain Mr. Wiederhold who resided at Malang. While it was in Wiederhold’s hands, a reproduction was sent to H. Kern which allowed him to read the inscription and comment on its contents (Kern 1908, 1911). The original plate was shown by Wiederhold to N.J. Krom in 1912.⁶

2. Cases where we do have both are rare. One of them is the Cunggrang inscription, for which we have the original stone and a Majapahit-period reissue.
4. See Damais 1951: 31–32, essentially repeating Brandes’ remarks in OJO LV, but adding in a note that the Nāgarakṛiṇāgama, nowadays more appropriately called Deśavarṇana by most scholars, “indique expressément que Hayam Wuruk, au cours de son voyage dans l’île, renouvela plusieurs privilèges tombés plus ou moins en désuétude”, with particular reference to stanza 73.2.
5. See NBG 1898, esp. p. 181.
After it was seen by Krom, the plate has come to be considered lost, and this is the main reason why it has never been restudied. But my documentation since 2008 of the epigraphic collections of Indonesian inscriptions kept in the Netherlands in the framework of the collaboration between the Pusat Penelitian Arkeologi Nasional and the EFEO to compile an inventory of ancient inscriptions of the Nusantaran archipelago has revealed that the plate was acquired in 1975 by the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde (presently called Museum Volkenkunde) in Leiden, from a Mr. A.J. Dirks (of Den Haag), through the intervention of a Mrs. F. Groosbeek-Baretta (of Apeldoorn). The plate has the inventory number RV-4801-1 in the merged collection of the recently formed Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, measures 8.2 × 41.5 × 0.3 cm, and bears five lines of writing on both sides. Good photographs of the plate ordered from the Museum make it possible to check and correct Brandes’ reading on several points, and to propose a translation on the basis of the revised edition.

In the spirit of Boechari’s words quoted above as motto, the first purpose of this article is to submit this inscription to a fresh study and to offer a translation into English. But my second purpose is to use this inscription to illustrate the significant progress that can be made more generally in the study of the epigraphic material of ancient Java — from the documentation of the physical whereabouts of inscribed artefacts, through the correct decipherment of the texts and the proper interpretation of the grammatical forms and lexical meanings of their words, to their exploitation for historical research.

2. Text

Using Brandes’ edition as base text, I offer here a new edition of the inscription, following the transliteration conventions of the ERC-funded research project DHARMA, i.e., largely the ISO standard 15919 but with some adaptations, some of which now mean a break with the system that I have used in previous publications, notably the use of capital letters for akṣara vowels that I would previously have indicated with a raised circle.


8. See Perret, Machi Suhadi & Richadiana Kartakusuma 2003–04. A first installment of the inventory will soon be published online through epigraphia.efeo.fr/nusantara/idenk.

9. This information about the acquisition history is taken from the Museum’s inventory card, which also indicates “ex collection Wiederholt” (sic).

10. See Balogh & Griffiths 2019.

11. See especially Acri & Griffiths 2014.
Fig. 1. The recto face of plate 1 of Mpu Mano’s inscription. Formerly Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, Leiden; now Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, coll. no. RV-4801-1.

Fig. 2. The verso face of plate 1 of Mpu Mano’s inscription. Formerly Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, Leiden; now Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen, coll. no. RV-4801-1.
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1 recto (fig. 1)

(1) // śrāvaṇamāsā, tīthī, Aṣṭamī kṛṣṇapakṣa, ha, va, ra, vāra, sinta, (2) bāyabastha grahačāra, rohinīnakṣatra, prajāpatidevatā, mahendramāṇḍala, harṣanayoga, vijayamūhūrtta, (3) kolavakaraṇa, śīnharāsī, Irika divāśanira, mpu mano, muniyāken, Imaḥ sīma, kaputrāṃśanira, kalīrāṇanira, saṅke kavvitanira (4) Ikaṁ harahara, kidul i pomahanira, hīṅanyā lor-kidul iṃ pagør-kinalihan-ı, mpu Iṃ mpu mano, hīṅanya kulvan-Anālihī pagør-ı, mpu Iṃ Iṃ kalampayan-ı, hīṅanya kidul-ı, Ikaṁ pagør-lor-saṅke kalimun-ı, ya t-

1 verso (fig. 2)

(1) ekā pinunyakənira Iṃ mpuṅku susuk-ı pagør-ı, mpu Iṃ mpuṅku Iṃ nairaṇjanā, Arthahetoḥ mpu buddhivāla, paknanya gavayənnira kuṭi, dharmma lpa(2)-ı: kapodgālikanani kulasantānānira mpuṅku Iṃ nairaṇjanā, kunaṁ kramanya, Ikaṁ savaḥ kidul iṃ kuṭi, təmpaḥ, 3, ya ta sinaṇḍa mpuṅku su(3) suk-ı pagør-ı, mpu Iṃ mpuṅku Iṃ nairaṇjanā, Iṃ mā kā 2(,)ı ya ta dharmma mpuṅku-ı, Iṃ susuk-ı pagør-ı, mpu Iṃ mpuṅku Iṃ nairaṇjanā-ı, An-ı paminta

12. The plate-number 1 stands in the left margin, rotated 90° clockwise vis-à-vis the text.

13. tīthī: tithi Brandes.


15. -muhūrta: -muhūrta Brandes.


17. kolavaː: the taling stands at the end of line 2 but is repeated at the start of line 3. See another occurrence of this (actually rather widespread) phenomenon indicated in n. 21.

18. kalīrāṇanira: kalīrāṇanira Brandes.

19. kavvitanira Ikaṁ: kavvitanira, Ikaṁ Brandes. No punctuation sign is engraved between these words.


21. ya tekā: the taling stands at the end of line 5 of the recto, but is repeated at the start of line 1 of the verso. See also n. 17 above.

22. mpuṅku susuk-ı: since in most cases we find Iṃ between these words, I assume that we must emend mpuṅku Iṃ susuk-ı here and in lines 2–3.


24. mpuṅku susuk-ı: see n. 22.


26. kā 2(,): the punctuation sign is very faint; it was not read by Brandes.

27. mpuṅku-ı: the punctuation sign was not read by Brandes.

28. Iṃ nairaṇjanā: I nairaṇjanā Brandes. Brandes did not observe that the plate here shows an error for the spelling of the toponym seen repeatedly in this text. Emend nairaṇjanā.
I(4)ka Imaḥ tumpal ika²⁹ savaḥ lor· damlaniroma³⁰ kuṭi, ya ta kāraṇanyan· linbaś³¹ ikaṁ savaḥ saṇḍanira mpu mano, Iṁ mā kā 3, mapa(5)k(na) bhuktyana saṁ hyaṁ kuṭi, sanka ri ga:ṃnyāmbha mpu mano,²² yat·³³ dharma donanya, Apitovin ana riṁ dharma parṇnah³⁴ mpu mano, denira mpuṅku Iṁ

3. Translation

(r. 1–3) Homage to every Buddha! Hail! Elapsed Śaka year 888, month of Śrāvaṇa, eighth tithi of the waning fortnight, Haryaṅ, Vagai, Sunday, (the vuku) Sinta, the grahačāra in the Northwest, the lunar mansion Rohiṇī, the deity Prajāpati, the maṇḍala in the East, the conjunction Harṣana, the muhūrta Vijaya, the regent of the astronomical node being the Moon, the half-tithi (karaṇa) Kolava, the zodiac sign Leo.

(r. 3–5) That was the time that Mpu Mano made a meritorious donation of sīma land that was his patrimony as child,³⁵ his inheritance from his ancestors, the uncultivated field (hara-hara)³⁶ south of where he resided. Its northern limit is south of the fence (pagər)³⁷ shared with Mpu Mano. Its western limit shares the fence with Paviḍəṅan.³⁸ Its eastern limit shares the fence with Kalampayan.³⁹ Its southern limit is the fence north of Kalimusan.⁴⁰

²⁹. tumpal ika: tumpalikaṁ Brandes. I think the cecek read by Brandes is actually just a scratch above the ka, although perhaps we do need a cecek here, if we are to understand tumpalnika(ṅ).

³⁰. damlira: damlira Brandes.

³¹. linbas: linbus Brandes. I do not see the needed suku. Emend tinbus.

³². ga:ṃnyāmbha mpu mano: ga:ṃnyā, mpuṅku mano Brandes. Emend ga:ṃnyāmbhok mpu mano. The emendation is supported by analogous phraseology in several Parva texts, thought to date to roughly the same period as this inscription. See Ādiparva, p. 97: sanka ri gōṇni prabhāvanira; Bhīṣmaparva, p. 84: sanka ri gōṇniṅ krodha saṅ bhimasena; Utarakāṇḍa, p. 126: saṅ hyan indra ta jūgāṅṅ vəlasny ambəknira. On the spelling bh in the word ambok, consistently found in the Majapahit-period manuscript of the Dharma Pātañjala, see Acri 2017: 55 / 2018: 40.

³³. yat*: emend yan· or yar·.

³⁴. parṇnah: parṇnah Brandes.

³⁵. On the meaning of kaputrāṅśan, see §6.1.

³⁶. On the meaning of hara-hara, see §6.2.

³⁷. On the way I translate pagor, see §6.3.

³⁸. Zoetmulder (1982) records the word vidōṅ in the meaning “(= yuyu) crab”, but cites only one occurrence. If paviḍōṅan is derived from that word in that meaning, it would have to mean ‘crab farm’, or such. But it seems imaginable that the word is to be connected rather with hidōṅ/iḍōṅ “(subst.) standing still”, inidōṅ “(pf) to make st. the constant object (of meditation, etc.)”, mapahidōṅ “to stand one’s ground, recover, rally” (Zoetmulder 1982). The meaning of paviḍōṅan could then be ‘place for solitary retreat (for meditation)’ or ‘rallying ground’. But it can also simply be a toponym, as I assume for the time being. The word does not occur elsewhere.

³⁹. Or kalampayan could be a common noun connected with lampyay ? kalampyayan? “a part. kind of plant (creepers)” (Zoetmulder 1982). The word does not occur elsewhere.

⁴⁰. In origin, at least, kalimusan must be a common noun derived from limus “a
(r. 5–v. 2) That is what he made a meritorious donation to the Master of Susuk Pagər and Master of Nairaṅjanā, [whose name mentioned here only] for practical necessity [is][41] Mpu Buddhivāla,[42] to serve for the monastery (kuṭi) to be made by him (Mpu Mano), a tax-exempt foundation (dharma lopas) that is to be individual property (kapodgalikan)[43] of the lineage of the Master of Nairaṅjanā.

(v. 2–5) As for its details: the wet-rice field south of the monastery (kuṭi), [measuring] 3 tempah, had been taken in security by the Master of Susuk Pagər and Master of Nairaṅjanā for 2 kāṭi of gold. That (field) was the foundation of the Master of Susuk Pagər and Master of Nairaṅjanā, who (an) requested a border land, the wet-rice field to the north, (to be used) for his (Mpu Mano’s) founding of a monastery.[44] That is the reason why the wet-rice field given in security by Mpu Mano was redeemed by him for 3 kāṭi of gold, to serve for being used as resource by the Holy Monastery (kuṭi), out of the greatness of the intent (ambək) of Mpu Mano that (yan) Dharma should be striven for by him. The more so as regarding the foundation (dharma), the relation of Mpu Mano to the Master of ...

4. Date

The inscription’s date has been discussed in exemplary fashion by Louis-Charles Damais (1955: 183). Unable to convert the date with the parameter śuklapakṣa as read by Brandes, Damais had to assume an error with regard to the fortnight, because 888 Srāvaṇa kṛṣṇapakṣa 8 Haryāṅ Vagai Sunday yielded
a perfect match with 12 August 966 CE. My new edition of the text confirms Damais’ suspicion. In their review of Damais’ data emphasizing the traditional Indian *pañcāṅga* (‘calendar with five elements’), which Damais generally ignored in his approach to date conversion based more on indigenous cyclical elements, Eade & Gislén (2000: 68) confirmed Damais’ result:

There is no *kaulava karaṇa* on astronomical *tithi* 8 waxing, though there is one in the second half of 8 waning and Damais indicates (...) that a confusion between waxing and waning is “very easy to make”. The diagram’s figures for Kaulava (58’ 2 I to 138’ 38) indicate that if, the nakṣatra, and the yoga are all in place for just over half the civil day (...).

To visualize what is explained here, see my fig. 3, a diagram which reproduces and enhances the one given by Eade & Gislén. The only remaining incongruity is that the *wuku* is stated to be Sinta, whereas the combination Haryaṇ Vagai Sunday should be the first day of Landep as shown in the diagram and in Damais 1955, Appendix 1. On this unresolved issue, see Damais 1955, Appendix 9.

Damais also mentions that some parameters of the dating formula are incompatible with a date in 888 Śaka, which indicated to him that he was dealing with a reissue in the Majapahit period. The idea, not made explicit here by Damais, is that the dating formula would have been expanded, without incidence on the critical parameters, to suit the customs of the Majapahit period by inserting parameters that were never included in earlier periods. The anachronistic parameters in our inscription may be brought out by juxtaposing its dating formula with a few others from inscriptions that are not reissues:

45. I have created the diagram with the application called HIC that can be obtained through http://home.thep.lu.se/~larsg/Site/download.html.

46. I quote the opening passages of the following inscriptions: (1) Hering, (2) Alasantan (ed. Wibowo 1979), (3) Muncang, (4) our inscription, (5) Cane.
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1. sakavārṣatīta 859 jeṣṭamāsa tithi saṣṭi śuklapakṣa ha va vṛ vāra agneyastha pūrṇavārṇanakṣatra toyadevatā bajrayoga garadhirakarana
2. sakavārṣatīta 861 bhadravādamāsa, tithi paṃcami krṣṇapakṣa, vā, pa, śu, vāra, aśvinīnakṣatra, aśvidevatā, viśkambhyoga
3. sakavārṣatīta 866 cetramāsa tithī saṣṭi śuklapakṣa tu pa ā vāra, rohiṇīnakṣatra karsalāsadevatā, prītiyoga
4. sakavārṣatīta, 888, śrāvaṇamāsa, tithī, aṣṭami krṣṇapakṣa, ha, va, ra, vāra, sīnta, bāyabyaṣṭhagrahačāra, rohiṇīnakṣatra, prajāpatidevatā, mahendramañḍala, hārṣanayoga, viṣkambhyoga, śaṃśaharaśa, saṇḍha parvavaiśa, kolakarana, sīnharāśi
5. sakavārṣatīta 943 kārtikamāsa tithi caturthi krṣṇapakṣa tu va śu vāra landəp pūrṇavasunakṣatra śubhayoga ariditidevatā grahačārapūrvvastha vavakaraṇa bāyabamanḍala

As Damais observes in a footnote, our inscription is “le seul document javanais retrouvé de la période s’étendant de la dernière charte de Pu Sinḍok à la grande stèle de 913 Śaka dont le nom royal n’a pas encore été déchiffré”,47 so that we cannot usefully compare the date of 888 Śaka with any date in the following decades until the Cane inscription of 943 Śaka, which does show some new elements vis-à-vis the dates of 859, 861 and 866 Śaka (graḥačāra, maṇḍala), but does not yet show any of the elements that become customary only later (muḥūrta, parveśa, rāśi).48

5. Palaeography

Both Brandes and Damais were undoubtedly right in arguing on the basis of the inscription’s dating formula that they were dealing with a reissue. In Brandes’ time, experience with Javanese palaeography was not sufficiently advanced for him to use any palaeographic argument, while Damais was unable to do so because he had access neither to the plate itself nor to any reproduction. Now that the documentary situation has changed, we can observe that the script is clearly different from what we see in original issues of the 10th century on stone and copper plate. The Alasantan inscription of 861 (fig. 4) may serve as example of the script typical in that period. On the other hand, the script we have seen in fig. 1 and 2 is entirely compatible with the hypothesis of reissuance in the Majapahit period.

It seems that the hand that we see on our plate is particularly similar to, and therefore contemporary with, the one responsible for the engraving of...

47. The published reading (OJO LVII) of the stele of 913 Śaka is too fragmentary to use for comparison, and none of the dating formula is preserved in the case of the more recently discovered but still unpublished Wwahan (or Bandar Alim) inscription, except the Śaka year 907. On this inscription and its date, see Boechari 1986: 190 n. 33 / 2012: 322 n. 31, Machi Suhadi & Richadiana Kartakusuma 1996: 46 (photo on p. 71), and Boechari 2012: 184. I was able tentatively to confirm the extremely faint reading 907 at the top of the almost entirely effaced front face of this stone during a visit to Pusat Informasi Majapahit in 2015.

48. See De Casparis 1978, Appendix II (“Gradual lengthening of the expression of dates in Old-Javanese inscriptions”).
Fig. 4. Alasantan inscription, left half of text on plate 1. Pusat Informasi Majapahit, no. 5-8/Tbg/BJJ/63/BPG. Photo courtesy of Nigel Bullough.

Fig. 5. Gajah Mada inscription. Museum Nasional, Jakarta, inv. no. D. 111. Photo OD OD-741A, courtesy of Leiden University Library.
Fig. 6. Kusmala inscription. Museum Airlangga, Kediri. Estampage EFEO n. 2228. Photo courtesy of the EFEO.

Fig. 7. Canggu inscription, plate 1 recto. Museum Nasional E. 54a. Rubbing kept at Leiden University Library. Photo courtesy of Leiden University Library.
the famous Gajah Mada inscription (fig. 5), dated to 1273 Śaka, or 1351 CE. The force of this comparison is brought out by showing another stone inscription of 1272 Śaka (fig. 6) and another copper plate of 1280 Śaka (fig. 7), both of which lack the peculiar roundedness that is common to our plate and the Gajah Mada stone inscription but that I have not found in any other inscription — giving reason to speculate that the same engraver may have been responsible for both. And it is further noteworthy that the script used to reissue Mpu Mano’s grant is quite different from that used in the reissue of the textually related Sobhamerta charter.\(^49\) The two grants were probably not reissued during the same century.

6. Vocabulary

6.1 kaputrāṅśan

After the dating formula, the object of the grant is described in the following words: \(i\)rika \(d\)ivaśa\(n\)\(i\)ra, \(m\)pu \(m\)ano, \(m\)unyāk\(\w\)n \(l\)m\(a\)h \(s\)ī\(m\)a, \(k\)aputrāṅśa\(n\)\(i\)ra, kalilīra\(n\)\(i\)ra sanke \(k\)av\(v\)i\(t\)a\(n\)i\(r\)a, i\(k\)aṅ h\(\text{\textit{a}}\)ra-h\(\text{\textit{a}}\)ra, kidul i pomahan\(i\)r\(a\)n\(i\)ra, hi\(n\)anya lor kidul i\(n\) \(p\)a\(g\)\(\text{\textit{a}}\)r k\(\text{\textit{a}}\)ni\(l\)i\(h\)an\(a\), mu\(a\)ṅ \(m\)pu \(m\)ano. While the words hara-hara and p\(a\)\(g\)\(\text{\textit{a}}\)r will be discussed in §6.2 and §6.3, we shall first concentrate on kaputrāṅśan. In the \textit{Old Javanese-English Dictionary} (Zoetmulder 1982, henceforward \textit{OJED}), we find the following entries:

\begin{itemize}
  \item putrāṅśa, kaputrāṅśa, kaputrāṅśan
  \item putrawaṅśa = putrāṅśa
  \item kaputrawaṅśa, kaputrawaṅśan
\end{itemize}

apanage, land assigned to a son by the king.

With the exception of two references to the \textit{Navaruci}, all of the textual passages cited by Zoetmulder are epigraphic. When checked against the most reliable editions available, it appears that none of the occurrences actually requires postulation of a form kaputrāṅśa or kaputrawaṅśa, without -\(a\)n suffix.

Including the one in our inscription, we can list the following epigraphic occurrences (cited here in somewhat normalized transcription):

1. Waharu I, reissue of a grant dated 795 Śaka, lines 1r3–4: \(p\)arṇnahanya \(s\)ī\(m\)a \(k\)aputraṅśana, kaliliran\(a\) deniṅ anak putu buyut santāna pratisantāna saṅ hadyan\(^50\)

\(^49\) See Damais (1955: 60 n. 1): “Ainsi qu’on peut le voir dans le fac-similé de \textit{KO}, XXII, l’écriture de cette copie diffère nettement de la plupart des autres copies tardives. Elle leur est probablement antérieure, mais nous n’osons préciser plus pour le moment.” See already Damais 1952: 60–61, n. 6. Five of the inscription’s seven plates are kept at the British Library, and can be viewed through that institution’s online database: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=MSS_Jav_106.

2. Pupus, a reissue, possibly in the same hand as that of Waharu I (no. 1), of an original grant possibly dated to around 800 Śaka, lines 1v2–3: tatkālanikaṅ vanvya ra pupus vatok vatu humalaṅ sinīma de rahyaṅta saṅjaya lbaṅ vukirnyadohnyaparā lmah kōlvanya ᵀk ra kalāṅ kalagavya paṅurumbbigyna śīma *kaputraṇśaṇ* de rahyaṅta saṅjaya. Same inscription, lines 2r5–6: samaṅkana īvāni lmah saṅ hyaṅ śīma i pupus *kaputraṇśaṇ* rahyaṅta saṅjaya*

3. Paradah II, 865 Śaka, front face, lines 9–11: putraṇśa kalilirāṇa denī anak putu puyut mani antah santāna pratisantāna saṅ śūlk dāvanya rikana sa saṅ maputra tinkahnikanaṅ lmah savah sima pacaru i saṅ hyaṅ dharmma kamūlān blah 1 paṅajayan su ku 1 (?) a .... ka 1 putraṇśa tampah 1 .... ikanaṅ lmah gagā ... i tagīn tampah blah putraṇśa juga manuṅisī i pinnai panigaran i paradah. Same inscription, back face, lines 28–29: asiṅ umuluhulah ikan lmah savah i paradah śīma inarpāṅkān sagluk i saṅ hyaṅ dharmma kamūlān i paradah lorniṅ luah muaṅ ... i tagīn putraṇśa in dlāha hlam an babatataya īṅnivaih yan davaṇa saṅ hyaṅ vatū śīma kabaṭatanyā patyananta ya

4. Kancana, a reissue dated to 1295 Śaka of a grant originally issued in the 10th century c.e., 4v4–5r3: samaṅkana paṅaturaṅdeśani lmah saṅ hyaṅ dārmmaśīma iṅ kāṅcana, kavibhajyanikaṅ savah, maprayoga i bḥaṭāra, tūmpah, 2, iṅ asana ungvan anśa bḥaṭārī, jōṅ, 2, ki, 1, bayai, jōṅ, 5, mapakna mpu sthāpaka, tūmpah, 2, iṅ gayanti ungvan, mpu brahmā ta sthāpaka, mpu asthavīra, jōṅ, 1, pamubur paragi, jōṅ, 1, muni parivāra, jōṅ, 2, gavainiṅ parivāra kinonkon adoh aparāṅ hōśniṅ bapra, jōṅ, 2, *kaputraṇśaṇ*, tūmpah, 20 dyah imbāni, mvaṅ dyah anārgha pramāṇa ikā, tka i santāna pratisantānānikā, tka mne hloṁ riṅ dlāhanin dlāha

51. On the Pupus inscription, see Damais (1952: 11 n. 2): “L’inscription de Pupus (OJO, LXV) forme un cas à part. Elle a une date complète (c’est à tort que la transcription de Brandes ne donne que quelques mots des lignes 1 et 2 car elles sont presque entièrement lisibles). Le style rappelle nettement les inscriptions de la fin du v° et du début du ix° siècles Śaka. Comme cependant le nom du wuku s’y trouve indiqué, on pense à une date postérieure. L’écriture, anguleuse, est difficilement datable. Le millésime ne saurait en tout cas être 1022 Śaka et Stutterheim a certainement eu tort de partir de cette date pour l’article qu’il a consacré à ce document (BKI, 90, 1933, 282-287). Nous n’avons pu jusqu’ici trouver de solution satisfaissante pour l’interprétation de la date et nous en reparlerons ailleurs.” Note the similarity of the words used by Damais (1955: 31) when discussing Waharu I: “il s’agit d’une copie, mais non d’une copie tardive car l’écriture est nettement antérieure à la période de Majapahit. Anguleuse, elle est difficilement datable et il s’agit peut-être de ce que nous avons appelé une « copie conforme ».” My suggestion that the two copies were made by the same hand is based on inspection of rubbings of the plates (Museum Nasional E. 3 and E. 24) kept in the Kern Institute collection of Leiden University Library.


54. Emended. Brandes reads *titah nikanaṅ*.

55. On this dating, see §7.

56. Emended. The plate reads *hasthavīra*.
5. The present inscription: *muṇyākən lmaḥ sīma, kaputṛāṅśanira, kaliliranira saṅke kavvitanira, ikaṅ harahara*

6. Pabuharan, a reissue of a grant originally issued possibly under the reign of Siṇḍok or Airlaṅga, lines 1b2–4: *ika ta makadṛabya ikaṅ kaputṛavāṇaṅ, lukat tampah, 1, maṅaṅ kamūladharmman, lukat, ki, 1, makamukhya savah bhaṭāra kabhaktin, an lukat, jōṅ, 1* 57

7. Waharu III, a reissue of a grant originally issued possibly under the reign of Siṇḍok or Airlaṅga, line 3r3: *atṛhər inanugrahan kaputṛavāṇaṅ savah* 58

8. Wimalasrama, reissue of a grant originally issued possibly under the reign of Siṇḍok or Airlaṅga, Hageman transcript, page 3, lines 2–3: *damlon kaputṛavāṇaṅ satn añ paniklana susur kapaṅģiha kalilirani vka vetnira mpuṅku muntun* 59

9. Rameswarapura, 1197 Śaka, lines 6r4–6: *ya teka pariṅaṅ kaputṛāṅśanani santaña pratisantarā šrī brahmārāja, maṅaṅ ikaṅ ulihniṅ amabaki, kunṅ ikaṅ gagā, kubvan, pariṅaṅ kaputṛāṅśan ika* 60

10. Sukhamerta, 1218 Śaka, line 11r3: *hana pvekāṅ savah kaputṛāṅśan, irika ta saṅ apaṅji patipati yan tan ārthakāraṅa*

Besides these epigraphic occurrences, predominantly dating from the 10th and 11th centuries, in the transmitted Old Javanese literature there are the two passages from the *Navaruci* cited in *OJED*, and a further passage not cited there:

11. *Navaruci*, chapter 2, first paragraph (pp. 29–30): *kaṅcit maṅkat rahaden bhīma. kapuṅkur in gajāhoya. tan kavarṇaa tikaṅ kalagen, kaputṛavāṇaṅ, muvah tikaṅ kaperiṅ mvaṅ kalintaṅan. ‘Immediately Bhīma set out. He had left Gajāhoya behind. The religious establishments (*kalagen*) and kaputṛavāṇaṅ will not be described, nor will (the places) he passed by and came across.’* Same text, chapter 3, first paragraph (p. 34): *aglis maṅkat rahaden bhīma, kapuṅkur ing gajāhoya. aṅlakvani jurāṅ səṅka aparaṅ aparua, mārgātrəbis, iriṅ-iriṅ. akveh tikaṅ vanādri bhaya kalintaṅan, muvah šoma, vatəs, pabajaṅan,*

---

57. Ed. Boechari 1985–86: 13–14. Despite what is suggested by inclusion in Boechari’s work, it is unclear to me whether the original plates forming this inscription have ever been actually kept at Museum Nasional. What is certain, is that the British Library now preserves the plates under shelf mark Ind. Ch. 57. Photos are accessible online, enabling me to check published readings of the lines in question: [http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Ind_Ch_57&index=13](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Ind_Ch_57&index=13).


59. Van Stein Callenfels 1924: 25–26; reading corrected on the basis of my inspection of the manuscript kept at the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, and further emended.

60. No edition of this charter has been formally published, although there is a reading in an unpublished “Laporan penelitian prasasti di Museum Mpu Tantular dan di Museum Purbakala Trowulan tahun 2003” by Machi Suhadi. I quote from my own forthcoming edition.
peṅənan in avan; gunuṅ pipitu kalintaṅan; mvaṅ kapuṅkur tekang taruk-tarukan, muvah kalagen, kaputravaṅśan, ḍusun, kuluvtan. ‘Immediately Bhīma set out. He had left Gajāhoya behind. He marched through steep ravines with rocks and cliffs. The path was rocky terrain and slopes. On the road, he came by numerous dangerous forest mountains, cemeteries, boundary markers, children’s graveyards, demarcations. He came by seven mountains. And he left behind settlements, as well as religious establishments (kalagen), kaputravaṅśan, and remote villages.’

12. Rājapatiguṇḍala, transcribed by Pigeaud (1960–63, vol. I: 88–89) from manuscript LOr 5056: ikā ta dharma saṅ vikū, mataṅhyan saṅ yogiśvara, hayva hinavara deniṅ jagat, āpan sira tirthhāniṅ bhūvanā, mnoṅ kaṅ pramananiṅ rāt, kāryyanira ṇuṣakon dupā, riṅ śūklapakṣa, makaṅūni hanadah akinkin dharma, bumi lvirnya, jumput kuluvt, kāṅlāṅ, kāṅgyān, kaputravāṅṣāṅ, tani, hanālaga dalun, salviraniṅ bhūmi carik, lmah aheṅ, tan salah amūktyakna. In this passage, kāṅgyāṅ must correspond to the kalagen of the Navaruci passages.

Clearly, the data reveal that the original and older spelling is (ka)putrāṅsā(n), i.e., from Sanskrit putra+aṁśa. Prijohoetomo explains in his glossary (1934: 220) that vaṅśa is the Middle Javanese form of aṁśa (i.e., aṁśa),61 and translates kaputravāṅṣāṅ as “inherited land” (erfland). This was also the interpretation given by H. Kern and after him by H.B. Sarkar for the occurrence in the Kancana inscription (no. 4), where the former translated “erfdeel” and the latter “patrimony for the children”.62 The occurrences listed above do not give clear support for Zoetmulder’s more specific interpretation as “apanage, land assigned to a son by the king”, because there is only one case of direct involvement of the king (in no. 2). But the idea that the word designates some kind of land is confirmed by its regular collocation with the words sīma (nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) and savah (3, 4, 6, 7, 10), while Prijohoetomo’s idea that we are dealing with inherited land is supported by collocation with such phrases as kalilirana deniṅ anak putu buyut santāna pratisantāna (1, see also 3 and 5), which can be read as glosses of putrāṅsā.

In his glossary, Sarkar 1971–72, vol. II: 355 cites “sanskrit Putrāṅsā, patrimony of the children” suggesting that it is a common Sanskrit term. It is remarkable, however, that this word, despite being entirely transparent as a Sanskrit compound meaning ‘son’s (or sons’) share’, does not seem to occur in Indian Sanskrit sources. It is therefore likely to be a compound of Javanese vintage. But I see no reason not to accept the translation proposed by Sarkar in

61. This claim is not confirmed by the entry waṅśa in OJED (a dictionary which, despite its title, also covers Middle Javanese). Another way to interpret the form putra-v-aṁśa might be to consider the extraneous consonant to serve as hiatus-bridger allowing to avoid vowel sandhi in putra+aṁśa.

favor of the more specific one indicated in the *OJED*. The *ka-***-an* circumfix found in most occurrences can then be interpreted as expressing the status of the lands as *putrāṅśa*.63

6.2 *hara-hara*

Ever since Louis-Charles Damais introduced a new nomenclature for Indonesian inscriptions taking text-internal toponyms as basis,64 and listed this inscription under the designation “Hara-Hara”, almost all scholars have adopted this designation which implies that the word *hara-hara* is a toponym, an implication which is sometimes presented as fact.65 Although she does not state this explicitly, Jan Wisseman Christie (2009: 46, 180) must have considered that such is not the case, because she chooses a different designation, “Mpu Mano inscription”. I recommend adoption of this new designation, because *hara-hara* is more likely to be a common noun than any kind of toponym. Indeed, Kern (1911: 199) translates the term as “woeste gronden” and the *OJED* has an entry *hara-hara, ara-ara* “treeless and uncultivated field or plain”. The dictionary cites only non-epigraphic occurrences, among them two telling stanzas from the *Deśavarṇana* (which I quote in normalized transcription, along with Robson’s 1995 translation):

sampun prāpte kulur mvaṅ bataṅ i gaṅan aṣom teki lampah narendra,
tis-tis hyaṅ sūrya pintaṅ ghaṭita pitu sırom kāmuṅ sanhub avrā,
skandhāvāre tōnahniṅ *hara-hara* dinunū Šrī narendra kamantyan,
prāptaṅ vyāpāra sampun panādhirā madum sthāna tekiṅ vvaṅ ākveṅ (18.8)
‘Having reached Kulur and Batang, the King now went on to Ganan Asom; the holy sun grew cooler and at about the seventh hour (4.30 p.m.) was dimmed, veiled by a spreading mist. At a camp in the midst of a grassy field the King was presently lodged. Refreshments arrived and after he had eaten we ordinary people each went to our own abode.’

śīghrāṅ daṅṅi i pajarakan pataṅ dina lavas narapatin amogil,
ūkāneṅ *hara-hara* kidul i śudharma sugatāsana makuvu-kuvu,
mantṛ viku ālī karuhun saṅ ārya sujñoṭtama paṅ umarēk,
kapvāṅaturakun upabhoga bhōjana vīneḥ dhana padākasukhan (32.1)
‘The King soon arrived in Pajarakan where he stayed for four days; the grassy field to the south of the Buddhist foundation was where they set up camp. The officials and King’s priests led by the excellent Árya Sujana came forward to pay their respects. And having offered him refreshments and food they were given money, which pleased them.’

64. Damais 1952: 7–9 (§18–25).
Rediscovering an Old Javanese Inscription

The *OJED* cites no epigraphic occurrences for the word, but besides the one in our inscription, at least one more is known to me:

Waringin Pitu, 1369 Šaka, 10v1–3:

muva *hara-hara* kagarbbha riṁ bəron·, paṅrt vetan·, ḍpa, 83, paṅlari kidul·, ḍpa, 202, paṅrt kulon·, paṅlari lor·, pada lavan vetan kidul· // muva hanālas kabhuksi sākim saṁ hyaṁ ḍarma riṁvariṁ pitu, riṁ pūrvvāsiḍakaṁ lavan niru, …

‘And there is a *hara-hara* falling under Bəron: (its) eastern barrier 83 fathoms, (its) southern length (? *paṅlari*) 202 fathoms, its western barrier (and) northern length equal to the western and southern ones. And there is a forest used as resource from the holy foundation of Variṅin Pitu, at its eastern points it adjoins Niru …’

Here, the parallelism between *muva(h) hana harahara* and *muva(h) hana alas* clearly demonstrates that *hara-hara* must be common noun and not a toponym.

6.3 *pagər*

The problem of whether a given word is to be interpreted as a toponym or as a common noun is indeed confronted very frequently when dealing with Old Javanese inscriptions, the data often being insufficient to make a reasoned choice. Some minor cases have been briefly discussed above in footnotes 38, 39 and 40. I turn here to the more important case of *pagər*.

Hadi Sidomulyo (2010: 22, n. 67), in discussing royal foundations in the ancient region of Jaṅgala (corresponding to modern Sidoarjo regency), took this *pagər* to be a toponym: “It can be added that the name Pagər is recorded in a number of very early inscriptions originating from this same region, among them *Kaladi* (909) and *Hara-hara* (966)”. In an earlier work, the same author has discussed the toponym at greater length, and referred to the mention made in the Mula-Malurung and Sukhamerta inscriptions, dated respectively to 1177 and 1218 Šaka, of a foundation (*dharma*) at Pagər. There is even a passage, among the inscriptions of that period, where the word undeniably serves as toponym in the determination of land boundaries:

---

67. I have found one other possible occurrence, the second set of Ukir Negara plates, a reissue of a grant originally issued in 1120 Šaka, 1v4–5, where I read from photos of the plate: *kulvan i ḍaṁri dagal, 5 juṁ luḍuṁ, 2 juṁ, a(k)ulu (h)ara-hara drvyā haji ma 1*. I am unable to determine the meaning here, because I do not understand the word *akulu*, if that reading is correct. Machi Suhadi & Richadiana Kartakusuma 1996: 9 read *ahulu*, which I cannot interpret either. Nigel Bullough (pers. comm.) kindly informs me that Issatriadi (1975: 18, 22 — unavailable to me), who likewise reads *ahulu hara-hara*, translates this as “di hulu padang”. The reading *ahulu* is perhaps possible, but it seems impossible to me to translate *ahulu* as ‘di hulu’.
Rameswarapura, 1197 Śaka, 6v5–6.\(^69\)

Asiḍaktan lavan· blut·, maṅalor amgat· lvah, ḍpa 340, Asiḍaktan lavan· pagə:r·, mlt· maṅetan anhalar·, ḍpa 80, Asiḍaktan· lavan· soso, maṅalor amnə:r·, ìken páścima, ḍpa 110
‘Adjoining with Blut, it goes North cutting through the river, for 340 fathoms. Adjoining with Pagər, windingly (?) it goes North-East, for 80 fathoms. Adjoining with Soso, it goes straight North, and arrives at the West point, for 110 fathoms.’\(^68\)

But if we assume pagər is a toponym also in the context of the land demarcation in our inscription, the resulting translation would have to be something like this: ‘That was the time that Mpu Mano made a meritorious donation of sīma land […]. Its northern limit is the south (side) of Pagər that is shared with Mpu Mano. Its western limit shares Pagər with Paviḍəṅan. Its eastern limit shares Pagər with Kalampayan. Its southern limit is Pagər north of Kalimusan.’ This seems to make less sense than if we translate pagər as a common noun meaning ‘fence’. By contrast, I assume that it is part of a toponym in the combination Susuk Pagər. For the time being, within the limits of my knowledge and the sources available to me, I am unable to propose identifications of any of these toponyms on the modern map.\(^70\)

6.4 kapodgalikan

The purpose of the transaction recorded in the inscription is stated in the words paknanya gavayənnira kuṭi, dharmma lpas kapodgālikana ni kulasantānānira mpuṅku iṅ nairanjanā, which I have translated ‘to serve for the monastery (kuṭi) to be made by him: the tax-exempt foundation (dharma) that is to be individual property (kapodgalikan) of the lineage of the Master of Nairāñjanā.’

The word kuṭi is used quite commonly in Buddhist sources from ancient Indonesia to designate some kind of Buddhist establishment, probably monastic, not clearly distinguishable from and often appearing in collocation with the more familiar term vihāra.\(^71\) Indeed, in the Sobhamerta inscription, the object of donation to the same protagonist — the Master of Nairāñjanā called Buddhivāla or Buddhivāla — as the one who figures in the inscription that concerns us here, is called vihantən,\(^72\) a krama-like derivation from the Sanskrit word vihāra.\(^73\) In Old Javanese sources, the word vihāra is a

---

\(^69\). See n. 60 above. I quote from my own forthcoming edition and translation.

\(^70\). In his article dedicated to toponyms in several Old Javanese inscriptions, van Stein Callenfels (1929: 382) also admitted his inability to identify any of these items. Nigel Bullough (pers. comm.) suggests to me that it is most likely that the toponyms are to be sought in the area between Surabaya and Trowulan.

\(^71\). See Griffiths 2014: 216.

\(^72\). Ed. Titi Surti Nastiti 2007, lines 2v3, 3v2, 3v5, 4v2.

\(^73\). The same form is also found in the Hering inscription that I will cite below. On
sure marker of a connection with Buddhism. While the word is found in all literary and didactic texts preserved to us that have explicitly Buddhist preoccupations, it is, to my knowledge, hardly ever attested in such texts which have other religious affiliations. In epigraphic texts, the context is often insufficient in itself to determine with certainty whether a monastery of Buddhist or some other affiliation is intended, but in all cases where the context does throw light on the matter, it is clear that vihāra designated specifically Buddhist establishments. Even if we forget the fact that the Mpu Mano and Sobhamerta inscriptions open with brief Sanskrit expressions of homage to all Buddhas, these other reasons alone would suffice to remove any doubt that we are dealing in both inscriptions with a transaction involving a Buddhist beneficiary.

In this light, it is remarkable that the OJED contains the following two entries for words quoted from the same two inscriptions, Mpu Mano and Sobhamerta, but occurring nowhere else in transmitted or epigraphic Old Javanese texts known to me:

**podgalika** Śiwaite
ČSt 22 (939) 1b.4: muaṅ tan paṅjurwa kaliliran i kula santāna mpunku tēka riṅ dlāha niṅ dlā<ha>, parnahanya podgaliḵa.

**kapodgalikan** establishment of Śiwaite, Śiwaite sanctuary
OJO 55 (966) b2: gawayĕn irda kuṭi, dharma lĕpas kapodgalikana ni kalasantāna nira mpunku in Nairaṅjana.

Now the base word podgalika, in the standard Sanskrit spelling paudgalika, is a well-known technical term of Buddhist monastic discipline (vinaya), and such *krama*-like formations in Old Javanese, see Damais 1950, Damais 1951: 12 n. 1 and Hoogervorst 2017, table 3. Several examples can be added from epigraphy, among them the toponym alasantan, in the eponymous inscription of 861 Saka, which is the equivalent of the common modern toponym Wonasari (i.e., vanasāri, meaning Flower Forest), although in modern Javanese alas is the *ngoko*-form while wana is the *krama*-form. Damais (1950: 269, 276) has emphasized the importance of *krama*-forms of modern toponyms, and a significant percentage of the *krama*-like forms found in Old Javanese are indeed toponyms or, like vihantən, words that designate respected places.

74. See, by way of example, the occurrences in manuscripts of the prose recensions of the Kuñjarakarnā story (van der Molen 1983: 136–137); in the *kakavin Kuñjarakarnā Dharmakathana* (1.7, 6.8–9, 11.4, 15.9, 16.2, 32.6); in the *Advayasādhana* part of the so-called *Saṅ Hyaṅ Kamahāvānyikā* (Lokesh Chandra 1997: 343); and in the *Deśavarnana* (93.1, in this text the word kuṭi is far more common). Exceptions, always in rather stereotypical lists of various religious establishments: *kakavin Rāmāyaṇa* (3.70); *Agəstyaparva* (27.22–29 and 69.8–16).

75. The most noteworthy example is the Wanua Tengah III inscription (Boechari 2012: 484–491).

76. The invocation reads *namo stu sarvabuddhāya* in Sobhamerta.

77. Representation of the Sanskrit diphthong *au* as *o* in Old Javanese is normal: see Gonda 1973: 369–370 (1st ed. 239–240).

78. See, for instance, Schopen 2001: 111–112.
the corresponding entry in Edgerton’s *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (1951) reads as follows:

**paudgalika**, adj. (Pali puggalika; to pugdala plus ika; in different sense recorded pw 4.302), *individual, personal*, always contrasted with **sāṃghika**, sometimes also **staupika**: sāṃghikāḥ puṣpavrksāḥ...“ka-paribhogaḥ bhuktāḥ Divy 342.19, ...were put to individual, personal (not selfish, with Index) use; staupikāṃ sāṃghikāṃ... vittam 6kaṃ ca RP 29.8; similarly Śikṣ 63.14; Bbh 166.26; MSV ii.123.19.

Zoetmulder’s interpretation of Old Javanese *podgalika* was clearly determined by the meanings ascribed to the word *pugdala* and *podgala* in his dictionary: “(Skt pudgala, a name of Śiwa) Śiwaite, follower of the Śiwaite way”. Although Edgerton’s dictionary is among the sources consulted by Zoetmulder when he was preparing the *OJED*, his entry for *podgalika* reveals that he failed to observe the clearly Buddhist context of the quoted phrases, and forgot to consult Edgerton’s dictionary. In brief, when a second edition of the *OJED* is prepared, the meaning for the entry *podgalika* and its derived form *kapodgalikan* will need to be corrected.

In that perspective, it must be noted that while *paudgalika* is an adjective in Sanskrit, the identification of the word class of Sanskrit words borrowed into Old Javanese is often problematic, so that we may either consider the word *podgalika* to have remained an adjective in Old Javanese, with the meaning: ‘belonging to (a Buddhist monk’s) individual property’, or to have been borrowed as a substantivized noun meaning ‘(a Buddhist monk’s) individual property’. The function of the circumfix *ka-...-an* in the derived form is in any case certainly not to indicate an establishment or sanctuary (as Zoetmulder presumed), but would either be to resolve the ambiguity of its word class, to create an abstract noun, or to indicate a status as in the case of *kaputrāṇśan* discussed above.

6.5 arthahetoḥ

The beneficiary of Mpu Mano’s donation is identified as follows: *ya tekā pinunyakantira in mpuṅku susuk pagər, muaṅ mpuṅku an nairañjanā, arthahetoḥ mpu buddhivāla*. Above, I have proposed the following translation: ‘That is what he made a meritorious donation to the Master of Susuk Pagər

---

82. The latter might be deemed to follow from the juxtaposition of the phrase *parṇnahānya podgālika* in Sobhamerta with such phrases as *parṇnahāya sīma svatantrā* (Turun Hyang) and *kevalā sīmā svatantra juga parṇnahāya* (Garaman, Boechari 2012: 503–512).
and Master of Nairaṅjanā, [whose name mentioned here only] for practical necessity [is] Mpu Buddhivāla.’

The word *arthahetoh*, obviously of Sanskrit origin, occurs in a limited number of Old Javanese inscriptions all dating to the 10th century CE:

1. Wurudu Kidul, 844 Śaka, verso, l. 19: *likhita tambra arthahetoh ḍañ ācāryya i griḥ prāmodyajātā*  
2. Kanuruhan, 856 Śaka, l. 6: *irikā divaśa rakryān kanuruhan arthahetoh dyah munpaṅ umanugraha*  
3. Hering, 859 Śaka, face A, l. 23: *i sira arthahetoh sam prasantamatiḥ*  
4. Sobhamerta, 861 Śaka, seven occurrences (1r4–5, 1r6, 1v2, 1v6, 2r1–2, 2v3 3v2), always in the same sequence *mpuṅku i nerāñjanā, arthahetoh boddhivāla*

If we include the occurrence in the Mpu Mano inscription itself, this amounts to five epigraphic sources, all but one of which (no. 2) were cited in the *OJED* entry *arthahetoh* which is furnished with the gloss ‘for the benefit of?’. No non-epigraphic occurrences are cited in this dictionary, but I have identified one and will return to it below.

In all cases, the word stands between the designation of a respected person and his name. The gloss proposed with a question mark by Zoetmulder does not fit in the contexts. And indeed other scholars have proposed different interpretations. Let me first quote from unpublished notes on the Kanuruhan inscription (above, no. 2) by J.G. de Casparis:

Finally, there is a minor problem concerning the term *arthahetoh* in l. 6. This is a correct Sanskrit compound meaning ‘on account of (for the sake of) a purpose (material gain etc.)’, but in Old Javanese inscriptions this term is generally used between the title and the name of a person, as in the present case between *rakryān kanuruhan* and *pu munpaṅ*, where this Sanskrit meaning does not make good sense. It is, in fact, an apposition to the title *rakryān kanuruhan*. Also the translation in the dictionary of Zoetmulder-Robson, s.v. *arthahetoh*, viz. ‘for the benefit of?’ is unsatisfactory. Stutterheim 1925: 59 f., notes a similar use of the term in *likhitatāmbra arthahetoh dan=ācāryya i gĕrih* and translates ‘for the sake of financial gain’ (‘terwille van het gewin’), which does make sense (the scribe who writes the edict for a certain fee), but is grammatically difficult to understand, as the term defines the function of the scribe.  

86. Edited by Titi Surti Nastiti (2007).  
87. This passage is found among the unpublished archives in preparation of a corpus of inscriptions of the reign of Śiṇḍok that De Casparis was working on in the years before his death, and that are preserved in the Kern Institute collection at Leiden University Library.  
88. I have not been able to trace the publication where De Casparis found the translation “terwille van het gewin”. The reference to p. 59 is that of the page where Stutterheim
originally an ablative formation, has been lifted from a Sanskrit context and used as a noun in the meaning of accountant or treasurer of a monastery or temple. The committees controlling the financial affairs of such institutions must each have had a treasurer for the income and expense, as is well known from the South Indian and Srilankan religious institutions. […] In the present case the R. Kanuruhan not only issues the edict but also keeps some financial control of the new foundation.

In her publication of the Sobhamerta inscription (no. 4), Titi Surti Nastiti (2007: 25, n. 60) noted:


But Boechari had on an earlier occasion (1975: 83–84 / 2012: 242–243) interpreted the final phrase of the Wurudu Kidul inscription, likhita tambra arthahetoh danācārya i grih prāmodyajāta, as follows: “Rupa-rupanya ada seorang pendeta dari desa Grih yang bernama Prāmodyajāta yang merasa perlu untuk mengutip kedua keputusan itu di atas tembaga” — here, the words “yang merasa perlu” seem to be an attempt to paraphrase arthahetoh. Sarkar (1970–71, vol. II: 204) translates arthahetoh in this same sentence as “against the payment of money”.

Clearly, none of the quoted scholars was aware of the technical usage of the word arthahetoh in Buddhist vinaya literature. See the long note of Nolot (1991: 388–390) on the expression arthahetoh … nāma grhnāmi, conveniently accessible even to a non francophone readership in the English summary of her work (pp. 530–531), from which I cite:

The phrase arthahetor nāma grhnāmi actually means, quite normally, « I mention the name because of the present circumstances », and expresses a pan-Buddhist (and pan-Indian) reluctance to pronounce the name of a revered person […].

(1925) edits the plate in question, but no translation is joined to that edition.
89. De Casparis here inserts a reference without page specification to Gunawardhana 1979.
90. The reference here is to volume II (Jaman Kuna), edited by Bambang Sumadio, of Sejarah Nasional Indonesia. I do not have access to the 1984 printing cited by Titi Surti Nastiti, but find the same words on the same page in the cetakan ke-6, edisi ke-4 of 1990.
Among the epigraphic occurrences in Old Javanese listed above, the Kanuruhan inscription (no. 2) contains no explicit trace of religious affiliation, and the fact that it is engraved on the back slab of a Gaṇeśa statue might indicate that the context here is not Buddhist. The Wurudu Kidul inscription (no. 1) is not explicit about any religious affiliation either, but the name Prāmodyajāta is nevertheless a sure indicator that the one who bore it was a Buddhist. The two remaining inscriptions are both explicitly Buddhist. Although the evidence is not entirely unambiguous, it is not incompatible with the hypothesis that the use of the word *arthahetoḥ* in our inscription is another instance of specifically Buddhist terminology, this expression serving to preempt any offense that might be caused by designating a respected Buddhist master with his name.

This hypothesis is only slightly complicated by the occurrence of the same word in at least one Old Javanese literary source, where any direct Buddhist connection is out of the question. The passage is found in the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (pp. 64–65):

*anugraha rahadyan saṁhulun mata sira; makasāksi rama rahadyan saṁhulun arthahetoḥ namaskāra bhaṭṭāra brahmā an tinirimakən de rahadyan saṁhulun ri sira*®

‘may he be granted eyes by milord; taking as witness milord’s father, Lord Brahmā (by name, mentioned only) for the practical purpose of obeisance, (as to the fact) that they have been given by milord to him.’

I imagine that the usage we see in this literary text may have been adopted (and adapted, by insertion of the word *namaskāra*) from the kind of contexts seen in the quoted inscriptions, where the *arthahetoḥ* applies to men of religion who can, in all but one instance, be identified without doubt as Buddhists. We may be dealing with a case of influence from Buddhist scribes on the literary language as a whole. The case would then be analogous to the influence exerted “behind the scenes” by Buddhist parties on chancery language in first-millennium India identified by von Hinüber (2013).

7. Relevance to economic history

In the context of debate about the colonial government’s agrarian legislation (Agrarische Wetgeving) of 1870, Kern (1911) drew attention to

---

91. See Edgerton 1953, Dictionary, under *prāmodya*.
92. Is it necessary to emend *anugrahana*? Gonda’s text edition (1933) gives *arthahetor*, but I have changed this to *arthahetoḥ*, as we find in the inscriptions, because Gonda informs us on p. 247: “arthahetor, vgl. Bmḍ. Pur. 1, 13, 58 abraviḍ vacanam devi namaskṛtya Svayambhuve. De beide woorden arth° nam° zijn m.i. als citaat op te vatten, al is het onzeker welke buigingsuitgang aan nam° is toe te kennen. De hss. hebben arthahetoḥ”. Zoetmulder probably failed to record this occurrence of *arthahetoḥ* in OJED because Gonda’s edition prints the words *arthahetor namaskāra* as though they were lemmata from the Sanskrit text — comparison with the Sanskrit *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (1.13.58–66) shows that they are not.
this inscription, even before its text was published, for its relevance to the
history of land ownership in Java.\footnote{Wanneer iemand woeste gronden, die hij uitdrukkelijk zegt van zijn voorouders als kindsheel geërfd te hebben, vrijelijk wegschenkt, moet hij toch als eigenaar in den volsten zin des woords beschouwd worden\textsuperscript{93} (Kern 1911: 199).} A century later, it was used by Wisseman Christie in her “Preliminary notes on debt and credit in early island Southeast Asia” (2009). One of the points of interest of this inscription indeed lies in the light it casts on economic transactions in ancient Java and notably on the role that pawns (saṇḍa) played in the endowment of religious establishments

The relevant passage must first be quoted again (this time in normalized and emended form):

```
\begin{verbatim}
(ya tekā pinunyakənira … pakänanya gavayənnira kuṭi, dharma lpas kapodgalikanani kuləsanțənənira mpuṅku in nairaŋjanə, kunən kramanya, ikaŋ savah kidul in kuṭi, təmpah, 3, ya ta sinaŋdə mpuṅku susuk pəgar, muaŋ mpuṅku in nairaŋjanə, in mā kā 2, ya ta dharma mpuŋku, in susuk pəgar, muaŋ mpuṅku in nairaŋjanə, an paminta ika ləməh tumpal ika savah lor damənira kuṭi, ya ta kərəpənən tənəbus ikaŋ savah saŋdənira mpu mano, in mā kā 3, məpəkənə bhuktyana saŋ hyaŋ kuṭi

‘That is what he made a meritorious donation … to serve for the monastery (kuṭi) to be made by him (Mpu Mano): the tax-exempt foundation (dharma) that is to be individual property of the lineage of the Master of Nairaŋjanə. As for its details: the wet-rice field south of the monastery (kuṭi), [measuring] 3 təmpah, \textit{had been taken in security} by the Master of Susuk Pagər and Master of Nairaŋjanə for 2 kəti of gold. That (field) was the foundation of the Master of Susuk Pagər and Master of Nairaŋjanə, who \textit{an} requested a border land, the wet-rice field to the north, (to be used) for his (Mpu Mano’s) founding of a monastery. That is the reason why the wet-rice field \textit{given in security} by Mpu Mano was redeemed by him for 3 kəti of gold, to serve for being used as resource by the Holy Monastery (kuṭi), \textit{…’}

I tentatively interpret the chain of transactions to be intended as follows:

1. Mpu Mano (A) wishes to endow a monastery to become property of the Master of Susuk Pagər and Nairaŋjanə (B) and his descendants.
2. A wet-rice field south of the monastery had been pawned by A to B against 2 kətis of gold.
3. It is used by B to make a foundation of his own.
4. B requests other land to be used for A’s foundation of a monastery.
5. A pays B 3 kətis to redeem the land he had pawned to B.
6. The whole sum of 3 kətis (or at least the difference, so 1 kəti) is itself made object of donation to serve as resource for the newly founded monastery.

Other scenarios are possible, depending on how the word \textit{an} and some of the instances of the pronominal suffix \textit{-nira} are interpreted. However far we stretch our imagination, it seems to me impossible to be sure about any particular scenario, because the language of the text is simply too ambiguous. But if the \textit{OJED} entry “ανανδα, sinaŋdə, kasənədə to take st. in security”}

```
is reliable, it seems difficult to interpret the transaction as it has been by Wisseman Christie (2009: 47):

The text records a substantial meritorious gift made by an individual donor to a sanctuary, part of which involved the redemption of land that had previously been pawned for the benefit of that religious foundation. This land, which had been pawned for 2 \emph{kaṭi} (1536 grams) of gold, was redeemed, on behalf of the sanctuary, at the cost of 3 \emph{kaṭi} (2304 grams) of gold, the additional \emph{kaṭi} of gold presumably representing the interest on the loan for which the pawned land acted as pledge.

For this interpretation requires translating \emph{sinaṇḍā} as ‘pawned’, i.e., ‘given in security’, which is the opposite meaning of the one indicated by \emph{OJED}. I am therefore a bit skeptical with regard to the conclusions that Wisseman Christie thought she could draw (\emph{ibid.}) from a group of just three inscriptions, including the one that concerns us here:

Four points of interest arise from this small group of inscriptions. The first is the fact that, in at least one case,\footnote{The single case intended here is precisely the one at issue in the present section.} the cost of redemption of the land was apparently greater than the original sum loaned to the person who pawned it. This indicates that profit in the form of interest was expected from the loan, over and above that derived from the creditor’s right to use the land. The second point is the fact that religious establishments, like individuals and communities, apparently borrowed substantial sums of money. The third point is that a serious argument could be mounted in court over the ownership of land allegedly pawned three centuries earlier. This suggests that the ownership of land in pawn did not automatically lapse after a set period of time. The fourth point is that there were apparently, by the fourteenth century, a number of existing law codes and a considerable body of customary law to be consulted by judges in such disputes.

Renewed study of the juridical texts from which most of the textual evidence underlying the relevant set of entries in \emph{OJED} has been taken by Zoetmulder, as confronted both with the \emph{saṇḍa}-related data from some unpublished texts of the same genre\footnote{For instance, the unpublished juridical text that is often, though erroneously, referred to as \emph{Svarajambu} in the secondary literature (the correct reading is \emph{Svayambhu} but this is not actually the title of the work), currently being edited and translated by Timothy Lubin and myself, contains a substantial passage on \emph{saṇḍa}.} and with new epigraphic evidence still unpublished at this time, may give reason to revise the dictionary and perhaps confirm Wisseman Christie’s interpretation. But until such a comprehensive study is undertaken, it seems that any conclusions for economic history based on this inscription should be treated with circumspection.

Let me conclude this discussion by presenting the most important new piece of epigraphic evidence that I am aware of at this time. The passage in question, which requires much more commentary than I can give here, is found in the unpublished Patitihan charter issued by Kṛtanagara. I cite it from my forthcoming edition, along with a tentative translation that attempts to retain the meanings for forms derived from the base \emph{saṇḍa} as they are indicated in the dictionary:\footnote{A private collector holds four plates of this charter, which in its original state...}

\footnotetext[94]{The single case intended here is precisely the one at issue in the present section.}
\footnotetext[95]{For instance, the unpublished juridical text that is often, though erroneously, referred to as \emph{Svarajambu} in the secondary literature (the correct reading is \emph{Svayambhu} but this is not actually the title of the work), currently being edited and translated by Timothy Lubin and myself, contains a substantial passage on \emph{saṇḍa}.}
\footnotetext[96]{A private collector holds four plates of this charter, which in its original state...}
muvaḥ tu/ru

Archipel 99, Paris, 2020

And the descent (i.e., concrete form?) of the grant of the Great King to the merchant guild of Patitihan, while the merchant guild of Patitihan holds all kinds of pawns, is that three years, three months, and three nights [should pass] before [the pawns] be forfeit if [the pawner] does not attentively comply with the interest (kālāntara). But the merchant guild at Patitihan should first make an announcement about the pawner, that the pawner is both unwilling to redeem and to furnish interest, [and] then that it will be forfeit, and it will be made known to many people. Moreover, that there is a pawn that has been lost; that gold has been sprinkled over (vinuvuran) so that it is similar in appearance (savrattya); that filigree (karavaṅ) has been silvered so that it is similar in appearance (savrattya); that a jewel is to be replaced equal to its price (batavasan) when they took it as pawn.

And if there is property that results from borrowing anything, it may be pawned by the borrower. It may even be sold, on the grounds of the duration of [holding] property that does not revert from (de) the borrower for as long as two years. If the borrower should die, and certainly if he should be killed by the lender, that property should not be confiscated so that the whole principal can be redeemed by the lender. And if the borrower lives, [the property] should be seized by the borrower [and] what is found of the property should be handed over to the Patitihan. The property should be confiscated, for one like that is not a thief. Property left behind and property given in trust are like that: all types of borrowed property will be of its kind.

If the pawer should be at fault vis-à-vis (de) the district (deṣa), the pawner leaves. The pawnee takes over fulfilling the takor turun (tax) when he works as fighter (?, atitih).
8. Excursus on the dating of the Kancana and Kutí inscriptions

In §6.1, I have presented textual material from the Kancana inscription (no. 4) and assigned to it a 10th-century date. In doing so, I have gone against the current *commnis opinio*, because I am persuaded by the arguments offered more than a century ago by Krom (1914, Ep. Aant. VIII) concerning the date of this inscription. Recording a grant by king Śrī Bhuvaneśvara Viṣṇusakalātmakadīvajayaparākramottuṅgadeva Lokapālāñchana and dated to 782 Śaka, this text contains many elements that would be highly anomalous for a grant issued in the Śaka 700s while they would agree well with what we find in original issues of the Śaka 800s. Krom proposes that the king in question can be identified with the Lokapāla, father of Śrī Makuṭavaṅsavardhana, figuring in Sanskrit stanzas VIII through IX of the Pucangan inscription issued by Airlaṅga in 963 Śaka, and tentatively suggests that the year 782 engraved at the start of the inscription could have been an inversion for 872.

I have trouble understanding why Damais (1955: 26 n. 1) felt confident that he could ignore Krom’s general arguments in favor of a date in the 10th century CE while also ignoring the possible link with the Pucangan inscription and opposing, against Krom’s more specific hypothesis of inversion 782 for 872, only the observation that “Les données ne sont réductibles qu’en gardant le millésime du texte, soit 782 śaka”. Damais wanted the date 782 to be correct because he had decided in an earlier publication (1949: 1–6) to include it as an element in his dossier establishing the existence of a king called Lokapāla in the Śaka 700s.

It is possible to retort that the dating elements which Damais took to confirm the date in 782 Śaka may well have been calculated *a posteriori* for that year, and this is precisely the kind of situation that Amrit Gomperts seems to have had in mind when he wrote (2001: 123):

> Calendar conversion of the Old Javanese calendar is essentially nothing more than a computational check on the consistency of all calendar and other *jyotiśa* elements. Indo-Javanese astrologers were mathematical craftsmen skilled in calculating time. They could easily falsify any day from a remote past into a perfectly consistent date in the Indo-Javanese period (A.D. 700–1500), as, for example, may be the case where the copper plates of Kuṭi are concerned (…).

Somewhat surprisingly, the parallelism between the Kancana case and that of the Kuti inscription, mentioned here by Gomperts, seems never to have played a role in the evaluation of the issue of dating the former, and was indeed not used by Krom himself, because he was convinced that the Kuti inscription

---

101. See also Krom 1931: 221–222, 224.
is spurious. This idea is still found expressed in recent scholarship, even though Damais himself (1955: 19–20 n. 2) had elaborately and convincingly argued against it. Now the Kuti inscription is a grant of king Śrī Lokapāla Harivaṅsottuṅgadeva bearing the date 762, convertible almost as flawlessly as the 782 date of the Kancana inscription. Despite his demonstration that the date is basically convertible, and despite his arguments against rejecting the inscription as spurious, Damais arbitrarily rejects this king Lokapāla as an anachronism (1949: 6, 1955: 20) while he does not reject the similarly named king in the similarly dated Kancana grant.

A clinching argument in favor of Krom’s hypothesis regarding Kancana, and for applying the same reasoning also to the Kuti inscription, comes from the passage where the latter mentions the children of king Lokapāla (lines 2v2–3):

hana tha vkanira pāduka śrī mahāraja, mañaran sira caṅcu makuṭa, sira caṅcu maṅgala, sira caṅcu makuṭa, anher iṅ kuṭi kulvan, sira caṅcu maṅgala, anher iṅ kuṭi vetan

‘His Majesty the Great King had children, the one with the famous name Makuṭa (and) the one with the famous name Maṅgala. The one with the famous name Makuṭa dwelt in Kuṭi West (and) the one with the famous name Maṅgala dwelt in Kuṭi East.’

In my view, it cannot be a coincidence that stanzas VII–IX of the Pucangan inscription clearly state Airlaṅga’s ancestor Makuṭavaṅśavardhana to have been the son of Lokapāla. I therefore propose,

1. to consider that the nearly synonymous titles Śrī Bhuvaneśvara Viṣṇusakalātmakadigvijayaparākramottuṅgadeva Lokapālalāñchana (in the Kancana charter) and Śrī Lokapāla Harivaṅsottuṅgadeva (in the Kuti charter) designated one and the same king;
2. to identify this king and his son Makuṭa with the Lokapāla and his son Makuṭavaṅśavardhana of the Pucangan inscription, which situates these two persons respectively three and two generations before Airlaṅga, and from which we learn that Airlaṅga was sixteen years of age in 939 Śaka, which means that he was born around 923 Śaka;

102. Krom (1914: 478, my emphasis): “Dat andere inscripties van soortgelijken opzet, uitvoerige privileges, enz. geen van allen een zoo vroegen datum dragen — natuurlijk blijft de door Cohen Stuart uitgegevene van 762, waarvan Brandes overtuigend de onechtheid bewezen heeft, buiten beschouwing — kan aan het toeval te wijten zijn en behoefte dus geen argument te zijn tegen de vroege dateering. Toch verdient het de opmerking, dat in het algemeen alle bekende oorkonden uit de achtste en nog het begin der negende eeuw een veel eenvoudiger karakter dragen.”

103. Gomperts (2001: 116): “The contents of the inscription appear fictitious as the dramatis personae never appear in Indo-Javanese history again.” I will show below that this point about dramatis personae seems to be wrong.

104. See already Sarkar (1971–72, vol. I: 84/91, n. 25), on the name Caṅcu Makuṭa: “This name reminds us of Mukuṭavangśavardhana, the son of king Lokapāla, who is...
3. to date the original issues of the Kuti and Kancana inscriptions well into the 10th century CE, i.e., after Śaka 850, and to consider the dates 762 and 782 Śaka engraved on the Majapahit-period reissues as spurious.\(^{105}\)

It does not seem entirely impossible that the original dates would have been altered only for the century, and were precisely 862 and 882, because nothing precludes the hypothesis that our 10th-century king Lokapāla was sovereign ruler over territory independent of that ruled by his father-in-law Siṇḍok — whose latest inscription (Muncang) is dated to 866 Śaka. But it is perhaps slightly more likely that both inscriptions belong to the Śaka 880s, as does Mpu Mano’s.\(^{106}\)

9. Conclusions

I hope to have shown how important it is to go and seek out Old Javanese inscriptions, whether they are kept in Museums or can be found in the field, because the reliability of the historical data that we extract from any inscription depends on a chain of interpretation that is only as strong as the reliability of every step beginning with our decipherment of the text. Several inscriptions considered lost are waiting to be rediscovered, while some others that have simply not been studied at all are waiting to be documented, read and analyzed.

The rediscovery of the plate that has been the focus of this article has made it possible to act upon Boechari’s instigation in the quote with which I started. Rereading the Mpu Mano inscription more than 100 years after Brandes’ 19th-century reading of it was published has yielded 19 improvements of referred to in the so-called Calcutta stone-inscription of Airlangga...”. The reading in stanza IX of the Pucangan inscription is actually -makuṭa-, not -mukuta-.

\(^{105}\) It might be objected that the appearance of the name Dakṣot(t)ama immediately after that of the king in two passages of the Kuti inscription contradicts my proposal, for Dakṣa, as is well known, was first Balituṅ’s Minister of Hino and then succeeded Balituṅ to reign during the second decade of the 10th century. The first passage (plate 2v–3r) is dinulur de rakryan· mahāmantri katiriṇi, rakryan· mantri hino, dakṣotama, rakryan· mantri halu, pratipakṣasāṇāya, rakryan· mantri śirikan·, mahāmāhino, while the second (plate 10r) is yan· hana vvaṁ lumarāḥanaṇi Ajñānira pāduka śrī mahārāja, dharmmodaya, mahāsambhū, mvāṇ mahāmantri dakṣotama, bāhubajrapratipakṣasāṇāya. I think we can safely discard both passages in attempting to date the original issue of the Kuti charter, because the text has quite obviously been distorted in the first passage, parts of Dakṣa’s well-known titulature (mahāmantri hino pu dakṣottama bāhubajra pratipaksāya) being redistributed to supply the names of the three Great Ministers. I assume that an attempt was made at the time of the charter’s reissue to rewrite the text in order to create the impression that it has originally been issued by Balituṅ, by a person who was apparently unaware or did not care that the date 762 Śaka would be incommittable with original issue during Balituṅ’s reign.

\(^{106}\) It should be noted that I am assuming the authenticity of the year 888 Śaka engraved on it, although we know that other parts of the date of this inscription are the result of manipulation at the time of reissue. See §4 above.
reading, a small handful among them significant. The result is a text in generally clear Old Javanese, unmarked by most of the errors and confusions that one might be led to expect by reading what our predecessors in Old Javanese epigraphy have written with regard to the fidelity of Majapahit-period reissues of earlier grants, called tinulad in the Indonesian-language scholarly literature. We often find such qualifications as “erroneous”, “revised” or “confused” applied to such reissues. It seems that at least the present inscription was a particularly faithful copy of its original, for evident anachronisms are found only in the dating formula, and evident errors (which might have occurred in the copying process) are rather few. The photos now available have also allowed me to propose an unusually specific paleographic comparison that confirms Brandes’ original suggestion that the reissue would have taken place in the 14th century, during the reign of Hayam Wuruk.

The process of translating even this short text has required reconsideration of the meaning of several headwords in the Old Javanese dictionary, and led me to propose revision of the meanings in more than one case. I have shown that the word hara-hara in the inscription is not a toponym and recommended that the inscription be designated henceforward after its main protagonist, Mpu Mano. In attempting to interpret the inscription, the fact that Mpu Mano wished to make merit by donating land to a Buddhist beneficiary has been an important guide, while I have tried to adopt a holistic approach to the problems of interpretation, taking into account both epigraphic and non-epigraphic evidence, including evidence in Sanskrit where it is relevant to the local history of Buddhism.

And this leads me to perhaps the most important implication of this study. The meritorious donation made by Mpu Mano is part of a noticeable spike in patronage of Buddhism in the middle and lower Brantas river in East Java during the second half of the 10th century — already noticed by Krom (1931: 219–221), and recently discussed again by Hadi Sidomulyo (2011: 129) — corresponding to the reign of Siṇḍok and his immediate successors, so Mpu Mano’s donation must be regarded in this context. Other epigraphical traces of

107. See above, notes 14, 30, 31 and 32.
108. See Damais 1952: 10 n. 2 for a collection of Dutch qualifications used in the scholarly literature; see also Boechari 2012: 9 (“Kekacauan semacam itu sering kali terjadi apabila kita dihadapkan kepada prasasti tinulad yang ditulis beberapa abad sesudah prasasti aslinya”), 75 n. 11 (“tetapi prasasti itu jelas tinulad; menurut bentuk hurufnya mungkin sekali dibuat dalam zaman Majapahit, sehingga tidaklah mengherankan apabila di dalam prasasti itu terdapat istilah yang biasa terdapat dalam prasasti-prasasti dari masa yang lebih muda”), 93 n. 43 (“Prasasti itu jelas tinulad, sehingga pencampurbauran gelar Siṇḍok dan Daṣaṣa itu sebenarnya tidak perlu dibicarakan, sebab mungkin sekali penyalin berhadapan dengan prasasti asli yang sudah sangat usang, dan ia menambahkan saja gelar yang terlintas dalam ingatannya (cf. Damais, 1955b:181, catatan no. 3)”. See for further references the index entries ‘tinulad’ and ‘copy’ in Boechari 2012.
this spike have been listed in §6.1 (no. 4) and §6.5. In my §8, I have restored two important inscriptions to their rightful place in this dossier.\textsuperscript{109} This epigraphic evidence can in turn be linked with other archaeological evidence of Buddhism in this area in the same period, such as the Muteran hoard and the finds at Candi Gentong (both at Trowulan), or the important hoard of bronze sculptures found in the village Candirejo in Nganjuk regency (where the Hering inscription originates as well);\textsuperscript{110} and it can perhaps be linked also with the issue of the dating of some of the Buddhist texts transmitted on Bali, associated (albeit unhistorically) in scholarship with the title Saṅ Hyaṅ Kāmahāyāṇikan, for mention is made in rare manuscripts of a “noble guru in Vaṅjaṅ”, a sīma “which was an offering to this master (guruyāga)” by king Siṇḍok.\textsuperscript{111} The Deśavarmaṇa (78.8) lists Vaṅjaṅ as one of the main Buddhist sanctuaries in Java but the site has to my knowledge not yet been identified. Perhaps a problem that future investigation of the history of Buddhism in this period and area will be able to solve!
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\textsuperscript{109} On the grounds that the foundation is called \textit{kuṭi}, I assume that we are dealing in the case of Kuti with a grant in favor of a Buddhist establishment, although the rest of the inscription is silent as to its religious affiliation. Cf. above, §6.4.
\textsuperscript{110} On the Muteran hoard and its 10th-century dating, see Lunsingh Scheurleer 2005; on the Buddhist finds at Candi Gentong, see Titi Surī Nastiti 2015; on the Candirejo finds, see Fontein 1990: 231–233.
\textsuperscript{111} I quote from Hudaya Kandahjaya 2016: 93. This author believes the passage is attested in only one manuscript (kept at Leiden), but I have found it also in a transcript of the lontar IIIIB. 246 belonging to the collection of the Kirtya in Singaraja, Bali.
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