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In 1910 Krom for the first time expressed his opinion that the two sisters of king Hayam Wuruk of Majapahit, the princesses of Lasêm and Pajang (the former being actually the king's cousin), are called Indudewï and ïswari respectively, in Canto 5 of the Nāgarakrātāgama of 1365 (Krom 1910: 158-9). According to Krom, the lines in which these names occur, viz.:

\[
\text{sang Śrī Rājasaśadwedewi...} \quad \text{(Nāg. 5-1-4)}
\]

and:

\[
\text{... Śrī Wardhdhanadwedewi īswari...} \quad \text{(Nāg. 5-2-1)}
\]

mean: "the illustrious Rājasa's daughter, Indudewï"

and: "the illustrious Warddhana's daughter, īswari",

and should be understood as indicating that the two princesses were the daughters of (Wijaya)rājasa and (Krta)warddhana, respectively. These conclusions of Krom's have since been generally accepted (Krom 1931: 385; Pigeaud 1962: 543).

There nevertheless seems to be reason to doubt the correctness of this interpretation. In the first place, it seems strange that the poet should have shortened the names of the princesses' fathers in such an unusual way, while he elsewhere mentions them in full (Nāg. 6-1-3; and Nāg. 3-1-3, 11-1-4, 88-4-1). On the other hand the word īswari, which just means 'mistress' or 'princess', is often used by the poet as merely an honorific addition to royal names, for example Rājapatnīswari (Nāg. 3-1-1) which, accordingly, is translated by Pigeaud as Rājapatnī-Mistress (Pigeaud 1960 II: 10; 1960 III: 5).

The word indu dewi, meaning 'moon-goddess', is not so used in the Nāgarakrātāgama. However, from the Waringin Pitu inscription of 1447,¹ which was discovered in 1938 (Stutterheim 1938: 117-119), it appears that this word occurred at the end of names of princesses just like dewi 'goddess' or īswari 'mistress'. This charter was issued by

¹ There is some confusion about the date of the Waringin Pitu charter, caused by a misprint in Stutterheim's first announcement of the discovery of the inscription. In the fragment of the text published by him on that occasion the date is given as 1368 Śaka, which corresponds with A.D. 1446 (Stutterheim 1938: 117). The correct date, however, is 1369 Śaka (i.e. A.D. 1447) as he himself mentions a few pages further on (Stutterheim 1938: 127) and is confirmed by Damais (1952: 80-81). Yamin, in his edition of the inscription, gives 1368/1447 as its date, which is a contamination (Yamin 1962).

Schrieke was misled by this misprint and tried to give an explanation of why king Kṛtawijaya issued this charter in 1368 while his predecessor, Queen Suhitā, died in 1369 according to the Pararaton (Schrieke 1957: 54; Par. 31, 35 - 32, 1). This attempt of Schrieke's is superfluous. On the contrary, the date of the charter is quite in accordance with the Pararaton data concerned: Kṛtawijaya must have issued this charter in the year of the death of his sister and predecessor Queen Suhitā and shortly after he had succeeded her as king.