

Author of digital edition: Jens Thomas

Contributor: Jens Thomas

Identifier: DHARMA\_INSTelugu00060

Repository: Telugu Inscriptions (tfb-telugu-epigraphy)

File path: texts/DHARMA\_INSTelugu00060.xml

Language: Telugu [Script (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-09-09 14:31 (ea24452), last modified 2026-09-09 14:25 (oba7051)

---

## Edition

<Face A> <A1> [svasti śrī prithivi-va]<A2>[llava-vijayāditya]<A3>[cōla-rājuḷ  
Iru]<A4>[vā]d[i]r[e]ṇdu ca[m]va<A5>ccarambuḷ pravartta<a6>llaN vāṇarājuḷ  
pā<A7>(bu)ḷigga Ēḷucu palla<A8>vādi<tya?>rājuḷa kūcapō<A9>rayāri tāmbuḷ  
cō<A10>la mahārājuḷa Amma<Face B> <B1> [1+](m)ukha<B2> laḷu(ru) ku-  
capā(ra)ki<B3> natū Icci ttra<B4> rāca(m)[ā]<B5>[na](m)bunaN Ēbhādi  
maṛu<B6>ntuḷu nēla Alaghacinta U<B7>(ttara)m̐bun kaṭṭu ṇṭṭa lya gōtrasya  
p;ā?<e><B8>nbāra<B9> sarmārik iccina (da)ti<Face C> <C1> svadatām<Face D> <D4>  
yā[m]j(ā)<D5>y;ā!<a>t;ō?<ē><D6>krimi[h]

## Apparatus

<5> pravartta<6>llaN • As for the verbal derivation via -alu, -ilu, and -ulu see Krishna-  
murti 1961, pp. 142–145.

## Commentary

The numbering of the faces of the inscription offered by the editors might be wrong. Two reasons can be adduced: 1) When comparing the structure and content with other inscriptions there is too much space on the allegedly lost second face for too less possible information. Furthermore, the end of the imprecation is found on the fourth face with a width of two *akṣaras* per line. If the third face was indeed the third one, the beginning of the imprecation ought to be found on that very face; yet, the twenty lacking syllables (six syllables are lost on the fourth face) would make up almost three

full lines (with seven to eight *akṣaras* per line). On the other hand, the estampage indicates that the narrow faces on both sides of the stone contained two *akṣaras* per line and that, if they followed the writing on the front side, 10 lines are to be expected on the face. Ten lines times two *akṣaras* makes 20 *akṣaras*, the number that we need. Therefore, it is very probable in my opinion that face three is face two and the lost face two is face three that can be fully reconstructed. The reconstruction of this face and of the three missing lines on the first face follows the copy of Colin Mackenzie's manuscript that the editors also used and also printed in their edition. Since certain flaws cannot be unambiguously attributed to either C. Mackenzie or the scribe the supplied text is given in the form it can be expected according to other inscriptions.