Land grant to Arahanta-Bhaṭāraḷu under the rule of Jayasiṁhavallabha

Mallampalli Sōmaśēkhara Śarma

Author of digital edition: Mallampalli Sōmaśēkhara Śarma

Contributor: Jens Thomas

Identifier: DHARMA_INSTelugu00100

Repository: Telugu Inscriptions (tfb-telugu-epigraphy)

File path: texts/DHARMA_INSTelugu00100.xml

Language: Telugu [Script (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-09-09 14:31 (ea24452), last modified 2026-09-09 14:25 (0ba7051)

Palaeographic description

The inscription was published without picture.

Edition

〈1〉 svasti śrī-sakalalōkāśraya-〈2〉śrī-jayasiṁghavallabha-mahā〈3〉rājulāku pravarddhamāna-vi〈4〉[jaya](rā)jya-saṁvatsaraṁbu〈5〉ll eṇbodi Annēṇṭan paḷḷināṇṭi〈6〉 dayāvesanu〈7〉 prithivīdēśa-raṭṭaguḷḷa〈8〉 muṭḷu danyavesanu prithivīdēśa-〈9〉raṭṭaguḷḷuvāriki muṭḷu kalyāṇa-da〈10〉sanula Icciri Arahanta-bhaṭā〈11〉raḷāku Āṟu puṭḷu〈12〉 Āṟḷa paṭṭu sukṣētraṁbu〈13〉 dēni tloṁṟūri raṭṭaguḷḷa Anva〈14〉yaṁbuna-vār evvaraiyumu rakṣimpan uṁna〈15〉 paṁnu vḷāyuṁ dēniki Ahitaṁbu cintiñcu-〈16〉(vāru) pañca-mahā-pātaka-saṁyuttu[...]〈17〉 [1 lost or illegible line]

Apparatus

〈5〉 paḷḷināṇṭi • In Sōmaśēkhara Śarma's Telugu edition the district is spelled *paḷḷināṇṭi*. This is the way double 〈ḷḷ〉 is spelled in modern Telugu wherefore I presume that the inscription really shows 〈ḷḷ〉 since 〈ḷl〉 does not occur in the inscriptions that I could see pictures of. This ought to be the case in all of these instances. Sometimes, however, Sōmaśēkhara Śarma's edition indeed shows 〈ḷḷ〉 (e. g. line 8)

〈6〉 dayāvesanu • In my opinion the latter element of the name is a Prakrit word *vēsa* 'dress, appearance'. The script does not differentiate between long /e:/ and short /e/. As for the ending see the commentary.

〈9〉 kalyāṇa-da〈10〉sanula • The oblique is not warranted since *Icciri* is an inflected verb. Hence, one should emendate into *-lu*.

〈16〉 saṁyuttu[...] • From other inscriptions we can reconstruct the missing part as *°saṁyuttuṉ agu*

〈17〉 [1 lost or illegible line] • It is probable that this line contained the scribe's name with a verb for 'to write'.

Translation

Svasti! In the era[1] of the increasing reign of victory of the Mahārāja Śrī Sakalalōkāśraya Śrī Jayasiṁghavallabha, in the eighth year, Dayāvēsa of Paḷḷināṇḍu, Dhanyavēsa, officer of Pṛthvīdēśa-Raṭṭaguḍi, and Kalyāṇadassana, officer of Pṛthvīdēśa-Raṭṭaguḍi gave to the Lord Arhat good land (with a) "handful" of millet (which is) six *puṭṭis*.[2] As long as anyone of the lineage of the Raṭṭaguḍi(s)[3] of Tloṁṟūru[4] is ready to protect (this grant) the taxe(s)[5] will be removed. Who(ever) contrives evil against it will be (guilty) of the five great sins.

[1] In contrast to the conventional interpretation as a plural I tend to see the ending as Kannaḍism due to the adoption of the fixed formula that follows the Sanskrit phrase ending in *°saṁvatsare*. As for the translation "era" see Sircar 1966, p. 293

[2] As for the phrases denoting the quantity and quality of the land see Jens Thomas (forthcoming).

[3] A honorific plural is widespread in the inscriptions. Here, however, it is not entirely clear whether a specific *Raṭṭaguḍi* is referred to or a family.

[4] The modern form of the village would be Toṇḍūru.

[5] If Sastri is correct the scribe misspelled an intended plural here

Translation by Sastri 1969

Hail! In the eighth year of the increasing victorious reign of the illustrious sakalōkāśraya Jayasiṁghavallabha mahārāja, Dayāvesanu of Paḷḷināṇḍu, Danyavesanu officer of Prithivīdēśa Raṭṭaguḷḷu (and) Kalyāṇa Dasanulu, (another) officer of Prithivīdēśa Raṭṭaguḷḷu gave to Arahanta bhaṭāra fertile excellent land sowable with six *puṭṭis* of paddy. Whoever of the descendants of family [sic!] of Tloṁṟūri Raṭṭaguḷḷu, protects this (gift) will be free from taxes. Those who think of obstructing it will incur the five great sins.

Commentary

The names of the donors are Prakrit names. Regarding *-nu* in *°vēsanu* there are two possibilities: 1. it is a Kannaḍa masculine ending, or 2. it is the conjunctive particle. In the latter case the names would not have an ending which would be exceptional. The respective word seems to be Prakrit *vēsa-* "dress/appearance", e. g. *dayāvēsa-* "whose appearence is compassion". Sōmaśēkhara Śarma suggested that they are Prakrit forms of *vacanu* or *vyasanu*; in this case, however, there would be no ending as well. The donée is *Arahanta-bhaṭāra* which probably refers to a single person with a honorific plural suffix. It could be the Buddha or the Jina. In this context the names of the donors appear to be secondary names, adopted later in a religious connection, or pious names given in a Jaina or Bauddha family. Sōmaśēkhara Śarma states that the part between *evvaraiyumu* and *dēniki* was obscure to him (1946, p. 186). K. M. Sastri refers to this passage in his grammar section regarding the usage of the infinitive with an auxiliary verb that conveys "the idea of futurity". In this connection he translates the passage a little bit differently than in his translation of the whole inscription: "if any of those belonging to the family of raṭṭaguḍis is going to protect this (gift i.e. in the future)" (???). This is the only example of such a construction. Sastri thereby tacitly also explains the form *uṁna* in line 14 as a conditional in *-inan* (hence *unnan*). Sastri's explanation is intriguing. As to my knowledge this construction rather is used in the English sense "going to do, ready to do". Hence, the meaning would be "if anyone is going to protect". It is possible that the connotation was different at the time but it seems to me that in this case the imprecation would indicate that if someone comes into the situation of protecting the grant, then the tax exemption will be put into effect. A similar construction is used to "express readiness" (Arden 1937, p. 230, № 481). The example given is □□□□ □ □□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ [*vāḍu ā pani ceyyanayi unnāḍu*]. *He is ready to do that work* (ibidem); so, the construction entails *ayi + uṇḍu* (lit. "having become be", hence a perfect) and therefore is not completely identical either.

However, we could also assume *uṁna* to be an infinitive as well. The mere infinitive could be used for forming a subclause indicating simultaneity as in the often used phrase *X ēḷan* "while X was ruling". Therefore, *rakṣimpan uṁna might* mean "while/as long as being ready to protect". In this case the tax exemption would temporally coincide with the actual protection. K. M. Sastri notes that the reading *paṁnu vḷāyuṁ* in line 15 "[m]ay be a scribal error for *pannuḷ vāyum*" (1969, p. 288, n. 1). That means that *pannu* "tax" would be in the plural and the respective verb is *pāyu* "to leave, quit". Apart from this good idea subscript ⟨°ḷ⟩ may have been a damage that Sōmaśēkhara Śarma interpreted as part of the *akṣara*. The original must be consulted to clearify this. The grammatical form *pāyun(u)* can be both singular and plural with an inanimate subject.

Bibliography

The inscription was published by Sōmaśēkhara Śarma together with a discussion but without a picture. According to him a picture of the estampage should have been published in one of the upcoming volumes of South Indian Inscriptions. However, I could not verify this and the picture may have never been published. Sōmaśēkhara Śarma states that he encountered the inscription in the enclosure of the taluk's office and that it had not been noted in ARIE at that point (1946, p. 182). The inscription was re-published by K. M. Sastri together with a translation and by B. Radha Krishna. Both do not mention any entry in ARIE.

Primary

[SS] Somasekhara Sarma, Mallampalli. 1946. "Modaṭi jayasiṁhavallabhuni mācerla śilāśāsanamu." Bh 23 (8), pp. 182–186. Pages 182–186.

Secondary

Sastri, Korada Mahadeva. 1969. *Historical grammar of Telugu with special reference to Old Telugu c. 200 B.C. - 1000 A.D.* Anantapur: Sri Venkateswara Univ. Pages 287–288, item 11.

Radhakrishna, Budaraju. 1971. *Early Telugu inscriptions (up to 1100 A.D.): with texts, glossary & brief linguistic history*. Hyderabad: Andhra Pradesh Sahitya Akademi. Page 12, item 15.