

Land donation by Viṭrāju, muṭlu of Maṅgiyuvarāja

Jens Thomas

Author of digital edition: Jens Thomas

Contributor: Jens Thomas

Identifier: DHARMA_INSTelugu00101

Repository: Telugu Inscriptions (tfb-telugu-epigraphy)

File path: texts/DHARMA_INSTelugu00101.xml

Languages: Sanskrit [Script (unspecified)], Telugu [Script (unspecified)]

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

Palaeographic description

The inscription is written from the bottom to the top. The *anusvāra* is placed on top of the *aṣṣara* that it is pronounced before, e. g. lines 3 and 8 <ṁbu> (written as if denoting <bum>). This is a feature that can be observed in several early Telugu inscriptions. The head of the *aṣṣaras* is often, but not always, written in an ornate manner in form of a little circle. There *may* be one *halanta* in line 11 (<N>), written very small and without a "head".

Edition

<Face A> <1> svasti śrī magidogarajula muṭlu<2> viṭrajula pratama-rā<3>jyambuna
kaḍu(mallu)<4>la Iccina reṇḍu vaṭi<5> miriyampu bōḷa<6>jakkuṛēgari pa<7>ḍaśina
reṇḍu vaṭṭi<8> padēndumbu Āḍlu pa<9>ṭṭu druggādēvi nēlayu<10> Uṛuvuṭuri
bōḷa<11> reṇḍuṭṭiyu tūrpuN<Face B> <12> I reṇḍ[ū](t)i lacuvaru<13> kaḷarēni

bāranāsi<14> vēgavilāḷu vē<gu>ḍlu<15>mu vēṣeruvuḷu<16> vēvuru parānu<17>
campinavanṛ agu<18>

1. Anuṣṭubh

<19> yaṣ!<s>ya yaṣ!<s>ya ya<20>ṭ!<d>ā bhūmi<s>
taṣ!<s>ya {(śa)}<21> taṣ!<s>ya taṭh!<d>ā ṣ!<ph>a(la)[m]

2. Anuṣṭubh

<22> svadat(ā) pa(ra)da<23>tā va
yō [ha](r)[ē](t)[i]<24> {ṣa} vaśundara (ṣṭhi)

Apparatus

<1> magidogarajula • Prabhākaraśāstri states in note no. 1 that it should be *maṁgi*. —
<1> muṭḷu ◇ *muḍḷu* PS • Prabhākaraśāstri remarks in note no. 2 that also *muṭḷu* could
be read. As far as I can say from the picture published in Prabhākaraśāstri's edition the
akṣara resembles <ṭ> in line 4. Other instances of the word in question show <ṭ>.

<3> kaḍu(mallu)<4>la ◇ *kaḍuvam(ḍlu)<4>la* PS • Prabhākaraśāstri notes that <du>
could be read as well, and that the reading of <ḍlu> is uncertain and also could be
<jlu> (notes nos. 3-4). The *akṣara* in question indeed looks like <jlu>. As far as I can
say from my bad scan the *akṣara* that was read as <va> by Prabhākara Śāstri could
also be <ma>. The following *akṣara* could be <lla> as spelled in the Zulakallu plates of
Vijayāditya I (line 17) (Gai 1965–1966), i. e. with the right upward line of the superscript
<l> drawn downwards on the left side ending into subscript <l>. The single <la> is
written in its fuller form in line 4 of our Telugu inscription but also occurs in a slightly
more advanced form in line 14.

<4> reṇḍu ◇ *reṇḍu* PS.

<6> jakkurēgari ◇ *jaku reṁgari* PS • Prabhākaraśāstri says in note no. 5 that it could
also be <kku> instead of <ku>. *Jakkurē-* seems to me to be one word consisting of two
elements in which the *anusvāra* would be superfluous (see commentary). However, a dot
can be seen on top of the *akṣara* <ga> that may be a damage on the stone though. — <6>
pa<7>ḍaśina ◇ *pe<7>ḍaśina* PS • According to Prabhākaraśāstri the spelling should be
<pa> (note no. 6); the respective verb would be *paḍayu*. The line that Prabhākaraśāstri
read as the vowel sign <°e> starts on the left side from the middle of the *akṣara* <pa>.
That would be very unusual because this vowel is normally written on the upper left
line of the *akṣara*. The alleged vowel sign may therefore be simply a damage on the
stone.

<8> Āḍlu • Prabhākaraśāstri notes (no. 7) that on the left upper side of the *akṣara* <Ā> a line like the vowel sign <°e> is visible. This seems to me to be a mere damage on the stone.

<11> reṇḍūṭṭiyu ◇ *reṇḍuṭṭiyu* PS • In Prabhākaraśāstri's edition *reṇṭuṭṭiyu* is printed but that seems to be a mere misprint. The vowel sign is written to the left side and has a hook on top drooping towards the left. Therefore, the vowel seems to be long /u:/ seems to be written. The form appears to be a contraction of /uva/ to /u:/ of the already mentioned *reṇḍuvaṭṭi* (i. e. *reṇḍuvaṭṭi* > *reṇḍūṭṭi*) — <11> tūrpuN ◇ *tūrpu* PS • There seems to be a very faint *halanta* <N> written at the end of the line. It is written very small and without a "head". This consonant forms a locative, hence "in the east".

<12> I reṇḍ[ū](ṭ)i ◇ *ī reṇḍuṭṭi* PS • The *akṣara* <I> looks like <I> in line 4. The intended meaning, however, must be "this" (ī). Prabhākaraśāstri had the original and the original estampage at his disposal wherefore his reading may be correct. However, I cannot see any vowel sign on <ṇḍ> and it seems that the vowel simply was forgotten. On the other hand, the lower part of <ṭi> seems to be damaged on the scan available to me so that it is also possible that the vowel sign of <ṇḍ> may have been lost due to damage. I supplied a long <°ū> due to the reading *reṇḍūṭṭi* in line 11. — <12> ḷacuvāru • Prabhākaraśāstri notes (note no. 8) that the form should be *ḷaccu*.

<14> vē<gu>ḍlu<15>mu • Prabhākaraśāstri edits the text as it is written but states that it should be *vēguḍlu* (note 9).

<16> paṛānu • Prabhākaraśāstri states in note no. 10 that it should be written *pāranu*.

<17> campinavanṛ agu ◇ *campinacannarṅgu* PS • According to Prabhākaraśāstri (note no. 11) the reading is unclear and also *canvaṃ* and *candhaṃ* are possible according to him (his alternative readings are very blurred in the bad scan at my disposal). The *akṣara* <va> is written in a little bit more elongated form than in e. g. line 14. The scribe forgot to write the horizontal line inside the *akṣara* <ra> so that it is an empty oval and thus resembles a <dha> or <va>. The reading *vanṛ agu* is what to be expected as can be seen from other inscriptions.

<19> yaḥś!<s>ya yaḥś!<s>ya ya<20>ṭ!<d>ā bhūmi<s> taḥś!<s>ya {(śa)}<21> taḥś!<s>ya taḥṭ!<d>ā ṭp!<ph>a(la)[rṇ] ◇ *yaśya yaśya ya<20>tā bhūmi taśyaśya<21> taśya tadhā palam* PS • The scan of Prabhākaraśāstri's article at my disposal is of a bad quality. On the picture I can see a shade of what could be interpreted as a <śa> but I can not see traces of subscript <°ya> in line 20. However, Prabhākaraśāstri may be right that the *akṣara* <śa> or <śya> was written twice by mistake. These two *pādas* normally are *pāda* 3 and 4 of a standard imprecation *śloka*. See commentary.

Translation

Whosoever owns the land at any time will have the profit (of it). Who takes land away, whether given by himself or by another (person).³

Translation by Prabhākaraśāstri 1928

[illegible]

⁴Prabhākaraśāstri does not give a translation proper but rather a paraphrase in the form of an annotated translation. He later discusses each word separately and extensively. This annotated translation, however, is very valuable and briefly shows his interpretation of the inscription.

□□□□□□□□□□, □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□. '□□□□ □□□□ □□□□
□□□□', □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□.

[‘While Mangiyuvarāju, ruler of the eastern Calukyas, was exerting (his) rule, during the rule of Viṭṭaraju, being either a small ruler under him (i. e. Mangiyuvarāju), a head of a district (*maṅgalādhīpa*-), or an official’, a person called Rēṅgarī acquired⁵ for the sake of the person called Mariyāṁpu Bōḷaja in a village called Kaḍavarīṇḍlula land of two *paṭṭis*⁶ that contain (□□□□□□□□□□) grains of millet of fifteen *tūmu*. To the east of that land the signs of the border (are) the land of the goddess Durgā and the (land) of Uṇuvuṭūri Bōḷa of two *paṭṭis*. If someone spoils this land of two *paṭṭis* he will experience (□□□□□□□□□□) the sins of having killed thousand cows⁷ thousand temples, thousand tanks and thousand brahmins in Vārāṇasī. That seems to me to be the meaning of the inscription. The *śloka* ‘*yasya yasya yadā bhūmir*’ etc. that is common to all inscriptions is at the end. (translation by Jens Christian Thomas)]

Translation by Sastri 1969

Hail! In the first year of the reign of Viṭṭarajulu, officer of Magi Dogarajulu, Rēṅgarī having obtained two *paṭṭis* of land sowable with fifteen *tūmus* of paddy in the village of Kaḍavarīṇḍlu, granted (it) to Miriyāṁpu bōḷaja. The land belonging to Durgādēvi, and the two *paṭṭis* of land of Uṇuvuṭūri bōḷa (i.e. the bōḷa of Uṇuvuṭūru) are (the boundaries) on the east. If there are any who obstruct (the grant of) these two *paṭṭis* (*paṭṭi* ?) (they will suffer) in the manner (of those) who killed a thousand cows, destroyed a thousand temples, and a thousand tanks, and killed a thousand brahmins in Bārāṇasī.⁸

Commentary

<1-18> I have to stress that my own reading is based on the picture in Prabhākaraśāstri’s edition. I only had access to a bad scan. That is why my reading might be faulty in

⁵Prabhākaraśāstri does not paraphrase the verb *paḍayau*. As far as I know the semantics of *paḍayau* only cover “to take, obtain, possess” etc. but not the opposite. That means that, in the context of Prabhākaraśāstri’s translation, Rēṅgarī “took” the land for the donée.

⁶Prabhākaraśāstri states that the meaning of *reṇḍuṇḍuṇḍu* (being a *dvigu*) is unclear but that the following ideas could match: it could denote a landscape, a donation, a land size, or a specific type of land. Prabhākaraśāstri uses “land of two *paṭṭis*” without changing the term much or paraphrasing it (???). That is why I kept it untranslated in the translation of Prabhākaraśāstri’s text.

⁷The Telugu text has two words here, the first being that of the inscription and the second an explanation (□□□□□□□□□□)

⁸K. M. Sastri left out the Sanskrit part in both his translation and re-edition of the text.

one or the other place and I apologize if I mistakenly "corrected" Prabhākaraśāstri's edition for the bad.

Prabhākaraśāstri interprets *kaḍuvam(ḍlu)la*, as he reads it, in lines 3-4 as the name of a village in the locative ("□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ [kaḍuvamḍlulagrāmamuna]" (1928, p. 937)). He regards *miriyampu bōḷaja* (with the dative suffix *-ku*) as the donée and *reṁgari* as the donor (1928, pp. 937-937). The semantics of *paḍayu* ("to obtain, possess"), however, are problematic in my opinion. According to my reading *kaḍumallu* is a person's name which means something like "strong wrestler" (*kaḍu* + *mallu*). Prabhākaraśāstri interprets *bōḷaja* as consisting of *bōḷa* and an abbreviated Prakrit form of *ajja* (from *ārya*) (1928, p. 942). However, since double <kku> is written in line 6, which therefore can not be the dative suffix being written with a single <k>, I would rather separate the usual designation *bōḷa* from the actual name that follows. The suffix *-gari* (i. e. *-gāri*) is the genitive of the honorific suffix *-g/vāru*. What remains is *jakkurē-* which consists of *rē-* "ruler" and *jakku* "yakṣa". Hence, *jakkurē-* means "ruler of the yakṣas" = Kubera.

The two words *reṇḍuvaṭi* and *reṇḍuvaṭṭi* seem to refer to the same thing. The spelling *vaṭi* seems to be a haplography of the fuller *vaṭṭi* which, in my opinion, corresponds to Sanskrit *paṭṭi* "a plot of land" (p > v / V(#)_ is a normal sandhi). The contracted form *reṇḍūṭṭi* is unusual. However, similar contractions sometimes occur, e. g. *pandumbu* from *paḍudumbu*.

The spelling *druggādēvi* seems to be a (spontaneous) metathesis of *Durgādēvi* "the goddess Durgā". The retainment of double <gg> rather serves to preserve the phonotactic structure of the word than simply being a remainder of the usual doubling of a consonant after *repha* because the preservation of the original phonotactic structure also seems to be the goal of vowel lengthening and consonant doubling after the usual metathesis in Telugu. Another example involving a loan word is *uramu ~ rommu* "chest, breast" (three morae each). Prabhākaraśāstri gives some more examples (1928, pp. 943-944).

The place name *Uruvuṭuri* (obl.) is identified by Prabhākaraśāstri with the modern village Uruṭūru, near Guḍivāḍa to the north of the Kṛṣṇā river (1928, p. 945).

<19-21> Ad lines 19-21: The *śloka* is not complete. The two *pādas* mentioned here normally form *pādas* c and d of a typical Sanskrit imprecation *śloka* one of several variants of which is: <a> bahubhir vvasudhā dattā bahubhiś cānupālītā <c> yasya yasya yadā bhūmiḥ <d> tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ

<22-24> The next *śloka* is incomplete as well. This time because the last two *pādas* are missing. From the picture as published in the edition it is not possible to say

whether there was more room on top of the stone for the effaced rest of the second *śloka* (because the inscription is written from the bottom to the top), or whether the stone is broken on top. Regarding the overall bad writing of the Sanskrit lines it is also possible that the scribe wanted to write only one single *śloka* but mixed up two *pādas* of different *ślokas* each. The misspelling in line 24 may corroborate this idea since the superfluous first and last *akṣaras* of the line together seem to form the first word of what should be the third *pāda* of this *śloka*: *ṣaṣṭhi* (this spelling, albeit wrong, occurs sometimes in other inscriptions, conf. INSTelugu00018, INSTelugu00027). The standard *śloka* would be: <a> svadattām paradattām vā yo hareta vasundharām<c> ṣaṣṭirvvarṣa-sahasrāṇi<d> viṣṭhāyām jāyate kṛmiḥ

I have edited these two *śloka*-parts as two different defective verses although they metrically form a single *śloka* because they do not form a coherent thought. The superfluous spellings of <ṣa> and <ṣṭhi> indicate that the scribe had the next lines of the second *śloka* at his disposal and seems to have intended to at least fill the line. That is why I think that the Sanskrit imprecation was mistakenly written as it is.

Bibliography

The inscription was edited by V. Prabhākaraśāstri together with a picture, a paraphrased translation and a detailed discussion. The inscription was re-edited by C. Nārāyaṇarāvu who added a short word explanation, by K. M. Sastri who added a translation, and by B. Radha Krishna. The latter three referred to the text as edited by Prabhākaraśāstri.

Primary

[PS] Prabhākaraśāstri, Vēṭūri. 1928. “Prācīnāṁdhraśāsanamulu.” Bh 5 (6), pp. 933–949. Pages 933–949.

Secondary

Nārāyaṇarāvu, Cilukūri. 1937. *Āṁdhrabhāṣacaritramu*. Valtēru: Ānāṁdamudraṇālayamu. Pages 1309–1310.

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 294–295, item 20.

Radhakrishna, Budaraju. 1971. *Early Telugu inscriptions (up to 1100 A.D.): with texts, glossary*

& brief linguistic history. Hyderabad: Andhra Pradesh Sahitya Akademi. Pages 15–16, item 19.