

## THE TAMIL PILLAR INSCRIPTION FROM MANKANAY

The epigraph from Mānkanāy, a village located about eight miles to the north of the town of Trincomalee, was discovered in 1956 by employees of the Archaeological Department, Colombo, and subsequently deposited in the Archaeological Museum at Anuradhapura. The text of the inscription was deciphered, edited and published by K. Kanapathipillai in 1962 on the basis of an estampage given to him.<sup>1</sup>

The inscription is engraved on two sides of the pillar in Tamil script interspersed with Grantha characters. The names Jayabahu and Gajabahu are written entirely in Grantha while the name Mānāparaṇa is written in Tamil characters. It is interesting to find that Grantha characters have been avoided in engraving the letters of the expression *tēvar*.

On each side there are 22 lines of writing and the letters are indited between neatly engraved horizontal lines which are 2 inches apart from each other. The broader face of the pillar is 11.5 inches and the narrower one is 7.5 inches in width.

The epigraph which, is dated in the 43rd regnal year of Jayabāhu, is of unusual interest and significance. It throws light on the activities of two princes, Gajabāhu and Mānābharāṇa, and on some events in the island just before the accession of Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186) to the throne of Polonnaruwa. It records a land grant made to a Buddhist temple called Veyka Vihāram and provides some insights on the procedures relating to land grants. Some of the terms and concepts recorded therein are significant as providing some indication of inter-cultural communications and social interaction as found in some parts of the island during the twelfth century. Although the inscription has run into two editions at the hands of specialists in epigraphy its contents have been understood imperfectly until now.

The purpose for which this inscription was set up could not be ascertained as the crucial expressions which provide a key to an understanding of its contents could not be deciphered correctly. Incorrect readings of vital portions of the text have led to fundamental misconceptions and wrong interpretations. Commenting on this inscription K. Kanapathipillai observes:

"Though the inscription was given by Gajabāhu, it is known from the second part of the inscription that it was inscribed on stone by Mānābharāṇa alias Virabāhu 1196 A.D. who was ruling the southern country."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>. K. Kanapathi Pillai, "Mankanai Inscription of Gajabahu II", *University of Ceylon Review* (UCR), vol. XX, No. 1 (April, 1962) ed. P.E.E. Fernando, W.J.F. LaBrooy, K.W. Goonewardena (155 pages), p. 12 - 14.

<sup>2</sup>. *ibid.*

"The object of the record is to register the donation for life of certain paddy lands to one Mintan Koṟṟan, the Overseer of the palanquin bearers of the palace."<sup>3</sup>

That the assumptions underlying these observations are false would become evident here later. Kanapathipillai's reading of the text is faulty in four cases. His decipherment of the expressions in lines 20-21 as *veyka vēratāna paritta* is wrong and his unsuccessful attempt here has led him to entertain untenable notions about the purpose for which the inscription was set up. The last letters of the last word in the last line of the text on face A of the pillar have not been recognized by him and so he decipheres the word as *ittarulina*. However, on close examination, one is able to recognize the traces of two letters after *na*. The expression concerned could be clearly deciphered as *ittarular*. The expressions in lines 16-19 of face B have eluded him. In the text as deciphered by him they are constructed wrongly so as to read: *Ce (yalenru)*. These have to be revised as *Ceytavarkaḷ narakil* and such a reading, apart from being supported by the engravings on the stone, enables one to comprehend the text in its proper setting. Finally, Kanapathipillai made a mistake in deciphering the last word of the text as *cūḷaravu*. As a matter of fact, the second letter of this expression which he has recognized as *lu* is altogether a different one. It is *la*. The revised and correct reading of the expression concerned is *Cūḷaravu*.

Inevitably his translation of the text, as will be seen later, is wrong and misleading in some important respects. For instance, he refers to 'the Vihāra of Gajabāhudēva which is situated on the main road' in the last sentence of the first paragraph of his translation.<sup>4</sup> The *vihāram* referred to in the epigraph was certainly not named after Gajabāhu, although he was its benefactor.

2. Twenty two years ago the present author made a contribution on this inscription, examining in some length the significance of its contents.<sup>5</sup> The ruler Mānābharana referred to in this inscription was identified as Mānābharana II, the son of Siri Vallabha of Rohana and a cousin of both Parākramabāhu I and Gajabāhu.

No attempt was made at that stage to revise the text as deciphered by Kanapathipillai as facilities for scrutinizing the extampage of the inscription were not readily available. I was then persuaded to take up the position that the record is spurious because of the fact that Mintan Koṟṟan is described in the first person and on account of the misunderstanding initially created by the editor of the inscription that it records

<sup>3</sup>. *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup>. *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup>. S. Pathmanathan, "The Tamil Inscription from Mankanai", *Pavalār Thuriappapillai Nootandu Vizha Malar*, Tellippalai (1972) pt. II, p. 81-88.

a land-grant made to Mintan Korṅan.<sup>6</sup> A re-examination of this inscription on the basis of experience gained over the years on studies on Tamil epigraphy has stimulated fresh thinking, and it has become obligatory on my part to reformulate my views on grounds of academic necessity and on the basis of revisions of the text deciphered and published by two editors.

3. S. Paranavitana's edition of this inscription appeared subsequently in an issue of the *Epigraphia Zeylanica* published in 1973.<sup>7</sup> Commenting on the need for a re-edition of the document, he says:

"While the learned Professor has made a distinct contribution towards the interpretation of the document, its historical significance has not been adequately elucidated by him. There are also some places in which Prof. K. Kanapathipillai's text admits of improvement. The document is therefore re-edited for the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*."

To what extent S. Paranavitana accomplished the task he has set upon himself in this respect may be investigated here, as it is a matter of great academic concern. The expressions in lines 19-20 which were erroneously deciphered as *vērattāna paritta* by Kanapathipillai have been revised as *vērattāna varāḱku* by Paranavitana. Besides, as usual he proceeds to provide explanations of the etymology of *vērattāna*. As an expression *varakku* has no meaning or significance, Paranavitana has obviously faltered here where Kanapathipillai has failed. The revisions in the reading made by him were not of such a character as to enable him or anybody else to comprehend correctly the contents of the inscription. In this respect Paranavitana could not move his readers from the position in which they had been left by Kanapathipillai ten years earlier.

Paranavitana correctly points out that the first editor has failed to recognize the traces of a letter after *na* in the last word of the text as found on face A of the pillar, and in the version of the text as revised by him the expression reads *ittaruliṇān*. However, it may be observed here that there is no trace at all of the letter *ṇ* (𑌕) in the inscription. The last letter as found in this face of the stone is *r* and not *ṇ* and therefore the expression, as stated earlier, has to be deciphered as *ittarulinār*, the expression being a finite verb ending with the honorific third person singular termination *ār* and referring to the act of *bhūmi tānam* performed by the ruler Gajabāhu.

Paranavitana's attempt to revise the first two lines of face B of the pillar has proved to be a fiasco. In his revised version they read: *i vittī arivu pukku*. Such a reading is not supported by the letters on the stone. The word *nirupati* is quite clear in

<sup>6</sup> *ibid*, p. 84.

<sup>7</sup> S. Paranavitana, "A Tamil Pillar-Inscription from Mankanai", *Epigraphica Zeylanica* (EZ), vol. VI, pt. 1, no. 2, p. 7-11.

the epigraph. Although the letters on the second line are not so clear Kanapathipillai's decipherment of the expression concerned as *kuṛippukku* has to be sustained until an improvement is found to be feasible.<sup>8</sup>

The revisions effected by Parnavitana in respect of the decipherment of the concluding expressions of the inscription have turned out to be distortions. He has transformed the words *Puttar* and *Vallavaraiyan* which could be recognized without difficulty even by those who are not specialists in epigraphy, into *Pattar* and *Pallavaraiyan*. Thus the revisions made by Parnavitana have turned out to be distortions. The translation of a distorted version could be very misleading and the impressions formed on the basis of it could be false. His translation reads:

Hail. Prosperity. In the 43rd year of Apaiya Colamekapanmar alias His Majesty, the Emperor Sri Jayabāhu I am Mintan korran, the Overseer of the palanquin bearers of his Majesty Gajabāhu - (the land) comprised within the four boundaries of this (estate) upto the limits of the lands of the monastery of Veyka, His Majesty, Lord Gajabahu, was pleased to assign (again) as a land grant. This information having come to the knowledge of (His Majesty) Mānābharana was pleased to Vouchsafe the boon of a verbal order (to the effect) that what has been granted by his Majesty Gajabāhu was (indeed a good) deed, and had the land granted by executing a writing on stone (and declaring that) those who cause any impediment to this (grant) (will be) fallen into hell.

The order (has been attested on) oath by Pallavaraiyan.<sup>9</sup>

Besides having failed, like Kanapathipillai, to discern the purpose for which the stone inscription was set up, Parnavitana has misrepresented the ideas conveyed by the concluding portion of the text on account of his own misunderstanding. In attempting to revise and improve the text on the basis of his decipherment he has in fact distorted it and in this instance his performance does not measure up to his claims and reputation.

Parnavitana's only concern in the elucidation of the historical significance of the inscription is the identification of Mānābharana and the circumstances leading to his presence in Polonnaruwa. In fact, there is no other single item which has attracted his attention as one requiring elucidation and explanation.

4. Our re-examination of this inscription shows that the key expressions in lines 19-20 of face A. which reveal the purpose for which it was set up, could be correctly

---

<sup>8</sup>. *ibid*, p. 8.

<sup>9</sup>. *ibid*. p. 11.

deciphered as *veyka vēratālvārkku*. These have a significance and meaning. Their direct meaning would be, 'to the ālvār of Veyka Vēram'. That *vēram* is an alternate form of *Vihāram* is known from the inscriptions of Rājarājap-perumpalli.

Both K. Kanapathipillai and S. Paranavitana read these expressions respectively as *veyka vēratāna paritta* and *veyka vēratāna varākku*. The decipherment of the last word as *paritta* is obviously wrong as the last two letters of it are *kku* and not *tta* as evident from the characters on the stone. Although Paranavitana came closer to a successful decipherment, he could not correctly identify the expressions owing to a lack of imaginative understanding in this respect. What both of them recognized as *vēratāna* is in fact *vēratāḷ*, which is incomplete as an expression. The last letter *l* (𑌮) has been mistakenly identified as *na* (𑌨) as the two letters have a close resemblance, the only difference being that the central stroke in *la* assumes the form of a circle in *na*. What Paranavitana recognized as *varākku* is in fact - *vārkku*. It should be noted here that in medieval Tamil inscriptions the long vowel *a* and the semi-vowel *ra* are represented by identical characters. So - *vārkku* could be wrongly identified as *varākku* particularly when the letters are indited in small characters and very close to one another owing to the inadequacy of space, as it is obviously in this case.

So *vēratāḷ* and *vārkku* put together reads *vēratālvārkku*, which is formed with the addition of the dative case termination *ku* to the nominative form *vēratālvār*.

In the light of the proper decipherment of the expressions concerned the portion of the text as found in lines 18-22 on face A of the Pillar, as found in the published versions, may be reconstructed as follows:

*Gajabāhu tēvar Veyka Vēratālvārkku bhūmitānam ittaruḷinār*

"Gajabāhu tevar made a land grant to the Ālvār of Veyka Vihāram."

It is thus clear that the inscription was set up to proclaim a land-grant made by Gajabāhu tēvar to a *Vihāram* and not the grant of maintenance lands to Mintan Korran, as claimed by K. Kanapathipillai and S. Paranavitana.

5. There are of course references in the inscription to two grants made by Gajabāhu tēvar, one to Mintan Korran and the other to the Ālvār of Veyka Vēram. What is significant is that these grants were not made simultaneously. They were made on different occasions and the second grant, the one made to the *Vihāram*, had the effect of annulling the one made earlier.

Mintan Korran, who is described in the epigraph as 'the superintendent of the palanquin bearers attached to the palace of Gajabāhu', was apparently a functionary of the royal court and in that capacity was a dignitary of considerable influence. According to customs prevailing in the country, those who performed services at the court and assisted the king in sustaining the framework of administration were supported with land

The epigraph under consideration highlights certain matters relating to procedures concerning the land-grant and the circumstances under which it was set up. As it is dated is the 43rd year of Gajabāhu it is clear that it was indited shortly before the coronation of Parākramabāhu I at Polonnaruwa around 1153. Mānābharāṇa was in control of the kingdom of Polonnaruwa for a while before this event and subsequent to the death of Gajabāhu.

As suggested by the text of the Māṅkauāy inscription the instructions pertaining to the land-grant made to the Veyka Vihāram were issued by Gajabāhu but the formal procedures regarding its execution were not completed during his lifetime. These were brought to the notice of Mānābharāṇa when he was in occupation of Rajarata after the death of Gajabāhu. Mānābharāṇa confirmed the grant and issued an order to the effect that the notification concerning the grant should be proclaimed in the form of a stone inscription (*Cilālekam*). In pursuance of that order Mintan Korran set up the stone inscription. In respect of the land-grant and its execution the epigraph from Māṅkanāy is reminiscent of the Leyden Plates of the Cōla kings, although they are by no means comparable in scale.

8. The identification of the rulers referred to in this inscription does not pose serious problems. Jayabāhu tēvar, described as *Apaiya Calāmekupanmar* and *Cakkaravarttikal*, was the younger brother and successor of Vijayabāhu I (1055 - 1110). Gajabāhu tēvar was a grandson of Vijayabāhu, being a son of Vikramabāhu and Sundarī, a Kalinga princess. The inscription refers to a third ruler - Mānābharāṇa, who issued an order confirming the grant made by Gajabāhu with the instruction that it should be proclaimed by means of a stone inscription.

In the twelfth century there were two princes in the island who had the name Manabharāṇa; one of them was a nephew of Vijayabāhu I. This prince, who was the eldest son of Mittā, the younger sister of Vijayabāhu I, was consecrated as *Yuvārāja*, heir-apparent, on the consecration of his uncle Jayabāhu as king around A.D. 1110. By this arrangement the claims of Vikramabāhu, the son of the previous king, were overlooked.<sup>11</sup>

Mānābharāṇa, however, was defeated by Vikramabāhu who secured control over *Rajarata*, 'the kings' country', comprising the northern parts of the kingdom. King Jayabāhu lost authority in Polonnaruwa and elsewhere. Vikramabāhu could not subdue the remaining portions of the kingdom. His cousins, Mānābharāṇa and his brothers, occupied them and divided their territories among them. Mānābharāṇa assumed control over *Dakkhinadesa*, corresponding to the Western and North Western parts of the island, while Rohana in the South and South-east was divided between his younger brothers, Kittī Siri Megha and Siri Villabha. The eldest of the brothers may be referred to as Manabharāṇa I to distinguish him from his nephew, Mānābharāṇa, the son of Siri Vallabha.

The suggestion made by the first editor of this inscription that the Mānābharāṇa referred to therein was the ruler of Māyarata is untenable. The inscription is dated in the 43rd year of Jayabāhu, which corresponds to A.D. 1153, whereas Mānābharāṇa I had died

<sup>11</sup>. *The Cūlavamsa* trans. in to German by Wilhelm Geiger and from German into English by C. Mabel Rickmers (Duff), Colombo (1953) lxi. 4, lxii. 4.

before Gajabāhu became ruler of Polonnaruwa around A.D. 1132. The prince referred to in the inscription was evidently Mānābharana II, the cousin and contemporary of Gajabāhu II and Parākramabāhu I.

Mānābharana II was deeply involved in the struggle between Parākramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II for the control of Rajarata. He had considerable support and sympathy among the inhabitants of the northern principality, to whom he appeared as the only source of support against the armies of Parākramabāhu which they seem to have disliked. Mānābharana led his armies into Rajarata on two occasions. On both occasions his success was conspicuous but shortlived. Although he displayed commendable skill as a military leader he was vacillating and irresolute and on account of such weaknesses he failed to consolidate his position in spite of the advantages gained in war.

On the first occasion, he advanced into Rajarata when Gajabāhu was imprisoned by the armies of Parākramabāhu which had overrun that principality. Manabharana dislodged those armies from Polonnaruwa and freed Gajabahu from captivity. Yet, he was not inclined to restore Gajabahu in power. He had the members of his family and his courtiers taken to Polonnaruwa from Rohana and took charge of the government there. Later, he was compelled to withdraw into his principality after military reverses.

Still later, when Gajabāhu died at Kantaḷāy, where he had taken up residence during the later part of his career, the functionaries of his court moved out to Kōṭṭiyāram from where they invited Mānābharana to come over and take charge of the government. In response to that appeal Mānābharana advanced into Rajarata and overwhelmingly defeated the armies of his rival cousin. The forces of Parākramabāhu had to temporarily abandon most of Rajarata.<sup>12</sup>

It was under such circumstances and around the year A.D. 1153 that the epigraph at Mānkanāy was set up. The contents of this record suggest that besides being engaged in warfare, Mānābharana had concerned himself with some matters pertaining to administration. It would appear that he had summoned to his presence court functionaries on some occasions and directed their affairs. Mintan Korran was obviously one such dignitary who was also probably associated with a group of functionaries who had invited Mānābharana on the demise of Gajabāhu. Such an impression gains support from the description of events leading to Manabharana's advance into Rajarata, as found in the *Cūlavamsa*.<sup>13</sup>

It may also be suggested that Mānābharana took up residence at the 'palace' at

<sup>12</sup>. The account of Mānābharana as found here is extracted from the present author's earlier paper, "The Tamil Inscription from Mankanai", Pavalur Thuraiappapillai Nootandu Vizha Malar, p. 81-80.

<sup>13</sup>. CV. lxx. 251-268.

Kantalāy where Gajabāhu had previously resided.<sup>14</sup>

9. The expressions *Perumāḷ*, *Ālvār* and *Vallavaraiyan* occurring in this inscription require some explanation and elucidation. The word *Perumāḷ* had many different connotations. As an epithet it was applied to persons of eminence. Sometimes, it was the component of an epithet of some principal dignitaries in the kingdom as it was in the case of *Tanininru Venra perumāḷ* and *Teyvaccilaip perumāḷ*, epithets of Ārya Cakravarttis serving under the Pāṇḍya king Māravarman Kulasekhara (1268-1310).<sup>15</sup>

The Cera kings had the title *Perumāḷ* and in this respect it was analogous to *Valavan* and *Ceḷian* generally applied to the Cōla and Pāṇḍya kings respectively. In the Hindu religious tradition it was applied to God and more specifically to Maha Visnu. Vaisnava temples are often referred to as *Perumāḷ Kōyil* even now.<sup>16</sup> In the Māṅkaṇay epigraph the word *Perumāḷ* is applied to Gajabāhu *tevar* as a royal epithet and in the sense of prince or ruler. It would appear that this inscription is the oldest among extant records in the island containing a reference to *Perumāḷ* being applied as a royal epithet.

The reference to the *Ālvār* of Veyka Vihāram is of particular significance. The *Ālvār* of Veyka Vihāram is obviously a representation of the Buddha in some form. It is interesting to find here an instance where a word generally applied to denote concepts in the Hindu tradition is applied to Buddhist concepts.

The twelve principal leaders of the movement of devotional theism in South Indian Vaiṣṇavism are generally referred to as Alvar. According to an authoritative opinion, the original correct form was *Ālvār* derived from the root *āl*, 'to rule'. It is argued convincingly that on account of the confusion between *la* and *la*, as suggested by numerous examples from epigraphy, alvar became established in course of time as the accepted literary form. Such an explanation is supported by the use of such terms as *Āṅṅāḷ* and *Ālavantān* in connection with some of the leading exponents of South Indian Vaiṣṇavism. These expressions are

<sup>14</sup>. *The Culavamsa* states:

*Gangataṭākam Agantvā Gajabāhu mahīpati rājadhānim Karivāma Nivasi so tahim sukham.*

"The ruler Gajabāhu betook himself to Gangataṭāka, made it his residence and dwelt there happily'. CV. lxx. 1, 6-7; 9, 72

<sup>15</sup>. An inscription from Tiruppullāṇi in Ramnad refers to a person called Aḷakan Āriyaccakkaravartti who had the epithet *Teyvaccilaip-perumāḷ* whereas one of the epigraphs from Sṛī Rāngam testifies that the Āriyaccakkaravartti called Matitunkan had the epithet *Tani ninru venra perumāḷ*. S. Pathmanathan, *The Kingdom of Jaffna*, pt. I Colombo. (1978) p. 175-176.

<sup>16</sup>. *Tamil Lexicon*, vol. V, Madras (1932) p. 2882.



undoubtedly derived from the root  $\tilde{a}l$ .<sup>17</sup>

The principal connotations of the word  $\tilde{a}lv\tilde{a}r$  were God, gods, supreme devotees, religious teachers and persons of great eminence.<sup>18</sup> As a term of description it could be applied to those who attracted and brought under their sway and influence men and women through their charismatic qualities. The word  $\tilde{a}lv\tilde{a}r$  is derived from the root  $\tilde{a}l$  and formed by the addition of a termination indicating third person honorific singular of the common gender. Its singular masculine and feminine forms are respectively  $\tilde{a}lv\tilde{a}r$  and  $\tilde{a}n\tilde{a}l$ . In our inscription the word *alvar* is applied as an epithet of the Buddha to signify his pre-eminence as a religious teacher.

*Vallvaraiyan Cularavu* occurs as the last sentence in the inscription. It is preceded by the expressions *puttarāññai*. These taken together translate:

The Oath (sworn) in the name of the Buddha  
The Oath (sworn) in the name of *Vallvaraiyan*.

*Vallvaraiyan* is a compound expression formed by combining the words *Vallavar* and *aiyan* meaning 'Lord' among several other things. The fact that an oath is sworn in the name of *Vallvar* provides the indication that he was considered as one worthy of worship and veneration as in the case of the Buddha in whose name also the oath is sworn. *Vallavar* is the Tamil form of *Vallabha*, one of the epithets of *Ganeśa*.<sup>19</sup> In the invocations addressed to *Ganeśa* he is also called *Vallabha* and in the manuals on Hindu iconography *Vallabha* is said to be one of the thirty-two forms of *Vināyaka*. As *Ganeśa* was known as *Vallavar* his consort was called *Vallavai*.<sup>20</sup> The tradition of incorporating the names of Hindu gods and concepts along with the *triratna* in the concluding imprecatory portions of inscriptions issued by court officials appears to have had its precedents in the practices of the Polonnaruwa period.

<sup>17</sup>. These views are based on the opinion expressed by Irakava Aiyankar, a reputed Vaisnava Tamil Scholar. See *Kalaikalañciyam* - I, Tamil *Valarccik Kalakam*, Chennai (1954) p. 75.

<sup>18</sup>. *ibid.*

<sup>19</sup>. *Tamil Lexicon*, vol. V. Madras (1932) p. 2882.

<sup>20</sup>. One of the introductory stanzas in the *Taksina Kailāca Purānam* contains a description of *Ganapati*. He is said to be having his consort *Vallavai* on his side. *Vallavai* is the feminine form of *Vallavar*. The relevant expressions in the text runs: *orupal vallavaiyun taritta cōdik kaimukanai maṇavāren itayam*.

*Taksina Kailāca purānam* ed. K. Civacitampara Aiyar Madras (1887) *payiram*, v. 5, p. 2.

Text of Inscription

Face A	Face B
1. ஸ்வஸ்தி ஸ்ரீ அ	1. நிருபதி
2. பைய சலாமே	2. தன் குறிப்பு
3. க பண்மரான ச	3. க்கு மாணா
4. க்கர வர்த்திக	4. பரண தே
5. ஸ் ஸ்ரீ ஐய ஷாஹு	5. வர் ஸ்ரீ ஐயா
6. தேவற்கு யாணன்	6. ஹு தேவர்
7. ௫ 43 ஆவது தி	7. செய்தது செ
8. ருப்பள்ளிச் சிவி	8. யவென்று
9. கையரில் கண்கா	9. அருளி திருமு
10. ணி மிந்தன் கொ	10. கம் வரக்கா
11. ற்றணைன் ஸ்ரீ ஐயா	11. ட்டிச் சிலா
12. ஹு தேவர் எனக்கு ஶீ	12. லைகஞ் செ
13. விதமாக இட்ட இ	13. ய்து குரு
14. த் தெல் வெசாரும்	14. த்து இது
15. கிரது நரது வெ	15. க்கு ஒரு வி
16. சாரும் இதில் நாற்	16. க்கஞ் செய்
17. பால் எல்லை பெ	17. தவர்கள் நர
18. ருமான் ஸ்ரீ ஐயா	18. கில் புத்தரா
19. ஹு தேவர் வெய்	19. ஞ்ஞை. வ
20. க வேரத்தாள்வார்	20. ல்லவ ரை
21. க்கு ஷாஹி தானம	21. யன் சூழ
22. ஈக இட்டருவினார்	22. றவு

## Transliteration of the text

Face A	Face B
1. Svasti Sṛī A	1. Nirupati
2. paiya calamē	2. tan kurippu
3. ka panmarāna ca	3. kku Mānā
4. kkara varttika	4. parana tē
5.   Sṛī Jayabāhu	5. Var Gajabā
6. tevarku yan	6. hu tēvar
7. tu 43 āvatu ti	7. Ceytatu Ce
8. ruppallīc civi	8. yalenru
9. kaiyāriḷ kankā	9. aruḷi tirumu
10. ni Mintan ko	10. kam varakka
11. rranen Gajabā	11. ttic cilā
12. hu tēvar enakkujī	12. lēkañ Ce
13. Vitamāka itta i	13. ytu kuṭu
14. t Tel Vēcārūm	14. ttu itu
15. kiratu naratu Vē	15. kku oru Vi
16. Carum itil nār	16. kkañ Cey
17. pāl ellai pe	17. tavarkaḷ nara
18. rumāḷ Gajabā	18. kil, Puttara
19. hu tēvar Vey	19. ṇṇai. Va
20. ka Vērattālvār	20. llava rai
21. kku bhūmi tānam	21. yan Cula
22. āka ittaruḷinār.	22. ravu.

## Translation

Hail Prosperity. In the 43rd year of Apaiya Calāmēka Varmar Cakkaravarttikaḷ Sṛī Jayabāhu tēvar.

Perumāḷ Gajabāhu tēvar gave as a land grant to the Ālvār of Veyka Vihāram, the fields called Tel Vēcar and Kiratu-Narātu Vēcar which were previously given to me, Mintan Korran, the Superintendent of Palanquin bearers attached to the palace, as maintenance land, and the lands adjacent to their four boundaries.

In respect of this king's order (recorded) in the entry, Mānāparana tēvar sent (us) a royal order proclaiming that it was an act of Gajabāhu tēvar. On the receipt of that order this inscription has been set up. Those who cause impediments to this grant shall be in hell.

This Oath is sworn in the name of the Buddha. The Oath is sworn in the name of Lord Vallavar (Ganapati).