

Kopparam plates of Pulakeśin II

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSBadamiCalukya00004

Repository: Bādāmi Cālukya (tfb-badamicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml-provisional/DHARMA_INSBadamiCalukya00004.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-09-09 14:24 (d6495bo), last modified 2026-09-09 14:20 (7bdo4b4)

Edition

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <1> svasti<.> śrīmatām sakala-bhu<va>na-sa(m)st[[u]]<<ū>>yamāna-
mānavya-sagotrāṇā<m> hārīti-putrāṇā<m> sapta-loka-māṭṛbhi<h> sapta-
mā<2>tṛbhi<h> (sa)m(ya)g abhivarddhitānā<m> kārṭikeya-paripālanādhigata-
kalyāṇa-paramparāṇā<m> bhagavan-nārāyaṇa-prasā<3>da-s<ā?<a>mās(ā)d<ā?<i>ta-
varāha-lāñchanekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśī-kṛtāśeṣa-mahībhṛtām anekāśvamedhāv-
abhr<?<th>a-snā<4>na-pavitri-kṛta-vapuṣā<m> calukyānā<m> kulam ab-
hyalāṁkariṣṇo<h> prathita-kī(r)tt[[i]]<<e>><h> śrī-kīrttivarmma-prthiv<il>-vallabha-
ma[hārā]<Page 2r><5>(ja)sya priya-p<au?<u>tra<h> praṇatāneka-mah(i)pati-makuṭa-
taṭa-vilagna-maṇi-makarikā-ghṛṣṭa-pādāravinda-(d)va(ya)<6>sya pratigatārāti-
cakra-vidhva<m>sana-vi<v?<dh>i-viśāradasya deva-dvija-guru-vṛddhāpacāyina<h>
pit<ail?<e><<va>> sūra<h> sa<7>tyāśray<ā?<o>○ <'>pratihatājña<h> śrī-pul(e?)keśi-
p<ri!thiv<il>-vallabha-mahārāj<al?<o> jyathāruha<yathārham> j<sanmānayati!<.>

vidit<i?<a><8>m as(t)u va(la)bha sama(kṣ)āvas<?<th>ite vidhiv<i?<a><<t>>
sa<m>pradattā <marnta kali-kulanām? aneka-saṁgrāma-sāhasa-dakṣeṇa<Page

2v> <9> ni<ś>kṛṣṭa-maṇḍalāgr<ā?<a>-sanāthena sva-bāhunā vipakṣa-maṇḍala<m>
nirjitya sva-sutānvaye pratiṣ<t?<th> āpita-rā<10>jyasya <prithividuvarājam āṇatti!<.>
mūgamūr-vv<a?<ā>stavyāya <chlāṇḍilyāyana-gotrasya Āpasta(mba)<11> -sūtrasya
○ viprasya vedaśarmmaṇa<h> karmma-rāṣṭre Irbuli-grāme Aṣṭa-śa<<ta>><<(m)>>
kṣetraṁ dat<t>arṁ<.> balāka-<b?<p>alva<12>lā<t> pūrvvata<h> karmmakara-
taṭākā<t> paścimata<h> koṇḍa(ce)rupū(r)-pathā<d> dakṣiṇata<h> virparu-pathā<d>
(Uttara)ta<h><.>

<Page 3r> <13> (pravarddhamāna-vi)jaya-rājya-<savasare!<sarṁvatsare> Ekavi<m>śati
kārttika-māse mah(ā-nava)[m]y[ām] (bṛ)<ha>s(p)ati-vāre pra<14>śaste mu○hūrtte
<'>syā datt<i?<e>r ājñapti<h><.>

1. Anuṣṭubh

bhūmi-dānā[[ta[2+]]]t paran dā<na>n
na bhūta<m> na bha<vi>ṣyati
tasyaiva ha(raṇā)(t pā?)<15>pan
na bhūta<m> na bhaviṣyati

2. Anuṣṭubh

bahubir vvasudhā dattā
bahu(bhiś cānu)pālītā
yasya yasya yadā bhūmi<s>
tasya<16> tasya tadā phala<m>

3. Anuṣṭubh

(sva-da)t<t>ā<m> para-dat<t>ā<m> vā
yatnād rakṣa yudhiṣṭhira
mahī<m> mah<i?<i>(bhu)jā<m> śreṣ(ṭha)
(dānā?)(t śr)e<yo nupālanam>

<Page 3v>

Apparatus

<4> -kī(r)tt[[i]]<<e>><h> ◇ -kīrtte<h> EH; -kīrtti<h> LR • Hultsch: “An i is also affixed to the tt of tte” [his reading is rtte, not tte]. The repha is not visible in the scan. There is an i mātrā floating above the top of the character, at the distance expected for a repha. I assume that there was an original repha that is now worn faint, and that an initially engraved rtti (eyeskip for kīrttivarma) was corrected to rtte.

<5> -p_iau?<u>tra<h> EH LR • Hultzsich agrees with LakshmanaRao that *pau*tra must be “a stupid error” for *putra*. Estienne-Monod is more careful: “Ce terme est incohérent car Pulakeśin est le fils de Kīrtivarman.”

<7> -pul(e?)keśi ◇ -pulakeśi EH LR • There is definitely something atop the *l* that looks like a serif in the scanned rubbing, extending symmetrically to a short distance on both sides. The printed facsimile or the original may decide if there really is an *e mātrā* here. — <7> *sanmānayati!* • Hultzsich emends to *sammānayati* which is of course plausible, but I think *san+mānayati* is conceivable if not very nice syntactically. For a parallel, *sanmānitā* also occurs in the Mandsaur inscription of Kumārarman. At the very least, the mistake is probably influenced by the word *sat*. Lakshmana Rao reads *sanmāyati* (typo) and does not emend.

<8> va(lla)bha sama(kṣ)āvas_it?<th>ite ◇ *vallabh_ia?<e> sama(kṣ)āvas_it?<th>ite* EH LR • The unclear notation on *lla* applies to the scanned rubbing; the character may be clear in the original or a good rubbing, but it is barely discernible in the scan. Hultzsich translates his emended text with “Vallabha (i.e. Pulakeśin II) being present in person.” PEM accepts this, translating, “qu’il soit connu qu’en présence de Vallabha l’exécution est confiée.” I have doubts about this; the language is badly garbled in several places, and I think that even if *vallabha* is clear, the intent may rather have been *bhavadbhiḥ samakṣāvasthitaiḥ*. Note also that Pṛthivīvallabha is speaking here; would he speak so of himself? — <8> vidhiv_i?<a><t> sa<ṁ>pradattā • *Sa* is a regular character at body height, while *t* is engraved on top of it. — <8> *marnta kali-kulanām?* ◇ *ma_irn_ita?<thā> kali-_ikula?<khalā>nām* EH; *ma(ntā/rnta) kali-kul_ia?<ā>nām* LR • See the commentary.

<10> *prithividuvarājam āṇattil<.>* ◇ *prithividuvarājam āṇatti?<prthivīyuvārājasyājñap-tiḥ><.>* EH; *prithividuvarājam āṇatti?<prthividuvarājavarmanātti>-* LR • See the commentary.

<11> vedaśarmmaṇa<h> EH ◇ *vedaśarmmaṇ_ia?<e>* LR • Hultzsich’s editor thinks the name is Aīśarman rather than Vedaśarman. He may be right: the first character’s body is a bit larger than expected for *v*, and the arm on the left does not start from the top, as expected for a vowel mark attached to a consonant, but from the stem at a slightly lower point. The second character could very well be *da*, but there is a little stub (in the scan, maybe more in the actual rubbing and the original) that may belong to the c-shaped end of *la*. — <11> -śa<ta><<(ṁ)>> • *ta* is added below *śa*. Two *kākapada*s shaped like + signs are placed above *śa*, on its left and right, presumably to identify the locus of insertion, as Hultzsich’s editor notes. The ed. also notes that there seems to be no *anusvāra* here, though H. reads one. There is a small dot to the right

of the *kākapadas*, which Hultzsich, whom I follow here, presumably interpreted as an added *anusvāra* to be read with the added *ta*, though other *anusvāras* are proper circles.

<12> koṇḍa(ce)rupū(r)- ◇ *koṇḍaverupū(r)* EH LR • The reading with *ce* was suggested by Hultzsich's editor in EI.

<13> -*jsavasare!*<*saṁvatsare*> LR ◇ -*jsavatsare!*<*saṁvatsare*> EH • I cannot tell clearly from my scanned estampage, but there may be a small *t* engraved on top of *sa*, in which case we have scribal correction here, executed in the same way as for *vidhivat* in line 8.

<14> -dānā[[ta[2+]]]t paran ◇ -*dānā{T}tparan* EH • Hultzsich's editor notes that there is a "vacant space" after *dānāT*, while Lakshmana Rao suggests that some characters were struck out here. This definitely seems to be the case. The first of these appears to be *ta* (not *T*), while the other two are now illegible. Whatever was mistakenly engraved, the correction was made immediately, and the scribe continued with *tpara* after the deletion. Another scenario, slightly more complex but perhaps more likely, is that *dānācchreyo* (and perhaps *nu* as well) was engraved here by eyeskip. The vestiges sort of suggest *cchr*. This was then beaten out, and the engraver first began to write *tpa* after *dānā* (the legible *ta* is a bit closer to *nā* than normal character spacing), then decided not to try to write over the corrected area, and continued with *tpara* after that.

<16> (sva-da)t<t>ā<m> para-dat<t>ā<m> LR ◇ (*sva-da*)*t(t)ā<m> para-dat(t)ā<m>* EH • Hultzsich prints the two subscript *t*-s as unclear. The bottom of the plate is damaged and I cannot exclude the possibility that they were engraved, but since Lakshmana Rao does not read them and there are other instances of a missing subscript *t* in the plates, I find it more likely that they were not. — <16> (dānā?)(t śr)e ◇ (*dānā*)*te* EH; *dā tsre* LR • Though apparently dismissed by Hultzsich, Lakshmana Rao seems to be correct in reading *tsre*. His omission of *nā* may be a typo. The ligature *ts* is attested in some inscriptions, including *tsrī* in the Orangoḍu Grant of Śiṃhavarman II (<http://www.indoskript.org/manuscripts/details/119>), very close in space, time and script to the present plates. Neither editor attempts to explain why the stanza is cut off before the end, though Lakshmana Rao at least remarks that it is. Could *yo nupālanam iti*, and perhaps something more, be engraved on the verso? And, being the back cover, perhaps it was so worn that it was not noticed?

Translation by Hultzsich 1925–1926

<1–6> Hail! The dear grandson (read: son) of the glorious Kīrtivarma-Prthivivallabha-Mahārāja who adorned the family of the glorious Calukyās, etc.; whose fame was

⟨widely⟩ spread; whose pair of lotus-feet was rubbed by the *makara* ornaments¹ of jewels attached to the slopes of the diadems of many prostrate princes; who was proficient in achieving the destruction of the circle of opposing enemies; ⟨and⟩ who honoured the gods, the twice-born, the Gurus, and the aged;

⟨6–7⟩ the glorious Pulakeśi-Pr̥thivivallabha-Mahārāja ⟨who⟩, like ⟨his⟩ father, ⟨is⟩ a hero, the abode of truth ⟨Satyāśraya⟩,² whose commands are unopposed, suitably honours ⟨the officials of this district and informs them as follows⟩:

⟨7–10⟩ “Be it known ⟨to you that⟩, Vallabha being present in person, the execution ⟨of the present grant⟩ was formally bestowed on Pr̥thividuvarāja (i.e. Pr̥thiviyuvarāja) who, having defeated the circle of enemies by his arm ⟨which was⟩ a churning-stick of the wicked ⟨people⟩ of the Kali ⟨age⟩, which was skilled in daring ⟨deeds⟩ in many battles, ⟨and⟩ which was wielding the drawn sword, has secured the kingdom to the lineage of his son.”

⟨10–12⟩ “To the Brāhmaṇa Vedaśarman who resides at Mūgamūr, belongs to the Śāṇḍilyāyana-*gotra*, ⟨and⟩ follows the Āpastamba-*sūtra*, a field of eight hundred ⟨*ni-vartanas*⟩ in the village of Irbuli in ⟨the district of⟩ Karma-rāṣṭra has been given. ⟨This field lies⟩ to the east of the Balāka-palvala ⟨pond⟩, to the west of the Karmakāra-taṭāka ⟨tank⟩, to the south of the road to Koṇḍav[e]rupūr, ⟨and⟩ to the north of the road to Virparū.”

⟨13–14⟩ “In the year twenty-one of the reign of increasing victory, in the month of Kārttika, on the great ninth ⟨*tithi*⟩, on a Thursday, at an auspicious moment, the execution of this grant ⟨was bestowed on Pr̥thiviyuvarāja⟩.”

⟨14–16⟩ ...³

Translation into French by Estienne-Monod 2008

⟨1–7⟩ Prospérité ! Satyāśraya, lui dont les ordres ne connaissent pas d'opposition, l'illustre Pulekeśi Pr̥thivi Vallabha, grand roi, cher fils de l'illustre grand souverain Kīrtivarman Pr̥thivi Vallabha, dont la gloire s'est répandue, aux pieds de lotus polis par les parures composées de pierres précieuses suspendues à l'orbe des diadèmes

¹According to Cowell and Thomas (Translation of the Harṣacarita, p. 266), “the word *makarikā* appears to denote a makara-shaped forehead ornament.” [DB: Possibly; my thought was earrings, probably on the basis of Gītagovinda, *maṇimaya-makara-manohara-kuṇḍala* (not checked).]

²This was the favourite surname of Pulakeśin II. See Fleet's *Dyn. of the Kan. Districts*, sec. ed., p. 351.

³Dániel Balogh: Hultzsch does not translate the rest of the text, summarising it as “three of the customary verses”.

des nombreux rois inclinés,⁴ qui est expert dans la manière de détruire le cercle des assaillants ennemis, honorant les dieux, les deux-fois-nés, les maîtres et les anciens, ornement de la lignée des Calukya, illustres, du même gotra que les descendants de Manu, loués dans l'univers entier, fils de Hārīti, bien fortifiés par les Sept Mères, mères des sept mondes, eux qui, les uns après les autres, possédèrent la prospérité venue de la protection de Kārtikeya, maîtres de tous les rois, soumis en un instant à la vue du signe du sanglier, faveur octroyée par le bienheureux Nārāyaṇa, eux dont les corps furent lavés par les bains purificateurs de nombreux aśvamedha, <Pulekeśin> héroïque comme son père, s'adresse avec le respect qui convient à chacun :

<7-12> qu'il soit connu qu'en présence de Vallabha l'exécution est confiée selon la règle à Pṛthiviyuvarāja,⁵ bâton qui baratte les multitudes de l'âge Kali, téméraire et agile dans de nombreux combats, qui a vaincu le cercle de ses ennemis⁶ de son bras armé du cimenterre <qu'il avait> dégaîné, qui a affermi son royaume pour la succession de ses fils; <celui-ci> donne au brahmane Vedaśarman, résidant à Mūgamūr, du gotra de Śāṇḍilyāyana, qui suit les sūtra Āpastamba, dans le Karmarāṣṭra, dans le village d'Irbuli, un terrain de huit cents (*nivartana*). à l'est de la mare Balāka, à l'ouest de l'étang Karmakara, au sud de la route de Koṇḍaverupūr, au nord de la route de Virparu.

<13-14> La vingt-et-unième année de l'auguste règne victorieux, au mois de Kārtika, le grand neuvième jour, le jour de Bṛhaspati, à un moment recommandé, l'exécution de ce don (a été faite).

1.

Il n'existe pas et n'existera pas de don égal à celui d'une terre, Il n'existe pas et n'existera pas de crime égal à celui de son vol.

2.

Beaucoup ont donné une terre et beaucoup l'on protégée ; celui qui possède cette terre en possède le fruit.

3.

⁴Ce composé est gravé au début du recto de la deuxième plaque. La cohérence de la traduction ne permet pas de conserver l'ordre du texte.

⁵Cette formulation est inusuelle : habituellement un nominatif est apposé à *ājñaptiḥ*, non un génitif. Ici *ājñaptiḥ* est un nom féminin signifiant « commandement » qui a pour complément Pṛthiviyuvarāja.

⁶Le fait que l'agent de l'absolutif *nirjitya* ne soit pas mentionné entraîne deux interprétations possibles. L'agent peut être le roi ou Pṛthiviyuvarāja. L'absolutif peut porter sur le procès exprimé par *pratiṣṭhāpitarājasya*. Dans ce cas *nirjitya* et *pratiṣṭhāpita* ont le même agent. L'ambiguïté demeure puisque cet agent peut être le roi ou Pṛthiviyuvarāja. Toutefois l'emploi répété de sva en premier élément de composé accrédite la deuxième hypothèse. Ce passage étant consacré à la présentation de l'exécuteur, dont il s'agit de faire l'éloge, nous optons pour la deuxième hypothèse.

Qu'elle soit donnée par toi ou par un autre, Yudhiṣṭhira, préserve avec soin la terre ! ô le meilleur des rois, la préservation d'une terre est plus méritoire que sa donation.

Commentary

〈6〉 Estienne-Monod: "L'éditeur lit viśaradasyadeva-dvija-guru-vṛddhāpacāyina. Cette lecture pose un problème car apacāyin signifie « qui n'honore pas », le composé n'a alors pas de sens. La lecture du fac-simile permet de corriger en °viśaradasyādeva-dvija-guru-vṛdhapacāyina. soit a-deva-dvija-guru-vṛddhāpacāyina, « qui n'est pas sans honorer les dieux, les deux-fois-nés, les maîtres et les anciens ».» I disagree. The ā of ddhā is indistinct in my scanned facsimile, but the right-hand side of the headmark does seem to extend to the right and bend down, and there is a dot below the bend that is probably the endpoint of the vowel mark. I'm not sure if there is a basis to the Monier-Williams entry (referring to a MBh locus) claiming that apa-cāyin [probably hyphenated precisely to highlight the understanding that apa is a privative prefix here] means "not rendering due respect," but I am sure that apacāyin can, and normally does, mean "rendering due respect", as shown by the related formations apacāyaka and apacāyita in MW and by the verb apa-ci itself, while Estienne-Monod's interpretation with the double negative is very awkward.

〈8〉 For marnta kalikulanām, Hultzsich suggests mathā kali-khalānām, noting (p258) that he thinks this qualifies svabāhunā, "by his arm ... (which was) a churning-stick of the wicked (people) of the Kali (age)." (the stem is mathin, irregular declension, ins. mathā). PEM seems to prefer the smaller emendation kulānām, translating "bâton qui baratte les multitudes de l'âge Kali," and seems (but my French is too poor to be sure) to understand this in apposition to Pṛthiviyuvarāja (which is impossible if we accept mathā and suppose that the syntax is legitimate). She notes, "Hultzsich propose une autre correction : khalānām, mais elle est plus éloignée du texte original et n'apporte pas un sens plus pertinent." I think khalānām is much more pertinent than "multitudes," especially in conjunction with the phrase "kaliyuga-khala-nirmathanaiḥ ... caritaiḥ" cited by Hultzsich from the Sātāra plates of Viṣṇuvardhana I. That said, I have strong doubts about Hultzsich's emendation and prefer to reserve judgement. Possibly marnta should be emended to mayā: Pṛthivivallabha is saying, "I have officially conferred the authority of execution on Pṛthividuvarāja". But then again, I'm actually beginning to like Hultzsich's mathā in apposition to bāhunā. (The spelling perhaps influenced by mathnā, instrumental of mathan, attested in the sense of fire stick but not a churning stick.) Lakshmana Rao prefers the reading mantā and mentions marnta (unless it is martta; my scan is not very good) in a footnote. His translation is "who is

death to Kali-Kula”, strangely at odds with his commentary’s mention that some later Rāṣṭrakūṭas bore the title kalivallabha, which may in fact be relevant here.

<10> Hultzs ch em. pr̥thivīyuvārājasyājñaptiḥ, the ājñapti was given to him. He notes that Lakshmana Rao identifies duvarāja as Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman (Goa plates, śaka 532). But H says duvarāja is a known Dravidian tadbhava of yuvarāja (ref. EI4 p180 n5). He understands the passage to mean that it was Pr̥thivīyuvārāja who secured the kingdom to the lineage of his son and thus the name refers to Viṣṇuvardhana I, younger brother of Pulakeśin II who was already a yuvarāja in year 8 of Pulakeśin II’s reign, but a mahārāja in year 18 of his own reign (632 CE). At any rate, the m may be non-standard sandhi, with the intent that prithividuvarāja is the āñatti.

<10> As Hultzs ch and PEM note, for precision’s sake the dative vāstavyāya could be emended to a genitive; or the following genitives to datives.

<10> For Mugamūr, Lakshmana Rao suggests the modern village Mūṅgamūr in Kandukar Taluk of Nellore district, though his reading is slightly different and he emends that to something different again. He also notes (pp 48-49) that karmakāra-taṭāka must be a Sanskrit translation of Telugu Kammari-vaṅla kuṁṭa/ceruvu, “tank of the iron-smiths.” He identifies Koṇḍaverupūr as modern Vipparla village near Kondavidu.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1922–23, p. 12, appendix A/1922–23, № 14 First edited by K. V. Lakshmana Rao (1922) with inked rubbings⁷ and translation. Re-edited by E. Hultzs ch (1925–1926) with (probably) different rubbings and a new translation. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Hultzs ch’s text with his published facsimile.

Primary

[EH] Hultzs ch, Eugen Julius Theodor. 1925–1926. “Kopparam plates of Pulakesin II.” EI 18, pp. 257–261.

[LR] Lakshmana Rao, Komarraju Venkata. 1922. “The Kopparam plates of Pulakeśin II.” ABORI 4, pp. 43–53.

⁷Only 2r, 3r and 3v appear in my scan, but the printed edition may have plates for all inscribed pages.

Secondary

[ARIE 1922-1923] ARIE 1922-23. *Annual report on South-Indian epigraphy for the year ending 31st March 1923*. Edited by G. Venkoba Rao. Madras: Government Press, 1924. Page 12, appendixes A/1922-23, item 14.