Koṇeki grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00013

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00013.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-10-28 17:37 (06a61a7), last modified 2026-09-18 17:45 (0273b8a)

Palaeographic description

Halantas. M: the first few are indistinct. l4 rājyānāM seems to be a J shape closed into a loop, but l5 yājināM also has an arm on the right, so it is a diminutive ma shape with the left arm elongated into a vertical. T, only in l20 opetatvāT, unclear and possibly incorrectly read; see apparatus. N: reduced na shape with long steam and no headmark, l22 grāmeyakāN. Ṭ(!) apparently a subsequent addition so not necessarily the regular form, l36 ṣaṬ, possibly a regular ṭa shape reduced in size, but looks more like a latin L, i.e. the horizontal part at the top is not discernible in the scan.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is placed after the consonant, at headline height (wherever it is clear in my scans, e.g. l12 bṛṁhita, l12 gāṁbhīryya, l17 saṁbandhibhir, l17 saṁpū, l18 jayasiṁgha and so on).

Edition

Seal

〈1〉 śrī-viṣamasiddh(i)

Plates

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 śr[ī]〈.〉 v[i]jayatā(ṁ) mah(ā)rā(ja)〈ḥ〉〈.〉 Ā(yur ā)rogyam aiśvaryya(ñ c)ābhivarddha(ṁ)t(āṁ)〈.〉 Iṣṭa-sampad ast¿u?〈ū〉tt¿ū?〈a〉rottarā〈ḥ〉 kri(yā)[s sa]〈2〉mpadya(n)t[āṁ]〈.〉

(śrīma)d-asanapurādhiṣṭhān¿u?〈a〉-vāsī śrīmad-bhagavat-svāmi-m¿ā?〈a〉hāsena-pādā¿ṇ?〈n〉udhyā(tā)〈3〉nā〈ṁ〉 tribhu◯vana-māt¡ri!〈ṛ〉bhir abhirakṣitānā〈ṁ〉 m¿a?〈ā〉navya-sa{na}gotrāṇāṁ hārītī-putrāṇā〈ṁ〉 k(au)śi(kī)〈4〉-vara-prasāda-labdha-rājyānāM catur-u(da)dhi-paryyanta{ḥ}-prathita-yaśas¿a?〈ā〉(M) Aś-vame¿d?〈dh〉a〈5〉-yājināM caḷukyānām anvayam unnamayitum asak¿ra?〈ṛ〉{r}d{d}-an¿a?〈u〉bhūta-raṇa-rāga(sya) 〈raṇarāgasya〉〈Page 2r〉 〈6〉 (pra)ṇaptā{ḥ} Asahya-vikramasya vipula-kīrtte〈ḥ〉 kīrttivarmmaṇa〈ḥ〉 prapautra〈ḥ〉 śakti-traya-vaśīk¡ri!〈ṛ〉ta-saka〈7〉la-(ma)hī-maṇḍalasya saty¿a?〈ā〉śraya-p¡ri!〈ṛ〉thiv¿i?〈ī〉-vallabha-mahārājādhirāja-parameśvara-bhaṭṭārakasya pri(yā)nu〈8〉jasya ◯ svāsi-dhārā-namita-samasta-sāmanta-maṇḍalasya sthala-j¿ā?〈a〉lādi-durgga-viṣameṣ(v) a〈9〉pi (lab)[dha]-(v)i(jaya)tvā〈d viṣamasiddheḥ〉 prathita-jana-prasnuta-kāmadheno〈ḥ〉 lokātiśayita-vikramatayā nara-lo(ka)〈10〉-vikra[masya vi]ṣṇu[var]ddhana-ma(hārājasya pri)ya-tanayasyāneka-samara-saṁghaṭṭa-labdha-vi(ja)ya-ś〈r〉ī-la〈Page 2v〉〈11〉tā-prasūta-yaśaḥ-prasūt〈y〉-āmoda-ga(n)dh(ā)dhivā(s)ita-sakala-di¡g!-maṇḍalasya nānā-ś¿a?〈ā〉strā〈12〉bhyāso(pa)bṛṁhita-niśita-vimala-buddheḥ tyāgaudāryya-gāṁbhīryya-dhairyya-kānti-pra〈13〉jñādi◯-guṇa-gaṇāla〈ṁ〉kṛtasya trailok〈y〉a-vikramod〈d〉yo¿d?〈t〉ita-sakala-lokāśraya〈sya〉 bhuja-yu〈14〉ga¡!!〈l〉a-bala-namitāśeṣa-ripu-nṛpati-vara-makuṭa-taṭa-ghaṭitāneka-maṇi-kiraṇa-rāga-rañji〈15〉ta-caraṇāravinda-yuga¡!!〈l〉asya v¿i?〈ī〉ra-dhvajopātta-śakra〈r〉ddhi-visparddhita-vibh(ū)ter anekāhi〈Page 3r〉〈16〉ta-nara-vara-śiraḥ-karoṭikā-vitā(na?)-vikhyāta-yaśaso deva-dvija-guru-¿yatadhi?〈yaty-atithi〉-śiṣṭeṣṭā〈17〉nuj¿i?〈ī〉vi-saṁbandhibhir anavarata-prakāmopabhoga-bhujyamāna-vividha-puṇya-¿p?〈ph〉ala-saṁp¿u?〈ū〉〈18〉rṇṇā◯mṛta-dhenoḥ śrī-jayasiṁ¡gh!〈h〉a-vallabha-mahārājasya priyānujasya tyā〈19〉ga-dhen¡u!〈o〉ḥ śakti-traya-sampan〈n〉āneka-vidyā-viśārad¡aḥ!〈asya〉 ripu-maṇḍaleṣv api vigraha-siddh¡iḥ!〈eḥ〉 siṁha〈20〉-vikram¡a!〈asya〉 nayopetatvā¿M?〈T〉 rāja-lokāśray¡a!〈asya〉 śrīmad-indravarmma-mahārajasya putra(ḥ)〈Page 3v〉 〈21〉 nānā-ś¿a?〈ā〉strābhyāsopā〈ttā〉neka-vidyā-viśāradaḥ viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārāj¡asya! paḷḷi-rāṣṭre koṇek(i?)〈22〉 nāma ◯ grāma〈ḥ〉 saṁpradattaḥ〈.〉 grāmeyakāN rājapuruṣa-ta¡!!〈l〉avara-daṇḍanāyaka-rāṣṭrika〈23〉-dū◯ta-bhaṭa-naṭa-ceṭaka-paricāraka-niyuktādhyakṣa-praśāstṛ-samāhartṛ-{nā}〈24〉nāyakā〈ṁ〉ś cājñāpayati

śrotriyasya sakala-dig-anta-prathita-yaśaso yajana-yā<25>janādhyayanādhyāpana-dāna-pratigrah¿ā?<a>-niyama-niratasya sarvvāgama-vi<Page 4r><26>śeṣa-pratipādanatvād adya-kāla-vararucir iti vikhyātasya mahāsenaśarmma(ṇaḥ)<27> putrāya viduśa<r>mm¡āṇaḥ!<aṇe> brāhmaṇa-sūtra-mantra-tantropaniṣa<t>-prabhṛty-¿ā?<a>n¿a?<e>ka-vidyā-vidu<28>ṣe ◯ parāśara-gotr¿a?<ā>ya sarvva-sa¡tv!ānukampita-maitr¿i?<ī>-ci⟦r⟧ttāya ¡taitrika!<taittirīyaka>-cara<29>ṇāya Āpastamba-sūtrāya kandeṛu-boya-brāhmaṇ¡(e)!<āya> Ātukuru-vastavy¡asya!<āya><30> māgha-māse soma¡gg!rahaṇa-kāle Asmad-āyur-bala-vijaya-bhogaiśvaryy¿a?<ā>bhi<Page 4v><31>v¿a?<ṛ>{r}ddhaye sa¡(M)!pradatt¡a! devabhoga-hala-va<r>ja(ṁ)

mamānvaya-jā ye kecid anāgate kā<32>le bhūmip(ālā)<ḥ> sa<r>vve grāma-sa<ṁ>rakṣaṇa(ṁ) k(urv)v(an)tu grāma-saṁbhavādhik¡ri!<ṛ>tā<ḥ> sa<r>vve Ayya<33>ṇānva◯ya-jā dhanañjaya-prabhṛtayas ta(t)-puruṣāḥ

Etasya grām¡(e)!<asya> (v)iṁśottara-(śateṣv aṁ)<34>śeṣu ◯ viṣṇuśarmmaṇe viṁśati Aṁśakāni<.> tasya ¡sunun(ā)!<sūnave> ma(di)śarmmaṇe (viṁ)(śati)<.><35> mahāsenaśarmaṇe <<viṁśati>><.> tasya ca priy(ā)nuj¡asya!<āya> dā(ma)śarmaṇe viṁś¿i?<a>(t)i<.> mudokura<Page 5r><36>-boy¡asya!<āya> gaṇaiśarmmaṇ¿a?<e> ṣa<<Ṭ>><.> Ātukuru-boy¡asya!<āya> viṣṇuśarmmaṇe pañca<.> koṇḍasāmi-bo<37>y¡asya!<āya> ⟦pañca⟧<<(tiṇṇi)>><.> pāḍi-¡boyasyeka!<boyāyaikaṁ><.> kumunūru-boy¡asya!<āya> mādiśarmmaṇ¿a?<e> catv(āri) [ca. 2×] (nd?)i-(bo)<38>y¡a◯sya!<āya> d(vau)<.> naḍukuḷi-boy¡asya!<āya> sarvvaśarmmaṇe dvau<.> veḷu(va?)(ḷ)i-(boy)¡(a)!<āya> (ba?)ṭṭa<39>śarmmaṇ¿a?<e> d(v)au<.> rey(ū)[ru]-(bo?)y¡asya!<āya> dvau<.> kanpaṟ-boy¡asya!<āya> maṇḍaśa(rmma)ṇ¿a?<e> dvau<.> reva(śarm)m(aṇe) dv(au)<.> Iru<40>kuṭūrur-bo(y)¡(asya)!<āya> (dvau)

yo <’>sm¿ā?<a>c-chāsanam ¡a(dh)ikramya!<atikrāmati> (sa pāp)¡(o)! śār¿i?<ī>raṁ daṇḍam arhati _

1. Anuṣṭubh

<Page 5v> <41> (bhū)mi-dānā(t) pa(ran dā)<na>n
na bhūtan na bhaviṣyati
(tasyaiva) ha(raṇāt pāpa)n
na bh(ūta)n na (bha)viṣya<42>(ti)

2. Anuṣṭubh

sva-datt(ā)ṁ (pa)ra-(dattāṁ) vā
yo haret¡u!<a> vasundharā(ṁ)
(gavāṁ śata-saha)<srasya>
<ha>(nt)u<ḥ> pibati ki<43>(l)¡(v)!<b>(i)◯(ṣaṁ)

3. Anuṣṭubh

(ba)[hu]bhi<r> vasudhā dattā
bahubhiś cā(nupālitā)
(yas)ya yasya ya<44>◯(dā bhūmi)<ḥ>
tasya tasya ta¿th?<d>ā ¿h?<ph>alaṁ

śrī-jayasi(ṁ)¡(gh)!<h>(a-valla)bha-mahārā(ja)<45>sya prava(rddhamāna-vi)ja<ya>-rājya-¡savasare!<saṁvatsare> ¡triṁśati! varṣa (Aśvayuje māse ś)ukla-pakṣe (daśa?)<46>(mī)-divas(e ś)ravaṇe candravāre gaṁgavija(ya-varddhaki-likhitam idaṁ) ¿s?<ś>āsa[naM]<.> (svasti)

Apparatus

Plates

〈1〉 śr[ī]<.> v[i]jayatā(ṁ) mah(ā)rā(ja)<ḥ><.> ◇ *śrī(r) vijayatāM<.>mahārā(ja)<sya>* HKN • — 〈1〉 -sampad • Narasimhaswami notes that something was added below *da* and then struck out. I see only noise here, and no more of that than in many other spots. — 〈1〉 ast¿u?<ū>tt¿ū?<a>rottarā<ḥ> • As Narasimhaswami notes, it seems that the marker for *ū* was accidentally added to *tta*. Moreover, the subscript part of that character may have been first engraved as something else. — 〈1〉 kri(yā)[s sa]〈2〉mpadya(n)t[āM] HKN

〈5〉 unnamayitum asak¿ra?<ṛ>{r}d{d}-an¿a?<u>bhūta-raṇa-rāga(sya) <raṇarāgasya> ◇ *unnamayitu¿ma?<ṁ>¡sakrarddana!<saṅkrandana>-bhūta-raṇarāgasya* HKN • The emendation suggested by HKN has also been written on the ASI transcript, with the note "this is Indra". My emendation is based on the parallel locus in line 3 of the Timmapuram plates of Viṣṇuvardhana I.

〈6〉 praṇaptā{ḥ} ◇ *praṇapt¿ā?<u>ḥ* HKN • See the commentary.

〈9〉 (lab)[dha]-(v)i(jaya)tvā<d viṣamasiddheḥ> ◇ *la(bdha)-vijaya¿tā?<sya>* HKN • To justify my rather heavy-handed emendation, compare line 4 of the Cīpurupalle plates and l8 of the Timmapuram plates, where, however, the phrase is *labdha-siddhitvād*. — 〈9〉 prathita- • The reading is clear, but probably something else had been intended by the composer, such as *praśrita-*, *prārthi-* or *arthi-*. Compare *artthi-jana-nitya-prasnuta-kāmadhenuḥ* in line 9 of the Timmapuram plates of Viṣṇuvardhana I and *samāśritānāṁ kāmadhenu-caritasya* in line 13 of the Peṇukapaṟu grant. — 〈9〉 -prasnuta- ◇ *-prastuta-* HKN.

〈10〉 -ś<r>ī-la<Page 2v><11>tā- ◇ *-śīla<Page 2v><11>tā-* HKN • Compare line 4 of the

Mḷopaṟṟu grant probably of Maṅgi Yuvarāja, which seems to have *jaya-śrī-latā-prasūta-yaśaḥ-prasūty-* (though the reading is problematic) in an otherwise largely identical compound. The bottom of the plate is damaged here, and a subscript *r* may in fact have been present. However, parallel phrases in line 8 of the Nutulapaṟu Grant and line 8 of the Elūru Grant of Maṅgi Yuvarāja, and line 7 of the Jaḷayūru grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III only have *-vijaya-yaśaḥ-prasūty-* without *-śrī-latā-*.

〈11〉 -prasūt〈y〉-āmoda- ◇ *-prasūtāmoda-* HKN • See the previous note for parallels substantiating this emendation. — 〈11〉 -lokāśraya〈sya〉 ◇ *-lokāśraya-* HKN • I emend diagnostically to indicatate that this phrase was probably adopted from a description of a ruling king in the nominative (such as in line 6 of the Mḷopaṟṟu grant probably of Maṅgi Yuvarāja) and inattentively changed only at the end to a genitive. I am certain that the compound ending here is not subordinate to the one beginning after this point. I also have a suspicion that the received form *°oddyotita-sakala-lokāśraya* is in fact haplography for *°oddyotita-sakala-lokas sakala-lokāśrayaḥ*, but have no exact parallel to attest to this.

〈16〉 -śiraḥ-karoṭikā-vitā(na?)-vikhyāta- HKN • There is a head-level roughly circular stroke between the *visarga* and the following *ka*, which may be noise, a remnant of a deleted character, or possibly a *jihvāmūlīya* used in addition to the *visarga* and affixed to the left of *ka* instead of on top because this is the first line on the page, with a very narrow top margin. Part or whole of the sequence *ṭikā-vitāna-vi* may have been written over deleted text. At the end, *tāna-vi* is written in narrower and more closely spaced characters than usual. These three characters are damaged, and *na* is completely illegible in the estampage. The ASI transcript only ready *vitāvi* instead of these three, and a secondary insertion shows a tentatively read *visarga* between these two characters. HKN's restoration (or tentative reading) is at any rate perfectly plausible. — 〈16〉 -¿yatadhi?〈yaty-atithi〉- HKN • Narasimhaswami's emendation (also noted in the margin of the ASI transcript) is ingenuous and very plausible.

〈20〉 -vikram¡a!〈asya〉 ◇ *-vikrama-* HKN • The composer of the text probably did not make a strong distinction between a string of nominatives and a string of stem forms, and I believe both the nominatives and the stem forms here were intended to describe Indravarman. Compare *lokāśraya* in line 11, and the string of nominatives beginning at the end of this line, which were clearly intended to describe the donor and should thus be in the instrumental. Narasimhaswami apparently thought likewise, but chose not to emend/normalise the stem forms to genitives, doing so only for the nominatives. — 〈20〉 nayopetatvā¿M?〈T〉 ◇ *nayopetatvā¿M?〈d〉* HKN. — 〈20〉 -lokāśray¡a!〈asya〉 ◇ *-lokāśraya-* HKN. — 〈20〉 putr¡a(ḥ)!〈eṇa〉 … -viśārad¡aḥ!〈ena〉 … -mahārāj¡asya!〈ena〉 … grāma〈ḥ〉 saṁpradattaḥ〈.〉 ◇ *putra〈ḥ〉 … -viśāradaḥ … -*

mahārāja¿sya?〈ḥ〉 … grāma〈ṁ〉 saṁpra¿dattaḥ?〈dāya〉 HKN • Narasimhaswami emends *mahārājasya* to *mahārājaḥ*, which he construes as the subject of *ājñāpayati* (line 24), emending further to extend the sentence that far. I prefer to assume that a number of nouns and adjectives in stem/nominative form were used laxly in apposition to the genitive, which in turn was employed in place of an instrumental; compare the similar string starting in line 19 above. The *visarga* at the end of *saṁpradattaḥ* implies the end of a semantic unit here; the subject of the next sentence is in my perception to be understood to be the same king, but is not explicitly mentioned.

〈21〉 opā〈ttā〉neka- HKN • I endorse Narasimhaswami's emendation. A note in the ASI transcript suggests *°opetāneka*, which I find inferior.

〈23〉 -samāhartṛ{nā}° • The superfluous *nā* is faint and quite small; it may have been struck out in the original after the engraver decided that it was squeezed into too little space at the end of the line. The ASI transcript reads the superfluous character as *ṇa*, which is not impossible.

〈27〉 vidu° • The reading is clear, but I wonder if this is a scribal error for *viṣṇu*. Compare the list of donees commencing in line 34.

〈28〉 -ci⟦r⟧ttāya ◇ *-ci{r}ttāya* HKN • Since the vowel marker is attached to the headmark rather than to the *repha*, I assume that the *repha* was struck out (or meant to be struck out) in the original.

〈29〉 -brāhmaṇ¡(e)!〈āya〉 ◇ *-brāhmaṇ¿a?〈āya〉* HKN.

〈31〉 -va〈r〉(jaṁ) ◇ *-varjja* HKN.

〈33〉 ta(t)-puruṣāḥ ◇ *tat-puruṣāḻḥ!〈ś ca〉* HKN • I find Narasimhaswami's emendation unnecessary; see my translation.

〈34〉 Aṁśakāni • Narasimhaswami emends to *Aṁśakāḥ* and meticulously emends all numerals in the list of shares to masculine. While *dvau* does occur in the original several times in lines 38-39, I prefer to keep the endings as received. — 〈34〉 ma(di)śarmmaṇe ◇ *m(ā)diśarmmaṇe* HKN • In the ASI transcript, an original *mā* seems to have been corrected to *ma*. I see no *ā* marker.

〈35〉 〈〈viṁśati〉〉 • Narasimhaswami also notes the fact of correction here. Curiously, both the initial *vi* and the final *ti* have been engraved twice with a slight offset. The text may have been corrected twice, from an original *viṁśati* to *daśa* (*da* is now discernible to the left of *śa*), then back to *viṁśati*. One of the stages may also have involved *tiṁśat* or *tidaśa* (for *tri-*).

〈36〉 gaṇaiśarmman¿a?〈e〉 • The first character of this name looks much like *śa* in

the estampage. Since both the ASI transcript and HKN read *ga* without comment, I assume that the somewhat awkward-looking crossbar is clearly identifiable as damage in the original. The ASI transcript reads the name as Gaṇeśarmman, emending to Gaṇeśaśarmman. — 〈36〉 Ātukuru- • The initial vowel seems to have an extra stroke on the bottom left, mirroring the curved stroke on the right that distinguishes *Ā* from *A*. The ASI transcript reads this as *Au*, while NHK prints it as an unclear *Ā*. I believe *Au* is unlikely to have such a shape, and given the unambiguous *Ātukuru* in line 29, the extra stroke may be dismissed as damage or a mistake.

〈37〉 ⟦pañca⟧〈〈(tiṇṇi)〉〉 ◇ 〈〈*pañca*〉〉 HKN • Narasimhaswami reads *pañca*, noting that these characters are written over an erasure. Given that *pañca* matches the character size and spacing of the line, while the characters occupying the same space are narrower and leave a gap before the following word, it seems to me that *pañca* is in fact the pre-correction text. The post-correction text seems to be *tiṇṇi*, which I assume was intended for *trīṇi*. — 〈37〉 pāḍi- ◇ *pāṭi-* HKN • The second consonant of this name might be *d* instead of *ḍ*, but definitely not *ṭ*. The ASI transcript's original reading has been struck out completely, corrected in the margin to *ddi*, with the emendation *peddi*. I see no subscript character. — 〈37〉 [ca. 2×] (nd?)i- • Narasimhaswami only notes that two or three characters are effaced here, and that the character before the following *bo* has the vowel *i* attached. The ASI transcript shows only a gap before *bo*. I think the last badly damaged character has *n* for its consonant component, possibly with a subscript *d*. It is probably preceded by two illegible characters.

〈38〉 d(vau) ◇ *dv¿e?〈au〉* HKN • Although my preference to retain *aṁśakāni* in line 34 above would harmonise better with *dve*, the subsequent iterations are clearly *dvau*, and the present character strongly resembles *dvau* at the beginning of line 39, only with damage partially obscuring the right arm of the vowel marker. — 〈38〉 naḍukuḷi- ◇ *naḍukuṛi-* HKN. — 〈38〉 veḷu(va?)(ḷ)i- ◇ *veḷu(caḷi)-* HKN. — 〈38〉 (ba?)ṭṭa° ◇ *pe(ṭṭa)°* HKN • My *ba* may be wrong, since HKN prints *pe* as clear, and the ASI transcript has the same reading (apparently added by a second hand, possibly HKN's, to a space left blank by the first transcriber). The same second hand corrects the originally transcribed *ṭṭa* at the end of the line to *ddi*, which is definitely wrong.

〈39〉 rey(ū)[ru]-(bo?)y¡asya!〈āya〉 ◇ *re[1×]boy¡asya!〈āya〉* HKN • This name has definitely been corrected from something shorter, as indicated by the smaller size of the post-correction characters. The final *ya* seems to have been reinscribed utilising the right limb of the original *ya* as the central stem of the newer one. Nothing else is discernible of the pre-correction text. The initial *re* was probably present pre-correction and is quite clear except for its vowel marker, while the following *yu* or *yū* is definitely a correction. I restore the topnym as *Reyūru* because this name is attested in the Reyūru

grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II. The ASI transcriber apparently read *koyuruboyasya* here, which the second hand corrected to *reyurboyasya*. The latter is definitely not the final text on the plate, but it seems possible that an initial *reyūrboyasya* was corrected to *reyūruboyasya* (or the same with *yu*). — 〈39〉 Iru〈40〉kuṭūrur- • Narasimhaswami notes that the final *r* is redundant. He does not explain whether he thinks so because the toponym is plausible without that *r* and implausible with it, or merely on the basis of intuition. Given the apparent correction of *reyūrboyasya* to *reyūruboyasya* earlier in the line, it may well be the case that the toponym here is indeed Irukuṭūru with a surd or silent final *u*, and the scribe was undecided between two ways of writing this.

〈41〉 (tasyaiva) ◇ *(tasyāpa)°* HKN • The ASI transcript also shows an unclear *tasyāpa°* here, but *pa* does not seem possible for the last character, and *tasyaiva* in this stanza is attested in several related grants.

〈42〉 -(saha)〈srasya〉 ◇ *-(saha)〈srāṇāṁ〉* HKN • The form with *sahasrasya* is attested in several related grants. The omission can be attributed to eyeskip from *ha* to the next *ha*.

〈44〉 ¿h?〈ph〉alaṁ ◇ *phalaṁ* HKN.

〈45〉 (Aśvayuje) ◇ *Āśvayuje* HKN. — 〈45〉 (ś)ukla-pakṣe • Krishna Rao (1973, p. 30, n. 2) reports this word as *guru-pakṣe*, interpreting it to mean *śukla-pakṣe*. Although the text is far from clear, that reading can be ruled out safely. The ASI transcript seems to have *gu* followed by a lacuna, completed by a second hand to *guru-pakṣe*, and corrected by a third hand to *śukla-*. — 〈45〉 (daśa?)〈46〉(mī)- HKN • The third hand in the ASI transcript fills the end of the line here with *daśa*, to which a fourth hand adds a note, changing the day to *pañcamī*, marking up *ñca* as unclear or a restoration. In some further notes at the bottom of the sheet in English, concerning the date and the eclipse, one hand had written *pañcamī*, which another hand corrected to *daśamī*, adding the note *vijayadaśamī* with a double underline. This last hand may have been HKN. The original may be somewhat clearer; from the facsimile, the reading is not impossible, but seems less likely: I would expect the right limb of *pa* to be taller, and the vestiges of the last character do not suggest *ñca* (though perhaps *ṁca* is plausible).

〈46〉 (ś)ravaṇe ◇ *śravaṇa-* HKN • The ASI transcript also reads *śravaṇa-*, but an *e* marker is clearly attached to the left of the consonant's body.

Translation

Plates

〈1–2〉 Glory! May the king (*mahārāja*) be victorious! May 〈his〉 vitality, health and dominion increase! May desires find accomplishment! May the most excellent deeds be accomplished!

〈2–24〉 〈While〉 residing at the court in majestic Asanapura, the great-great-grandson (*praṇaptṛ*)[1] of Raṇarāga, who repeatedly experienced the thrill of battle (*raṇa-rāga*) to elevate the lineage of the Caḷukyas—who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by the majestic divine Lord Mahāsena, who are protected by the Mothers of the three worlds, who are of the Mānavya gotra, who are sons of Hāritī, who attained kingship by the grace of Kauśikī's boon, whose reputation extends to the shores of four oceans, and who perform the Aśvamedha sacrifice—; the great-grandson (*prapautra*) of Kīrtivarman of irresistible valour and widespread fame; the son of the majestic King (*mahārāja*) Indravarman, a Milchcow of Liberality (*tyāga-dhenu*) who was endowed with the three powers (*śakti-traya*) and was versed in numerous sciences, who prevailed in conflict (*vigraha-siddhi*) even in the territories of his enemies, who was endowed with leonine courage (*siṁha-vikrama*) and who, because of his political astuteness (*naya*), was a refuge for all rulers (*rāja-lokāśraya*), and who (Indravarman) was the dear younger brother of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Jayasiṁha Vallabha, who perfumed the complete circle of the quarters with pleasant fragrance from the efflorescence, which is glory, sprouting from the liana that is the victory goddess attained in the clash of many a battle,[2] whose keen and flawless intellect was heightened by the study of various textbooks (*śāstra*), who was ornamented by a host of virtues such as selflessness, generosity, profundity, perseverance, beauty and wisdom, a shelter to the complete world (*sakala-lokāśraya*) illuminated by his valour 〈unique〉 in the three worlds, whose pair of lotus feet were tinted by the hues of the rays from the many gems fitted to the surfaces of the crowns of all the eminent enemy kings bowed down by the power of his two arms, whose magnificence (*vibhūti*) vied with the supernatural power (*ṛddhi*) of Śakra 〈whom he〉 adopted as 〈the emblem on〉 his heroic banner, whose reputation was proclaimed by a profusion of severed heads from a great number of eminent men ill-disposed 〈to him〉, who was a cow yielding nectar complete with various propitious fruits that were being consumed ceaselessly by gods, Brahmins (*dvija*), teachers (*guru*), ascetics, guests, learned men, friends, dependants and relatives partaking of them

[1] The genealogy is garbled. See the commentary for my interpretation of the anomalies.

[2] If I am wrong about the alterations suggested on the basis of parallels in the apparatus to lines 10 and 11, an acceptable translation of the received text would be "fragrance arising from the glory generated by his proclivity for attaining victory in the clash of many a battle".

at will, and who (*Jayasiṁha*) was the dear son of King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (I), who by the blade of his sword forced the entire circle of subordinate rulers (*sāmanta*) to bow, who was ⟨known as Viṣamasiddhi because he was⟩ victorious even over adverse (*viṣama*) ⟨conditions, such as⟩ forts on land, water and so on, who was well known as a cow of plenty (*kāma-dhenu*) overflowing with milk for the populace,[3], who by his valour surpassing common folk was a Vikrama (Viṣṇu) in the world of men, and who (Viṣṇuvardhana I) was the dear younger brother of Satyāśraya Pṛthivīvallabha (Pulakeśin II), the Sovereign (*bhaṭṭāraka*) who was the overlord (*parameśvara*) of emperors (*mahārājādhirāja*) and who subjugated the entire circle of the earth by means of his three powers (*śakti-traya*)—⟨he, namely⟩ King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (II), versed in many sciences acquired through the study of various textbooks (*śāstra*), has donated the village Koṇeki in Paḷḷi country (*rāṣṭra*). He commands the residents of the village along with royal agents (*rājapuruṣa*), territorial headmen (*taḷavara*), prefects (*daṇḍanāyaka*), district headmen (*rāṣṭrika*), heralds (*dūta*), constables (*bhaṭa*), ¿dancers? (*naṭa*),[4] ¿lieutenants? (*ceṭaka*), ¿aides-de-camp? (*paricāraka*), subordinate officials (*niyukta*), superintending officials (*adhyakṣa*), magistrates (*praśāstṛ*), collectors (*samāhartṛ*) and governors (*nāyaka*) ⟨as follows⟩:

⟨24–31⟩ In the month of Māgha, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, in order to augment our vitality, strength, victory, domain and dominion, ⟨we have⟩ donated ⟨this village⟩, excepting arable land in the possession of deities, to Viduśarman[5] of the Parāśara gotra and the Taitrika school, adherent of the Āpastamba sūtra, a Kandeṟuboya Brahmin residing in Ātukuru, a scholar of many sciences including the Brāhmaṇas, Sūtras, Mantras, Tantras and Upaniṣads, a man of good disposition who feels sympathy for all beings, who is the son of Mahāsenaśarman, a theologian (*śrotriya*) engaged in (the six) duties of performing sacrifices, conducting sacrifices (for others), studying, teaching, giving and accepting gifts, whose fame extends to all horizons, and who was renowned as the "Vararuci of this day" on account of his outstanding exposition of all (branches of traditional) lore (*āgama*).

⟨31–33⟩ Whatsoever kings may be born of our lineage in times to come, they shall all protect (the status of) this village, and so shall all the local-born officials (*adhikṛta*) from the lineage of Ayyaṇa, beginning with Dhanañjaya, as the representatives (*tat-puruṣa*) of those ⟨kings⟩.

[3] I translate as best I can make sense of the received text, but the intent of the composer was more likely to have been "who was a cow of plenty overflowing with milk for people who sought his protection". See the apparatus for *prathita-* in line 9.

[4] The intended word may have been *cāṭa*, "men-at-arms".

[5] Or perhaps Viṣṇuśarman. Compare the list of donees below.

〈33–40〉 Out of the hundred and twenty shares comprising this village,[6]

- to Viṣṇuśarman 〈shall go〉 twenty shares;
- to his son Mādiśarman, twenty;
- to Mahāsenaśarman, twenty;
- to the latter's dear younger brother Dāmaśarman, twenty;
- to Mudokura-boya Gaṇaiśarman, six;
- to Ātukuru-boya Viṣṇuśarman, five;
- to Koṇḍasāmi-boya, three;
- to Pāḍi-boya, one;
- to Kumunūru-boya Mādiśarman, four;
- to [...]ndi-boya, two;
- to Naḍukuḻi-boya Sarvaśarman, two;
- to Veḷuvaḷi-boya ¿Baṭṭaśarman?, two;
- to Re¿yūru?-boya, two;
- to Kanpaṟ-boya Maṇḍaśarman, two;
- to Revaśarman, two;
- to Irukuṭūru-boya, two.

〈40〉 If anyone transgresses our decree, that villain deserves corporal punishment.

1.

There has never been and will never be a gift surpassing the gift of land, nor has there ever been or will ever be a sin 〈surpassing〉 the seizing of the same.

2.

He who would seize land, whether given by himself or by another, imbibes the sin of the slayer of a hundred thousand cows.

3.

[6]The following list adds up to 113 shares as I read the text and to 115 as read by its previous editor.

Many (kings) have granted land, and many have preserved it (as formerly granted). Whosoever at any time owns the land, the fruit {reward (accrued of granting it)} belongs to him at that time.

〈44–46〉 This decree was written (*likhita*) by the engraver (*vardhaki*) Gaṁgavijaya in the thirtieth year (reckoned as) a year of the progressive triumphant reign of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Jayasiṁha Vallabha, in the month Āśvayuja, in the bright fortnight, on the tenth day, (under the) Śravaṇa (asterism), on Monday. Welfare!

Translation into French by Estienne-Monod 2008

Plates

〈1–2〉 Fortune aux vainqueurs ! Que la réussite désirée de ceux qui accroissent la durée de vie, la bonne santé et la souveraineté du roi, de ceux qui accomplissent des sacrifices augmente sans cesse !

〈2–24〉 Résidant dans la capitale de l'illustre Asanapura, (Viṣṇuvardhana était) l'arrière arrière petit-fils de Raṇarāga, pareil à Saṁkrandana, qui fit s'élever la lignée des Calukya, méditant aux pieds de l'illustre et bienheureux seigneur Mahāsena, protégés par les mères des trois mondes, du même *gotra* que les descendants de Manu, fils de Hārītī, qui obtinrent leur royaume grâce à la faveur de l'excellente Kauśikī, dont la gloire s'étend jusqu'au cercle des quatre océans, qui pratiquèrent l'aśvamedha, l'arrière petit-fils de Kīrtivarman, à la vaillance insoutenable et à la gloire immense, (son grand-père était) le frère cadet aimé de Satyāśraya Pṛthivī Vallabha, roi suprême des grands rois, excellent souverain, illustre seigneur, maître du cercle de la terre entière, soumise à ses trois pouvoirs. (Son grand-père était) le grand roi Viṣṇuvardhana, doué de vaillance parmi les hommes, grâce à une vaillance qui surpassait l'ensemble des hommes, qui posssédait tout le cercle des feudataires inclinés devant la lame de son épée, qui avait remporté des victoires sur des forteresses pourtant inaccessibles sur terre et sur mer,[7] célébré comme le vache des désirs, que louent les hommes. (Son père était) le cher frère cadet de l'illustre grand roi Jayasiṁgha Vallabha, maître du cercle de tous les horizons, parfumés par le baume de la joie, engendrée par sa gloire, (elle-même) née de sa bonne conduite et des victoires qu('il) remporta dans le choc de maints combats, dont l'esprit immaculé est aiguisé et fortifié par l'étude des différents traités, qui est orné d'une multitude de vertus qui sont la générosité, la noblesse, la dignité, la constance, la beauté, la connaissance, etc., dont les deux pieds de lotus sont rougis par les rayons lumineux des nombreuses pierres précieuses serties sur l'orbe des diadèmes

[7] Glose du *biruda vijaya-siddhiḥ* déjà appliqué à Viṣṇuvardhana I, cf. insc. 10 à 12.

des nombreux rois ennemis, inclinés devant la puissance de ses deux bras, refuge de tous les hommes, brillant par sa vaillance dans les trois mondes, dont la puissance n'a d'autre rivale que la moitié de Śakra, qui figure sur son héroïque bannière, dont la gloire est célébrée par la multitude des crânes de ses nombreux et excellents ennemis, vache immortelle pleine de fruits variés et purs que l'on mange, nourriture faite de jouissances éternelles. (Son père était) le grand roi illustre Indravarman, possesseur de la vache des désirs, doué de connaissances expertes, obtenues grâce à ses trois pouvoirs, qui remporta le succès dans les batailles contre des cercles d'ennemis, car il était fin politique et possédait la vaillance d'un lion, refuge du monde et des rois. Le grand roi Viṣṇuvardhana, qui mûrit de nombreuses connaissances acquises par l'étude des divers traités, ayant donné le village nommé Koṇeki dans le Paḷḷirāṣṭra, ordonne aux intendants du village et aux agents royaux, subordonnés, gouverneurs de province, intendants de *rāṣṭra*, messagers, troupes régulières, chef des danseurs, intendants, serviteurs, officiers subordonnés, chefs de département, juge, percepteur d'impôts, officiers en chef :

〈24–31〉 (nous) donnons au fils de Mahāsenaśarman, brahmane versé dans les Veda, dont la gloire s'étend au bout de tous les horizons, qui se plaît à sacrifier pour lui et pour autrui, à réciter et à enseigner, à donner et à recevoir, ainsi qu'à pratiquer l'ascèse, qui possède une exceptionnelle compréhension de tous les Veda, réputé sous le nom de « Vararuci du temps présent », à Viduśarman, qui connaît les Brahmaṇa, Sūtra, Mantra, Tantra, Upaniṣad, etc., et les nombreux Veda, du *gotra* de Parāśara, dont le cœur est plein de compassion et de bienveillance à l'égard de tous les êtres, de l'école de Taittirīya, qui suit les *sūtra* Apastamba, disciple de Kandeṟuboya,[8] habitant à Ātukuru, au mois de Māgha, à l'occasion d'une éclipse de lune, pour l'accroisement de notre durée de vie, puissance, victoire, jouissance et souveraineté, à l'exception du terrain du *devabhoga*.

〈31–33〉 Puissent tous les seigneurs de la terre de notre époque et ceux à venir protéger ce village, ainsi que les officiers héréditaires en charge du village, Dhanañjaya et tous ses descendants et ses serviteurs nés dans la lignée de Ayyan !

〈33–40〉 Parmi les cent vingts parts de ce village, (nous en donnons) à Viṣṇuśarman,[9] vingt, à son fils Mādiśarman, vingt, à Mahāsenaśarman, vingt et au frère aimé de celui-ci, à Dāmaśarman, vingt, à Gaṇaiśarman, de Mudokuraboya, six, à Viṣṇuśarman, de Ātukuruboya, cinq, à Koṇḍasāmiboya, cinq, à Paṭiboya, un, à Mādiśarman, de Kumunūruboya, quatre, [...]-boya, deux, à Sarvaśarman, de Naḍukuṟboya, deux, à

[8] Pour ce terme cf. insc. n° 21.

[9] Le texte est incompréhensible en l'état. Le fac simile étant illisible, nous supposons cette traduction.

Peṭṭaśarman, de Veḷucaḷiboya, deux, à [...]-boya, deux, à Maṇḍaśarman, de Kanpaṟboya, deux, à Revaśarman, deux, à Irukuṭūruboyāya, deux,

〈40〉 Celui qui transgresse notre édit commet un crime passible de la peine capitale.

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.

Qu'elle soit donnée par lui ou par un autre, celui qui prend prend une terre se souille du crime du meurtrier de cent mille vaches.

3.

Beaucoup ont donné une terre, beaucoup l'ont protégée, celui qui possède la terre en possède le fruit.

〈44–46〉 En la trentième année du règne auguste et victorieux de l'illustre grand roi Jayasiṁgha Vallabha, au mois d'Aśvayuja, le dixième jour de la quizaine claire, le jour où la lune est dans la constellation de Śravana. Cet édit a été gravé par Gaṁgavijaya et Vardhaki. Prospérité !

Commentary

A note on the phrase kauśikī-vara, frequent in grants from this time onward. Most editions that I have encoded so far do not include a translation of the laudatory phrases. Naṭeśa Śāstrī (1884, p. 56) interprets it as I do (boon) in his translation of the Eḍeru plates. Hultzsch (1890, p. 35) interprets it the other way (bridegroom) in his translation of the Koṟṟapaṟṟu grant. I'm quite sure at least one edition mentioned Kauśikī in the introductory discussion, but I could not find which one when I realised this was a potential issue.

The genealogy at the beginning of this grant is replete with problematic declension and suffers from some scribal omissions. Two spots are particularly problematic. The first such spot is the word *praṇaptāḥ* in line 6. Narasimhaswami emends this to the genitive *praṇaptuḥ* and notes that it sould in fact be *naptuḥ*, assuming the intent was to describe Kīrtivarman as the grandson of Raṇarāga. I, on the other hand, feel quite certain that the composer's intent was a nominative here (correctly *praṇaptā*), describing the issuer Viṣṇuvardhana II just as the following *kīrttivarmmaṇaḥ prapautraḥ* correctly describes Viṣṇuvardhana II as the great-grandson of Kīrtivarman. The problem is that in fact

Viṣṇuvardhana II was Raṇarāga's great-great-great-grandson, which is not a regular meaning of *praṇaptṛ*. One possible explanation is that the word is used here in the vague sense of "remote descendant." Another possibility is that the genealogy has been clumsily adapted from a grant of an earlier ruler. In the Timmapuram plates of Viṣṇuvardhana I (the only other Eastern Cālukya grant to mention Raṇarāga), the issuer is described as the *naptṛ* of Raṇarāga, evidently in the sense of "great-grandson" (rather than the best established sense of "grandson", for which that text uses *pautra*). The present genealogy may thus be an inattentive rewriting of such an account for a subsequent generation.

The second highly problematic spot is *asahya-vikramasya vipula-kīrtteḥ kīrttivarmmaṇaḥ prapautraḥ* in line 6. The closely parallel Timmapuram plates read *asahya-vikramasya raṇavikramasya pautro vipula-kīrtteḥ kīrttivarmaṇaḥ priya-sutaḥ* here, while the present genealogy skips Pulakeśin I Raṇavikrama. This may be a scribal omission in the present text (though it is not a clear case of eyeskip), or Raṇavikrama may have been ignored deliberately, perhaps only to shorten the list. If Raṇavikrama was not accidentally omitted from the list but actually conflated with Kīrtivarman in the composer's mind or deliberately suppressed, then it turns out that Viṣṇuvardhana I is "truthfully" (though not factually correctly) described above as Raṇarāga's *praṇaptṛ* (i.e. great-great-grandson, with the sense of *naptṛ* seen in the Timmapuram plates). In this way, the received genealogy may be perceived as internally consistent. If on the other hand the omission of Raṇavikrama is accidental, then his name may have been meant to go before *praṇaptāḥ*, where the name of Raṇarāga is also omitted, and only implied by an epithet ending in *raṇa-rāga*. Thus, a text reconstructed along the lines of *...anubhūta-raṇa-rāgasya raṇarāgasya putrasyāsahya-vikramasya raṇavikramasya praṇaptā vipula-kīrtteḥ kīrttivarmmaṇaḥ prapautraḥ...* would also yield a correct genealogy of Viṣṇuvardhana II, where each predecessor is associated with an epithet evocative of their name.

Finally, the grant was issued in the last regnal year of Jayasiṁha I, and the genealogy devotes more praise to that king than to the donor Viṣṇuvardhana II (in fact, Jayasiṁha I gets more words than the rest of the *praśasti* combined). One might thus assume that the text was originally composed during the reign of Jayasiṁha I (and based on an earlier version composed for Viṣṇuvardhana I, as preserved in the Timmapuram plates). This text might have been hastily revised by a less than competent person to serve in a grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II. Now Jayasiṁha I would be correctly described as the *praṇaptṛ* of Raṇarāga (admitting the existence of Raṇavikrama and understanding *praṇaptṛ* as great-great-great-grandson), and emending the received *praṇaptāḥ* to *praṇaptuḥ* would yield this meaning. But beyond this point, the genealogy loses consistency. The subsequent *kīrttivarmmaṇaḥ prapautraḥ* can only refer to Viṣṇuvardhana II, but linking

praṇaptuḥ to *jayasiṁgha-vallabha-mahārājasya* would then make the syntax extremely awkward.

All in all, I prefer to translate the text as received but believe that the most likely solution to the genealogical discrepancy is simply that Pulakeśin I Raṇavikrama was omitted by accident, and the intent had been to describe Viṣṇuvardhana II as Raṇavikrama's *praṇaptṛ* meaning great-great-grandson. The syntax of the complex opening sentence remains problematic, as the relationship terms and the epithets of Viṣṇuvardhana II are in the nominative, his name is in the genitive, and the verb is expressed by a passive participle that would require the logical subject to be in the instrumental. This kind of incongruency is, however, quite common and can be ignored.

Bibliography

First noticed in ARIE 1939–43, p. 30, appendix A/1940-1941, № 39. Edited from the original by H. K. Narasimhaswami (1955–1956) with a summary of the contents, estampages of the plates and a (poorly printed) photograph of the seal. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Narasimhaswami's edition with estampages preserved at the ASI (Mysore).[10] Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[HKN] Narasimhaswami, H. K. 1955–1956. "Koneki grant of Vishnuvardhana II." EI 31, pp. 74–80.

Secondary

ARIE 1939–43. *Annual reports on South Indian epigraphy for the years 1939-40 to 1942-43*. Edited by C. R. Krishnamacharlu & N. Laksminarayan Rao. Delhi: Government of India, 1952. Page 30, appendixes A/1940-1941, item 39.

Balogh, Dániel. 2026. "Metadata for the DHARMA editions of Veṅgī Cālukya copper plates." Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22827003. [URL].

[10]The estampages are accompanied by a Devanagari transcript. Corrections and notes added to this transcript may come from Narasimhaswami, since they concern emendations and restorations that he too makes in his edition. There are several spots in the text where nothing can be made out in the estampage, but both the transcript and the edition show a plausible reading. I assume that these can be read in the original, and show them in my edition as restorations on the evidence of a previous editor.