

Pr̥thivipallavapaṭṭana grant of Viṣṇuvardhana IV

Dániel Balogh

Alternative title: Ahadanakaram plates of Viṣṇuvardhana V

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00019

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00019.xml

Languages: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)], Telugu [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-10-16 17:02 (a1bf930), last modified 2026-10-14 16:53 (deb89dd)

Palaeographic description

Halantas. In the Telugu section, there occurs a final form of ḷ. Instances are found from line 23 onward. It looks like a full-sized ḷa without a headmark, though it can be simplified to a wavy vertical line with a loop at the bottom, as in l28, -konthukaḷ. Final N (l16, pramukhāN) is simplified, with a long stem and no headmark.

Other palaeographic observations. As Fleet observes, in l10 °opajāyamāno°, jā is formed very strangely, with a downward-bending vowel marker attached to the top prong of j. In l15 -jvālā, the vowel is also attached to the upper prong, but it bends upward. The weird khā in line 16, which Fleet calls "very anomalous", looks essentially like a pa, with the right limb bending outward. It has some resemblance to a khā that, according to Indoskript, occurs in the Vijayawada plates of Cālukya-Bhīma I. Short and long i/ī are not distinguished in the Telugu section (except in some words perceived to be Sanskrit, e.g. l24 śrīya). Though Fleet reads some (incorrect) long ī-s there when the circle is not completely closed on the left, in my opinion these are just less well executed short i-s. They definitely lack the conspicuous inward hook of instances of long ī in the Sanskrit. In the Telugu part, anusvāras are placed at the top right of the character after the

character to which they belong (and were thus read by Fleet as being one character further on than they were meant to be). A number of characters in the Telugu part, looking like a circle that may have nothing inside or various parts of a plus-shaped cross, are shown here as an unclearly written th. Some or all of these may have been meant for dh, l or r but the notchless circular shape of these glyphs speaks against them being one of the Dravidian retroflexes. Unambiguous instances of r in line 28 and probable instances of l in line 25 look very different from these. Rare initial Ū occurs repeatedly in the Telugu section. The Telugu section may be in a different hand, but it is more likely to be the same hand, perhaps a late one who attempted to imitate an earlier style throughout the document, and to a greater extent in the Sanskrit section.

Edition

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <1> (sva)sti<.> śrīmatām sakala-bhuvana-(saṁst)ūyamāna-<māna>vya-
(sago)trāṇ<a?<ā>m hāri<2>ti-(putrā)ṇām k<o?<au>ś<i?<i>kī-vara-prasāda-
labdha-rājyānā<m> mātr-gaṇa-p<ā?<a>rip<a?<ā>li<3>tānām (svā?)Omi-
mahās<ā?<e>na-ḥpādānāduān(th)anā?<pādānudyātānām> bhagavan-nārāyaṇa-
pra<4>sāl[(dasa)]da-samāsādita-var<ā?<a>-varāha-lāñchan<ā?<e>kṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-
vaśīk(r)<5>t<a?<ā>rāt<i?<i>(m)<ā?<a>ṇḍalānām Aśvamedhāvabhṛtha-snāna-
pavitrikṛta-vapuṣ<ā?<ā>m ca<Page 2r><6>ḷukyānām k<a?<u>(la)m alarṇka(riṣṇoḥ)
sv<a?<ā>si-dhārā-prabhāvāva(r)jj(i)tāś{r}(eṣa-mahī-maṇḍa)la<7>sya śrī-vi(ṣṇuva)rddhana-
mahārājasya <pautraḥ> bhr<u?<ū>-bh<ā?<a>mga-mātra-vidhūta-sam<ā?<a>stārāt(i-
maṇḍalasya)<8> <kāriṇa? AOneka-tulā-dhṛta-śātakumbha-viśrāṇan<a?<ā>vadāta-
śar<i?<i>rasya śrī-(vija)<9>yādi(tya)-mahārājasya priya-tanayaḥ cakrava<r>t<th?<t>i-
lakṣaṇopetaḥ (cakra)<10>dhara Iva lakṣm<il<i>-vallabhaḥ bhāsvān i<va ni>ty-
opajāyamānodayaḥ candra Iva (ja)<Page 2v><11>gad-āhlādana-karaḥ sura-gaja
Iva dāna-va<r>ś<i?<i>jalanidhir iva gambh<i?<i>ra-satvaḥ yudhiṣṭhira Iva<12>
bh<i?<i>masenānvitaḥ kā<r>t<th?<t>ikeya Ivāpratihata-śaktiḥ śakti-trayopetaḥ catas-
ṛṣu nṛ<13>pa-vidyāsu O vicakṣaṇaḥ yuddheṣu viṣama-siddhiḥ A<r>tthi-jane kāma-
dhenuḥ str<i?<i>ṣu ma<14>kara-dhvajaḥ ripu-timira-vidhvamsane pralayādityaḥ
jvalat-pratāpānala-jvālāval<i?<i><15>dha-ripu-nṛp<ā?<a>ḥ <śi>ghra-pavanaḥ vi-
jig<i?<i>p<s>ur ddharma-vijay<i?<i>parama-brahmaṇyaḥ para<ma>-māhe<Page
3r><16>śvaraḥ sarvva-lokāśraya-śr(i)-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārājaḥ rāṣṭrak<u?<ū>ṭa-
pramu(khā)N kuṭ<il<u>mbinaḥ (sa)<17>rvvān ittham ājñ<alpayati<.> viditam astu vo
<'>smābhiḥ

svast_{ḥa?}<_i><.> p_{ri}lthiv_{il}-pal<1>ava-paṭṭana<m>buna Ūri<18>vāru karigaḷla-
vaḍavariki Ūri-svāmuḷ. Iccina s_{it}l<th>iti<.> reṇḍuvāḍala-paṭṭanāvuraku<19> Ariyu ○
(ḍ)agu-tereyu siddhāyambu daṇḍu-dasaparādhambunu sarvva-bāda-pa<20>riyāruvu
Ūru-dāya-sesi Icci<.> diniki vakrambu ledu vaccinavāru gaḷareni Ūri s_{it}l<th>iti<21>
dappinavāru<.> diniki vakrambu vaccina gaccuru reṇḍuv_{ḥa?}<_ā>ḍala Ele muvarulem-
ula ce<22>sinadiyu cannu<.> viripayināḍuv_{ḥa?}<_ā>ru gaḷgina Eḷemuḷa cesina seyuḍu
sanu

<Page 3v> <23> mahanabhiyuḷ. narāḷoka mahasatthavuḷ. virāpava mahanabhiyu(ḷ)
gaḷṇa(m?)bu (se)<24>(th)la naḍupuḷ. _{ṣamasta-bhuvanaśrīya!}<_{samasta-bhuvanāśraya}>
kanadiraju

badrapereya Ūri panina vrasī vara<25> vayye(ḷ)ī māhanabhiḷ. vayye(ḷ)ī mahabhiḷ.
panikoḷuce neraka pañcina vras(i)

<26> vayye(ḷ)ī ○ mahanabhiyuḷ. ma<<(ka)>>la kon(th)ukaḷ. sa<r>vva-
(lo)k_{ḥa?}<_ā>śraya mahāsattthavaḷ<27> perddaḷ. n_i!<_i>ravadya mahāsartthavaḷ.
paṣiṇḍi mu(th)lu veṭandala caruvayya viṣṇuvarddhana ma<28>hasattthavaḷ. pa-
sukṣevula kon(th)ukaḷ. Accakurṛavaniyu kon(th)ukaḷ. ga(jambu?) se(th)lala<29>
naḍupuḷ. prithi(v)ī mahasartthavaḷ. veṭandaḷ. ponikan(th)īramukoḷa naḍupu viṣṇuvard-
dhana<Page 4r> <30> mahasattthavala kon(th)ukalu niravadya-_{ṣpridhivi!}<_{ṣr̥thivī}>-
kanadirajuḷ. gunavana mahanabhiyuḷ<31> muddakañcikoḷ. ramisvarā-_{ṣpridhivi!}<_{ṣr̥thivī}>-
mahasartthavala Apayajanuvakola koṇḍukaḷ. korin(th)ikoḷ<32> karigala-_{ṣpridhivi!}<_{ṣr̥thivī}>-
mahasattthavala konthukaḷ. nandi mahanavila naḍupu śrī-maha<33>sattthavala
○ saka<la>-_{ṣlokaśrayya!}<_{lokāśraya}> _{ṣpridhivi!}<_{ṣr̥thivī}> mahasartthavala
div_{ḥa?}<_ā>karayya pa(ñca)<34>koḷ.

śrī-jaṣṭi-pendaṭṭarṛa gan(th)ān(th)u

<Page 4v> <Page 5r> <Page 5v>

Apparatus

<1> -(sa)st)ūyamāna- ◇ -_{sam}<_s>_{tūyamāna}- JFF • Fleet's notation may mean that s is lost rather than omitted, but it is the same as that for *māna* later in the line. Parts of s and t are definitely visible in the rubbings.

<2> p_{ḥā?}<_ā>rip_{ḥa?}<_ā>li<3>tānām ◇ _{parip}_{ḥa?}<_ā>li<3>tānām JFF • The last three characters in line 2 (especially *pali*) are horizontally compressed and squeezed together. There is no trace of correction, but it seems likely that at first, *pālītānām* must have been engraved, after which *li* was struck out and *ripali* was added in its place.

⟨3⟩ (svā?)○mi- • I am not at all certain that svā is or was ever present in the plate. There are some scratches next to the hole, but they are too narrow and their shape does not indicate svā, although it is possible that the expected character was once indeed engraved, and has been badly worn. — ⟨3⟩ -ṣpādānāduān(th)anā?⟨pādānudhyātānām⟩
 • The character duā, with two vowel markers, may be a scribal mistake for a pre-written ddhā, itself a mistake for dhyā. The subscript component of the next character, which I read with JFF as th, is a rough circle divided into four quarters by a cross. It is conspicuously different from the standalone th in the Sanskrit section (line 5, āvabhṛtha) as well as from subscript th-s (line 9, cakravatthi; l13, atthi). It is, however, also not a proper r, and looks identical to several characters that JFF reads as th in the Telugu section. — ⟨3⟩ -pra⟨4⟩sā[(dasa)]da- ◇ -pra⟨4⟩sāda-{sada}-samāsādita- JFF • I am fairly certain that the second and third character in the line have been deleted.

⟨5⟩ ca⟨Page 2r⟩ ⟨6⟩ lūkyānā ◇ cā⟨Page 2r⟩ ⟨6⟩ lūkyānām JFF • I (and Fleet) read lu with goodwill. The character looks rather like ḍu or du.

⟨8⟩ ṣkāriṇa? • This word is not interpretable in the context. The reading is clear, but cannot be what the composer had intended. It may be the end of a largely omitted compound qualifying the issuer's father. Elsewhere in the corpus, compounds similar to the following one here are not uncommon and compounds similar to the preceding one here occur occasionally, but none of these occurrences are adjacent to any other phrase that provides a clue to what might have been omitted here. A compound beginning with Aneka-tulā-dhṛta- is preceded directly by one ending in -maṇḍalasya in the Nemmalūru grant of Vijayāditya I and the Dinakādu grant of Vijayāditya I, and by a different compound likewise asserting mastery over rivals in the Tāṇḍivāḍa grant of Vijayāditya II. The closest parallel I have been able to find is the phrase kāraṇa-ṣiṣṇor iva appearing (uniquely) in the Pedda-Vegi plates of Jayasimha I in the description of Viṣṇuvardhana I, where the adjacent phrases do not resemble the present text. Given this paucity of plausible restorations, it is also possible that the word kāriṇa is completely superfluous here, or that it is misplaced in addition to being corrupt. I wonder if it may have something to do with the missing pautraḥ in the previous line.

⟨10⟩ bhāsvān i⟨va ni⟩tyopajāyamānodayaḥ ◇ bhāsvān iṣty?⟨v⟩opajāyamānodayaḥ JFF • The character ni is very narrow and in my opinion very likely to have been corrected from an earlier final N. The following tyo may have been corrected from an initial I, but this is much less certain. Fleet's less invasive emendation is not implausible, but I cannot conceive of a scribe who accidentally writes tyo instead of vo, and believe that something more complicated must have been going on here. My suggested omission of two akṣaras can be easily attributed to eyeskip haplography, although this is still complicated by the presumed correction from an original bhāsvāN I. For the content

of my emendation, compare *Āditya Iva satatodaya-karī* applied to Vijayāditya III in his Sātalūru plates.

<15> -nrp;ā?<a>ḥ <śī>ghra-pavanaḥ • I adopt JFF's emendations, but *śīghra-pavanaḥ* on its own strikes me as very odd. The beginning of a compound ending with *ghra-pavanaḥ* may well have been omitted here. Compare *para-gaja-ghana-ṣaṭala-pavanaḥ* in line 9 of the Lohaner plates of Pulakeśin II, and especially *Ari-nṛpa-vāji-vāraṇa-padāti-mahābhra-virāma-mārutaḥ* applied to Viṣṇuvardhana V in the Sātalūru plates of Vijayāditya III.

<17> svast;ā?<i> R&RM ◇ *svasti* JFF; *svasta* KMS. — <17> -pal<l>ava- JFF ◇ *-pallava-* KMS R&RM. — <17> -paṭṭana<ṛi>buna JFF ◇ *-paṭṭanabuna* KMS R&RM • The expected *anusvāra* may in fact be present, as there is a conspicuous dot inside the subscript *b* of *kuṭimbinaḥ* in the previous line. This is, however, well to the right of *bu*, and there is plenty of blank space where an *anusvāra* would normally be placed.

<18> -vaḍavariki KMS R&RM ◇ *-vaḍav;ā?<ā>riki(m?)* JFF • JFF's *vā* is probably a tentative emendation, while his *kiṛi* is an uncertain alternative reading of what is probably just a small spot of damage. — <18> reṇḍu° KMS R&RM ◇ *reṇ(d/ṭ)u°* JFF. — <18> °vāḍala- JFF R&RM ◇ °*vāḍala-* KMS • Probably a typo in KMS.

<19> (ḍ)agu JFF R&RM ◇ *dagu* KMS • JFF and RRM print a clear *ḍ*, while KMS's *d* may be a typo or an error of my scan. The character is not a definite *ḍ* as it lacks a notch in its bottom, but it is also not a *d*, as the end of its body stroke curves upward and inward. — <19> siddhāyambu KMS ◇ *siddhāyabu(m?)* JFF; *siddhāyabu* R&RM • The *anusvāra* is clear at the top right of (bu). — <19> daṇḍu KMS R&RM ◇ *daṇ(d/ṭ)u* JFF. — <19> -dasaparādhambunu KMS ◇ *da;s?<ś>ā?<ā>parādhambunu* JFF; *-dasaparādhambunu* R&RM • The *anusvāra* is again clear at the top right of (bu). — <19> -bāda- KMS ◇ *-bā;ḍ?<dh>a-* JFF; *-bā;ḍa?<dhā>-* R&RM.

<20> Ūru- JFF KMS ◇ *<gānu> Ūru-* R&RM • RRM do not explain their emendation, which is opaque to me. — <20> Icci JFF KMS ◇ *Icci<ri>* R&RM • KMS also suggests emending to *Icciri* in a tentative note. — <20> diniki JFF ◇ *diniki* KMS R&RM. — <20> vakraṇbu KMS ◇ *vakrabuṁ* JFF; *vakrabu* R&RM. — <20> ḷedu JFF KMS ◇ *ḷ!<l>edu* R&RM. — <20> gaḷareni JFF KMS ◇ *ga;ḷ!<l>areni* R&RM.

<21> diniki JFF ◇ *diniki* KMS R&RM. — <21> vakraṇbu KMS ◇ *vakrabuṁ* JFF; *vakrabu* R&RM. — <21> reṇḍuv;ā?<ā>ḍala R&RM ◇ *reṇḍuvaḍala* KMS; *reṇ(d/ṭ)uv;ā?<ā>ḍala* JFF. — <21> Ele JFF KMS ◇ *E;ḷ!<l>e* R&RM. — <21> ce<22>sinadiyu KMS ◇ *ve<22>sinadiyu* JFF R&RM • The last character of line 22 is partly invisible in Elliot's rubbings because the paper did not fit the rim of the plate well, but it is quite clear in Fleet's estampage. In spite of Fleet's reading of *ve*, it is indeed much more likely to be *ce* than *ve* (compare

the circular body of several instances of *va* earlier in the line), and the elongated and notched body of ca e.g. in *cannu* in the next line.

<22> viripayināḍuv; *a?<ā>ru* ◇ *viripayināḍuv; a?<ā>ru* R&RM; *viripayin āḍuvaru* KMS; *viripayinā; d?<ḍ>uvaru* JFF. — <22> Eḷemuḷa JFF KMS ◇ *Eḷemu<varul emu>ḷ!<ḷ>a* R&RM.

<23> mahanabiyuḷ JFF ◇ *mahānabiyuḷ* KMS; *mah; a?<ā>nabiyuḷ* R&RM • Here and below, RRM emend all instances of *mahanabiyuḷ* and *mahasatthavuḷ* to *mahā-*, while Sastri reads (or silently emends to) the same. — <23> narāḷoka JFF KMS ◇ *narāḷoka* R&RM. — <23> gajña(rn?)bu JFF ◇ *gajñambu* KMS; *gajñabu* R&RM. — <23> (se)<24>(th)la- ◇ *se<24>(lla/thu)-* JFF; *se<24>ḍla-* KMS; *seṭhla-* R&RM • The problematic character's subscript component is certainly *l*. The principal component is a circle with a horizontal line crossing it; a similar character occurs in line 3 and several times in the following lines. See also the palaeographic discussion. It is definitely neither *ḍ* nor *ṭh*. I would expect *l* to be elongated, and notched in the centre.

<24> naḍupuḷ KMS R&RM ◇ *naḍupuḷ* JFF • While *d* and *ḍ* are practically indistinguishable from the glyph alone, I accept the Telugu scholars' opinion. — <24> *śamasta-bhuvanaśrīya!<samasta-bhuvanāśraya>* ◇ *ś!<s>amasta-bhuvana-śrīya* JFF; *śamasta-bhuvana-śrīya* KMS; *śamastabhuvanaśrīya!<samasta-bhuvanāśraya>* R&RM • While *d* and *ḍ* are practically indistinguishable from the glyph alone, I accept the Telugu scholars' opinion. — <24> kanadiraju JFF ◇ *kanadiraju* KMS; *kanadir; a?<ā>ju* R&RM. — <24> Ūri panina JFF KMS ◇ *Ūr; i?<u>pa; n?<ñc>ina* R&RM. — <24> vrasī vara JFF KMS ◇ *vr; a?<ā>si<na> v; a?<ā>r; a?<u>* R&RM.

<25> vayye(ḷ)ḷi R&RM ◇ *vayyeti* JFF; *vayyeti* KMS • The problematic consonant looks much like a modern Telugu *t*. It is certainly not *ṭ*; I believe RRM are right in reading it as *ḷ* (which they print as certain). — <25> māhanabhiḷ JFF ◇ *mahānabhiḷ* KMS; *mah; a?<ā>nabhi<yu>ḷ* R&RM. — <25> vayye(ḷ)ḷi mahabhiḷ ◇ *vayyeti mahabhiḷ* JFF; *vayyeti mahābhiḷ* KMS; *{vayyeḷi mahabhiḷ}* R&RM. — <25> vras(i) KMS ◇ *vras(i/e)* JFF; *vr; a?<ā>se* R&RM • The vowel marker does not seem to be closed into a circle on the left, but it is shorter than an *e śiromātrā* is expected to be, and *e* is written with a *prṣṭhamātrā* everywhere else. Compare the same word in the previous line, where RRM too read *śi*: there the circle is almost complete but does not seem to be closed at the left side of the bottom. There are multiple instances of very similar markers in the Telugu section in places where *i* is definitely expected, and has been read by RRM as well as others; see line 30 for several side by side. — <25> vayye(ḷ)ḷi R&RM ◇ *vayyeti* JFF; *vayyeti* KMS.

<26> ma<<(ka)>>la ◇ *marala* KMS; *(sa?)kala-* JFF; *sakala-* R&RM • The first character definitely looks like *ma*, not *sa*. The second character (which was obviously added afterward in the space between the first and the third) is, however, quite certainly *ka*; KMS's

reading may be a silent emendation. — <26> kon(th)ukaḷ ◇ *konthukaḷ* JFF; *kondukaḷ* KMS; *konṛukaḷ* R&RM • See the note to line 23 and the palaeographic description about the problematic character. This instance is a circle with a cross inside.

<27> perddaḷ n_je!<i>ravadya R&RM ◇ *pe(rdda/ṭṭā)ḷ n_je!<i>ravadya* JFF; *perddaḷ neravadya* KMS • Except for the initial *pe*, these characters are small and narrow, and may have been written over a shorter deleted segment. — <27> paṣiṇḍi KMS R&RM ◇ *paṣiṇ(ḍ/ṭ)i* JFF. — <27> mu(ṭh)lu R&RM ◇ *mudhlu* JFF; *muḍlu* KMS • See the note to line 23 and the palaeographic description about the problematic character. This instance is a circle with nothing inside, so I accept RRM's reading of *ṭh* (which they print without uncertainty). — <27> viṣṇuvarddhana JFF KMS ◇ *v_je?<i>ṣṇuvarddhana* R&RM • Here again, the vowel marker is not closed on the left and thus resembles an *e śiromātrā*; see also the note to line 25. Note that the vowel marker in *neravadya* earlier in this line is also the expected *prṣṭhamātrā*, so I do not think an *e* was intended here. — <27> ma<28>hasatthavaḷ JFF ◇ *ma<28>hāsathavaḷ* KMS; *ma<28>h_ja?<ā>sathavaḷ* R&RM.

<26> kon(th)ukaḷ ◇ *konthukaḷ* JFF; *kondukaḷ* KMS; *konṛukaḷ* R&RM • Both instances of this word in the line are read by the different editors as shown here, and the problematic character in both appears as a circle with a T shape (a cross sans the upper arm) inside. See also the note to line 23 and the palaeographic description.

<28> ga(jambu?) ◇ *ga(jabum?)* JFF; *gajña* KMS; *gajñabu* R&RM • Compare the unambiguous *gajña(m?)bu* in line 23. The problematic segment here is very narrow. Apart from the quite certain *anusvāra*, it may be a very compressed and poorly executed *jabu*, or a partly disjointed and even more poorly executed *jña*. A correction from *jña* to *jabu* is also possible. RRM's reading *jñabu* is, however, out of the question, since there is only one descender, which may either be part of *ñ* or an *u* marker. — <28> se(ṭh)lala ◇ *se(dhra?)la* JFF; *seḍlala* KMS; *seṭhla* R&RM • See the note to line 23 and the palaeographic description about the problematic character. This time, it is an oval with nothing inside, so I read it as *ṭh*. RRM may be right that *la* is superfluous (compare l. 24), but it is certainly present.

<29> naḍupuḷ KMS R&RM ◇ *nadupuḷ* JFF • Again, I accept the Telugu scholars' opinion. — <29> prithi(v)i- ◇ *prithi_jm?<v>i-* JFF; *prithimi-* KMS; *p_jri<ṛ>thivī-* R&RM • The problematic character is distinctly different from the following *ma*, so I prefer to assume it is a correct *va* with an accidental extra stroke. — <29> ponikan(th)īramukoḷa ◇ *p(o/au)nikan(th?)īramukoḷa* JFF; *ponikandīramu koḷa* KMS; *ponikakṣeramukoḷa* R&RM • See the note to line 23 and the palaeographic description about the problematic character. This time it is a circle with two lines inside, pointing to 12 and 3 o'clock from the centre. I cannot agree with RRM's *kṣ*, as this character looks very different not only from a

typical *kṣ* but also from the cursive one in line 28. Reading the vowel as *e* also seems unlikely even though the marker is not closed on the left; compare the note to line 25. — <29> naḍupu KMS R&RM ◇ *naḍupu* JFF • Again, I accept the Telugu scholars' opinion.

<30> kon(th)ukalu JFF ◇ *konḍukalu* KMS; *konrukalu* R&RM • See the note to line 23 and the palaeographic description about the problematic character. This one is a circle with a horizontal line inside. — <30> -jpridhivi!<pr̥thivī>-L ◇ -prithivi- JFF; -pridhivi- KMS; -p̥ri?<r>thivī- R&RM.

<31> muddakañcikoL KMS R&RM ◇ *mu(dd/ṭṭ)akañcikoL* JFF. — <31> ramisvarā JFF ◇ *ramisvanā* KMS; *ramīśvarā* R&RM • Presumably a typo in KMS, while RRM's reading may be a silent emendation.

<30> -jpridhivi!<pr̥thivī>-L ◇ -prithivi- JFF; -prithivī- KMS; -p̥ri?<r>thivī- R&RM.

<31> -mahasartthavaḷa JFF ◇ -mahasartthavaL KMS; -mah̥ā?<ā>sattthavaḷa R&RM. —

<31> Apayajanuvakola KMS ◇ *Apayajanuva-kāla* JFF; *Apayajanuvako;l?<ḷ>a* R&RM. —

<31> konḍukaL R&RM ◇ *kon(d/ṭ)ukaL* JFF; *konḍukaL* KMS. — <31> korin(th)ikoL R&RM ◇ *korindhikoL* JFF; *korindikoL* KMS • See the note to line 23 and the palaeographic description about the problematic character. Here too, it is an empty circle.

<32> -jpridhivi!<pr̥thivī> ◇ -prithivi- JFF; *pridhivī-* KMS; -p̥ri?<r>thivī- R&RM. — <32> konthukaL JFF ◇ *konḍukaL* KMS; *konrukaL* R&RM • See the note to line 23 and the palaeographic description about the problematic character. This instance is a circle with a complete cross inside it. — <32> nandi JFF R&RM ◇ *nadi* KMS • KMS's omission of *n* is probably a typo, since it is present in his translation. — <32> -mahanavila JFF ◇ *mahānavila* KMS; *mah̥a?<ā>navi<yu>la* R&RM.

<29> naḍupu R&RM ◇ *naḍupu* JFF; *naḍu* KMS • Again, I accept the Telugu scholars' opinion. KMS's omission of *pu* is a typo, since the syllable is present in his translation.

<32> -maha<33>sattthavaḷa JFF ◇ -mahā<33>sattthavaḷa KMS; -mah̥a?<ā><33>sattthavaḷa?<ḷ> R&RM.

<33> saka<la>-jlokaśrayya!<lokāśraya> R&RM ◇ *sakā<la>jlokaśrayya!<lokāśraya>* JFF; *sakalokaśrayya* KMS • JFF's first *ā* is probably a typo, since he does not emend it. —

<33> -jpridhivi!<pr̥thivī> ◇ -prithivi- JFF; *pridhivī-* KMS; -p̥ri?<r>thivī- R&RM. — <33> mahasartthavaḷa JFF ◇ *mahāsartthavaḷa* KMS; *mah̥a?<ā>sarthavaḷa?<ḷ>* R&RM. — <33> div̥a?<ā>karayya JFF R&RM ◇ *divakarsyya* KMS • Typo in KMS.

<34> -jaṣṭi-pendaṭṭarra JFF R&RM ◇ -jaṣṭi *pedaṭṭarra* KMS • The omission of *n* in KMS must be a typo. — <34> gan(th)ān(th)u ◇ *gandhānthu* JFF; *ganḍāṇḍu* KMS; *ganrānru* R&RM • See the note to line 23 and the palaeographic description about the problematic

character. Here, the first instance has a horizontal line across it, while the second has full cross inside.

Translation¹

⟨1–17⟩ Greetings. ⟨The grandson⟩ of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (III), who made the complete circle of the earth bow down by the power of the blade of his sword and who was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Caḷukyas—who are of the Mānavya *gotra* which is praised by the entire world, who are sons of Hārīti, who attained kingship by the grace of Kauśikī's boon, who are protected by the band of Mothers, who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by Lord Mahāsena, to whom the realms of adversaries instantaneously submit at the ⟨mere⟩ sight of the superior Boar emblem they have acquired by the grace of the divine Nārāyaṇa, and whose bodies have been hallowed through washing in the purificatory ablutions (*avabhṛtha*) of the Aśvamedha sacrifice—; the dear son of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Vijayāditya (I), who by a mere frown dispersed all enemy kingdoms,² whose body was cleansed by the distribution of gold weighed on many balance scales,³ His Majesty the supremely pious King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (IV), shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), supreme devotee of Maheśvara, who possesses the bodily marks of a universal sovereign (*cakravartin*), who is the beloved of Royal Fortune (*lakṣmī*) as (Viṣṇu) the Bearer of the Discus {is the beloved of Lakṣmī}, whose ascendancy occurs perpetually, as that of the sun,⁴ who produces delight in the world like the moon {with its rays}, who scatters gifts like a divine elephant {sprinkling rut fluid}, who is profound by nature, like the ocean, who is attended by a fearsome army like Yudhiṣṭhira {who is attended by Bhīmasena}, whose power is as irresistible as {the spear} of Kārttikeya, who is equipped with the three powers (*śakti-traya*), learned in the four royal sciences, prevailing over adversity (*viśama-siddhi*) in battles, a cow of plenty (*kāmadhenu*) to supplicants, a crocodile-bannered ⟨god of love⟩ to women, a doomsday sun (*pralayāditya*) to dispel the darkness of his enemies, the flames of the wildfire of whose blazing valour have licked enemy kings, a ¿swift? wind,⁵ a conqueror (*vijigīṣu*) who conquers righteously (*dharma-vijayin*)—⟨this Viṣṇuvardhana⟩ commands all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including

¹The translation of the Sanskrit section is my own. For the Telugu section, I venture a tentative translation, likely to be wrong in many details, based on K. M. Sastri's translation (1969, pp. 300–301), Ramesh and Ramachandra Murthy's discussion (1975, pp. 127–130), and my own conjecture.

²There is an uninterpretable word at this point in the text; see the apparatus to line 8.

³That is, gold weighed on a scale against his body, the *tulāpuruṣa mahādāna*.

⁴I translate my conjectural emendation noted in the apparatus for line 10.

⁵There is probably something wrong with the text here. I translate as best I can, but see the apparatus note to line 15.

foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)— as follows: let it be known to you that we <have given>⁶

<17–22> Greetings. The masters of the town (*ūri-svāmuḷ*) in Prithivīpallava-paṭṭana have made a grant to (the deity) Karigaḷḷa-vaḍavaru in the town.⁷ The town's donation is <comprised of> the fixed income (*siddhāyambu*) from (the taxes) *ari* and *dagu-tere* and the penalties on the ten kinds of crime collected from Reṇḍuvāḍala-paṭṭana, with an exemption from all interference. Whatever action the three officers of Reṇḍuvāḍala protecting the grant take against those violating it, will prevail. If there is any authority over these officers, <even then> the action taken by the latter will prevail.⁸

<23–24> <The three officers are>⁹ The sea merchant (*mahanabiyuḷ*) Narāḷoka;¹⁰ the land merchant (*mahasatthavuḷ*) Virāpava; the sea merchant guildmaster Gajñambu as the agent (*naḍupuḷ*) of Samasta-bhuvanāśraya Kanadiraju.¹¹

<24–25> By the order of the town, composed by Badrapereya and written by the sea merchant Vayyeḷi.¹²

⁶The text leaves off abruptly here, and the Telugu section begins anew with the salutation *svasti*.

⁷Karigaḷḷa is apparently a cognomen of Viṣṇuvardhana V (but see also the commentary), and Ramesh & Ramachandra Murthy 1975, p. 126 argue that *vaḍavaru* is equivalent to Sanskrit *bhaṭṭāra(ka)*. The deity is thus probably one established by the king.

⁸I follow K. M. Sastri in the translation of these two sentences. According to Ramesh and Ramachandra Murthy, the latter means that whoever questions the punitive action of the town's officers shall be subject to the same punishment.

⁹According to Sastri, this is already the beginning of the list of witnesses. I follow Ramesh and Ramachandra Murthy in the interpreting this passage as specifying the three officers referred to above, but segment it differently. By their explanation, Narāḷoka is both *mahanabiyuḷ* and *mahasatthavuḷ*, while the last person with the royal name is neither.

¹⁰See Ramesh & Ramachandra Murthy 1975, pp. 128–129 for a convincing argument to equate *mahanabiyuḷ* and its variants to Sanskrit *mahā-nāvika* and *mahasatthavuḷ* and its variants to *mahā-sārthavāha*, interpreted respectively as masters of trade over sea and land. I adopt this interpretation here, although some doubt is cast on it by the fact that *mahasatthavuḷ* is several times associated with a royal title. Were the kings given merchant honorifics, or were some merchants named after kings? See especially the combination of *mahasatthavaḷa* with *śrī* and a royal cognomen in ll. 32–33.

¹¹I accept Ramesh and Ramachandra Murthy's translation of *naḍupu* as “agent,” but in their interpretation each time it is a person named after a king who seems to be the agent of a person with a commoner's name. I therefore venture, without being at all certain, that the relationship is to be understood in reverse, with the commoner-named people acting as royal agents.

¹²Ramesh and Ramachandra Murthy's explanation of this passage is not at all transparent. It seems to me that neither composition nor writing can actually be read in the text, and I do not know how *panikoḷuce neraka pañcina vrasī* figures in their interpretation. They may well be right to believe that the repetition of *vayyeḷi mahānabhiḷ* (with some variation) is redundant dittography, but I am not at all convinced that the persons named acted in the functions with which these scholars associate them. K. M. Sastri's translation makes these people witnesses, with the first Vayyeḷi “toiling in the service of the village” and the second Vayyeḷi “in the service of the village at the instance of the first, who could not carry on the work.”

⟨26–34⟩ ⟨Witnessed by:⟩¹³

- sea merchant Vayyeli
- land merchant Sarvalokāśraya, the son of Makala¹⁴
- the respected land merchant Neravadya
- treasury officer Veṇandala Caruvayya
- land merchant Viṣṇuvardhana
- guildmaster Gajambu, son of Accakurṛavaniyu ⟨who was the⟩ son of Pasukṣevulu, as the agent of land merchant Prithivi
- Veṇandaḷ Ponikanthirāmukoḷ, as the agent of Niravadya Pridhivi Kanadirajuḷ son of the land merchant Viṣṇuvardhana
- sea merchant Gunavana
- Muddakañcikoḷ
- land merchant Ramisvarā Pridhivi
- Korinthikoḷ, son of Apayajanuvakol
- sea merchant Nandi, son of the land merchant Karigala Pridhivi, as the agent of His Honour the land merchant Sakala-Lokāśraya Pridhivi
- land merchant Divākarayya Pañcakoḷ

⟨34⟩ Engraved by His Honour Śrī Jaṣṭi Pendaṭṭarṛa.¹⁵

Translation into French by Estienne-Monod 2008

⟨1–17⟩ Prospérité ! Le petit-fils de l'illustre grand roi Viṣṇuvardhana, qui a conquis le cercle de la terre immense par la puissance de la lame de son épée, ornement de la lignée des Calukya, illustres, du même *gotra* que les descendants de Manu, honorés

¹³In segmenting the list below, I mostly follow Ramesh and Ramachandra Murthy, but add Sastri's translations of some terms left untranslated by them, and adopt the spellings shown in the present edition.

¹⁴In Ramesh and Ramachandra Murthy's discussion this is "son of Sakala". Given that the reading is quite certainly *makala*, I wonder if this word is a Tamil one meaning "son" redundantly rather than a name, in which case this Sarvalokāśraya might be the son of Vayyeli, who has just been mentioned twice before.

¹⁵Ramesh and Ramachandra Murthy suggest deriving *pandaṭṭarṛa* from Tamil *peruntattāra* equivalent to Sanskrit *mahā-suvarṇakāra* and attested in some inscriptions of the Gaṅgas of Talakāḍu. This sounds plausible, but I do not know whether "engraved by" is their translation of *ganthānthu* or a conjecture, and I wonder if a master goldsmith would receive the honorific *śrī*.

dans le monde entier, fils de Hārīti, qui obtinrent leur royaume grâce à la l'excellente faveur de Kauśikī, protégés par la troupe des Mères, méditant aux pieds du seigneur Mahāseṇa, dont les cercles ennemis furent soumis en un instant à la vue du signe du sanglier illustre, faveur octroyée par le bienheureux Nārāyaṇa, dont les corps furent purifiés par les bains purificateurs de l'*aśvamedha*, le cher fils de l'illustre grand roi Vijayāditya, destructeur qui a balayé le cercle de tous ses ennemis par son seul froncement de sourcil, qui a purifié son corps en pesant maintes donations d'or,¹⁶ lui qui porte la marque d'un souverain *cakravartin* ; bien-aimé de la Fortune, comme Cakradhara est le bien-aimé de Lakṣmī, il voit s'accroître sa prospérité comme le soleil levant, il fait le bonheur de l'univers comme la lune le réjouit de ses rayons, il fait pleuvoir des dons, comme l'éléphant des dieux fait pleuvoir le *dāna*, il possède un profond courage, comme l'océan dont la profondeur est la nature, il dispose d'une armée terrifiante, comme Yudhiṣṭhira est accompagné de Bhīmasena, sa puissance est invaincue comme la lance de Kārtikeya, dont les pouvoirs sont inattaquables, il est doué des trois pouvoirs, expert dans les quatre sciences des rois,¹⁷ il obtient des succès difficiles dans les combats, il est la vache des désirs pour les miséreux, Makaradhvaja pour les femmes, s'agissant de disperser ces ténèbres que sont les ennemis, il est le soleil de la Grande Destruction, feu impétueux dont les flammes du brasier qu'est son énergie flamboyante lèchent les rois ennemis, vijigīṣu, conquérant du dharma, très pieux, excellent seigneur, le grand roi illustre, refuge de tous les hommes, Viṣṇuvardhana, ordonne ceci à tous chefs de familles, *rāṣṭrakūṭa* en tête : qu'il soit connu de vous que par nous à Pṛthivi-pallava-paṭṭana ?¹⁸

Commentary

The findspot "Ahadanakaram" has not been identified; already Fleet prints the name in inverted commas, while Ramesh and Ramachandra Murthy refer to it as "elusive."

The plates had a ring, which was cut by the time Fleet saw it. The seal was also lost by that time. Or perhaps a seal was never attached, as the authenticity of the plates is questionable.

In the Telugu section of the grant, I attempt to provide a diplomatic reading of what is visible in the plates, noting in the apparatus alternative from JFF, KMS (many of which

¹⁶Allusion au sacrifice dit *tulābhāra* au cours duquel le roi donne son poids en or à un ou à plusieurs brahmanes.

¹⁷La philosophie, les trois Veda, l'économie et les traités politiques. *Arthaśāstra*, 1, 2, 1.

¹⁸La suite du texte semble être rédigée en telugu, nous n'avons pu proposer une traduction.

seem to be silent emendations) and RRM. In spacing, hyphenation and punctuation, I largely follow RRM.

The word *karigaḷḷa* in line 18 seems to be part of the name of the deity who receives this grant, and it occurs again in the form *karigala* in line 32 as part of the name of a person who also has the name or title *pridhivi* implying a royal connection. The other known occurrence of *karigalla* (in this third form) is in stanza 2 of the Sātalūru plates of Vijayāditya III, where it is almost certainly used as a cognomen of Viṣṇuvardhana V. Ramesh & Ramachandra Murthy 1975, p. 126 also point out this, and suggest interpreting the term as “he who is efficient in taming the elephants” or “he who forcibly takes away (or steals away) the elephants of the enemy kings”, also citing (and expressing disagreement) with Veturi Prabhakara Sastri who interpreted it as meaning “he who hits at the cheeks of the elephants.” They infer, very plausibly, that the deity of the present grant is thus named after the king, and further suggest deriving *vaḍavaru* from Sanskrit *bhaṭṭāra*. In this they again disagree with the opinion of Veturi Prabhakara Sastri (and M. Somasekhara Sarma who agreed with Prabhakara Sastri) that the word is from Tamil *uḍaiyavar*, since the cognates of those are *vaḍayaru* (*odayaḍu*) in Telugu and *vaḍayar* (*oḍeyaru*) in Kannaḍa.

The presence of the name *Karigaḷḷa* suggests that this charter was issued by Viṣṇuvardhana V. For reasons to be elaborated elsewhere, I believe that attribution to Viṣṇuvardhana IV is more likely. The unintelligibly corrupt string *karigaḍapelimarājaraja* in the Pamiḍimukkala plates (set 2) of Viṣṇuvardhana II may contain the epithet *Karigaḷḷa*, indicating that it was used by several Viṣṇuvardhanas.

Bibliography

Edited from the original by J. F. Fleet (1884) without translation, with estampages of the plates. Fleet’s edition and introduction was reproduced in Burgess & Naṭeśa Śāstrī 1886, pp. 174–176. Subsequently noticed in ARIE 1956–57, p. 37, appendix A/1956–1957, N° 86 and again in ARIE 1962–63, p. 49, appendix A/1962–1963, N° 17, both without discussion. The text of the Telugu section (without indication of editorial intervention) was published with a translation by Korada Mahadeva Sastri (1969, pp. 299–301). A more critical and thorough edition and analysis of the Telugu section was also published by K. V. Ramesh and S. V. Ramachandra Murthy (1975), who also summarise previous scholarly opinions published in Telugu.

The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Fleet's text with his facsimiles and with inked impressions from Sir Walter Elliot's collection.¹⁹

Additional, untraced bibliography, mostly in Telugu:²⁰

- *Journal of the Punjab Historical Society*, Vol. 5, pp. 174ff;²¹
- *Bhārati* vol. 5 pt. 2 (1928), pp. 96-110, a critical study of the text by Veturi Prabhakara Sastri;
- *Bhārati* vol. 5 (1928?), pp. 286-301 and 661-665, discussion especially of palaeography by Mallampalli Somasekhara Sarma;²²
- *Andhra Sahithya Parishat Patrika* 22 (1933 or 1934), pp. 174-176, text and notes by Lakshmana Rao;
- *Andhra Sahithya Parishat Patrika* 22 (1933 or 1934), pp. 185-196, critical study by Kunduri Iswaradatt;
- Chilukuri Narayana Rao, *History of Telugu Language (Andhra-bhasha-charitramu)* (1937), vol. 2 (or vol. 1?), pp. 1310-1316, text and notes;
- *Bhārati* vol. 14 (probably 1937), pp. 825-847: discussion by K. Suryanarayana.
- *RPS*, pp. 71-72 (publication not identified): text and notes by M. Somasekhara Sarma;
- *Andhra Parīśōdhakamaṇḍali Pancama vārīkōtsava* (publication not identified): notes by K. V. Lakshmana Rao;

Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[JFF] Fleet, John Faithfull. 1884. "Sanskrit and Old Canarese inscriptions, no. CXLVII." *IA* 13, pp. 185-187.

[KMS] 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 299-301.

¹⁹Scans of these impressions were obtained by Emmanuel Francis from the Edinburgh University Library, the Bibliothèque nationale de France and the British Museum.

²⁰These items have been gathered from Ramesh & Ramachandra Murthy 1975, *ARIE* 1956-57, p. 37, appendix A/1956-1957, N° 86, and personal communication with Jens Thomas. Some may be inaccurate.

²¹Not found; volume 5 of the *Journal of the Punjab Historical Society* (1918) seems to end on p. 125; volume 5 of the *Journal of the Panjab University Historical Society* (1938) seems to end on p. 75.

²²Or possibly in Volume 2 (1925?) rather than 5, same page range.

[R&RM] Ramesh, K. V. & S. S. Ramachandra Murthy. 1975. “The Ahadanakaram plates: a critical study.” JESI 1, pp. 124–131.

Secondary

ARIE 1956–57. *Annual report on Indian epigraphy for 1956-57*. Edited by B.C. Chandra. New Delhi: Manager of Publications (Department of Archaeology), 1957. Page 37, appendixes A/1956-1957, item 86.

ARIE 1962–63. *Annual report on Indian epigraphy for 1962-63*. By G. S. Gai. Delhi: Manager of Publications, 1967. Page 49, appendixes A/1962-1963, item 17.

Gaur, Albertine. 1975. *Indian charters on copper plates in the Department of Oriental Manuscripts and Printed Books*. London: British Museum Publications. Page 6, item Ind. Ch. 9.

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