

Moga grant of Bhīma I

Dániel Balogh

Alternative title: Vinnakoṭa plates of Bhīma I

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00026

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00026.xml

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

Commit: 2026-10-16 17:02 (a1bf930), last modified 2026-09-18 17:45 (0273b8a)

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final M is derived from the shape of a classical ma with an upward extension that bends right and then up again, but is now stylised into a circle with a tail on top that bends right and then up. The circle part is much like an anusvāra. E.g. l3 °litānām. Final N is likewise based on na, but has only a horseshoe shape at the bottom, with the upward tail bending right, up, then right again. E.g. l10 māsāN. Final T is normally formed in the same way. A clear example is l17 avarddhayaT; the two instances in line 15 look rather like a regular ta, but I assume that the vertical extension is missing here because this is the first line of a plate.

Original punctuation marks are long, straight and plain verticals. This sign is doubled after l27 ca. The one after l14-15 āharata is unclear and may in fact consist of three short verticals.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is a fairly large circle well above the headline, atop or to the right of the consonant to which it belongs, occasionally atop the next character, probably only when displaced by a descender, e.g. the first anusvāra of l10 saptatrimśataṁ is above śa, because stra in the previous line prevents it from

being closer to tri. Occasionally it is also lowered to or below headline height, e.g. l1 Ekāṇnavimśatin, where jo and vi in the previous line (themselves pushed downward by descenders further above) prevent its regular placement. Rare jha occurs (as a subscript consonant) in l26 jhaṭiti. Upadhmāṇiya occurs before l45 parantapaḥ. Initial Ī occurs in line 52, but in the scanned photo it cannot be made out at all.

Edition

Seal

<1> (śrī?)-(t)ri(bhu)(vanāṁku?)(śa)

Plates

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <1> svasti<.> śrīmatām sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-mānavya-sago<2>trāṇām hārīti-putrāṇām kauśikī-vara-prasāda-labdha-rājyānām mātṛ<3>-gaṇa-paripālitānām svāmi-<<mahāse>>na-pādānuddhyātānām bhagavan-(ā)<4>rāyaṇa○-pras(ā)da-samāsādita-vara-varāha-lāṁch<ā?<a>nekṣaṇa<5>-kṣaṇa-vaśīkṛtārāti-maṇḍalānām aśvamedhāvabhṛ<t?<th>a-snāna-pavi<6>trikṛta-vapuṣām cālukyānām kulam alāṁkariṣṇos satyāśraya-va<7>l(l)abhendrasya bhrātā kub(j)a-viṣṇ(u)varddhano <'>ṣṭādaśa va(rṣā)ṇi<.> tat-suto ja(ya)<Page 2r><8>simhas trayastrimśataM<.> tad-anujendrarāja-nandano viṣṇuvarddha(no) nava<.> tad-(ātma)<9>jo maṁgi-yuvarājaḥ paṁcaviṁśatin<.> tat-tanujo jayasimhas trayodaśa<.> ta<10>d-anujaḥ kokkil<il> ṣaṇ māsāN<.> tad-*āgrā?*<agra>jo viṣṇurājas saptatrimśataṁ<.> (tat-ta)<11>(nu)jo vija○yāditya Ekāṇnavimśatin<.> tat-tanujo viṣṇurā(jaṣ ṣa)ṭtrim<12>(śa)ta(m)<.> tat-sū○nur vvijayādityaś catvārimśataM<.> tat-tanayaḥ ka(li)-vi<13>(ṣṇuvarddha)no <'>ddhyarddha-varṣaM<.> tad-apatya-mukhyaḥ yas tu

1. Anuṣṭubh

kālīmga-gaṁga-r(ūpyād)i

<14> (kośa)le<ṣ?<ś>(a)-dvipādi [(ja)]<<ca>>

pāṇḍya-pallava-hemādi

balā<t> tyā(gārt)th(am ā)<Page 2v><15>haraT(||)

2. Anuṣṭubh

ga(m)gān āropayad gaṁga-
-kū(ṭam) maṁgi-śiro <'>cchina(T)
kr(ṣṇam raṇe)<16> <'>jayad vaktum
kas samart<th>o <'>sya sāhasāN

sa vijayādityaś catuśca<17>tvārimśata(m) ve(m)gī-deśam anuvarṣam avarddhayaT|

3. Anuṣṭubh

jayasimgha-dvay(e) cai<18>vaṁ
viṣṇu○varddhana-paṁcake
maṁginā kokkilau vijayā-
ditya-tra<19>ya Ite tataḥ|

tasya vijayādityasya bhrātur vvikramākrānta-saka<20>la-bhuvana-talasya
vi[(jayā?)]<<(kramā)>>ditya-bhūpater agra-tanayaḥ

4. Varṇāśmālā

<21> (Adhyāsta) sim(hā)sana(m ārddhidat r)ipūn
api(spaśa)d (bh)ūmim a(narṁdaya)<Page 3r><22>t prajāḥ
yaśo vyatān(i)t sad apūpujad <d>vijān
ama(m)sta sādḥūn a<23>vahad guṇa-*j?*<s>rajaḥ|

5. Sragdharā

mattāditya-prasāda-dvirada-vara-guru-skandham ā<24>ruhya kopā○T
cāpād unmukta-bāṇair udaya-girim ito bhānur u<25>sraisa tamisraṁ○
yadvat <t>advan nir<a?<ā>sthad dhṛta-sakala-bhuvo yas tu goḷā<26>-taṭa-sthāN
karṇṇātān durddurūṭā<n!>jhaṭiti paṭu-naṭad-ghoṭakān lāṭa<27>kāṁś ca||

sa sarvva-lokāśraya-śrī-vi<<ṣṇuvarddhana-cālukya)>>-bhīma-mahārā<28>jādhirāja-
parameśvaraḥ parama-māheśvaraḥ varavara-rāṣṭra{kū}<Page 3v><29>-(ni)vāsino
rāṣṭrakūṭa-pramukhān kuṭumbina Ittham ājñāpayati|

6. Anuṣṭubh

<30> sarvvarājasya sāmanta-
-mukhyasya khyāta-tejasah
Umā himāla<31>yasyeva
tailāmbākhyā sutābhavaT|

7. Anuṣṭubh

tām śrī-baladakayyākhy<i>a?<a>-
sā<32>(ma)ntādhīpa○tes sutah

Avoḍha śarimbhuvad yuddha-
malla_jś! _jś!ū<33>(kara)-lāmchanah

8. Anuṣṭubh

tat-sutā(r̄m) śrī-mahādevī<r̄m>
dhavalāyata-locanā<34>m
aśoka-pallavākāra-
-pāṇi-pāda-talāmguḷim

9. Anuṣṭubh

pīn{n}onnata-kucāna<35>mrām
nimna-nābhīm guru-kṣitām
pakva-bimbādhārān tanvīm
tapta-he<Page 4r><36>ma-prabhām śubhām

10. Āryāgīti

niravadya-dhavaḷa-putro naptā śrī-pāṇḍarāṁga<37>-sāmanta-pateḥ|
nuta-kaṭakarāja-vaṁśa-kramāgatānindya-paṭṭa-ba<38>ddha-lalāṭah
yaś ca|

11. Āryāgīti

manur iva sa-vicāra-girā harir iva lakṣmyā<39>kṛtānta ○ (l)va śauryyeṇa
smara Iva rūpeṇa dhi<40>yā guru○r iva dānena kalpatarur iva (bh)āti|

Api ca

12. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

<41> śauryyaṁ duryyamam ariyama-dyuti vapuś cittarṁ svabhāvottamarṁ
<42> (sa)t(y)an (n)ityam anatyayaṁ jaya-paṭarṁ kāśa-prakāśarṁ yaśah
sāram<Page 4v> <43> [bhū](ri) vic(ā)ra-cāru caritarṁ dānarṁ c;ā?<a> d(i)na-(stutarṁ)
(jñā)na(r̄m) jñānavat(ār̄m) [ma]<44>(tan) tu vijayādityasya yasya kṣitau

13. Anuṣṭubh

(so?) <'>yaṁ śrī-vijayāditya<45>(s?)
(sa?)tya-vādyā○ḥ parantapaḥ
(yām) prāpya dharmma-kāmārtthān
kṛ<ta>(vā)(n loka?)<46>(sā?)t kṛt(i)
ta○(s)yai (śrī?)-mahādevyai tat-pati-(k)ṛta-pūrvvo(pakāra-s)m(a)<47>raṇa-santuṣṭah

kṛtajñatā-prakhyāpana-nimittam sarvva-kara-parihāre<48>(ṇa) mogābhidhāno
grāmo dattaḥ

Asyāvadhayāḥ<.> pūrvvataḥ<49> (pu)liyeru-ṇāma nadī| Āgneyataḥ mūṇṭha-
rāvula guṇṭha<.><Page 5r> <50> (da)kṣiṇataḥ cembarṇka-narendreśvara-kṣetraM|
nairi!<ṛ>tyām tai(la)-(śa?)<51>(rvva)-kṣetraM| paścimataḥ devu(la-ce)ṛuvu| vāyavy-
ataḥ ca(rmma)<52>ṇḍ(i)-paścima○-taṭākāM(l) Uttarataḥ peddapūṇḍi-cariya(l)
ī<53>(ś)ṛ(a)?<ā>na(taḥ) r(i?)○ṇṭha-mrām̐kulu| na kenacid asyopari bādh(ā)
karaṇīyā(l)<54>(ta)thā ca

14. Anuṣṭubh

ṣaṣṭim varṣa-sahasrāṇi
svargge modati bhūmidāḥ
Ākṣeptā<55>(cā)numantā ca
tāny eva narake vaseT|

Asyājñapti<ḥ> (ka)ḍeya-rāja E<56>(va)<.> (bha)ṭṭa-vāmanena (ra)citam idaM<.>
koṇḍācāryye(ṇa l)i(kh)i(taM)

<Page 5v>

Apparatus

Seal

<1> (śrī?)-(t)ri(bhu)(vanām̐ku?)(śa) • SS reports it as *śrī-tri(bhuvanām̐ku)śa*, and the reading is of course in all probability correct, but from the published photos, it can only be confirmed as far as I indicate here.

Plates

<3> -<<mahāse>>na- • The first three characters of this word are closely spaced, and *hā* and *se* are awkwardly formed (both in body shape and in the unusual positioning of their vowel markers). They thus seem to be a correction (possibly along with the preceding *i* marker), but there is no clear indication of the pre-correction text. Possibly, *svāmihāse* or *svāmahāse* was first engraved.

<4> -pras(ā)da- • The vowel marker goes horizontally from the headmark, but bends downward still on the left of the consonant's leg (rather than, as expected, passing above the leg and then bending down to the right of the consonant). It may have been added subsequently. — <4> -lām̐chṛā?<a>nekṣaṇa- NV ◇ -lām̐chanekṣaṇa- SS.

<10> -*ḷāgrā?*<*agra*>jo NV ◇ -*ḷā?*<*a*>*grājo* SS • Pre-modern correction may be present here. The superfluous *ā mātrās* may have been deleted, and it is also possible that *tadānujo* was first engraved and then corrected into the expected text.

<11> *viṣṇurā(jaṣ)* SS ◇ *viṣṇurājo* NV.

<13> <'>*ddhyarddha*- ◇ *dhyarddha*- SS; *dvārdha*- NV • The character *ddhya* is faint but reasonably clear in the photo. NV's *v* is probably a typo, but his omission of *y* may not be, as the sbuscript *y* is indiscernible in his estampage.

<14> (kośa)le_ḷ*s?*<*ś*>(a)- SS ◇ (*kośaleṣu*) NV • I prefer SS's reading even though it requires emendation, because I see no indication of *u* in either facsimile of the plate. I also find it more likely that a compound was used here, as in the other claims of this stanza. Nonetheless, NV may be correct that the composer's intent had been *kośaleṣu*, and I cannot fully exclude the possibility that this is in fact engraved. In a footnote, NV emends his text to *kosaleṣu*, but this is unnecessary. — <14> -*hemādi* NV ◇ -*hemādir* SS • Possibly a typo in SS's edition. — <14> *balā<t> tyā(gārt)th(am)* SS ◇ *balātyārtham* NV • Probably a typo in NV's edition.

<17> -*deśam* SS ◇ -*dḷa?*<*e*>*śam* NV • The vowel marker (on top of the consonant) is clear in the photo, though not in the rubbing. — <17> -*dvay(e)* SS ◇ -*dvayān* NV • The vowel marker (on top of the consonant) is clear in the photo, though not in the rubbing.

<21> (Adhyāsta) NV ◇ *Adhyasta* SS • Probably only a typo in SS. — <21> (*ārddhid*) SS ◇ (*a*)*rdddayad* NV • NV may be right that only *a* is present here, but if so, then emendation into *ā* is warranted. SS's reading (which he prints as clear throughout) is definitely superior and mostly confirmed by the facsimiles. — <21> *apī(spaśa)d (bh)ūmim* SS ◇ *apī sva{va}-bhūmiḷn?*<*m*> NV • SS's reading is again far superior and, except for the illegible *spa*, confirmable from the facsimiles. NV's emendation is unmetrical. — <21> *a(pīpala?)<Page 3r><22>t* ◇ *a(nāmdaya)<Page 3r><22>t* SS; *avarakṣa<Page 3r><22>t* NV • While NV's reading is again definitely inferior (and unmetrical), in this case SS's reading also seems to be incorrect. I see no indication of a subscript consonant where he reads *nda*, nor space at the end where *ya* might fit. My own suggestion is also very tentative; I must note that I see no vestige of *ī*, but the reading fits the context, and *p-s* seem probable as the main components of two successive characters.

<23> -*ḷj?*<*s*>*rajaḥ* SS ◇ -*ḷj?*<*v*>*rajaḥ* NV.

<25> *goḷā*- ◇ *godā*- SS; *goḷl?*<*d*>*ā*- NV • NV's reading *l* is probably a typo for *ī*. Both editors understand this name to mean the Godāvarī, but given the received spelling, this does not seem so certain.

<26> jhaṭiti SS ◇ *jhaṭiti* NV. — <26> lāṭa<27>kāṁś • The vowel marker in *lā* is attached to the subscript *l*.

<27> -vi<<ṣṇuvarddhana-cālukya>>- • The first of the indicated characters, *ṣṇu*, may have been engraved only once; the following ones are definitely engraved over erased text, but nothing of the pre-correction text can be read.

<31> -baladakayyākhy<ā?><a>- ◇ -*baladakayyākhy<ā?><aḥ>* NV; -*baladakayyākhyā*- SS.

<34> -talāṁgulim NV ◇ -*talāṁgu<llim?><lim>* SS • The double *l* is probably a typo in Sankaranarayanan's edition, and the reason he emends is only to normalise *anusvāra*. — <34> pīn{n}onnata- NV ◇ *pīnonnata*- SS.

<39> (I)va • The scribe has omitted the two circles that form the lower part of *I*.

<43> jñānavat(ām) [ma]<44>(tan) tu NV ◇ *jñānavatām<44>(ta)mtu* SS.

<44> -vijayāditya<45>(s sa?)tya- ◇ -*vijayāditya(h)<45> [sa]tya*- SS; -*vijayāditya<45> (satya)*- NV.

<45> -vādyā<h> ◇ -*vādyāḥ* SS; -*vā<d?><k>yaḥ* NV • NV's emendation is unnecessary. — <45> (yām) ◇ (*yām*) NV; *ya<h>* SS • This character is slightly awkward in shape (but not unique, compare the likewise narrow *yām* in the previous line). I am quite certain that its right extremity is a downward-bending hook for *ā* rather than the upward arm of *y*. This is clearer in the rubbing, but also discernible in the photo. — <45> kṛ<ta>(vā)(n loka?)<46>(sā?)t kṛt(i) ◇ *k<ri?><ṛ>[tavān loka?]<46>-[sa?]t-kṛtiṁ* SS; *kṛcchra<46>vat-kṛti* NV • SS's *kri* is probably a typo for *kṛ*, since this character is clear. The next character is almost certainly *vā*, definitely without an intervening *ta*, so SS probably intended to supply an omitted *ta* here. After this point, the plate is badly effaced, with only vestiges visible in the rubbing and less than that in the photo. Nonetheless, these vestiges give some confirmation for most of SS's reading, which he offers as a tentative restoration. After *vā*, *nlo* (especially a subscript *l* and the vocalisation *o*, the whole character being lowered because of the overhanging subscript *y*) is very plausible. Conversely, NV's *kṛcchra* is impossible; what he apparently saw as the subscript part of *cchra* is in fact the vowel marker of *rvvo* in the following line (which he misreads as *rvva*, see the apparatus there). NV's reading is, moreover, hypometrical. Since there are probably only two characters after *vā* (though a very narrow additional character right after *vā* cannot be ruled out), I agree that one more syllable needs to be supplied and accept SS's restoration with minor changes. I endorse NV's reading of *kṛti* at the end of this segment. I construe the text very differently from how SS must have understood it, since I feel certain of the reading *yām* earlier in the stanza, and to obtain a coherent sentence, read *lokasāt* instead of *loka-sat*. I remain far from certain in this

reconstruction and my interpretation of the stanza. A scrutiny of the original may be helpful here.

⟨46⟩ ta○(s)yai (śrī?)- NV ◇ *tasyai[va ca]* SS • Although SS prints a single dot for this lacuna, in a footnote he proposes to restore two characters into it, which definitely cannot fit here. The vestiges indicate *śrī*, which may thus be an integral part of the lady's name rather than just an honorific. — ⟨46⟩ -(k)ṛta- SS • There are some additional strokes here, including a circle that is almost certainly an *i* marker. It may be that *kṛ* was engraved with a superfluous *i*; most likely, this character is a correction from a previously engraved *ti*. — ⟨46⟩ -pūrvvo(pakāra)- SS ◇ *-pūrva-dāna-karmma* NV • NV's failure to read *rvvo* is because he mistook the vowel marker for a subscript component belonging to the line above. The rest of his reading is impossible to fit in the damaged part (he may have read the last character of the line first as *rmma*, then changed his reading to *sma* in light of the next line, but neglected to discard the initial *rmma*), while SS's reading is fully in line with the vestiges.

⟨49⟩ nadi NV ◇ *taṭi* SS. — ⟨49⟩ mūṇṭha- ◇ *mūṇṭha-* SS NV. — ⟨49⟩ guṇṭha SS ◇ *guṇṭha* NV.

⟨50⟩ cembaṛka ◇ *cerimbaṛu* SS; *verimbaṛu* NV • The first character looks more like *ce* than *ve*, but these characters are too similar to tell apart for certain in an unfamiliar word. The last character, as engraved, is definitely *rka*. — ⟨50⟩ tai(la)-(śa?)⟨51⟩(rvva)-kṣetraM SS ◇ *tai⟨51⟩kṣetram* NV • NV apparently disregards the badly legible characters and even the fairly distinct *rvva* in the next line. In his discussion he speaks about *taila-kṣetra*, so he probably did read *la* here. SS prints only *śa* as unclear, and indeed, no decisive vestiges of this character are present. He assumes that this is the name of a Śiva temple connected to Tailāmbā. I accept the reading on his authority, but this needs confirmation from the original. Lacking such confirmation, it may be possible instead to restore *taila-pūrvva-kṣetram*, meaning a field that was already in the possession of the family of Tailāmbā.

⟨51⟩ devu(la-ce)ṛuvu ◇ *devula-ceruva* SS; *devuḍu-ceruva* NV • The final *a* is probably a typo in SS. NV's *devuḍu* can be ruled out. SS further notes that this term is engraved over an erasure. This is not obvious in the available facsimiles, but may well be the case, at least for the characters *la-ceru*. — ⟨51⟩ ca(rmma)⟨52⟩ṇḍ(i)- SS ◇ *cava⟨52⟩ṇḍi-* NV • SS's reading (which he prints as *clear*) is quite certain; the subscript *m* is clear and a superscript *repha* is likely in the last character of line 51. NV prints the name as *cāvanṭi* (sic) in his discussion. — ⟨51⟩ r(i?)○ṇṭha-mrāṇkulu ◇ *reṇṭhamrākulu* SS; *reṇṭha-mrāṇkulu* NV • The *anusvāra* in the second term is quite clear and is probably what NV had intended to indicate here. The vowel of the first character is distorted

and damaged due to being on the edge of the hole. Reading it as *e* is possible, but I am more inclined to read *i*, encouraged by the fact that NV uses *riṇṭha* in his discussion.

<55> Asyājñapti<ḥ> SS ◇ *Ājñaptiḥ* NV. — <55> (ka)ḍeya-rāja SS ◇ *kaḍiya-rāja* NV. — <55> E<56>(va) SS ◇ *E<56>varṇi* NV • The plate is badly weathered here, so an *anusvāra* cannot be ruled out, but I see no indication of one, and find the reading better without.

Translation

Plates

<1–13> Greetings! Satyāśraya Vallabhendra (Pulakeśin II) was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Cālukyas—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,¹ who are protected by the band of Mothers, who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by Lord Mahāseṇa, 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. His brother Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana <reigned> for eighteen years. His son Jayasīmha (I), for thirty-three. His younger brother Indrarāja's son Viṣṇuvardhana (II), for nine. His son Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five. His son Jayasīmha (II), for thirteen. His younger brother Kokkili, for six months. His elder brother Viṣṇurāja (Viṣṇuvardhana III), for thirty-seven. His son Vijayāditya (I), for nineteen. His son Viṣṇurāja (Viṣṇuvardhana IV), for thirty-six years. His son Vijayāditya (II), for forty. His son Kali Viṣṇuvardhana (V), for a year and a half. His firstborn progeny, the one who—

1.

forcibly seized, in order to donate it, the silver and other <goods> of the Gaṅgas of Kalinga, the elephants and other <goods> of the Lords of Kośala, and the gold and other <goods> of the Pāṇdyas and the Pallavas;

2.

pressed the Gaṅgas up to the Gaṅga peak, struck off the head of Maṅgi, defeated Kṛṣṇa in battle—who would be capable of recounting his daring deeds?

¹Or, alternatively, by the grace of Kauśikī's bridegroom, i.e. Śiva. In spite of its slight awkwardness, I prefer the former interpretation because the Bādāmi Cālukyas refer to themselves as nourished (*saṁvardhita*) by Kauśikī.

⟨16–17⟩ —that Vijayāditya (III) strengthened the land of Veṅgī year after year for forty-four ⟨years⟩.

3.

Then, after two Jayasirṇhas and likewise five Viṣṇuvardhanas, Kokkili along with Maṅgi, and three Vijayādityas had thus passed—

⟨19–20⟩ that Vijayāditya's (III) brother was King (*bhūpati*) Vikramāditya who conquered the entire surface of the earth by his valour (*vikrama*). His firstborn son—

4.

ascended the throne, pulverised his foes, held the earth in his fetters, ȳprotected? his subjects, displayed his glory, duly worshipped Brahmins, honoured the worthy, bore garlands of virtue;

5.

the one who, wrathfully mounting the heavy shoulder of his excellent elephant the raging Ādityaprasāda, with the arrows released from his bow at once dispersed—just as the sun ascending Mount Sunrise ⟨disperses⟩ the darkness with its rays—the dastardly Karṇāṭas stationed on the bank of the Godā, who had occupied the entire earth, and the Lāṭakas with their smartly prancing horses—

⟨27–29⟩ that shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), His Majesty Viṣṇuvardhana Cālukya-Bhīma (I), Supreme Lord (*parameśvara*), the Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*) and supreme devotee of Maheśvara, commands all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Varavara district (*viṣaya*) as follows:

6.

The foremost baron (*sāmanta*) Sarvarāja of renowned valour had a daughter named Tailāmbā, as the Himalaya had ⟨the daughter⟩ Umā.

7.

Yuddhamalla of the boar ensign, son of the foremost baron (*sāmanta*) named His Highness Baladakayya, married her as Śambhu ⟨married Umā⟩.

8–9.

Their resplendent daughter Śrī-Mahādevī was slender but bent with ⟨the weight of⟩ her plump and firm breasts; her eyes were bright and wide, her fingers, toes, soles and

palms resembled tender *aśoka* sprigs, her navel was recessed and her hips² heavy, her lips were like a ripe *bimba* fruit, and her complexion was like heated gold.

10.

(Vijayāditya was) the son of Niravadya Dhavala, grandson of the lordly baron (*sāmanta*) His Highness Pāṇḍarāṅga and one whose head was wrapped in the impeccable turban duly inherited in the celebrated lineage of castellans (*kaṭaka-rāja*),

<38> and who—

11.

appeared like Manu in his considerate speech, like Hari in his majesty {with Lakṣmī}, like Death in his valour, like Love in his physical beauty, like Guru (Bṛhaspati) in his intellect, like a wish-fulfilling tree in his generosity;

<40> moreover,

12.

the valour of this Vijayāditya was indomitable, his figure bright as the sun, his mind innately excellent, his truthfulness constant, his banner of victory unbroken, his reputation brilliant like tufts of *kāśa* grass, his wealth great, his demeanour thoughtfully pleasant, his generosity lauded by the needy, his wisdom esteemed by the wise on earth.

13.

He, His Highness the above Vijayāditya, truthful of speech and a scorcher of foes, accomplished <his goals> in having acquired her (the above Śrī-Mahādevī, as his wife), and thereupon distributed <objects of> (the three human objectives) religious duty (*dharma*), pleasure (*kāma*) and wealth (*artha*) to the populace.³

<46–48> To that Śrī-Mahādevī, <we, Cālukya-Bhīma,>⁴ fondly recalling the previous service done by her husband, <have> granted the village named Moga with an exemption from all taxes, in order to proclaim <our> gratitude.

<48–54> Its boundaries <are as follows>. To the east, the river named Puliyeṛu. To the southeast, the Mūṇṭha-Rāvula pond (*guṇṭha*).⁵ To the south, the field of the Cembar̥ka-

²The word *kṣitā* or *kṣita* is not known from other sources, but must mean hips or buttocks here.

³The reading of this stanza is problematic and may be incorrect in one or more spots. My tentative understanding of its meaning differs significantly from that of previous editors. See the apparatus to line 45 and the commentary.

⁴See the commentary for my understanding of this elliptical passage.

⁵Venkataramanayya, who reads *muṇṭha-rāvula-guṇṭha*, translates, “the hill with three(?) pipal trees”

Narendreśvara <temple>. To the southwest, the field of the Taila-Śarva <temple>.⁶ To the west, the Devula reservoir (*ceṛuvu*). To the northwest, the western tank (*taṭāka*) of <the village?> Carmaṇḍi. To the north, *peddapūṇḍi-cariya*.⁷ To the northeast, *riṇṭha-mrāṁkulu*.⁸ Let no-one pose an obstacle (to her enjoyment of her rights) over it. Moreover,

14.

A donor of land rejoices in heaven for sixty millennia, <while> a seizer (of granted land) and a condoner (of such seizure) shall reside in hell for just as many.

<55–56> The executor (*ājñapti*) of this <provision> is the castellan (*kaḍeya-rāja*)⁹ himself. This <grant> was composed (*racita*) by Bhaṭṭa Vāmana. Written (*likhita*) by Koṇḍācārya.

Translation into French by Estienne-Monod 2008

Plates

<1–13> Prospérité ! Kubja Viṣṇuwardhana, frère de Satyāśraya Vallabhendra, ornement de la lignée des Calukya, illustres, du même *gotra* que les descendants de Manu, honorés dans l'univers entier, fils de Hārītī, qui obtinrent leur royaume grâce à l'excellente faveur de Kauśikī, protégés par la troupe des Mères, méditant aux pieds du seigneur Mahāseṇa, dont le cercle des ennemis fut soumis en un instant à la vue du signe illustre de l'excellent sanglier, faveur octroyée par le bienheureux Nārāyaṇa, dont les corps furent purifiés par le bain purificateur de l'*aśvamedha*, <régna> pendant dix-huit années ; son fils, Jayasimha, pendant trente-trois <années> ; le cher fils de son frère cadet Indrarāja, Viṣṇuwardhana, pendant neuf <années> ; le fils de celui-ci, Maṁgi-Yuvarāja, pendant vingt-cinq <années> ; son fils, Jayasimha, pendant treize <année> ; son frère cadet, Kokkili, pendant six mois ; le frère de celui-ci, Viṣṇurāja, pendant trente-sept <années> ; son fils Vijayāditya pendant dix-neuf <années>;¹⁰ le fils de celui-ci, Viṣṇurāja, pendant trente-six <années> ; son fils Vijayāditya pendant

⁶My translation is based on Sankaranarayanan's reading, but see the apparatus to line 50 for my doubts concerning this.

⁷According to Sankaranarayanan, this means a precipice or valley belonging to Peddapūṇḍi village. Venkataramanayya elaborates this to "a hollow between hills in which stood the village".

⁸According to Sankaranarayanan, who reads *reṇṭha-mrāṁkulu*, this means "some two trees (?)". Venkataramanayya's gloss of the term is "soap-nut trees".

⁹The term *kaḍeya-rāja*, equivalent to *kaḍa-ereya* and *kaṭaka-rāja*, is normally understood to mean a chief officer of the royal camp (cf. Fleet 1902–1903, pp. 183–185 and Sircar 1966, s.vv. *kaṭaka-rāja*). However, as it seems to denote a very high hereditary office in the Cālukyan court, I believe it had in this case no direct association with any army camps.

¹⁰Toutes les autres inscriptions de notre corpus attestent une durée de règne de 18 années.

quarante <années>, le fils de ce dernier, Kali-Viṣṇuvarddhana, une année et demi ; Le prince de cette lignée,

1.

qui, rapporta, par la force, l'argent des Kālirīga et des Gaṁga, etc., les éléphants des Kośāla, etc., maître de l'or des Pāṇḍya et des Pallava , etc., dans le but de les donner ;

2.

contraignit les Gaṁga à monter sur le Gaṁgakūṭa, coupa la tête de Maṁgi,¹¹ vainquit au combat Kṛṣṇa, - qui pourrait décrire les exploits que produisit sa fougue?-

<16-17> Lui, Vijayāditya, fit prospérer à chaque saison le royaume de Veṅgī, pendant quarante-quatre années.

3.

Lorsque les deux Jayasimha, les cinq Viṣṇuvardhana avec Maṁgi, Kokkili, les trois Vijayāditya, s'en furent allés,

<19-20> le fils aîné du roi Vikramāditya, dont la vaillance avait conquis toute la surface de la terre, le frère de ce dernier Vijayāditya.

4.

Il s'assit sur le trône, tourmenta ses ennemis, veilla sur la terre, fit la joie de ses sujets, étendit sa gloire vertueuse, honora les deux-fois-nés, respecta les saints hommes, porta des guirlandes de vertus.

5.

Monté sur les épaules d'un excellent maître éléphant ivre de fureur, faveur <octroyée> par Aditya,¹² dans sa colère, des flèches décochées de son arc - tel le soleil parvenu Mont du Levant, chasse la nuit en dardant les rayons de la lumière matinale, il délogea les Karṇāṭa qui, tenant la terre entière, occupaient les rives de la Godā<varī>, ainsi que, soudainement, les Laṭaka mécréants, dont les chevaux dansaient avec adresse.

<27-29> Lui, refuge du monde entier, l'illustre Viṣṇuvardhana Cālukya Bhīma, roi suprême des grands rois, seigneur suprême, dévôt de Māheśvara, ordonne ceci aux chefs de familles, habitant le rāṣṭra de Varavara, rāṣṭrakūṭa en tête :

6.

¹¹Il est aussi question de ce personnage dans les insc. nos 32, str.5 ; 37, str. 10, 41.

¹²Le nom Aditya désigne à la fois le dieu et son oncle Vijayāditya qui lui a légué le royaume.

Ce roi universel, éminent feudataire, au tejas renommé, telle Umā <née> d'Himalaya, avait une fille nommée Tailāmbā.

7.

Le fils du seigneur des feudataires, - illustre, nommé Baladakayya -, l'épousa, comme Śāmbhu, Yuddhamalla, porteur de la marque du sanglier ;¹³

8.

sa fille <fut> l'illustre Mahādevī, aux resplendissants yeux en amande, dont la peau des doigts des mains et des pieds étaient un massif de bourgeons d'*aśoka*,

9.

qui ployait sous le poids de ses seins charnus et proéminents, au nombril profond, à la démarche grave, aux lèvres couleur du bimba mûr, menue, éclatante comme l'or en fusion, resplendissante.

10.

Le seigneur des feudataires, l'illustre Pāṇḍarāṅga, eut un descendant exempt de blâme et splendide, dont le front s'ornait du bandeau irréprochable hérité du lignage célèbre des *kaṭakarāja* ;

<38> et,

11.

il ressemble à Manu par ses paroles réfléchies, à Hari par sa Fortune, à Kṛtānta par sa vaillance, à Smara par sa beauté, par son intelligence, au *guru*,¹⁴ par sa libéralité à l'arbre à vœux .

<40> Et,

12.

<Il possédait> une vaillance invincible, une beauté resplendissante, un esprit naturellement éminent, toujours sincère, exempt de méchanceté, <il possédait> une gloire à

¹³La strophe 7 poursuit peut-être la comparaison diagrammatique entre la lignée divine śivaïte et la lignée du héros. La relation *bimba-pratibimba* est fondée sur l'analogie entre la relation filiale de Tailāmbā et Sarvarāja et celle d'Umā et Himālaya. La comparaison de Baladakayya à Śāmbhu incite à penser que cette figure se poursuit sur la strophe 7 : la relation conjugale de ce dernier et Tailāmbā correspondant à celle de Śiva et Umā. Mais le composé *sūkara-lāṁchanah*, « porteur de la marque du sanglier », dans le pāda d, ne peut désigner que Viṣṇu, lui aussi qualifié souvent de « Śāmbhu ». Cette expression est une allusion au sceau des Cālukya de Veṅgī.

¹⁴Bṛhaspati.

la forme éclatante < telle > un dais de ses victoires, la puissance, une conduite charmante < fondée > sur une abondante réflexion, < lui dont > les dons étaient loués par les nécessiteux, doué d'une sagesse estimée par les sages sur terre, < lui > Vijayāditya.

13.

L'illustre Vijayāditya, aux paroles sincères, destructeur des ennemis, atteint la réalisation du *dharma*, du *kāma* et de l'*artha*,¹⁵

<46–48> <Vijayāditya>, qui éprouvait de la reconnaissance au souvenir des services rendus par l'époux de celle-ci, donne à cette Mahādevī le village nommé Moga, exempté de toute taxe, à l'occasion d'une annonce portée à la connaissance < de tous > ,

<48–54> Les limites de ce dernier < sont > : à l'est le rivage nommé Puliyeṛu, au sud-est l'étang de Muṇṭha-Rāvula, au sud le terrain de Narendreśvara, Ceṁbaṛu, au sud-ouest tout le terrain de Taila, à l'ouest Devulaceṛuva, au nord-ouest un étang à l'ouest Carmmaṇḍi, au nord Peddapūṇḍi-Cariya, au nord-est Reṇṭhamrākulu. Aucune charge ne doit lui être imposée. Ainsi Vyāsa a-t-il dit :

14.

le donateur d'une terre se réjouit pendant soixante mille années dans le ciel ; celui qui abroge < cette donation > ou l'approuve réside tout aussi longtemps en enfer.

<55–56> L'exécuteur de < ce don > est précisément le *kaḍeyarāja*. Cet < édit > a été composé par Bhaṭṭavāmana < et > gravé par Koṇḍacārya.

Commentary

Sankaranarayanan gives the metre of stanza 4 as *indravaṁśā*, in which case the first quarter should begin with a short syllable.

In agreement with previous editors, I assume that Vijayāditya, introduced in stanza 10 as the son of Niravadya Dhavala and grandson of Pāṇḍarāṅga,¹⁶ married the lady Śrī-Mahādevī (father: Yuddhamalla; paternal grandfather: Baladakayya; mother: Tailāmbā; maternal grandfather: Sarvarāja). I further assume (again in agreement with them) that the donor is the king, who rewards Vijayāditya's widow(?) for her husband's service. To arrive at this, we need to understand *santuṣṭaḥ* in line 47 as an instrumental and supply a name or pronoun to which it stands in apposition (e.g. *asmābhiḥ ... santuṣṭaiḥ*

¹⁵Il manque cinq syllabes. On attend, après l'énumération des trois buts, l'évocation du quatrième but, mokṣa. Le fait que le roi fasse un don de village à Mahādevī corrobore l'hypothèse que ce personnage soit mort.

¹⁶This genealogy is confirmed in lines 44-45 of the Maliyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II.

or *cālukya-bhīmena ... santuṣṭena*). Were this not the case, the implication would be that Vijayāditya is the donor. This alternative possibility cannot be rejected out of hand, but would first require us to understand Śrī-Mahādevī and Tailāmbā to be the same person (whose father is Sarvarāja), and second, to emend *dattaḥ* in line 48 to an active verb, e.g. *dattavān*. Neither of these are impossible, but I believe that if the donor were not the king himself, then this would be stated more explicitly in the text and the king's consent would also be mentioned.

Unlike the previous editors, I believe that the problematic stanza 13 (for which see the apparatus to line 45) in fact mentions their marriage explicitly. In this way, the description of Śrī-Mahādevī in the accusative in stanzas 8-9 is picked up by the accusative *yām* in stanza 13, and the introduction of Vijayāditya in stanzas 10-12 is a parenthetical excursus.

Previous editors are probably correct to assume that Vijayāditya has died and that the grant is being made to his widow. This is implied by the fact that the recipient is the lady, but nowhere in the text is Vijayāditya's death explicitly mentioned (unless the damaged and tentatively restored part of stanza 13 say this instead of what I restore in the edition). Moreover, the remark *ājñaptiḥ kaḍeya-rāja eva* (if *eva* is correctly read) may in fact imply that the executor is the very *kaḍeya-rāja* Vijayāditya who has been described in the text. The present-tense description of Vijayāditya may imply the same. The possibility should remain open.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1960–61, p. 38, appendix A/1960–61, № 2 with discussion at *ibid.*, p. 14. Edited (from photos, impressions and the original) by S. Sankaranarayanan (1973, pp. 95–104, № 2), with photographs of the plates and seal (no translation). Also edited by N. Venkataramanayya (1974) with photo of the seal and inked rubbings of the plates (no translation). The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of the previous editions and the visual aids published with them. Both editions contain plenty of typographic mistakes; only significant ones are shown in the apparatus here and others are silently assumed to have been correctly read by the original editors. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[NV] Venkataramanayya, N. 1974. “The Mōga grant of Chālukya Bhīma I.” In: *Epigraphia Āndhrīca vol. III*. Edited by P. V. Parabrahma Sastry & N. Venkataramanayya. Epigraphical series 7. Hyderabad: Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, pp. 28–42.

[SS] Sankaranarayanan, S. 1973. “Two copper-plate charters of Chalukya Bhima I from Vinnakota.” *EI* 39, pp. 81–104. Pages 95–104, item 2.

Secondary

ARIE 1960–61. *Annual report on Indian epigraphy for 1960–61*. Edited by H. K. Narasimhaswamy. Delhi: Manager of Publications, 1964.

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