Diggubaṟṟu grant of Bhīma II

Dániel Balogh

Alternative title: Pāganavaram plates of Bhīma II

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00032

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00032.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final M is quite small and raised, consisting of a circle with a single sinuous tail on the top left (much like a lowercase delta, δ). E.g. l9 trayastriṁśataM. Final T is a full-sized ta without headmark, with a short and sinuous vertical tail at the top right, much like a repha. E.g. l8 anvapalayaT. Final N is a raised and reduced na with no headmark an elongated tail that bends slightly to the right.

Original punctuation marks are pairs of straight verticals about the height of a character body, usually, but not always, with a small hook at the top, bending at a right angle to the left. Final N is also a full-size na without headmark, with a vertical tail curving to the right (not a sinuous one). E.g. l11 māsāN.

Other palaeographic observations. Dependent o is sometimes formed with the modern/cursive single stroke that starts at the top left of a consonant, turns up and right, has a notch in the middle, then bends down on the right and extends below the headline. Fleet reads some of these as au and emends (e.g. l1 sagautrānāṁ, l47 gautama-gautra), but reads others as the expected o (e.g. l11 kokkili, jyeṣṭho). I prefer, in most instances, to read the ambiguous grapheme as the expected vowel. On a few occasions, where o

is expected yet the stroke is particularly asymmetrical (the right hump being much larger) and/or its tail extends particularly far down, I read au and normalise to o. (These include l11 kaukkili, where I think au was definitely intended by the scribe. Is this a Sanskrit derivation of the name from kokila?) Instances where I read the ambiguous stroke as o are marked in the XML with a comment. See also the apparatus to tāḷadhipopo in line 26.

Sandhi of a final s with an initial ṣ is written as a double ṣ, clearly not a jihvāmūlīya. E.g. l11 kokkiliṣ ṣaṇ; l13 varddhanaṣ ṣaṭ. Upadhmānīya is used repeatedly and is in shape identical to ṛa, though slightly smaller. Its use is quite consistent; the only visarga before p is in line 61 where a sentence end is to be understood after asyāvadhayaḥ. On two other occasions, visarga/upadhmānīya is omitted before p (l10 yuvarāja paṁca; l39 hetu pradveṣi, falling on a pāda boundary).

Edition

Seal

〈1〉 śrī-tribhuvanāṁkuśa

Plates

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 svasti〈.〉 śrīmatāṁ sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūy¿ā?〈a〉māna-mānavya-sago〈2〉trāṇāṁ hārīti-putrāṇāṁ kauśikī-vara-prasāda-labdha-rājyānāṁ mā〈3〉t¡ru!〈ṛ〉-gaṇa-paripālitānāṁ svāmi-〈ma〉hāsena-pādānudhyātānāṁ bha-gava〈4〉n-nārāya◯ṇa-prasāda-samāsādita-vara-varāha-lāṁ¿c?〈ch〉a〈5〉nekṣaṇa-kṣa◯ṇa-vaśīkṛtārāti-maṇḍalānām aśvamedhāva〈6〉bhṛ¿t?〈th〉a-snāna-pa◯vi¡tt!rīkṛta-vapuṣāṁ calukyān¿a?〈ā〉〈ṁ〉 kulam ala〈ṁ〉ka〈7〉riṣṇos satyāśraya-vallabhendrasya bhrātā kubja-viṣṇuvarddhano 〈'〉(ṣṭāda)śa〈8〉 varṣ¿a?〈ā〉ṇi veṁgi-maṇḍal¿ā?〈a〉m anvap¿a?〈ā〉layaT‖ tad-¿a?〈ā〉tmaj¿e?〈o〉 jaya(siṁha)〈Page 2r〉〈9〉s trayas-triṁśataM‖ tad-anujendrarāja-nandano viṣṇuvarddhano 〈nava〉 varṣ(ā)ṇi(‖)〈10〉 tad-anujo maṁ¡gg!i-yuvarāja〈ḥ〉 paṁcaviṁśatiM‖ tat-putro jayasi〈11〉ṁhas tray-odaśa(‖) tasya dvaimāturaḥ k¡au!〈o〉kkili¡ṣ! ṣaṇ māsāN‖ tasya jye〈12〉ṣṭho bhrātā vi◯ṣṇuva〈r〉ddhanas sapta¡tt!riṁśataM‖ tat-suto vija〈13〉yāditya-bha◯ṭṭ(ā)rako 〈'〉ṣṭādaśa‖ tat-sūn¿ū?〈u〉¿m?〈r v〉viṣṇuvarddhana¡ṣ! ṣaṭtri(ṁ)〈14〉śataM‖ tat-sūnur aṣṭ¡au!〈o〉ttara-śata-mita-narendreś〈v〉ara-karaṇ¿ā?〈a〉-raṇa-gaṇāri〈15〉-

vijiti-saṁprāpta-k¿i?<ī>rtti<r> mm¿u?<ū><r>t<t>imān dharmma Iva narendra-mṛ<ga>-rāj¿e?<o> <’>ṣṭacatvāri<16>ṁśataM‖ tat-sūnuḥ kali-viṣṇuvarddhano <’>dhya<r>ddha-varṣaM‖ tat-sūnu<r> mmaṁ¡gg!i-ha<Page 2v><17>nana-kiraṇapura-dahana-vikhyāta-k¿i?<ī>rtti<r> gguṇaga-vijayādityaś ca<18>tu<śca>tvāri<ṁ>śataM| tad-anuja-yuvarāja-vikramāditya-bhūbhṛd-ā<19>tmajaś cālukya-bhīma-bhūpālas triṁśataM‖

1. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

tat-putr¿āḥ?<a>s tad-ananta<20>reṇa vija◯yādityo vij¿a?<i>ty¿a?<ā>have‖
sv¿ai?<e>naikena ga<21>jena vāra◯¿n?<ṇ>a-gh¿ā?<a>ṭ¿a?<ā>r¿u?<ū>ḍhān
k¿u?<a>liṁgādhipā<N>(|)
Āru<22>hyo¡j!<jj>vala-hema-kalpita-tulā-koṭiṁ vadānyo jaya-
-staṁbhaṁ<23> k¿i?<ī>rttimayan nidhāya viraje ṣaṇ-māsam ās¿i?<ī>n nṛpaḥ|

tasyā<24> gra(ḥ) sūnur amma-rājas sap(t)a varṣ(ā)ṇi‖ tat-suta<ṁ> vijayā<Page 3r><25>dityaṁ kṛta-kaṇṭhikā-paṭṭa-bandhābh¿ī?<i>ṣekaM{‖} bālam uccāṭya<26> tāl¿a?<ā>dhi{po}po māsam ekaM‖ ta<ṁ> yudhi vinihatya punaś c(ā)<27>lukya-bhīma-bhūpātmajo vikramāditya-rājaḥ Ekādaśa mā<28>sān bhuvam a◯nvapālayaT‖

2. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

ta¿b?<m> bhi¡t!<tt>vā yudhi bhīma<29>-sannibha-ba◯lo bh¿i?<ī>mo <’>mma-sūno<r> bbhaṭas
san māsā<30>ṣṭakam āvad eva vasudhāṁ vyāpādy⟦ā⟧<<a>> taṁ saṁyuge
tāḷa-jye<31>ṣṭha-suto <’>tha malla-nṛpatis saptānvapād vatsar¿a?<ā>n
utsāryy¿a?<ā><32>tha tam agrahīt kula-bhuvaṁ paṭṭena bhīmo nṛpaḥ|

3. Praharṣiṇī

tasyaiva vyasa<Page 3v><33>nam iha trayaṁ <ca> j¿a?<ā>taṁ
śāstrāstr¿a?<ā>bhyasanam aninditaṁ ca bhū<34>yaḥ
saṁrakṣā sakala-janasya śāstra-dṛṣṭyā
sandānaṁ budhaja<35>nasāt-kṛtaṁ sa-mānaM|

4. Mandākrāntā

meḷāṁbāyā<ṁ> dyuti-nuti-mati-śrī-dhṛ<36>ti-kṣānt¿a?<i>m¿ā?<a>◯tyām
atyādityo jagati vijayāditya<37>Ājījana◯d yaM
dharmmendrāgni-trinayana-dhaneśoda<38>keśādi-dha<r>mma<ṁ>
senā-nāthan tripura-mathanaḥ kanyakāyā<ṁ> ya(th)ā(huḥ?)

5. Indravajrā

〈39〉 mitrāravinda-pratibodha-hetu〈ḥ〉
pradveṣi-nīhāra-vighāta-(he)tu(ḥ)
〈40〉 yasyoc¿c?〈ch〉¿ṛ?〈ri〉tan teja Ihaijate kau
tejasvinas teja ivātipūta〈M〉

6. Gīti

〈Page 4r〉 〈41〉 yasmin śāsati vasudhāṁ vasubhis sa〈ṁ〉pūr¿nn?〈ṇṇ〉a-sakala-janatā(ṁ ca‖)
〈42〉 rājani dharmma-tanūje yathā manu-prokta-dharmma-saṁpanne|

sa¡s! sa〈43〉rvva-lokāśraya-śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārāj¿a?〈ā〉dhirājaḥ para(ma)-mā〈44〉heśvaraḥ pa◯rama-brahm¿ā?〈a〉ṇyo mātā-pitṛ-pādānudhyāta〈45〉ś c¡a!lukya-bhī◯ma-gaṇḍa-mahendra〈ḥ〉 siṁhās⟦th⟧an¿ā?〈a〉-maṁ¿ṭ?〈ḍ〉a〈pā〉rū¿ḍ?〈ḍh〉a〈46〉ḷ pāgunavara-viṣaya-nivāsino rāṣṭrak¿u?〈ū〉ṭa-pramukhān sarvvān samā〈47〉h¿⟦ā⟧〈〈u〉〉?〈ū〉ye{r}ttham āj̃ñ¡a!payati

viditam astu vaḥ

7. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

śrīmān gautama-gotra〈48〉-jo dvija-varas sad-vartma-gaḷ puṇya-bhāg
nād¿ā?〈a〉tte vasudhām api kṣiti〈Page 4v〉〈49〉-talādhīśais su-vaṁśod¿dh?〈bh〉avaiḥ
datt¿a?〈ā〉ṁ tūrkkama-bhūsuraḥ krama-yu〈50〉taḥ khyātaḥ kṣitau sad-guṇai〈ḥ〉
dīnānanda-vidhāyi-dāna-niratāḷ pūj〈y〉a〈51〉s satāṁ sarvvadā¿N?〈‖〉

8. Upendravajrā

tad-ātmajo dik-prathito guṇaughair
dvijendra-vaṁśā〈ṁ〉ba〈52〉ra-pūrṇṇa-ca◯ndraḥ
Anūna-d¿o?〈ā〉nā{ccita-bandhu-}(r)ccita-bandhu-mitro
〈53〉 mahā-guṇ¿ai?〈o〉 ◯ mādhava-soma-y¿a?〈ā〉j¿i?〈ī〉¿N?〈‖〉

9. Upendravajrā

sutas tadīyo (g)u〈54〉ṇi-¡b!ṛnda-vandyaḥ
kalā-kalāpasya ¿bh?〈c〉a pāra-dṛś〈v〉ā
śruti-smṛti-prokta-sa〈55〉masta-vastu–
viśuddha-dhīm¿a?〈ā〉n iha viddamayyaḥ|

10. Upendravajrā

gṛhaṁ yadīyaṁ sva〈56〉-gṛhaṁ satā〈ṁ〉 yad
dhanāni yasyārttha-yutāni ¿pātri?-

-samarppaṇāt sa〈Page 5r〉〈57〉rvva-dig-a¿s?〈n〉tarāṇi
yadīy{y}a-kī〈r〉tyā paribhūṣitāni||

11. Upendravajrā

śuddhānvayaś śu〈58〉ddhatara-pravṛtti〈r〉
nniyukta-karmmaṇy upadhā-viśuddhaḥ
satām matas sad-bahu〈59〉-poṣya-v¿ā?〈a〉rggas
samasta-bhūta-priya-vāk-〈k〉riyaś ca|

tasmai tat-k〈l〉eśātiśaya〈60〉-san¿d?〈t〉uṣ¿m?〈ṭ〉¿e?〈ai〉r a◯smābhir ddiggubaṟṟu-grāmo dattaḥ

Asy¿a?〈ā〉vadha〈61〉yaḥ〈.〉 pūrvvataḥ ◯ kra(ñ)ca|| dakṣiṇataḥ kranūru| paścimataḥ __〈62〉 _Uttarataḥ palukaunu| Asyopari 〈na〉 k¿o?〈e〉nacid bādhā karttavyā¿ḥ?〈|〉

12. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhi〈r〉 vvasudhā {da}〈63〉 dattā
bahubhiś cānupālitā
yasya yasya yad¿a?〈ā〉 bhūmis
tasya tasya ta〈dā〉 phalaM|

13. Anuṣṭubh

sva-da〈64〉ttāṁ para-dattāṁ vā
yo hareta vasundharāṁ
ṣaṣṭi-varṣa-sahasrāṇi
viṣ¿ṭa?〈ṭhā〉yā〈ṁ〉 j¿a?〈ā〉〈ya〉te k¡ri!〈r̥〉miḥ||

〈Page 5v〉

Apparatus

Plates

〈14〉 -karaṇ¿ā?〈a〉-raṇa- • I cannot interpret *-karaṇāraṇa-*, which Fleet does not emend (and does not analyse as a compound). The text as I emend is still quite awkward and it is possible that something else was intended by the composer.

〈16〉 mmaṁ¡gg!i- ◇ *mmaṁ{dh}gi* JFF • The main component of the conjunct *gg* may be malformed and it may be a clear *dh* in the original, but Walter Elliot's estampage permits reading it as *g*, and this was clearly the intent.

〈19〉 -putr¿āḥ?〈a〉s • Fleet suggests the emendation *putrāṁs* in addition to suggesting *putras*, but I do not think this would be appropriate. From Elliot's estampage it seems that the *ā* may have been deleted; this may be ascertained from a photo.

〈21〉 k¿u?〈a〉liṁgā° • The spelling *kuliṁga* may be a deliberate slur at the Kaliṅgas rather than an innocuous mistake. See also the note to the translation of this spot and the apparatus to *-sanduṣmer* in line 60.

〈23〉 °ā〈24〉 gra(ḥ) ◇ *°ā〈24〉 gra-* JFF • What I see as a (visarga) in Elliot's rubbing may just be noise; this could be confirmed from a photo.

〈24〉 tat-suta〈ṁ〉 ...〈Page 3r〉〈25〉... °ābh¿ī?〈i〉ṣekaM‖ • This sequence, ended by what Fleet describes as a superfluous punctuation mark, is an almost correct *āryā* hemistich. If we reject Fleet's emendation of *sutaṁ* and read *suta-* and read *kaṇṭhika* instead of *kaṇṭhikā*, then the only remaining prosodic anomaly is syncopation from the fifth to the sixth foot, something that occurs in other *āryā*s in the Eastern Cālukya corpus. However, I see no straightforward way to fit either the preceding or the following sequence to another moraic hemistich. I believe the composer intended this sentence to be prose, but probably adopted the entire passage with some changes from a pre-existing version in moraic verse.

〈26〉 tāḷ¿a?〈ā〉dhi{po}po ◇ *tāh¿a?〈ā〉dhi{po}po* JFF • The second character looks much like *ha*, but must nonetheless be *ḷa*. It is distinguished in this hand from *ha* by the fact that the final hook of the latter bends backward underneath the body, extending beyond the left edge of the body (see e.g. l2 *hārīti* and l3 *hāsena*), while *ḷa* has a smaller hook that does not bend below the body. In the dittography *popo*, the first instance is written with a cursive *o* (see also the palaeographic description), and the second with a traditional *o* of two strokes. The repetition of the syllable may be a correction of the former to the latter, or possibly a botched attempt at inscribing *tāḷapādhipo*. — 〈26〉 c(ā)〈27〉lukya- • Fleet explicitly avows that the original plate has *cā* here, though the vowel marker is not visible in the estampage. Nor can I make it out in Elliot's rubbing. A photo may confirm.

〈27〉 -rājaḥ • Fleet reads a superfluous single punctuation mark after this word. I see no trace of this in the estampages available to me, but a photo may confirm this. The *visarga* looks a bit like vertical bar in Fleet's estampage (but not in Elliot's), so Fleet may have read that character twice. — 〈27〉 mā〈28〉sān • Here too, Fleet notes that the vowel of *mā* is not visible in the estampage. This is indeed the case in his estampage, but the vowel is clear in Elliot's rubbing.

〈28〉 ta¿b?〈m〉 bhi¡t!〈tt〉vā ◇ *ta¿b?〈ṁ〉 ¿bh?〈j〉itvā* JFF • I believe my emendation assumes a smaller and more likely scribal error than Fleet's. Spelling *bhittvā* with

a single *t* would be quite natural (compare l22, *°ojvala*), and although *jitvā* is most straightforward in the context, *bhittvā* is also appropriate.

〈29〉 -sūno〈r〉 ◇ *-sūn¿o?〈u〉〈r〉* JFF • I find Fleet's emendation unnecessary. See the commentary.

〈30〉 tāḷa- ◇ *tāha-* JFF • Compare the same word in line 26 above.

〈33〉 trayaṁ ◇ *tray¿ā?〈a〉ṁ* JFF • I see no indication of *ā* in either Fleet's estampage or Elliot's rubbing. Possibly a typo in Fleet's edition. His emendation is shown as part of the larger emendation of the unmetrical phrase, and may not have been intended as an emendation for this particular spot. — 〈33〉 〈ca〉 JFF • I adopt the emendation suggested by Fleet. Alternatively, the hypometrical line could be corrected by supplying *na* instead of *ca*, resulting in a different tone for the stanza as a whole. Both result in a rather awkward sentence; see also the note to the translation.

〈37〉 Ājījana◯d • According to Fleet, this word is *Ajījanad*, lengthened in the first syllable only for the sake of the metre. I see no reason not to assume that the prefix *ā* is present; *ā-jan* is attested in the causative (and meaning "beget, generate") at least in the Atharvaveda.

〈38〉 -dharmma〈ṁ〉 • Fleet also proposes the alternate emendation *-dharmmaḥ*. I feel quite certain that the qualities of these gods were thought to be present in Kumāra/Bhīma rather than in Śiva/Vijayāditya, especially as the gods include Śiva. — 〈38〉 ya(th)ā(huḥ?) JFF • The last character is illegible in my facsimiles. I tentatively adopt Fleet's reading, which is itself tentative. The word fits the syntax very badly (though it can fit the semantics) and may need to be revised from a photo. If correct, the *visarga* should probably be marked as an omitted character, since there seems to be no room for it before the edge. In Elliot's rubbing, the character looks rather like it has a subscript *r*, though *hu* is also possible assuming that the vertical line to the left of the body is damage. I wonder if the correct reading might be *yathā prāK*, though a final *K* seems as impossible to fit here as a *visarga*.

〈42〉 yathā ◇ *yathā-* JFF • If the hyphen in Fleet's edition is not a typo, then he seems to have understood the composer to say the king was himself the son of Dharma. I prefer to construe a simile with *yathā*.

〈43〉 -mā〈44〉heśvaraḥ̱ • Here too, Fleet notes that the vowel of *mā* is not visible in the estampage, but present in the original.

〈45〉 siṁhās⟦th⟧an¿ā?〈a〉-maṁ¿ṭ?〈ḍ〉a〈pā〉rū¿ḍ?〈ḍh〉a〈46〉ḥ̱ • The deleted *th*, which Fleet describes as partially erased, is very clear in Fleet's rubbing. There may also be a deleted *ā* attached to this character, which is only visible in Elliot's rubbing. There

also seems to be plenty of noise around the preceding characters *hendra si*; photos of the original may tell whether something (perhaps *maheśvara*?) has been deleted here. For the second part of the compound, I endorse Fleet's emendation, as I am unable to come up with anything more likely. Fleet reads *ru* where I read *rū*, assuming that the bend toward the right at the end of the *u* marker was added to make it *ū*.

〈46〉 samā〈47〉h¿[[ā]]<<u>>?〈ū〉ye{r}ttham • Fleet does not note a correction here, but merely reads *hu=ā* and emends to *hū*. The marker for *u* is attached to the baseline of *h* and cuts twice across the extended final hook of *h*, which is why I believe it was added subsequently, and probably only after the following line had been inscribed. The most likely assumption is thus that an initially inscribed *hā* was corrected to *hu* (intended for *hū*). A proper *ū*, rising to body height on the right of *h*, was impossible to add at this stage, because the next character on the right is too close. However, it is also possible that the *ā* marker has been deliberately employed as a length marker for the *u*. In this case too, I think correction must lie in the background, either from an initially inscribed *ha* (adding a combined *u* and *ā*, to represent *ū* in a way that fits in the available space), or an initially inscribed *hā* (adding *u* and deliberately not deleting *ā*, with the same intent).

〈49〉 -vaṁśod¿dh?〈bh〉avaiḥ ◇ *-vaṁśod¿v?〈bh〉avaiḥ* JFF.

〈51〉 sarvvadā¿N?〈‖〉 • I agree with Fleet's observation that the superfluous final *N* is a scribal mistake for a double punctuation mark. — 〈51〉 guṇaughair ◇ *guṇaughai〈r〉* JFF • The repha, though very small, is in my opinion present between the consonant and the vowel marker of the following *dvi*. Compare *dik-* earlier in this line, where the *i* fits the upper part of *d* snugly.

〈52〉 {ccita-bandhu-}(r)ccita-bandhu- • According to Fleet, these four syllables (which he reads identically, without *r*) are repated by mistake. It seems to me that the second iteration has a small repha between the *i* and the consonant. Moreover, in Elliot's rubbing (but not in Fleet's estampage), the first iteration has a rather strong shadowy outline. This is present in many places in Elliot's rubbing but I wonder whether in this case it may indicate that the first iteration was deleted by paring down the copper around the letters. A possible reason for such deletion may be that the scribe omitted the repha at first, noticed this four characters later, and re-inscribed the sequence correctly. But if so, I do not know why he did not delete only *cci* and re-inscribe *rcci* over it. Photos of the original may reveal more.

〈53〉 -yāj¿i?〈ī〉¿N?〈‖〉 • As in line 51 above, Fleet is probably correct in assuming that a final N was mistakenly inscribed instead of a double punctuation mark. In this

case, however, it also seems possible that the stem form *-yājin* was intended, without a punctuation mark.

〈56〉 yad • This word is superfluous. The composer may have intended it in compound with the following *dhanāni*, but that is associated with *yasya*. I therefore understand this *yad* as a weak and unnecessary connective particle. — 〈56〉 ¿pātri? • I cannot interpret *pātri* or *pātrin* here and assume that either the composer used this word in the sense of *pātra*, or it is a scribal mistake for *pātra*.

〈59〉 -v¿ā?〈a〉rggas ◇ *-¿v?〈m〉ārggas* JFF • As Fleet does not offer a translation, I am not sure how he interpreted his emendation *poṣya-mārggas*. I see no clear way to interpreting it, while *poṣya-varga* is attested and fits the context.

〈60〉 -san¿d?〈t〉uṣ¿m?〈ṭ〉¿e?〈ai〉r ◇ *-sanduṣ¿m?〈ṭ〉¿a?〈ai〉r* JFF • Fleet reads *ṣma* where I read *ṣme* on the grounds that the left arm of the subscript *m* is extended in a curve identical to that in *tasmai* in the previous line where, in combination with an overhead vowel mark, Fleet too reads it as *ai*. I believe that Fleet's retention of *du* must be a typo. Given, however, that *tat-keśātiśaya-sanduṣṭair* is meaningful (though wholly inappropriate), I wonder if, in addition to the scribal mistake in *ṣme*, a playful draftsman's deliberate "mistake" was also involved here. — 〈60〉 a◯smābhir ◇ *asmābhi〈r〉* JFF • Here too, the *repha* is present in the form of a short connecting segment between the consonant and the vowel marker. — 〈60〉 ddiggubaṟ̱ru- • There is a very clear dot above *ba*. Fleet explicitly notes that this is not an *anusvāra* but a fault in the copper. In the rubbings it looks exactly like an *anusvāra*, but its position above the middle of a character makes it likely that it is not one.

〈61〉 paścimataḥ _〈62〉 _Uttarataḥ • There is no trace of a deletion in and around these spaces in the facsimiles, nor does Fleet mention any. The space may be a proper vacat, left blank to fill subsequently, but if so, it is quite narrow; the space at the beginning of line 62 could accommodate one narrow character at most.

〈62〉 palukaunu • Fleet primarily reads *palukonu*, offering *au* as an alternative reading. While the intent may have been a cursive *o*, the shape of the grapheme is rather on the *au*-end of the spectrum. — 〈62〉 〈na〉 k¿o?〈e〉nacid bādhā • I follow Fleet's choice of the spot to insert the omitted *na*, but it would be equally appropriate at the end of this string.

〈64〉 -varṣa- • As Fleet notes, the *repha* is not visible in Fleet's estampage, but it is present (though not quite clear) in Elliot's estampage.

Translation

Plates

〈1–19〉 Greetings. Satyāśraya Vallabhendra (Pulakeśin II) was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Calukyas—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 enemy territories 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 protected (*pāl-*) the country of Veṅgī for eighteen years. His son Jayasiṁha (I), for thirty-three. His younger brother Indrarāja's (Indra Bhaṭṭāraka's) son Viṣṇuvardhana (II), for 〈nine〉 years. His younger brother[1] Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five. His son Jayasiṁha (II), for thirteen. His 〈brother〉 by a different mother, Kokkili, for six months. His eldest brother Viṣṇuvardhana (III), for thirty-seven. His son Vijayāditya (I) Bhaṭṭāraka, for eighteen. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (IV), for thirty-six. His son (Vijayāditya II) Narendramṛgarāja, who attained fame by constructing Narendreśvara 〈temples〉 numbering a hundred and eight and defeating enemies ¿in a series of 〈the same number of〉 battles?,[2] and who was like Dharma incarnate, for forty-eight. His son Kali-Viṣṇuvardhana (V), for a year and a half. His son Guṇaga Vijayāditya (III), whose reputation is famed for the slaying of Maṅgi and the burning of Kiraṇapura, for forty-four. The son of his younger brother the heir-apparent (*yuvarāja*) Prince (*bhūbhṛt*) Vikramāditya, King (*bhūpāla*) Cālukya-Bhīma, for thirty.

1.

After him his son Vijayāditya (IV) was king for six months, defeating in battle with 〈just〉 one elephant of his own the overlords of Kaliṅga[3] mounted on hosts of elephants, generously ascending the beam of a balance scale furnished with bright gold,[4] and commissioning a victory pillar representing his reputation in Viraja.

[1] Maṅgi Yuvarāja was the son, not the younger brother of Viṣṇuvardhana II.

[2] My translation is based on a tentative emendation; see the apparatus to line 14.

[3] The actual spelling in the inscription is *kuliṁga*, which may be simply a scribal error or a reflection of local pronunciation or a deliberate slur at the Cālukyas' enemies. The word *ku-liṅga*—literally "having bad/strange marks"—may refer to a person of ill omen or, more vulgarly, to one whose virility is questionable; it is also used for a rodent and several birds and may thus imply that these rulers are unpleasant pests rather than worthy enemies. In the only other known attestation of this stanza (the Varaṇaveṇḍi grant of Bhīma II) the spelling is the expected *kaliṁga*, so innocuous scribal error is likely in the present case.

[4] That is, donating his own weight in gold.

〈23–28〉 His firstborn son Ammarāja (I), for seven years. After dethroning his son the child Vijayāditya (V) who had been consecrated for kingship with the locket (*kaṇṭhikā*) and turban (*paṭṭa-bandha*), Tāḷādhipa, for one month. Next, having slain him in battle, King (*bhūpa*) Cālukya-Bhīma's son King (*rājan*) Vikramāditya (II) protected (*pāl-*) the earth for eleven months.

2.

Having crushed him in battle, Bhīma—whose strength resembled that of (the epic) Bhīma—being a soldier (*bhaṭa*) of Amma's son (Vijayāditya V), did nonetheless protect (*av-*) the earth for eight months.[5] Overthrowing him in conflict, Tāḷa's eldest son King (*nṛpati*) Malla (Yuddhamalla II) ruled (*pā-*) 〈the earth〉 next for seven years. Then, having ousted him, Bhīma (II), as king (*nṛpa*), seized the dynastic land 〈along〉 with the 〈royal〉 turban.[6]

3.

That same (Bhīma II) had a threefold vice (*vyasana*) on earth: the impeccable practice of learning (*śāstra*) and combat (*astra*); even more, the protection of the entire populace in accordance with the views of the treatises (*śāstra*); and generosity directed at the learned along with respect.[7]

4.

Vijayāditya (IV), who surpassed the sun on earth, begat him (Bhīma II) on Meḷāmbā, who possessed effulgence, acclaim, intelligence, majesty, steadfastness and forbearance, to be a leader of armies, imbued with the essence of 〈gods〉 such as Dharma, Indra, Agni, the Three-eyed (Śiva), (Kubera) the Lord of Wealth and (Varuṇa) the Lord of Water—just as (Śiva) the tormentor of Tripura is said to have begotten {(Skanda) the Leader of Armies, imbued with the essence of these gods} on the Maiden (Pārvatī).

5.

[5] My interpretation of this stanza is different from that of all previous opinions. See the commentary.

[6] The sentence also permits the interpretation, perhaps deliberately intended by the composer, that Bhīma II grabbed the dynastic land—visualised as a goddess—by her robes.

[7] I translate the text as emended in the edition; see the apparatus to *ca* in line 33. Read this way, the king's vice (*vyasana*) in fact turns out to be virtue, but the composition of the stanza as a whole is very awkward. Alternatively, the hypermetrical first quarter could be completed with *na* to the effect that Bhīma did not have the triad of vices (viz., chasing women, indulgence in drinking and avid hunting), but he did immerse himself all the more in the impeccable activities listed in the next three quarters. The words *bhūyaḥ* and *aninditam* are more appropriate in this alternative, but the stanza as a whole is blander, lacking the first alternative's figure of praising the king under the guise of censure. Parts of the composition remain awkward in this latter alternative too, especially the construction with *vyasanam … trayam*. The composer may have had either alternative in mind.

The intense energy (*tejas*) of this energetic man (*tejasvin*) shines here on earth like an extremely bright effulgence (*tejas*) that is the cause of blooming for the lotuses that are his friends and the cause of destruction for the darkness that is his enemies.[8]

6.

While this king—who like (Yudhiṣṭhira) the Son of Dharma was endowed with the law (*dharma*) taught by Manu—was ruling the earth and all its populace abounding in wealth—

〈42–47〉 that shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), His Majesty the supremely pious Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (Bhīma II), supreme devotee of Maheśvara, who was deliberately appointed (as heir) by his mother and father, 〈namely〉 Calukya-Bhīma Gaṇḍa-mahendra, seated in his throne room, convokes and commands all who reside in Pāgunavara district (*viṣaya*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—as follows:

〈47〉 Let it be known to you 〈that〉

7.

〈There was〉 a majestic and excellent twiceborn born in the Gautama *gotra*: the god-on-earth (Brahmin) Tūrkkama, learned in *krama* 〈recitation〉. Treading the path of the true and invested with virtue, he would not accept even 〈if〉 the whole earth 〈had been〉 offered to him by kings born of a noble lineage. He was famed on earth by his good qualities, intent on generosity causing joy to the afflicted, and ever worthy of true men's praise.

8.

His son, renowned in all quarters by his hosts of good qualities, was the Soma sacrificer Mādhava of great virtue. A full moon in the sky that was that lineage of excellent Brahmins, he honoured his kin and friends with outstanding generosity.

9.

His son is Viddamayya here, worthy of laudation by the flocks of the virtuous and an accomplished master of a whole array of arts, whose wisdom has been polished by all the subject matters taught in the Vedas (*śruti*) and scriptures (*smṛti*).

10.

[8] Given the solar imagery in this stanza, it may perhaps be a description of Bhīma II's father Vijayāditya. But given its location in the narrative sequence, I prefer to assume it is about Bhīma, and the solar imagery is associated with his kingship without being an allusion to his name.

The house of this man is home to ⟨all⟩ virtuous men; his wealth attains purpose through being offered to worthy recipients; his reputation embellishes all regions of the horizon.

11.

Pure in descent and even purer in conduct, proven worthy of high office (*niyukta-karman*) by trials (of honesty) (*upadhā*), he is esteemed by honest men, has a numerous flock of honest dependants (*poṣya*), and is kind in speech and action to all living beings.

⟨59–60⟩ Being pleased with his excessive troubles (undertaken on our behalf), we have granted to him the village Diggubaṟṟu.

⟨61–62⟩ Its boundaries ⟨are as follows⟩. To the east, Krañca. To the south, Kranūru. To the west ⟨and⟩[9] to the north, Palukaunu. Let no-one pose an obstacle (to his enjoyment of his rights) over it.

12.

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.

13.

He who would seize land, whether given by himself or by another, shall be born as a worm in faeces for sixty thousand years.

Translation into French by Estienne-Monod 2008

Plates

⟨1–19⟩ Prospérité ! Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana, 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 Hāriti, qui obtinrent leur royaume grâce à l'excellente faveur de Kauśikī, protégés par la troupes des Mères, méditant aux pieds du seigneur Mahāsena, 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 purificatoire de l'*aśvamedha*, protègea le cercle de Veṁgī pendant dix-huit années ; son fils, Jayasiṁha, pendant trente-trois ⟨années⟩ ; le fils d'Indrarāja, le frère cadet de ce dernier, Viṣṇuvardhana, pendant neuf années ; son

[9] It is also possible that space was left blank for the name of the western boundary and was never filled; see the apparatus to line 61.

frère cadet, Maṁgi Yuvarāja, vingt-cinq ⟨années⟩ ; son fils, Jayasiṁha, pendant treize années ; son demi-frère, Kokkili, pendant six mois ; le frère aîné de ce dernier, Viṣṇuvardhana, pendant trente-sept ⟨années⟩ ; son fils, Vijayāditya Bhaṭṭāraka, pendant dix-huit ⟨années⟩ ; son fils, Viṣṇuvardhana, pendant trente-six ⟨années⟩ ; le fils de ce dernier, qui acquit la gloire grâce aux cent huit Narendreśvara qu'il fit construire et aux cent huit victoires qu'il remporta sur les troupes ennemies, ⟨lui⟩ pareil au dharma incarné, Narendra Mṛgarāja pendant quarante-huit années ; son fils, Kali Viṣṇuvardhana, pendant un an et demi ; le fils de celui-ci, dont la gloire se répandit, incendie ⟨détruisant⟩ les forteresses,[10] dont les rayons causèrent la perte de Maṁgi,[11] Guṇaga Vijayāditya, pendant quarante-quatre ⟨années⟩ ; le fils du roi Vikramāditya, prince héritier et frère cadet de ce dernier, le roi Cālukya Bhīma, pendant trente ⟨années⟩ ;

1.

immédiatement ⟨après lui⟩, son fils Vijayāditya, ayant vaincu au combat, avec son unique éléphant, les seigneurs du Kaliṁga, montés sur un grand nombre d'éléphants, après être monté à l'⟨une des⟩ extrêmités d'une balance qu'il équilibra avec de l'or rutilant, dans sa munificence, ⟨et⟩ après avoir érigé un pilier de victoire fait de sa gloire, fut roi pendant six mois, dans la pureté.[12]

⟨23–28⟩ le fils aîné de ce dernier, Ammarāja, pendant sept années ; après avoir chassé le fils de celui-ci, Vijayāditya, alors qu'il était encore jeune et avait été sacré par le bandeau ⟨royal⟩ ainsi que le collier, Tāhādhipa ⟨régna⟩ pendant un mois ; mais après avoir terrassé à son tour celui-ci au combat, le fils du roi Cālukya Bhīma, le roi Vikramāditya, protègea la terre pendant onze mois ;

2.

ayant vaincu celui-ci au combat, Bhīma, fils d'Amma, dont la force était égale à celle de Bhīma, étant un guerrier, protègea la terre pendant huit mois ; puis, ayant tué celui-ci lors d'une bataille, le fils aîné de Tāha, le roi Malla, régna ensuite pendant sept années ; après avoir chassé ce dernier, le roi Bhīma, ayant ceint le bandeau ⟨royal⟩, s'empara ensuite du royaume de sa lignée ;

3.

et il avait une triple obsession dans ce monde : l'irréprochable étude des traités et des

[10] Allusion implicite aux forteresses des Asura.

[11] Il est aussi question de ce personnage dans les insc. nos 32, str.5 ; 35, str.2 ; 37, str. 10.

[12] Mention du sacrifice du *tulā-bhara*, l'un des *mahā-yajña*, lors duquel le roi donne son poids en or.⟨Cf. P.V. Kane, 1974, VII, part. II, p. 869 et ss.⟩

armes, plus encore la protection de tous les hommes, l'union avec la compréhension des traités,[13] honorée pareillement par les sages ;

4.

Dans ⟨le sein de⟩ Meḷāṁbā, douée de splendeur, d'éloges,[14] d'intelligence, de beauté, de fermeté, de patience, Vijayāditya, soleil suprême sur le monde, engendra un chef d'armée, qui possédait la nature de Dharma, Indra, Agni, Trinayana, Dhaneśa, Udakeśa,[15] etc., de même que, dit-on, le Destructeur de Tripura, engendra dans ⟨le sein de⟩ Kanyakā, le chef de l'armée.[16]

5.

Cause de l'éveil des lotus que sont ses alliés, cause de la ruine de ces ténèbres que sont ses ennemis, son immense majesté resplendit sur cette terre, pure comme l'éclat du soleil.[17]

6.

Lorsque ce roi gouverne la terre et toute l'humanité, comblée de richesses, il est pareil au fils de Dharma, doué du *dharma* que Manu proclama.

⟨42–47⟩ Lui, refuge de tous les hommes, l'illustre Viṣṇuvardhana, roi suprême des grands rois, excellent dévôt de Maheśvara, très pieux, méditant aux pieds de sa mère et de son père, Calukya Bhīma Gaṇḍa Mahendra, installé dans le pavillon où ⟨se trouve⟩ le trône, ordonne ceci à tous habitants du viṣaya de Pāgunavara rassemblés, *rāṣṭrakūṭa* en tête :

⟨47⟩ qu'il soit connu de vous que :

7.

l'illustre brahmane Tūrkama, né dans le gotra de Gautama, excellent deux-fois-né, foulant le chemin du bien, jouissant de mérites, n'a pourtant pas reçu une terre donnée par les maîtres de la surface de la terre, nés dans une excellente lignée, lui qui maîtrise la lecture progressive ⟨du Veda⟩, qui est renommé sur la terre pour ses nobles vertus,

[13] L'auteur évoque ici la mise en application plus que la connaissance.

[14] Compte tenu de la place de ce terme dans la phrase, il faut le comprendre dans un sens objectif et subjectif : elle reçoit des éloges et loue elle-même les dieux.

[15] Mélange intéressant des Lokapāla ⟨ Agni, Indra, Dhaneśa, Udakeśa, qui est peut-être Varuṇa⟩, de Śiva, au centre, et de Dharma.

[16] Skanda. Le statut de chef d'armée renvoie à son archétype, Skanda , et laisse suggérer une comparaison entre le roi et Śiva, la reine et Umā, le prince et Skanda.

[17] Le terme tejas désigne à la fois l'énergie propre au roi et l'éclat du soleil. Ce śleṣa glose le biruda Vijayāditya.

qui se consacre à des dons qui font la joie des affligés, ⟨et⟩ qui mérite le respect éternel des hommes de bien.

8.

Son fils, loué sur l'étendue de la terre pour le flot de ses vertus, pleine lune dans le ciel d'une lignée d'excellents deux-fois nés, qui honore ses parents et ses amis avec des présents généreux, pourvu de grandes vertus, sacrificateur de Soma à Mādhava ;

9.

son fils, qui mérité l'éloge des hommes vertueux, qui connaît parfaitement les parties et le tout, qui posséde une claire connaissance de tous les sujets évoqués dans la Śruti et la Smṛti, intelligent, est ici ⟨nommé⟩ Viddamayya ;

10.

La demeure de cet homme est la demeure des hommes de bien ; ses richesses sont pourvues d'un but grâce aux dons qu'il consentit aux gens vertueux ; tout l'espace compris entre les horizons est orné par sa gloire.

11.

Doué d'une lignée resplendissante, doué d'une conduite tout à fait irréprochable dans les tâches qui lui sont confiées, parfaitement purifié dans les épreuves des vertus, honoré par les gens de bien, dont le chemin doit être cultivé par les hommes de bien, dont les paroles et actes[18] sont chers à tous les êtres.

⟨59–60⟩ Nous, très touchés par l'excès de souffrance qu'il a subi,[19] donnons à celui-ci le village de Diggubaṟṟu.

⟨61–62⟩ Les limites sont : à l'est Krañca, au sud Kranūru, à l'ouest et au nord Palukonu. Aucune charge ne doit lui être imposée.

12.

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

13.

Qu'elle soit donnée par lui ou par un autre, celui qui prend une terre renaît ver de terre dans excréments pendant soixante mille ans.

[18] C'est-à-dire : les hymnes et les oblations.

[19] Il a sans doute subi une ordalie, *upadhā*, suite à quelques accusations dont il est sorti blanchi, *viśuddha*.

Commentary

Late caesura in v1a (śārdūlavikrīḍita), vijayā/dityo. Also compound across odd pāda boundary in v1c-d. Early caesura in v4c (mandākrāntā), dhaneś/odakeśādi. Regular fused (late) caesura in v7b (śārdūlavikrīḍita), kṣiti-talā/dhīśais.

2.

The present inscription is the only known record to date that has been understood to mention a Bhīma, son of Amma, whom Fleet (1891, p. 269 calls Bhīma III although he purportedly reigned before the more prominent Bhīma II. I disagree with Fleet's emendation of *sūno* to *sūnur* and doubt the existence of this ruler. The text is in my opinion correct as received (discounting the lack of a *repha*, which is implied by the doubling of the following consonant). Read this way, it speaks about Bhīma II, stating that at first he ruled pro tempore, nominally as a soldier (*bhaṭa*) of Amma's son, i.e. Vijayāditya V. He was then overthrown by Yuddhamalla II, but after seven years he reconquered the country and crowned himself king. No other Eastern Cālukya grant has any unequivocal reference to Bhīma III (see my commentaries to the Single Bhimavaram plate of a late Eastern Cālukya king, the Kōḷūru (spurious?) grant of Bhīma II and the Varaṇavendī grant of Bhīma III(?)). If there was no Bhīma III, then the present stanza becomes less awkward, since the Bhīma mentioned in the first quarter is then not different from the Bhīma of the fourth line.

A *jaya-stambha* erected by Kollabigaṇḍa Vijayāditya's father Bhīma I is mentioned in line 35 of the Kākamrāṇu grant of Bhīma I. Closer to home, Kollabigaṇḍa Vijayāditya is said to have died in battle at Virajāpurī in a grant of Rājarāja II (ARIE 1917–18, p. 116), and a son of Bhīma I is said to have erected a pillar of victory at Viraja in a grant of Śaktivarman (ARIE 1918–19, p. 132). I have not traced whether these grants have been properly published.

Bibliography

Edited from the original plates by J. F. Fleet (1884), with facsimiles but no translation. Subsequently noticed in ARIE 1962–63, p. 49, appendix A/1962-63, № 21. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Fleet's edition with his facsimiles

and the inked rubbings in Sir Walter Elliot's collection.[20] 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. CXLVIII." IA 13, pp. 213–215.

Secondary

Kielhorn, Lorenz Franz. 1902–1903. "A list of inscriptions of southern India from about A.D. 500." *Epigraphia Indica* 7, Appendix. Page 95, item 560.

ARIE 1962–63. *Annual report on Indian epigraphy for 1962-63*. By G. S. Gai. Delhi: Manager of Publications, 1967. Page 49, appendixes A/1962-63, item 21.

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

Gaur 1975, pp. 13–14, № Ind. Ch. 21

[20] Scans of these impressions were obtained by Emmanuel Francis from the Edinburgh University Library, the Bibliothèque nationale de France and the British Museum. I presently have no image of the seal, which Fleet says is badly effaced. Photos of the original plates and seal will probably be obtained from the BL, which will then need to be collated.