Māṁgallu grant of Dānārṇava

Dániel Balogh

Alternative title: Māṁgallu grant of Amma II

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00039

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00039.xml

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

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas. T looks like a full-sized ta without a headmark (l21, l47); some specimens also have a short vertical tail, e.g. l21 balāT. N looks like a simplified and slightly reduced na without a headmark, with the top extended in a short tail slanting to the right (l10, l11, l17, l20 etc). M seems to be a circle without a tail, as in l22 bhuvaM. R apparently sees no instances of final M in this text, but I am quite certain some final anusvāras in his edition are actually M.

Original punctuation marks are plain straight verticals, a character body in height.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is a dot after the character to which it belongs, placed at midline height or even lower. Dependent o occurs both in the single-stroke cursive form and as two separate strokes. The cursive form (e.g. l2 gotrā°) has low humps identical on both sides, and a short tail descending barely below headline (but some instances, e.g. l16 kollabi°, have a longer tail, while others have none, ending well above headline, e.g. l18 tanayo). Dependent au (e.g. l3 kauśiki) does not differ conspicuously from cursive o and is read on the basis of context, without flagging as an erroneous o. The character dha is mostly written to look like va (e.g. (l1)). I, like R,

accept these as instances of dha. They represent a smooth continuum from identical to va to the regular shape expected for dha (l25 vacadharasya, l33 °dhyakṣam). Many of the intermediate forms have a gap at the top of the body, which is probably meant to distinguish them from va, but a similar gap can sometimes occur in va as well. There is also an instance of tha that looks like va with a dot in it (l6), while a normal-shaped tha occurs in l62. Superscript r is often written horizontally even when there is plenty of free space above, and is in these cases difficult or impossible to distinguish from the vowel ā. I have given the scribe the benefit of the doubt in these cases. In many other cases, the scribe misinterpreted superscript r as something else, such as an e or o marker, or rv as m.

Edition

Seal

〈1〉 śrī-tribhuvanāṁkuśa

Plates

〈Page 1r〉

1. Anuṣṭubh

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 śrī-kāntāyābjanābhāya
namo bh¿ū?〈u〉vana-rakṣine|
vikramādhaḳkṛtātyugra-
-balaye vara-dā〈2〉yine|

svasti〈.〉 śr¿i?〈ī〉matāṁ sakala-bh¿ū?〈u〉vana-saṁstūyamāna-m¿a?〈ā〉navya-sagotrāṇā〈ṁ〉 ¡hāriti!〈3〉-putrāṇāṁ kauśik¿i?〈ī〉-vara-pras¿a?〈ā〉da-labdha-rājyānām mātṛ-gaṇa-paripālitānāṁ sv¿a?〈ā〉mi〈4〉-mahāse◯na-pādānudhy¿a?〈ā〉tānāṁ bhagavan-nārāyaṇa-prasāda-sam¿ya?〈ā〉sādi〈5〉ta-vara-varā◯ha-lāṁ¿c?〈ch〉anekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśīkṛtārāti-maṇḍalānām aśvamedhā〈6〉vabhṛ(th)a-snāna-pavitr¿i?〈ī〉kṛta-vapuṣāṁ cālukyānāṁ kulam alaṁkari¿ga?〈ṣno〉s {saṁtyāśraya-va}〈7〉{llabhen-drasya pratā kubja-viṣṇaṣ(ṇu)vi} satyaśrāya-va〈〈lla〉〉bhendrasya bhrātā kubja-viṣṇuva〈r〉ddha〈Page 2r〉〈8〉no{|} 〈’〉ṣṭādaśa varṣāṇi veṁgī-deśam ap¿a?〈ā〉layaT| tat-putro jayasiṁha-vallabhas traya〈9〉striṁśataṁ| tad-anujendrarājas sapta dinā(n)i| tan-nandano viṣṇuvarddhano nava saṁva〈10〉tsarāN| tat-tokam maṁgi-yuvarājaḥ

paṁcaviṁśa¿⟦(kr)⟧<<r>>ima?<tiM>| tad-auraso jayasiṁhas trayodaśa<|><11> tad-<d>vaim¿a?<ā>tu◯rānujaḥ kok<k>iliḥ ṣaṇ māsāN| tasya jy¿a?<e>ṣṭho bhrātā viṣṇuva{ddhā}<12><r>ddhanas tam u◯¿py?<cc>āṭya saptatriṁśad va<r>ṣāṇi| tad-¿ā?<a>patyaṁ vijayāditya-bhaṭṭ¿a?<ā>rako <'>ṣṭā<13>daśa| tad-ātmajo viṣṇuvarddhanaḥ ṣaṭtriṁśataṁ| tat-tanujo narendra-vijayāditya<ḥ><14> Aṣṭa-catvāriṁśataṁ| tat-putra¿ṁ?<ḥ> kali-viṣṇuvarddha¿ṇ(ā)?<no> <'>dhyarddha-<va>(rṣa)(ṁ|?) tad-ātmaj¿e?<o> gu<Page 2v><15>ṇakkenalla-vijayādityaś catuś-catvāriṁśataṁ| tad-anuja-v¿e?<i>kramāditya-sū<16>nuś cālukya-bhīmas triṁśataṁ| tat-putraḥ kollabigaṇḍa-vijayādityaḥ ṣa<17>ṇ māsāN| tat-s¿u?<ū>nur ammarājas sapta va(r)ṣāni| tat-suto ¿bhe?<rbha>ka-vijayādityaḥ pa<18>kṣaṁ<|> {n}tatas tā◯ḷapa-rājo māsaṁ| taṁ jitvā cālukya-bhīma-tanayo<19>vikramā◯dityas saṁvatsaraṁ|

2. Āryāgīti

sāmanta-śabara-vallabha-daṇḍāś cā¿ṇya?<nye><20> ca bhuvam aluṁpann abdāN
saptā{śa}ntare <'>tra malla{ra}pa-rāja<ṁ> kṛta-paṭṭa-bandham ava<21>matya balāT|

3. Anuṣṭubh

¡meḷaiṁha!<meḷāṁbā>-vijayāditya-
-nandano bhīma-bhūpatiḥ|
tān samastān sa<22>mutkhāya
dvādaśābdān apād bhuvaṁ|

4. Sragdharā

sūnus tasyāmma-rājas surapati-vibhavaḥ paṭṭa<Page 3r><23>-baddho dharitrī<ṁ>
rakṣann ekādaśābdā¡ṁ!<ñ> jita-ripur agama(t kṛ)ṣṇa-kop(ā)t kaliṁgā¿ṁ?<n>|
tasya<24> dvaimāturaḥ kṣ<m>āṁ sakala-jana-mu⟦p⟧<<d>>e vallabhād āpta-rājy¿ā?<o>
bhaimi(r?) ddānārṇṇaveśo<25> <'>py avati manu-nayād aṁkidevī-tanūjaḥ|

5. Śārdūlavikrīdita

vaidagdhyaṁ ¡vacadharasya! vāriruha<26>-saṁbhūta◯sya bhū-devatā-
-grām¿ū?<ya>tvākalitaṁ kalāsu gaditaṁ vāg-aṁga<27>nāyā{ḥ} A◯pi|
strī-n¿au?<ai>sa<r>ggika-cāpalāspadatayā nindārham ity āda<28>rā(d)
¿u?<ya>d-vaida◯gdh¿u?<ya>m alaṁ kalāsu sakalais saṁstūyate sajjanaiḥ|

6. Upendravajrā

sthirāpi<29> śaśvad bhramati trilokīṁ
jan¿a?<ā>nurāgaṁ kurute sitāpi|

vicitra-rūpeti s¿e?<a><30>dā vi<śi>ṣṭai<r>
¿m?<v>vicāryyate kī<r>tti-latā yad¿i?<ī>yā|

sa samasta-bhuvanāśra<<ya-śr(ī)>>-vijayā<Page 3v><31>ditya-mahārāj¿a?<ā>dhirāja-param¿a?<e>śvara-parama-bhaṭṭ¿a?<ā>rakaḥ parama-brahmaṇyo nāta<32>vāḍi-viṣaya-nivāsino rāṣṭrak(ū)ṭa-pramukh(ā)n kuṭuṁbinas samāhūya ma<33>[[tī]]ntri-purohita-senāpati-yuvar¿o?<ā>j¿a?<ā>dy-aṣṭādaśa-tī{E}¿ttho?<rtthā>dhyakṣam
ittham ā<34>j<ñ>¿a?<ā>payati|

7. Āryā

śrī◯-saṁbhūti-nimitt¿e?<aṁ> ¿vū?<mu>{||}ktāphala-pur¿ā?<u>ṣa-ratna-saṁyuktaṁ|
<35> sāma¿g?<n>ta-vo◯(ṭṭ)i-saṁjñaṁ ¿kaṁ?<ku>lam āsīj jalanidhi-pratimaṁ|

8. Vasantatilakā

tad-vaṁśa-vāri<36>nidhi-vṛddhi-ka◯¿k?<r>aḥ karāsi–
ni<r>ddāri-caṭa-bala-vī(ra)-(bhaṭā)ndhakāraḥ|
Āsī¡t ś!<c ch>aśā(ṁ)<37>ka ¿ga?<I>va guṇḍiya-rāṣṭrak¿u?<ū>ṭas
sa{ṁ}t-pūjya-sat-pa(tha)-gati-pravaṇa-sva-vṛttaḥ|

9. Upajāti

{śrīmac-ca}<38>{lukyaku}¿bha?<ca>lukya-vaṁśodita-bhūm[[a]]<<i>>pāla-
-śrīdvā(ram ad)yā¿g?<n>ugataṁ praviśya
n¿a?<ā>n¿u?<yā><39>dhipa-dvāram a¿ma?<haṁ> viśām¿i?<ī>ty
akṣ¿a?<e>ṣṭa vāṭa(ṁ) gata-vallabh(e?)śaṁ|

10. Upendravajrā

samasta-satyādi-gu<Page 4r><40>ṇa-prapannaḥ
paropa¿r?<k>āra-pravaṇa-prabhāvaḥ|
Abhūd arātīndhana-vahnir ugraḥ
tad-ā<41>tmabhūr eṟiya-rāṣṭrakūṭaḥ|

11. Upendravajrā

t¿ū?<u>raṁgamārohaṇa-kauśalena
tiras¿(l)a?<kṛ>tānindita-vatsa<42> <rājaḥ|>
<Abhūt su>to betiya-n¿a?<ā>ma¿ṣa?<dhe>yas
samasta-saṁpan-nilayas tadīyaḥ|

12. Anuṣṭubh

tasya śrī-vandyanāṁbāy¿a?〈ā〉m
a〈43〉bhava{va}d bhava-sannibhaḥ
samasta-saṁpan-nilay¿e?〈o〉
guṇḍyanā{ra}khy[[e]]〈〈a〉〉ḥ sutottamaḥ|

13. Anuṣṭubh

pratāpāya¿ṝi?〈44〉tām eti
vi◯rodhi-timirāpahaḥ
nity[[ā]]〈〈aṁ〉〉 padmākarārā¡dhdh!yo
yasya {ga} tejo-vi〈45〉ro(c)anaḥ|

tena ◯ kākatya-guṇḍyana-nāmadheyena{(|)} prārtthyamānair asmābhiḥ|

14. Anuṣṭubh

(v)el(a)〈46〉paṟṟu-mahā-grāma-
-vāstavy¿ā?〈o〉 vadatāṁ varaḥ|
kutsa-gotrābhisaṁbhū〈to〉
(v)iddamayyaḥ purā〈47〉bhavaT|

15. Anuṣṭubh

śrīdhar(āṁ)ghri-dvayāṁbhoja-
-sevī śrīdhara-saṁjñayā|
viśrutas tat-suto j¿a?〈ā〉〈48〉to
bhūdeva-śrīdhara-śriyā|

16. Anuṣṭubh

tasyābhūn mācemāṁbāyā〈ṁ〉
sūnu〈r〉 ddommana-saṁj〈ñ〉a〈Page 4v〉〈49〉kaḥ
samasta-¿ś?〈g〉u¿no?〈ṇa〉-saṁpann¿e?〈a〉s
sat-sādhu-jana-vatsala(ḥ)|

17. Anuṣṭubh

śr(u)ti〈-smṛ̥ti〉-sadācāra-
-p¿ra?〈u〉r¿o?〈ā〉ṇo〈50〉dita-vartmani|
durāpe 〈’〉nyaja{sa}nai〈r〉 nnityaṁ
yasy-ācā{ci}raḥ pravarttat¡i!〈e〉

18. Anuṣṭubh

kākartya-gu〈51〉ṇḍy(a)naṁ (vī)ram
uddiśyāha¿ppā?〈ḫpa〉ti-¿ṣ?〈p〉rabhaṁ|

yena karppaṭam āba¿p?<d>dhaṁ
t¿ā?<a>t-prasādābhi<52>kāṁkṣinā|◯

19. Anuṣṭubh

prāta<ḥ>-snānaṁ ¿b?<p>ratidinaṁ
br¿ā?<a>hma(c)aryyam akhaṇḍitaṁ|
¿ga?<I>ty-ādi ye<53>nācaritaṁ
ka◯rppaṭi-vratam (ā)darāT

20. Anuṣṭubh

(sa)tyaṁ śaucan dayā dānam
anu¿p?<ṣ>ṭhānam u<54>dāra-dhīḥ¡||!
kṣāntis saujanyam ityādi
yad-upajñam i¿(h)?<d>(aṁ) kalau(|)

tasm¿e?<ai> do¿t?<m>mana-nāmne<55>māṁgallu nāma gr¿a?<ā>mas sarvva-kara-parihāreṇa (U)daka-pūrvvam uttarāyaṇa-ni<56>mit(t)¡a! Agrahārīkṛ-tyā{ttacha}smābhi(r) ddatta ¿ga?<I>ti viditam astu vaḥ

Asyāvadhaya(ḥ)<.><Page 5r> <57> pū¿m?<rv>vataḥ‖ *koḍupulū¿v?<r>i pola-garusuna yilindi-guṇṭa*| Āgneyataḥ *kuṟṟa<58>labola pannasa*| dakṣiṇataḥ laṁjiya[[ma]]<<vā>>ḍa-sīmā| ¿ṇe?<nai>rṛt¡i!<ya>taḥ munna-nad¿i?<ī>|<59> paścimataḥ *pallikaṇḍi-bhaṭāraṇḍu*| vāyavyataḥ *muyyalu-kaṭṭu*| Uttarataḥ<60> *koṇḍṟūri* ◯ *pola-garusuna cintalu*<|> ¡ī!<Ai>ś¿a?<ā>nataḥ *muyyalu-ku<61>ṭṭuna pulu◯guḍla-guṇṭha*| Asyopari na <kena>cid bādhā ka(r)ttavyā yaḥ ka<62>roti sa paṁca-mahāpātaka-sa<ṁ>yukto bhavati<.> tathoktaṁ vyāsena|

21. Anuṣṭubh

ba<63>hubhi¿m?<r v>vasudhā dat<t>ā
¿l?<b>ahubhiś cā¿s?<n>upālitā|
yasya yasya yadā bhū<64>mis
tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ|

22. Anuṣṭubh

sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā
yo hareta vasundharāṁ|
ṣaṣṭi<65>(ṁ) ¿(l)?<v>arṣa-sahasrāṇi
vi(ṣṭhā)yāṁ j¿a?<ā>yate k¿u?<ṛ>miḥ|

23. Śālinī

sarvv¿aṁ?〈ā〉n etān ¿b?〈bh〉āvinaḥ pā〈r〉tthivendrān
bhūyo〈Page 5v〉 〈66〉 bhūyo yācate rāmabhadraḥ
sāmānyo 〈’〉yan dha(r)mma-setur nnṛpāṇāṁ
kāle kāle pālanīyo bha〈67〉v¿i?〈a〉dbhiḥ

Ājñaptiḥ kaḍaka-rājaḥ〈.〉 potanabhaṭṭa-kṛtiḥ|

Apparatus

Plates

〈3〉 -vara-pras¿a?〈ā〉da-labdha-rājyānām mā° • These characters, have been scratched shallowly on the plate then re-engraved properly, with the final lines not fully overlapping the pre-scratched ones (except for *rā* and *nā*, where either the overlap is perfect or there was no pre-scratched text).

〈4〉 -sam¿ya?〈ā〉sādi〈5〉ta- PS ◇ *-sam{y}āsādi〈5〉ta-* R • The originally inscribed subscript *y* is attached to the right arm, rather than the body, of *ma*. Part of the *y* seems to have been struck out, while much of it has been retained as an ornamental extension of the subsequently added *ā* marker.

〈5〉 -vaśīkṛtārāti- ◇ *-vaś¿i?〈ī〉kṛtārāti-* R PS.

〈7〉 {-viṣṇaṣ(ṇu)vi-} ◇ *{-viṣṇuṣūvi-}* R PS • At this locus, R marks the text from *pratā* to *vallabhendrasya* as superfluous, while PS discards the string from *pratā* to (the first) *vallabhendrasya*. There is no way to tell which iteration of the (imperfectly) repeated string was inscribed in error, but PS's excision of a string stretching across both iterations can not, in my opinion, be reasonably derived from scribal error; and since the second instance of *vallabhendrasya* contains a scribal correction (see next apparatus entry), I assume that its presence in the text was approved by a contemporary editor. Thus, by my reasoning, the whole of the first iteration was rejected, and the text re-inscribed from *satyaśrāya* onward, ignoring the fact that, if the rejected string were explicitly deleted, this string ought to have started with *ssa*. — 〈7〉 -va〈〈lla〉〉bhendrasya • The addition is written below the line and to the right of *bha*, i.e. one character to the right of where one would expect it to be. — 〈7〉 kubja- R ◇ *kubba-* PS.

〈10〉 paṁcaviṁśa¿⟦(kr)⟧〈〈r〉〉ima?〈tiM〉 ◇ *paṁcaviṁśa¿kr?〈t〉i¿ma?〈M〉* R; *paṁcaviṁśat¿i?〈ī〉¿ma?〈M〉* PS • Although bizarre, it seems that *kri* was originally inscribed (probably as a scribal misinterpretation of a predrawn *ti*), and it has been wrongly corrected to *ri*.

〈12〉 u◯¿py?〈cc〉ātya ◇ u◯¿py?〈tp〉āṭya R PS • Related grants use *uccātya*; *utpāṭya* never occurs as far as I am aware.

〈14〉 viṣṇuvarddha¿ṇ(ā)?〈no〉 ◇ *viṣṇuvarddhano* R PS. — 〈14〉 dhyarddha- ◇ *dhyardha-* R PS. — 〈14〉 -〈va〉(rṣa)(ṁ|?) ◇ *-(varṣa)ṁ〈|〉* R PS. — 〈14〉 -ātmaj¿e?〈o〉 ◇ *c-ātmajo* R PS.

〈17〉 ¿bhe?〈rbha〉ka ◇ *bheka* R PS • The reading is clear, but unattested elsewhere (except in secondary literature), while the form *arbhaka-vijayāditya* is attested in the Koḷūru grant of Bhīma II.

〈19〉 cā¿ṇya?〈nye〉 ◇ *cānye* R PS.

〈20〉 saptā{śa}ntare R ◇ *saptā{sa}ntare* PS • PS's *sa* is probably a typo. — 〈20〉 -rāja〈ṁ〉 kṛta- ◇ *-rāja-kṛta〈ṁ〉* R; *-rājaṁ kṛta-* PS • While there is no original *anusvāra*, nor space for one in its usual position, PS's version is a better emendation in my opinion. R's emendation is also metrically and semantically possible.

〈23〉 dharitrī〈ṁ〉 ◇ *dharitr¿(i)?〈ī〉〈ṁ〉* R PS. — 〈23〉 °ābdā¡ṁ!〈ñ〉 jita-ripur agama(t) R ◇ *°ābdā(n) agama(t)* PS • Typographic omission in PS.

〈24〉 -mu⟦p⟧〈〈d〉〉e ◇ *-mude* R PS. — 〈24〉 -rājy¿ā?〈o〉 ◇ *-rājyo* R PS. — 〈24〉 bhaimi(r?) ddānārṇṇaveśo ◇ *bhaimo d{d}ānārṇṇaveśo* R PS • The *i* of *mi* has a gap at the top right to accommodate the subscript *k* above, while the *repha* of *rddā* is damaged and attached separately to the top right rather than being combined with the *ā* marker. I am nevertheless confident of my interpretation; of there is only damage and no original *repha*, then one is to be supplied.

〈25〉 ¡vacadharasya! ◇ *vac¿a?〈o〉(dha)¿r?〈v〉asya* R; *{va}ca¿dha?〈tu〉rasya* PS • In addition to an extra light syllable in this word (where the poet apparently availed of a licence to use three light syllables where two would be expected), the first *pāda* of this stanza also has a caesura between a prefix and a verb, which is also permissible only by licence. R's emendation, while it improves this particular word, only aggravates the metrical anomaly. PS's emendation is metrically and grammatically correct, but is too heavy-handed to accept, while with his alternative proposal *ca varasya* is awkward and bland (not to mention that this is one of the very few instances of *dha* that does not look like *va*, so it should probably not be emended to *va*). If I am correct in interpreting the composer's intent (for which see the translation), then the meaning could have been expressed in correct prosody, e.g. as *vacasaḥ pateḥ kamala-saṁbhūtasya* (though the inferior caesura is not remedied by this suggestion).

〈26〉 -grām¿ū?〈ya〉tvā° PS ◇ *-grāmy¿ā?〈a〉tvā°* R.

〈27〉 -n¿au?〈ai〉sa〈r〉ggika- ◇ *naisa〈r〉ggika* R PS.

〈28〉 ¿u?〈ya〉d-vaida◯gdh¿u?〈ya〉m ◇ *¿u?〈ya〉d-vaida◯gdhyam* PS; *udvaidagdhyam* R • The *d* preceding this word may have been corrected from *p*.

〈30〉 vi〈śi〉ṣṭai〈r〉 ¿m?〈v〉vicāryyate ◇ *vi〈śi〉ṣṭai〈r〉 vvicāryate* R PS • The character *mvi* is probably the engraver's misinterpretation of a predrawn *rvvi*. — 〈30〉 kī〈r〉tti- ◇ *kīrtti-* R PS.

〈31〉 -mahārāj¿a?〈ā〉dhirāja- ◇ *-mahārājādhirāja-* PS; *-mahārāja-* R. — 〈31〉 -param¿a?〈e〉śvara- ◇ *-parameśvara-* R PS. — 〈31〉 -param¿a?〈e〉śvara- ◇ *-parameśvara-* R PS. — 〈31〉 -bhaṭṭ¿a?〈ā〉rakaḥ ◇ *-bhaṭṭārakaḥ* R PS.

〈32〉 samāhūya • The formation of *hū*, with the vowel small in size and attached to the left of the body beyond the shorter-than-usual tail, shows that the text was pre-drawn for the engraver, and this character was shaped so as to leave room for *mi* below. — 〈32〉 ma〈33〉⟦tī⟧ntri- ◇ *ma〈33〉ntri-* R PS • I cannot interpret the character *tī* (or possibly *ti*) written directly below *vā* in the line above and ignored by both previous editors. The character has not been deleted and is larger than other interlinear additions, nor can I see any locus where such an addition would be appropriate. I can only assume that it was engraved in error for the *ntri* required here, and the correct character was re-engraved to the right of it. The superfluous character was engraved before the rest of line 33 and slightly higher than the other characters of that line, so that its top touches the bottom of *vā* above. The correct *ntri* is to the right of and below this one, encroaching on the space of the next line and forcing the first few characters there to be reduced. The following *pu* is level with *ntri*, but from *ro* onward the line continues at the expected distance from the adjacent lines.

〈33〉 -yuvar¿o?〈ā〉j¿a?〈ā〉dy- ◇ *-yuva(rā)jādy-* R; *-yuvarājādy-* PS. — 〈33〉 -tī{E}¿ttho?〈rtthā〉dhyakṣam ◇ *-tī{E}rthādhyakṣam* R; *-tī{E}rthādhyakṣam!〈ān〉* PS.

〈34〉 -nimitt¿e?〈aṁ〉 R ◇ *-nimitte* PS • There may in fact be an original *anusvāra* after this word. — 〈34〉 ¿vū?〈mu〉{‖}ktāphala- ◇ *m¿ū?〈u〉{‖}ktāphala-* R PS.

〈35〉 sāma¿g?〈n〉ta- ◇ *sāma(nta)-* R PS • The principal consonant of the problematic character is definitely *g* (compare *n* at the beginning of the next line and *g* in the second next), which must be the engraver's misinterpretation of a predrawn *n*. The subscript *t* is attached with an additional notch as many other times in the inscription, compare e.g. line 9, *sapta*. — 〈35〉 -vo◯(ṭṭ)i- PS ◇ *-voḍḍi-* R • In my opinion, R's *voḍḍi* can be excluded, because throughout the inscription, *ḍ* has a tail that curls conspicuously upward (cf. e.g. l32 *ḍi*), which is definitely not present here. At face value, the most likely reading is *voddi*, for which compare l51 *ddi*, practically identical to what we have

here. PS also mentions *voddi* as a possible reading in his discussion. A stem between the headmark and the body speaks against reading *ṭṭi*, which should not include such a stem (compare e.g. *ṭṭa* in ll 12, 20 and 31). However, l53 *ṭi* does have a neck and looks quite identical to the upper part of the present character. Given this and PS's argument that we are dealing with a cognate or corruption of the name *sāmanta viṣṭi* (see the commentary), I accept *ṭṭi* as the most likely reading. — 〈35〉 ¿kaṁ?〈ku〉lam ◇ *(ku)lam* R PS • Here again, the engraver must have misinterpreted the *u* attached to the consonant's side.

〈36〉 -ka◯¿k?〈r〉aḥ R ◇ *-ka¿t?〈r〉aḥ* PS • Possibly a typo in PS. — 〈36〉 ni〈r〉ddāri-caṭa-bala- PS ◇ *-ni〈r〉ddāri-cāṭa-bala-* R • I am reasonably certain that the received reading is *caṭa* (unmetrical). Emending to *cāṭa*, as read by R, straightforwardly solves the metrical problem but leaves us with an uninterpretable compound. PVPR proposes emending to *nirddāritāri-bala-*, which makes sense but is difficult to explain as a scribal mistake. Similarly invasive alternative emendations include *nirddārita-prabala-*. Although *cāṭa* may be a scribal mistake for something else (perhaps elicited by the proximity of *bhaṭa*?), I think it is more likely that it was the composer who did a poor job here and used *nirddāri* either in the meaning *nirddārita* or in an incorrectly constructed compound where this word ought to have been the last member. — 〈36〉 -vī(ra?)- ◇ *-v¿i?〈ī〉(ra)-* R PS • The vowel mark of the first character has a dot, so I prefer to read it as the expected *ī*. For the second character, R admits to uncertainty but PS does not. It can plausibly be read as *ra*, but several other readings may be possible, including *ri*. If the latter is correct, then the word may be emended to *vairi*, in which case *ari* is not needed in the previous locus. — 〈36〉 (bhaṭā?)ndhakāraḥ • The problematic first two characters (shown by PS as clear) are reasonably certain from my photographs. The first looks rather like *ca*, but if that is the correct reading, it is still likely to be a scribal mistake for *bha*.

〈37〉 -rāṣṭrak¿u?〈ū〉ṭas ◇ *-rāṣṭrakūṭas* R PS. — 〈37〉 sa{ṁ}t-pūjya- ◇ *saṁ{t}pūjya-* R; *satpūjya-* PS • While R's emendation is also plausible, I prefer my emendation as being less invasive and slightly smoother. PS may have been of the same opinion, though he ignores the superfluous *anusvāra*. — 〈37〉 -pravaṇa-sva- ◇ *-pravaṇa〈ḥ〉sva{(ḥ)}-* R PS • The superfluous *visarga* shown by both previous editors is definitely not present on the plate. Emendation to *pravaṇaḥ* is unnecessary and results in inferior text. Compare *paropakāra-pravaṇa-prabhāvaḥ* in line 40 below. — 〈37〉 {śrīmac-ca}〈38〉{lukyaku}¿bha?〈ca〉lukya- ◇ *śrīmac-cā〈38〉lukya{kubhalukya}-* R; *{śrīmac-}ca〈38〉lukya{kubhalukya}-* PS • The character at the end of line 37 is *cca*, though R reads it as *ccā*. To reduce the dittography, both previous editors suppress the string *kubhalukya*. While this yields meaningful text with a small and straightforward suppression, it seems unlikely that these characters could

have been erroneously engraved while the others were correct and deliberate. Much more likely in my opinion is that the engraver first started with *śrīmac-calukya-ku*, probably beiginning to engrave *kula* out of habit. Realising the mistake, he would have started again from the beginning of the stanza, but this time round, he neglected to close the bottom of *ca*, so the character as engraved turned out as *bha*. My emendation is thus more complex than that of the previous editors, but presupposes much more feasible scribal mistakes. The final problem with this locus is that of *śrīmac*. Suppressing this word results in correct prosody for the line, but so does suppressing the subsequent *vaṁśa* (and altering a retained vowel, so we are left with *śrīmac-calukyodita-*). I believe it is much more likely that *śrīmac* was, again out of habit, engraved unnecessarily (or perhaps conceived of as a bit of prose tagged on before the stanza). Moreover, with my emendation of the dittography, *śrīmac* is a natural part of the erroneously engraved string, whereas PS has to resort to a separate emendation to suppress it (while R only notes that the stanza is metrically faulty, but does not attempt to correct it, though his editor does propose deleting *śrīmac* in a footnote.).

〈38〉 -śrīdvā(ram ad)yā¿g?〈n〉ugataṁ ◇ *-śrīdvāra-madhyānugataṁ* R; *-śrīdvāram ¿adhyā?〈ājñā〉nugataṁ* PS • The reading is quite certain in spite of extensive damage to the characters *rama*. The following *dyā* is quite clear, but due to the ambiguity of the script, *dhyā* and *vyā* cannot be excluded, and *ddhyā* or *dvyā* are also conceivable, if barely. I find none of these alternatives interpretable in the context. Next, the character read as *nu* by both previous editors is in fact a perfect specimen of *gu*, though *nu* must indeed have been intended (compare *sāmagta* in l35). My interpretation is tentative; see the translation and the commentary. — 〈38〉 n¿a?〈ā〉n¿u?〈yā〉〈39〉dhipa-dvāram ◇ *nanu〈39〉 vipad-〈d〉vāram* R; *¿nanu?〈nūnaṁ〉〈39〉 vipad-〈d〉vāram* PS • R's editor in a footnote proposes emending the (unmetrical) *nanu* to *nānyo*. It is not clear to me how he sees this as an improvement to the text without additional alterations. I find that emending *nu* to *nyā* is a minor intervention, and there are two instances in the text where *u* must clearly be emended to *ya* (lines 26 and 28), so we know the scribe is prone to this kind of mistake. I thus emend the first two characters in a way similar to that suggested by R's editor. But in the next line, I read *dhipa-dvāram* in preference to *vipa-dvāram* (which requires supplying an extra *d*). Most instances of *dh* in this text are indistinguishable from *v*, but in this case the large gap at the top of the body strongly implies that *dh* was intended. See the commentary and the translation about my interpretation.

〈39〉 a¿ma?〈haṁ〉 PS ◇ *ama* R • R's editor proposes the same emendation in a footnote. It probably reflects the intent of the composer, though given that the stanza as a whole is difficult to interpret, something else may have been intended, e.g. *amuṁ*, *imaṁ* or *aho*.

— 〈39〉 viśām¿i?〈ī〉ty akṣ¿a?〈e〉ṣṭa ◇ *viśāmi tyakṣaṣṭa-* R; *viśāmīty akṣa〈ṁ〉¿ṣṭ?〈st〉a* PS • I find PS's interpretation unconvincing. R's editor in his footnote proposes *viśāmīty ācaṣṭa*, which is not impossible. See the translation and the commentary for further discussion. — 〈39〉 vāṭa(ṁ) gata- • The *anusvāra* is in fact a short *daṇḍa* just like the one following the *anusvāra* at the end of this stanza. — 〈39〉 -vallabh(e?)śaṁ • The vowel *e*, shown as clear by both previous editors, is certainly expected, but it is either not present or overlaps with the bottom of the subscript *y* above and discernible only as a small stroke rising from the headmark of *bh* and possibly another small stroke descending toward the headmark of the following *śa*.

〈40〉 paropa¿r?〈k〉āra- ◇ *paropakāra-* R PS.

〈41〉 -kauśalena ◇ *-k¿o?〈au〉śalena* R PS. — 〈41〉 tiras¿(l̤)a?〈kṛ̤〉tānindita- ◇ *tiras¿tha?〈kṛ̤〉tānindita-* R PS.

〈42〉 °〈rājaḥ| Abhūt su〉to PS • PS's restoration is perfectly plausible, though the intended wording may have been slightly different. R offers no emendation, while his editor in a footnote suggests *°rājaḥ suto bhavad*, which is inferior because it requires inserting text both before and after the inscribed *to*. — 〈42〉 n¿a?〈ā〉ma¿ṣa?〈dhe〉yas ◇ *nāma¿p?〈dh〉eyas* R PS. — 〈42〉 -vandyanāṁbāy¿a?〈ā〉m ◇ *-va(ndya)nāṁbā(yā)m* R PS.

〈43〉 -nilay¿e?〈o〉 ◇ *-nilayo* R PS. — 〈43〉 guṇḍyanā{ra}khy[[e]]〈〈a〉〉ḥ ◇ *guṇḍyanā{(ta)}khyaḥ* R PS • The superfluous character is clearly *ra*. A superfluous *e* attached to *khya* has probably been deleted in the original. PS suggests alternatively that the superfluous character and the next one together could be alternatively read as *ryyaḥ*. While *khye* does bear some resemblance to *ryya*, there is no reason to prefer this alternative. — 〈43〉 pratāpāya¿r̤i?〈44〉tām ◇ *pratāpāya(ti)〈44〉tām* PS; *pratāpāyya (ci)〈44〉tām* R • The last character in line 33 has interference from the rim, but it is unequivocally *r̤i*, with a notch in the bottom and a cross-stroke. It is clearly a scribal mistake for something else, but no clear solution offers itself. It may have been intended for *ti*, as read by PS, but this still leaves us with a very awkward stanza. Any other corrections I can think of (e.g. *pratāpāyodhitām*) involve more emendation and are still awkward.

〈44〉 nity[[ā]]〈〈aṁ〉〉 ◇ *nityaṁ* R PS • The down-curling end of *tyā* was probably the engraver's misinterpretation of *tyaṁ*, which has been reversed by deleting part of the line at the top right. — 〈44〉 °ārā¡dhdh!y(o) ◇ *°ārādhyo* R PS. — 〈44〉 -vi〈45〉ro(c)anaḥ ◇ *virocanaḥ* R PS • The engraved character looks like *va* or a *va*-like *dha*. I agree with the previous editors that *virocana* was probably intended.

〈45〉 -nāmadheyena{(|)} ◇ *-nāmadheyen¿ā?〈a〉* R; *-nāmadheyena* PS. — 〈45〉

(v)el(a)〈46〉paṟṟu- • Outside context, he first consonant of this name would be a rather unambiguous *c*, and may have been intended as such. However, Velapaṟṟu is perhaps a more likely name (compare Velaṁbaṟṟu in an eponymous grant attributed to Amma I), and the same graphic shape is used in the name of Viddamayya (for which see the apparatus to line 46). The second character may have an *ā* marker. It ends in a slight bend to the right instead of a proper hook for *ā* or a vertical stem and a headmark for *a*. Since there are several instances of *la* of the same shape in lines 57-58, including one with the vocalisation *u*, I prefer to read *la* here. Both previous editors print *velāpaṟṟu* in their texts, but PS uses Celāpaṟṟu in his discussion.

〈46〉 °saṁbhū〈to〉 (v)iddamayyaḥ ◇ *°saṁbhū〈to〉 ciddamayyaḥ* R PS • The first character of the name does indeed look like *ci* (see also the previous entry on *velapaṟṟu*). However, since the names Viddamayya, Viddamiya and Viddamaśarman are attested in several related inscriptions, while I know of no occurrence of Ciddamayya (although Cīḍamārya exists), I prefer to read this character as *vi*. Note that both previous editors may have vacillated on the reading, since both of them supply *to* for the preceding word rather than *taś*, as would be expected before *c*.

〈47〉 j¿a?〈ā〉〈48〉to ◇ *jā〈48〉tyā* R PS.

〈48〉 bhūdeva- ◇ *bhūdeva〈ḥ〉* R PS. — 〈48〉 mācemāṁbāyā〈ṁ〉 ◇ *mācemāṁbāyāṁ* R; *macemāṁbāyāṁ* PS • The short *a* in PS is probably a typo. I see no original *anusvāra* here. The composer's intent may also have been *mācemāṁbāyāḥ*. It may also be possible to read the name as Māvemāṁbā (compare the notes to lines 45 and 46 above). The *e* must be short for the line to be metrical. — 〈48〉 sūnu〈r〉 ddommana- ◇ *sūnur ddommana-* R PS.

〈49〉 -¿ś?〈g〉u¿no?〈ṇa〉- ◇ *-¿ś?〈g〉u(ṇa)-* R PS. — 〈49〉 saṁpann¿e?〈a〉s R ◇ *saṁpa¿ṇ?〈n〉nas* PS.

〈50〉 durāpe PS ◇ *durāp¿e?〈o〉* R. — 〈50〉 ācā{ci}raḥ ◇ *ācā{vi}raḥ* R PS. — 〈50〉 kākartya- PS ◇ *kāka{rt}tya-* R. — 〈50〉 -gu〈51〉ṇḍy(a)naṁ • The top of the subscript *y* bends to the right, so the character looks like *ṇḍyā*. The intent was clearly *ṇḍya*.

〈51〉 (vī)ram • I accept the reading of both previous editors, but the engraved character is definitely not *vī*. By the shape, I would read it as an initial *Ai*, but this is uninterpretable in the context (unless *Aiṟam* was intended, in the meaning "descendant of Eṟiya", but aside from the spelling, this is also problematic with respect to sandhi). It is thus most likely that the intent was *vīram*; *dhīram* may also be possible, but is less likely, as the top of the body is fully closed. — 〈51〉 āha¿ppā?〈ḫpa〉ti- ◇ *āha〈ḥ〉p{p}¿ā?〈a〉ti-* R; *āharppati-* PS • I assume that the upper *p* with the vowel mark (which PS reads as a *repha*) is the engraver's misinterpretation of a predrawn *upadhmānīya*. This presupposes a

much smaller scribal error than R's equivalent emendation and is preferable to PS's non-standard reading. — 〈51〉 -¿ṣ?〈p〉rabhaṁ ◇ *-prabhaṁ* R PS. — 〈51〉 karppaṭam PS ◇ *ka〈r〉ppaṭam* R • The character is slightly damaged, but the *r* is definitely present, although it looks rather like an *ā* marker. — 〈51〉 āba¿p?〈d〉dhaṁ ◇ *āba(ddhaṁ)* R; *āra(bdhaṁ)* PS • The received reading is unequivocal in spite of some damage. The body of the conjunct has a flat headmark clearly distinct from the curly top of the preceding *ba*. The intended word may have been either previous editor's reading. I prefer *ābaddhaṁ* partly because it presupposes a simple scribal mistake (misinterpreting a predrawn *d* as *p*), and partly because of the attestation of *baddha-karppaṭakaḥ* in line 21 of the Cevuru plates of Amma I.

〈52〉 ¿ga?〈I〉ty- PS ◇ *gaty-* R • Given that *ga* is repeatedly inscribed instead of initial *I* throughout the inscription (l37, l56), I fully endorse PS's emendation.

〈53〉 ka◯rppaṭi- PS ◇ *ka¿ppā?〈rppra〉ṭī-* R • R's emendation to *rppra* seems to be a typo for *rppa*. His original reading is due to the horizontal formation of the superscript *repha*. — 〈53〉 anu¿p?〈ṣ〉ṭhānam ◇ *anuṣ¿ṭ?〈ṭh〉ānam* R; *anuṣ¿ta?〈ṭhā〉nam* PS • PS's *t* and *a* are probably typos; his actual reading would have been indentical to R's. I disagree with both previous editors: the principal consonant is clearly *p*, while the subscript consonant looks like *v* but given that the intent must have been *ṣṭhā*, it can easily be accepted as *ṭh* (while *ṭ* is impossible).

〈54〉 i¿(h)?〈d〉(aṁ) ◇ *iha* R; *i(daṁ)* PS • The locus is damaged, but the received reading is quite unequivocal. Since *iha* is unmetrical, the intent was probably *idam*. — 〈54〉 tasm¿e?〈ai〉 ◇ *tasmai* PS; *tasme* R • R's editor suggests emendation to *tasmai*. — 〈54〉 do¿t?〈m〉mana-nāmne PS ◇ *dotmāna-nāmne* R • The expected emendation is also suggested by R's editor. R's reading of *tmā* cannot be excluded (but would still have to be emended to *mma*), and the apparent *ā* marker seems to me rather to be an ornamental extension of the headmark, which is also mirrored on the left side. PEM's etext emends here to *ātmano nāmnā*. I do not know if this is her own emendation or if it comes from an unnamed source. It is in line with PS's opinion (which I endorse) that Dānārṇava issued this charter in his own name rather than in lieu of Amma II, but I am confident that this was not the intent of the composer here.

〈55〉 gr¿a?〈ā〉mas ◇ *grāmas* R PS. — 〈55〉 sarvva- ◇ *sa〈r〉vva-* R; *sarvva-* PS • The superscript *r* is horizontal, resembling *ā*. — 〈55〉 -ni〈56〉mit(t)¡a! ◇ *-ni〈56〉mittaṁ* R PS • There is definitely no *anusvāra* here. Since practically all related grants that mention an occasion use *nimitte* (with a few occurrences of *nimittena* and none, that I know of, of *nimittam*), I think an omitted *e* marker or non-standard sandhi is more likely than an omitted *anusvāra*.

〈56〉 Agrahārīkṛtyā{ttacha}smābhi(r) PS ◇ *Agrahārīkṛtyā{ttaca}smābhir* R. — 〈56〉 ddatta ◇ *datta* R PS.

〈57〉 pū¿m?〈rv〉vataḥ ◇ *pūrvvataḥ* R PS. — 〈57〉 koḍupulū¿v?〈r〉i R PS • I adopt the emendation of the Telugu faith in the previous editors.

〈58〉 laṁjiya⟦ma⟧〈〈vā〉〉ḍa- ◇ *laṁjayamāḍa-* R; *laṁjiyavāḍa-* PS. — 〈58〉 ¿ṇe?〈nai〉rṛṭ¡i!〈ya〉taḥ ◇ *nairṛṭ¡i!〈ya〉taḥ* R; *nairṛtitaḥ* PS.

〈59〉 pallikaṇḍi- ◇ *pallikaṇṭi-* PS; *pallikaṇṭī-* R. — 〈59〉 muyyalu- • The *u* of *lu* seems to have been engraved twice, once fully below the body (which may have been deleted), and a second time starting from the bottom right of the body and rising up on the right.

〈61〉 pulu◯guḍla-guṇṭha ◇ *pūlagudla-guṇta* R; *puluguḍla-guṇṭa* PS.

〈62〉 -sa〈ṁ〉yukto ◇ *-saṁyukto* R PS. — 〈62〉 ba〈63〉hubhi¿m?〈r v〉vasudhā ◇ *ba〈63〉hubhir vvasudhā* R PS.

〈63〉 dat〈t〉ā ◇ *dattā* R PS. — 〈63〉 ¿l?〈b〉ahubhiś ◇ *bahubhiś* R PS.

〈64〉 ṣaṣṭi〈65〉(ṁ) ◇ *ṣaṣṭi〈65〉-* R PS • A probable *anusvāra* is visible in the groove where the rim begins.

〈65〉 -¿(l)?〈v〉arṣa- ◇ *-varṣa-* R PS. — 〈65〉 vi(ṣṭhā)yāṁ ◇ *viṣ¿ṭ?〈ṭh〉āyāṁ* R; *viṣ¿ṭa?〈ṭhā〉yāṁ* PS • Aside from the body, this character is largely obliterated. I see no reason to doubt that correct *ṣṭhā* was engraved. — 〈65〉 j¿a?〈ā〉yate ◇ *jāyate* R PS. — 〈65〉 k¿u?〈ṛ〉miḥ ◇ *kṛmiḥ* R; *k¿ṛ?〈ri〉miḥ* PS • There is definitely a typo in PS's edition. His intended reading and emendation may have been the same as mine. — 〈65〉 sarvv¿aṁ?〈ā〉n ◇ *sarvvān* R PS • The engraver apparently mistook the downward bend of the *repha* (i.e. the *ā* marker) for an *anusvāra*. — 〈65〉 pā〈r〉tthivendrān ◇ *pārthivendrān* R; *pārtthivendrān* PS.

〈66〉 bha〈67〉v¿i?〈a〉dbhiḥ ◇ *bha〈67〉vadbhiḥ* R PS.

Translation

Plates

1.

Homage to the beloved of Śrī with a lotus in his navel, the boon-granting protector of the world who by his valour overcame the exceedingly savage Bali.

〈2–19〉 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 Hāriti, 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 Vallabha (I), for thirty-three. His younger brother Indrarāja (Indra Bhaṭṭāraka), for seven days. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (II), for nine years. His offspring Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five. His son Jayasiṁha (II), for thirteen. His younger brother by a different mother, Kokkili, for six months. After dethroning him, his eldest brother Viṣṇuvardhana (III), for thirty-seven years. His son Vijayāditya (I) Bhaṭṭāraka, for eighteen. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (IV), for thirty-six. His son Vijayāditya (II) Narendra(mṛgarāja), for eight and forty. His son Kali-Viṣṇuvardhana (V), for a year and a half. His son Guṇakkenalla Vijayāditya (III), for forty-four. The son of his younger brother Vikramāditya, Cālukya-Bhīma, for thirty. His son Kollabigaṇḍa Vijayāditya (IV), for six months. His son Ammarāja (I), for seven years. His son the infant[1] Vijayāditya (V), for a fortnight. Then King (*rājan*) Tāḷapa, for a month. After defeating him, Cālukya-Bhīma's son Vikramāditya (II), for a year.

2.

At this point, the armies of provincial lords (*sāmanta*), tribesmen (*śabara*) and Rāṣṭrakūṭas (*vallabha*), as well as others, ravaged the land for seven years, audaciously disdaining King (*rājan*) Mallapa (Yuddhamalla) 〈even though he〉 had donned the 〈royal〉 turban.

3.

King (*bhūpati*) Bhīma (II), the son of Meḷāmbā and Vijayāditya (IV), eradicated all of these and protected (*pā-*) the earth for twelve years.

4.

Magnificent like (Indra) the Lord of the Gods, crowned with the turban, his son Ammarāja (II) defeated his enemies and protected (*rakṣ-*) the earth for eleven years, 〈then〉

[1] Vijayāditya V is named Beta in some records of his much later descendants. In this text, the received reading is Bheka, which is in my opinion a scribal mistake for *arbhaka* (see the apparatus to line 17), though a deliberate slur is not altogether out of the question. The word *bheka* means a frog and, at least in lexicons, also a coward.

went to the Kaliṅgas because of Kṛṣṇa's (the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III's) wrath. 〈Now〉 his half-brother, Lord (*īśa*) Dānārṇava, the offspring of Bhīma (II) born of the body of Aṅkidevī likewise protects (*av-*) the earth to the delight of all the populace and according to the policy of Manu, having obtained kingship from the Vallabha (Kṛṣṇa III).

5.

"The sophistication of the lotus-born Supporter of Speech (Brahmā) is reckoned 〈on a par with〉 the rusticity of the Earth Goddess,[2] and even the art discourse of Lady Speech (Sarasvatī) is subject to the natural frivolity of women and thus despicable"—so do all men of culture, out of respect, abundantly praise his sophistication in arts.

6.

"Strange is its appearance: though permanent {stationary}, it always wanders about the triple world; though white, it makes people affectionate {red}"—so do eminent people continually puzzle over the creeper that is his reputation.

〈30–34〉 That shelter of the entire universe (*samasta-bhuvanāśraya*), His Majesty Vijayāditya (Dānārṇava) the supremely pious Supreme Lord (*parameśvara*), the Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*) and Supreme Sovereign (*parama-bhaṭṭāraka*), convokes the householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Nātavāḍi district (*viṣaya*), and, witnessed by the eighteen worthies (*tīrtha*)[3] beginning with the minister (*mantrin*), the chaplain (*purohita*), the general (*senāpati*) and the crown prince (*yuvarāja*) as follows:

7.

There was a family named Sāmanta Voṭṭi, a source of majesty and prosperity endowed with precious men who were not attached (*mukta*) to fruitless (*aphala*) 〈causes〉, resembling the ocean {which is the source of the generation of Śrī and is endowed with pearls that 〈serve as〉 jewels for men}.[4]

8.

[2]Though I feel quite certain that this is the intended meaning of the first statement in this stanza, the text is vague and may stand in need of correction. Whereas the second statement includes the reason why the divine exemplar is inferior, I do not see one here and do not know why the Earth Goddess would be thought of as particularly rustic (perhaps because she is worshipped in villages?) and how Brahmā is associated with her (perhaps because he is born of a lotus, which in turn normally rises out of mud?).

[3]Eighteen dignitaries, normally called *mahāmātra*, are listed in*Arthaśāstra* 12.6 and referred to by the term *tīrtha* in *Arthaśāstra* 12.20.

[4]I am not sure my translation exactly reflects the bitextual meaning intended by the composer, especially in the long and rather awkward compound beginning with *muktāphala*.

Like a moon which produces the ascendance {tide} of that ocean-family and which, with his rays that are like a sword {with the sword held in his hand}, shatters the darkness consisting of ¿rogue bands and audacious soldiers?[5] there was 〈born in that family〉 Guṇḍiya Rāṣṭrakūṭa, whose inherent conduct was inclined to follow the true path respected by gentlemen.

9.

¿"Having today attained (*anugata*) 〈and〉 passed through the gateway of honour (*śrīdvāra*) of the noble kings of the Calukya dynasty, I shall not pass through the gateway of another suzerain"—so saying, he took up residence in Vāṭa, from where the Vallabha lord had departed.?[6]

10.

He had a son equipped with all virtues beginning with honesty: Eṟiya Rāṣṭrakūṭa, whose power was inclined to aid others, a fierce fire to the kindling sticks that were his enemies.

11.

He had a son with the given name Betiya, a repository of all talents, who surpassed the immaculate Vatsa king (Udayana) in his skill at horsemanship.

12.

He had a perfect son resembling Bhava (Śiva) by Her Grace Vandyanāmbā, a repository of all talents named Guṇḍyana.

13.

The sun (*virocana*) of his glory, being the dispeller of the darkness of enemies and ever adored by clumps of lotuses {the hand of Padmā (Śrī)}, becomes ¿the continuation of? 〈his predecessors'?〉 valour.[7]

〈45〉 Being requested by that Kākatya Guṇḍyana, we (Dānārṇava)...[8]

14.

[5]There are problems with the received text here (see the apparatus to line 36), but the composer's intent was probably something along these lines.

[6]This stanza is all but incomprehensible, with several scribal blunders of which some afford no straightforward correction. My translation rests on a number of tentative emendations. See the apparatus to lines 37 to 39 for the textual problems, and the commentary for a discussion of the purport.

[7]The text of this stanza is corrupt and the translation may be inaccurate. See the apparatus to line 43.

[8]This sentence is continued in line 54 after the introduction of the donee. The logical subject (in the original, the agent of the sentence in the passive) is repeated there.

There was once an excellent orator residing in the great village of Velapaṟṟu: Viddamayya born of the Kutsa *gotra*.

15.

A son was born to him, a servant of the lotus that is the two feet of Śrīdhara (Viṣṇu), renowned by the name Śrīdhara for being as excellent as a Śrīdhara among Brahmins.

16.

He had a son by Mācemāmbā. Named Dommana, he was imbued with all virtues and fond of good and decent men.

17.

Though difficult for others to attain, his action is always conducted along the path taught by the Veda (*śruti*), ⟨scripture (*smṛti*)⟩, the practice of good men and the Purāṇas.

18.

He took upon himself the *karpaṭa* (vow) for the benefit of the valiant Kākartya Guṇḍyana who is brilliant as the sun, desiring ⟨to obtain⟩ his favour.

19.

The vow of the *karpaṭin* that he performed out of respect included daily bathing early in the morning, ceaseless chastity and so forth.

20.

Truthfulness, purity, compassion, generosity, religious observance and a magnanimous mindset: ⟨all⟩ this and more comes to him instinctively ⟨even⟩ in the Kali age.

⟨54–56⟩ To that one named Dommana, on the occasion of the winter solstice we have given the village named Māṁgallu, converted into a rent-free holding (*agrahāra*) by a remission of all taxes, ⟨the donation being⟩ sanctified by (a libation of) water. Let this be known to you.

⟨56–62⟩ Its boundaries ⟨are as follows⟩.[9] To the east, the *yilindi* pond at the verge of the fields of Koḍupulūr. To the southeast, the *pannasa*[10] of Kuṟṟalabola. To the south, the border of Laṁjiyavāḍa. To the southwest, the river Munna. To the west, Pallikaṇḍibhaṭāraṇḍu. To the northwest, the triple boundary juncture. To the north, the tamarind tree at the verge of the fields of Koṇḍṟūru. To the northeast, the *puluguḍla*[11] pond at the

[9] Throughout this passage, I translate the Telugu phrases tentatively and incompletely on the basis of words occurring in other Eastern Cālukya inscriptions and translated by the respective editors.

[10] *Pannasa* is an obscure term that may mean land held in some sort of tenure. See Sircar 1966, s.v. pannasa.

[11] Estienne-Monod translates *l'étang au lotus*.

triple boundary juncture. Let no-one pose an obstacle (to his enjoyment of his rights) over it. He who does so shall be conjoined with the five great sins. So Vyāsa has said:

21.

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.

22.

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

23.

Over and over again, Rāmabhadra begs all these future rulers: "Each in your own time, you shall respect this bulwark of legality that is universally applicable to kings!"

〈67〉 The executor (*ājñapti*) is the castellan (*kaḍaka-rāja*). The composition is by Potana Bhaṭṭa.

Translation into French by Estienne-Monod 2008

Plates

1.

Hommage à Viṣṇu dont le nombril est un lotus, protecteur de l'univers, Dont le courage a rabaissé le très puissant Bali, au dispensateur de dons !

〈2–19〉 Prospérité ! Le roi Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana, frère de Satyāśraya Vallabhendra, qui orne la dynastie des Cālukya, illustres, du même *gotra* que les descendants de Manu, loués dans l'univers entier, fils de Hārīti, ayant reçu leur royaume par l'excellente faveur de Kauśikī, protégés par les Mères réunies, méditant aux pieds du seigneur Mahāsena, eux dont les cercles des ennemis ont été soumis en un instant à la vue du signe de l'excellent sanglier, faveur octroyée par le bienheureux Nārāyaṇa, eux dont les corps ont été purifiés grâce aux bains consécutifs au sacrifice du cheval, a protégé la contrée de Veṅgī pendant dix huit années. Son fils Jayasiṁha Vallabha pendant trente-trois ans, Le frère cadet de celui-ci, Indrarāja, pendant sept jours, Le fils de ce dernier, Viṣṇuvardhana, pendant neuf ans, Son fils Maṁgi, le prince héritier, pendant vingt-cinq ans, Son fils légitime Jayasiṁha pendant treize ans, Le frère de celui-ci, né d'une seconde mère, Kokkili, pendant six mois, Son frère aîné

Viṣṇuvardhana, après l'avoir détrôné, pendant trente-sept ans, Le fils de celui-ci, Vijayāditya, l'illustre seigneur, pendant dix-huit ans, Son fils Viṣṇuvardhana pendant trente-six ans, Son fils Narendra Vijayāditya pendant quarante-huit ans, Le fils de ce dernier, Kali Viṣṇuvardhana pendant un an et demi, Son fils Guṇakenalla[12] Vijayāditya pendant quarante-quatre ans, Le fils de Vikramāditya, frère cadet de ce dernier, Cālukya Bhīma pendant trente ans, Le fils de celui-ci, Kollabigaṇḍa Vijayāditya, pendant six mois, Son fils, Ammarāja, pendant sept ans, Son fils Bheka-Vijayāditya pendant quinze jours, Puis le roi Tāḷapa pendant un mois, Après avoir vaincu ce dernier, le fils de Cālukya Bhīma, Vikramāditya, a protégé la terre pendant un an ;

2.

Les armées de ses feudataires Śabara et Vallabha,[13] ainsi que d'autres, ravagèrent sa terre pendant sept années, Méprisant avec violence la couronne placée, entre-temps, sur la tête du roi Mallapa.[14]

3.

Le fils de Meḷāṁbā[15] et de Vijayāditya[16] fut le roi Bhīma ; après avoir éradiqué tous ceux-ci, il protégea la terre pendant douze ans.

4.

Son fils, Ammarāja, qui a la puissance du roi des dieux, dont la tête est ceinte du diadème, alors qu'il protégeait la terre depuis onze ans, vainqueur de ses ennemis, attaqua les Kaliṁga, à cause de la colère de Kṛṣṇa. Son frère, né d'une autre mère, qui, pour la joie de tout le peuple, a reçu le royaume de Vallabha, Bhaima, bien qu'il soit souverain des flots de dons,[17] fils de Aṁkidevī, administre la terre selon les préceptes de Manu.

5.

* * *[18]

6.

[12]Ce roi est sans doute Guṇagāṁka

[13]ou Śabara-Vallabha

[14]Feudataire des Rāṣṭrakūṭa, cf. supra II, B, 1, p 25 .

[15]corr. pour Meḷaimha.

[16]Il s'agit Kollabhigaṇḍa-Vijayāditya.

[17]Jeu de mots sur l'opposition entrela mer et la terre, entre le « souverain des flots » et celui qui « administre la terre », ce paradoxe est un virodha, marquée notamment par l'emploi de la particule api . Ainsi, contrairement à l'éditeur de ce texte, nous n'estimons pas que le terme *dānārṇava* soit à interpréter comme un nom.

[18]Nous n'avons pu proposer de traduction pertinente de ce vers.

Bien que ferme, sans cesse elle parcourt les Trois Mondes ; elle sucite l'amour des hommes malgré sa blancheur : « Merveilleuse est sa beauté », voilà ce que toujours les êtres distingués pensent de la liane de sa gloire.[19]

30–34.

Celui-ci, refuge pour l'univers entier, l'illustre Vijayāditya, grand roi, premier seigneur, illustre seigneur, très pieux, ayant convoqué les chefs de familles de la circonscription de Nātavāḍi, à commencer par les *rāṣṭrakūṭa* et le conseiller, le chapelain, le maréchal, le prince héritier, les dix-huit Tīrtha[20] en tête, ordonne ceci :

7.

à l'occasion de Śrīsaṁbhūti, liée à Muktāphala, cette perle d'homme, il y eut une famille portant le nom de la feudataire Voḍḍi, comparable à l'océan.

8.

Source de prospérité pour l'océan de cette lignée, source de ténèbres pour les pillards, les brigands, les troupes, les guerriers et les soldats portant l'épée au poing, naquit, pareil à la lune, Guṇḍiya-Rāṣṭrakūṭa qui, hommage rendu, enclin à fouler le chemin de la vertu, fut indépendant.[21]

10.

Doué de toutes les vertus à commencer par la sincérité, dont la puissance étaient encline à servir autrui, naquit , incendie pour ses ennemis réduit à l'état de bois d'allumage, puissant, son fils Eṟiya-Rāṣṭrakūṭa.

11.

Par son adresse à monter les chevaux, humiliant le roi des Vatsa, son fils fut Bhetiya, trésor de toutes les prospérités.

12.

Il eut de l'illustre Vandyanāmbā un fils qui était pareil à Bhava. Son fils, nommé Guṇḍyana, ⟨fut⟩ un trésor de toutes les prospérités,

13.

[19] La liane est un topos qui renvoie à l'amante. Ce composé laisse suggérer que la gloire, telle une amante passionnée, ne délaisse jamais le roi.

[20] Gardiens et intendants des lieux saints ou allusion à la liste de 18 *tīrtha*, officiers, fournie dans l'*Arthaśāstra*, I, 12.

[21] Le vers 9 contient des formes irrecevables. L'éditeur constate qu'en substituant 4 composés du texte et en les remplaçant par d'autres termes, *it may yield some sense*.

Ayant allumé le bûcher , il se développe, repoussant les ténèbres ennemis, apportant une satisfaction éternelle au massif de lotus, lui, dont la puissance est resplendissante.

14.

Par celui-ci, qui portait le nom de Kākatya Guṇḍyana, nous avons été sollicités. Habitant le grand village de Velāpaṟṟu, le meilleur des orateurs, issu de la famille des Kutsa, Ciddamayya naquit autrefois.

15.

Rendant un culte aux deux lotus que sont les pieds de Śrīdhara, connu sous le nom de Śrīdhara. Son fils fut par sa naissance un brahmane, ainsi que par l'éclat de Śrīdhara.[22]

16.

Celui-ci eut un fils de Mācemāṁbā nommé Dommana. Possèdant toutes les vertus, il fut l'ami des hommes vertueux et des saints,

17.

lui dont la conduite demeure sur le chemin enseigné par la Révélation, la Tradition, l'usage des hommes de bien et les Purāṇa, conduite à jamais inaccessible aux autres hommes.

18.

A l'égard du héros Kākartya Guṇḍyana, dont l'éclat est celui du soleil, qui a pris l'habit des ascètes, désireux d'obtenir sa faveur,

19.

Qui pratique un bain matinal quotidien et dont le vœu de chasteté n'est pas rompu, qui accomplit avec respect le vœu des ascètes, conduite qui commence par la marche,

20.

lui qui en ce monde et dans le Kaliyuga enseigne la sincérité, la pureté, la compassion, la générosité, le respect des rites, l'intelligence, la tolérance, l'amabilité.

〈54–56〉 Nous donnons à celui qui porte ce nom, le village nommé Māṁgallu, exempté de toute taxe, après avoir fait une libation d'eau, en qualité d'*agrahāra*, à l'occasion du solstice d'hiver. Que cela soit connu de vous.

〈54–56〉 Ses limites sont : à l'est l'étang Yilindi vers le pépier de Koḍupūluru, au sud-est le pannasa de Kuṟṟalabola, au sud la limite de Laṁjayamāda, au sud-ouest la rivière

[22]Jeu de mots sur le terme śrīdhara qui désigne à la fois le personnage et l'époux de Śrī, Viṣṇu.

Munna, à l'ouest Pallikaṇṭī-Bhaṭāraṇḍu, au nord-ouest le point de jonction des trois routes, au nord les tamaris vers le pépier de Koṇḍṟūru au nord-est au l'étang au lotus vers le point de jonction des trois routes. Aucune charge ne doit lui être imposée, celui qui en impose est lié aux cinq grands crimes. Vyāsa a dit ceci :

21.

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

22.

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

23.

Rāmabhadra demande ceci à tous les princes des rois à venir de la terre, encore et encore : « ce pont du dharma commun aux rois doit toujours être protégé par vous. »

〈67〉 L'exécuteur est le *kaḍakāraja*. L'auteur est Potanabhaṭṭa.

Commentary

7.

Parabrahma Sastry 1969, p. 65 connects the name Voṭṭi to Sāmanta Viṣṭi mentioned, apparently as the family name of the Kākatīyas, in the Kazipet Dargah inscription of Tribhuvanamalla Duggarāja (Corpus of Telingana Inscriptions Part 3 pp 25-31, not traced). He thinks Viṣṭi may be derived either from Vṛṣṇi or from Skt viṣṭi = forced labour, and argues that viṭṭi is a legitimate Telugu form of that word, while voṭṭi may be a corruption of the former. I have doubts concerning his etymology, but find his linking of Voṭṭi to Viṣṭi plausible.

9.

This stanza was probably quite awkward even as intended by its composer. Compounded with the deplorable work done on it by the scribe, a proper interpretation may be impossible even though all of it is legible with fair confidence in the photos of the original. The previous stanza introduces Guṇḍiya, and the next one introduces his son Eṟiya. There is nothing in this stanza to imply another generation in between, so logically, stanza 9 should pertain to Guṇḍiya, even though there is no pronoun, relative or demonstrative, that would make this explicit. Aside from the fairly straightforward superfluous text (for which see the apparatus to line 37), the text requires

fairly invasive emendation to render it intelligible. The emendations suggested by R's editor yield the text *cālukya-vaṁśodita-bhūmipāla-śrī-dvāra-madhyānugataṁ praviśya| nānyo vipad-dvāram ahaṁ viśāmīty ācaṣṭa vāṭaṁ gata-vallabheśam||*, which he feels "may yield some sense." While all words are meaningful, I find no coherent meaning in this reconstruction.

9.

PS's reconstruction of the stanza, with hyphenation and some typos silently corrected to the best of my ability, runs as follows: *cālukya-vaṁśodita-bhūmipāla-śrī-dvāram ājñānu-gataṁ praviśya| nūnam vipad-dvāram ahaṁ viśāmīty akṣaṁsta vāṭaṁ-gata-vallabheśam||*. His translation of this (1969, p. 64) is: "He (Guṇḍiya) according to (his master's) orders entered the *Śrīdvāra* of the kings of the Cālukya *vaṁśa* saying "I will certainly enter the gates of death", and enabled Vallabheśa to penetrate into Vāṭa." On the same page, he tentatively interprets "the vāṭa" as "fortified town", whereas, still on the same page, he says it was "probably Vijayavāḍa." In his discussion of Kākatīya history (1978, p. 21) he paraphrases the stanza to say, "Guṇḍiya Rāṣṭrakūṭa entered *vipad-dvāra* (the gate of risk) in order to help his master Vallabheśa while capturing Vāṭa or Vijayavāṭa, the capital of the Eastern Cālukya king".

9.

I have strong reservations about understanding *kṣam* as "enable," much less "help." I also have misgivings about his heavy-handed emendation *ājñānugata* and, even if accepted, the role of this word in the syntax; as well as about his assertion that *vāṭa* means the city of Vijayavāṭa and his claim that *aksaṁsta vāṭam-gata-vallabheśam* can be taken to mean "enabled Vallabheśa to penetrate into Vāṭa". The emendation to *nūnam vipad-dvāram ahaṁ viśāmīty* is quite ingenious, but beyond the pale of plausibility.

9.

PS also ignores the word *śrīdvāra*, which is not the gate of a city or fortress, but a technical term for a status symbol apparently granted by suzerains to prominent subordinates as a mark of recognition (q.v. line 49 of the Pedda-Gāḷidiparṟu grant of Amma II and my commentary there; and line 83 of the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya). Thus, the stanza cannot be about Guṇḍiya's ostensible breaching of a Cālukya stronghold. PS (1969, pp. 64–65) reasons that Guṇḍiya must have been in league with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, which may have been true some of the time. However, the fact that he is called a *rāṣṭrakūṭa* need not imply that he had any connection to the imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Moreover, even if he was at some point a Rāṣṭrakūṭa subordinate, his victory on behalf of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas against the Cālukyas would not be emhpasised in a Cālukya grant.

All in all, I see no way to interpret the first hemistich to mean anything other than that Guṇḍiya had been granted the *śrīdvāra* by some Cālukya ruler.

9.

More specifically, I am quite confident that the first three quarters of the stanza should be reconstructed as *cālukya-vaṁśodita-bhūmipāla-śrī-dvāram adyānugataṁ pravisya| nānyādhipa-dvāram ahaṁ viśāmīty*. These words, from the mouth of Guṇḍiya, are evidently an oath given at the time (*adya*) he attained (*anugata*) the distinction of the *śrīdvāra*, swearing that he will never accept the same distinction (*dvāra = śrīdvāra*) from another suzerain (*adhipa*), i.e. not disregard his fealty.[23] The key to the last quarter lies in the word *akṣaṣṭa*. In my opinion this should be emended to *akṣeṣṭa*, which is the least invasive intervention of those so far proposed. To the best of my knowledge this is a legitimate s-aorist (middle voice singular third person) from *kṣi*, probably used here in the sense of 'inhabit.' I thus interpret the last line to mean, that he took up residence in a place called Vāṭa from where the Vallabha (i.e. Rāṣṭrakūṭa) lord had departed.

9.

There is, however, another piece of evidence that PS cites to corroborate his hypothesis that Guṇḍiya was a Rāṣṭrakūṭa subordinate. Stanza 6 of the Vedatulūru grant of Bhīma I (then unpublished and called Masulipatam plates by PS) says that in the battle of Peruvaṅgūr Bhīma I's stripling son Iṟimaṟtigaṇḍa had defeated someone named Guṇḍaya along with a Rāṣṭrakūṭa army, thus allowing Bhīma I to become the ruler of all the world *vallabha-daṇḍena guṇḍayākhyaṁ hatvā ... avanim aśeṣān nirākulām mahyam adāT*.[24] It is more than likely that this Guṇḍaya is identical to our Guṇḍiya. The latter was the great-grandfather of the instigator Guṇḍyana, a contemporary of Dānārṇava probably in 957 CE, while the former was a contemporary of Bhīma I probably near the beginning of that king's reign in 892 CE, and the 65 or so years separating the two grants correspond neatly to three generations.

9.

Even so, I maintain that it is impossible to interpret the present text to say that Guṇḍiya was on the Rāṣṭrakūṭa side. It may be noted that *hatvā* in the Vedatulūru grant need not mean that Iṟimaṟtigaṇḍa slew Guṇḍaya: the verb applies also to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army, and it is obvious that the army would not have been killed to the last man. As

[23] Stanza 20 of the Ciṁbuluru plates of Vijayāditya III says that the general Pāṇḍaraṅga had undertaken an *eka-pati-vrata*, which presumably means much the same as the sentiment I detect here.

[24] The name of this person repeatedly appears as Daṇḍena-guṇḍaya or Daṇḍeṇa-guṇḍaya in the secondary literature. The received reading is indeed *daṇḍeṇa*, but it is evident from the context that this is not a name and can be straightforwardly emended to the instrumental *daṇḍena*.

a new piece of evidence to the contrary, the nine sets of Kodad plates discovered in 2025, whose full text is not yet accessible, reportedly attest that a temple founded in Koṇḍapalli *viṣaya* by a man named Guṇḍaya was patronised by the Eastern Cālukya kings Bhīma I, Amma I and Vikramāditya II.

9.

We must also keep in mind that Dānārṇava, who is now rewarding Guṇḍiya's descendant, gained the throne of Veṅgī with the approval and probably outright support of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. This implies that, in Dānārṇava's days, Guṇḍiya's line may have been subordinate to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor. Thus, Dānārṇava (or his PR officer Potana Bhaṭṭa) is in something of a tough situation here. He must acknowledge his indebtedness to the Voṭṭi clan (and perhaps, indirectly, to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas) while maintaining a proud Cālukyan façade and at least a semblance of independence.

9.

The contested land between the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and the Cālukya core territories was probably a hotbed of rapidly shifting allegiances. I believe that Guṇḍiya was initially a subordinate of the Veṅgī Cālukyas (or perhaps of the minor Cālukya line of Mudugoṇḍa). The lands he controlled came at some point (probably shortly before the reign of Bhīma I) under the sway of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. He may or may not have resisted this, and it was probably Iṟimaṟtigaṇḍa who ungently put him in his proper place as a Cālukya subordinate. At any rate, the narrative spun by the present inscription seems to be that a Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler (Kṛṣṇa II?) had offered Guṇḍiya the honour of the *śrīdvāra* (i.e. recognition as an eminent underlord). However, the stalwart man refused this on the grounds that he had already sworn fealty to, and been recognised as worthy by, the Cālukyas. Guṇḍiya then set up his seat, either in nominal independence or in continuing nominal subordination to the Cālukyas, at a place called Vāṭa that had been vacated by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king. The Kodad plates show that his loyalty continued to be rewarded by the next couple of Cālukya rulers, but by the time of Dānārṇava his descendants may have switched sides again or maintained a precarious neutrality between the lion and the bear.

9.

There remains a question of what this Vāṭa may have been. Although *vāṭa* on its own rather means a garden or park, the abundance of settlement names ending in this word may imply that it also meant a fortification. Most probably, it is an abbreviated form of such a settlement name. If so, I do not think Vijayavāṭa is a plausible candidate for the town where Guṇḍiya took up residence. Much rather, it may stand for Kuṟṟavāḍi, the place where Guṇḍiya's son Eṟiya/Eṟṟa is known from the Bayyaram inscription to have

ruled (Parabrahma Sastry 1969, line 19). Probably the same place is called Kuravāṭaka in a thirteenth-century inscription (Gopinatha Rao 1917–1918, line 23). According to the identifications proposed by Nilakanta Sastri and Venkataramanayya (in Yazdani 1960, p. 481), Kuṟṟavāḍi is modern Kuravi (17°31'28.9"N 80°00'06.6"E) and Peruvaṅgūr, where Guṇḍiya was defeated, is modern Pedavangara (17°33'28.2"N 79°34'56.5"E), a mere 44 km west of the former. The Koṇḍapalli *viṣaya* of the Kodad plates must have had modern Nelakondapally (17°06'06.4"N 80°03'15.0"E) as its headquarters, 47 km south of Kuravi, while the findspot Kodad is 15 km SW of Nelakondapally.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1916–17, p. 6, appendix A/1916-1917, № 1 with a description at ARIE 1916–17, pp. 115–116, § 24. First edited from inked impressions by V. Rangacharya (1955–1956), with facsimiles but without translation. Re-edited by P. V. Parabrahma Sastry (1969) with inferior reproductions of the same impressions, also without translation. Part of this edition (lines 21 to 45 and some text from ll54-56) was re-published in Parabrahma Sastry 1978, pp. 305–307, appendix 1 without any change except the odd new typo. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on photographs taken by myself in February 2023 at the Government Museum, Chennai, collated with the previous editions and Rangacharya's facsimiles. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[R] Rangacharya, V. 1955–1956. "Mangallu grant of Amma II." *Epigraphia Indica* 31, pp. 37–44.

[PS] Parabrahma Sastry, P. V. 1969. "The Māṅgallu grant of Dānārṇava." In: *Epigraphia Āndhrica vol. I*. Edited by N. Venkataramanayya. Hyderabad: Government of Andhra Pradesh, pp. 57–70.

Secondary

ARIE 1916–17. *Annual report on epigraphy 1916-1917. Recording, with remarks, the progress report of the Assistant Archaeological Superintendent for epigraphy, Southern Circle, for the year 1916-1917*. Edited by H. Krishna Sastri. No place, 1917.

Parabrahma Sastry, P. V. 1969. "The Bayyāram tank inscription of Kākati Mailama." In: *Epigraphia Āndhrica vol. I*. Edited by N. Venkataramanayya. Hyderabad: Government of Andhra Pradesh, pp. 71–94.

Parabrahma Sastry, P. V. 1978. *The Kakatiyas of Warangal*. Hyderabad: Government of Andhra Pradesh.

Venkataramanayya, N. 1949. "The date of Solada-Ganda Baddega of Vemulavāda." In: *The proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Tenth Session, Bombay University and Bombay Historical Society, Bombay, 1947*. By Indian History Congress. Session (10th : 1947 : Bombay, India) creator. Allahabad: Indian History Congress, pp. 214–218.

Yazdani, Ghulam. 1960. *The early history of the Deccan, parts I–VI*. London: Oxford University Press. [URL]. Page 481.

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