

Andhra Sahitya Parishad plates of Śaktivarman

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00052

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00052.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final N (e.g. l8, l31) is a raised and reduced na-shape with a sinuous tail. Final M (e.g. l11, l25) is a raised circle with a sinuous tail. Final T looks like ta with sinuous tail instead of headmark (e.g. l6), or like a raised and reduced ta with a sinuous tail, almost identical in the unclear facsimile to final N and M (l44, l52).

Original punctuation marks are double verticals with a pronounced serif.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is normally at head height after the character to which it belongs. Initial Ī occurs in line 49. Some ā markers look identical to superscript rephas (e.g. in line 27, compare the vertically oriented but distinctly recognisable ā marker in l29 ekādaśa). There is also ambiguity in the shape of superscript rephas when combined with an ā marker, cases of which have been read with the benefit of doubt.

Edition

Seal

<1> śrī-tribhuvanāmkuśa

Plates

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <1> [svasti]<.> [śrīmatām sa](kala-bhuvana-saṁstūya)māna-mā(na)vya-
sa(gotrā)[nām hārīti-putrānām]<2> [kauśikī-vara-pra](sāda)-labdha-rājy(ā)(n)(ām)
mā(tṛ-gaṇa-paripāl)it(ānām) [svāmi-mahāsena]<3>[-pādānudhyātānām bha](gavan-
n)ārāya(ṇa)-prasāda-(saṁsādita-vara-varāha-lāṁccha)[nekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa]<4>-
[vaśī](kṛtā)○rāti-maṇḍal(ānām aśvamedhāvabhṛ)ḥ(t)?<th>(a-snāna)-pavitri(k)ṛta-
(vapu)[śām calukyā]<5>[nām kulam a]○lāmkaṛiṣṇoḥ satyāśraya vallabhendrasya
bhrātā (ku)bja-viṣṇuvarddhano <'>(ṣṭ)[ādaśa] va<6>[rṣāṇ](i verṁgi)○-deśam
apālayaT|| tad-ātmajo jayasimhas tra(yastrimśataṁ| ta)[d-a]<7>[nujendrarāja]-
(nandano viṣṇu)arddhano nava| tat-sūnur mmaṁgi-yuvarājah pañcavi(mśatim|
tat-pu)[tro jaya]<8>[sim](has trayodaśa) tad-ava(ra)jah ko{r}kkiliḥ ṣaṇ māsāN| tasya
jyeṣṭho bhrātā vi(ṣ)ṇ(u)var(ddhana)[s tam uccā]<9>[tya saptatrimśa](taṁ| tat-putro
v)ijayāditya-bhaṭṭārako <'>ṣṭādaśa| tat-suto viṣṇu(va(r)ddha(naṣ ṣaṭtrim)<śataṁ|>

1. Sragdharā

<Page 2r> <10> tat-sūnur bhānu-bhāso raṇa-(v)igaṇaḥ[(y)]<<n>>?<n>ayā
nīlakaṇṭhālayānām
(sa)-grāmārāmakā(nām sa-la)<11>(li)ta-ramaḥn?<n>i-saṁ!pp!<p>adā(m) sat-
padā(nām|)
(kṛt)vā protturṁ!gg!<g>am aṣṭottara-śata(m a)bhunag vīra-dhīro <'>(ṣṭa-yuktā)<12>ś
catvāri(mśa)t samā<ḥ> (kṣmām) (jana-nuta-vijayāditya)-nāmā naren(draḥ||)

2. Praharṣiṇī

tat-sūnus satata(m anū)[na-dā]<13>na-ḥc[ā]<<i>>?<vr>ṣṭ<y>ā
dīnā○nḥd?<dh>a-(dvija?)-(ga)ṇikārtḥt?<th>i-sā(r)tḥt?<th>a-sasya(M)|
sa(n)toṣa(m sakalam a)[vāpaya?]<14>n<n> apād gā(m)
aḥddh!<dh>ya○(rddham kila) kali-viṣṇu(var)ddhano <'>bda(m)||
tat-priya-(tana)ya(h||)

3. Sragdharā

(Am)ig(g)!<g>(āt sa)[rṅrāma]<15>-raṁigg!<g>e nija-la○<sa>(d-asi)nā ma(rṁ)igg!<g>(i-
rājo)ttamāṅgaṁ
jtt!<t>u(rṁ)igg!<g>ādre<h> śṛṅga(m urvyām aśani)[r iva mudā]<16>pātayat
kan<n>arā<rṁ>ka(rṁ)|
ni(ś)śaṁkaṁ śaṁkil(ena) prathita-ja(na)padād <d>durggġā?<a>mān ni(r)ggama[yya]
[drāg dāvaṁ ya]<17>ġt?<h>(pr)a(v)e[śya] (prabhur a)bha(ya-manā)<h>(p)ratyapād
(badde)gā(rṁkaṁ||)

4. Anuṣṭubh

(sa)śr(i)mān vi(jayāditya)-
-[bhūpati]<18>[r bhrā](t)[r]bh[i]s (sa)[ha]
(catvāriṁśat sa)mās <s>ā(rdhaṁ)
(ca)turbhir abhunag (bh)uvaṁ||

5. Anuṣṭubh

(tad-bhrātur vv)[ikramāditya]-
<Page 2v><19>-bhūpates sac-camġu?<ū>pateḥ|
vilasat-kaṇṭhikā-dġa?<ā>ma-
-kaṇṭhasya tanayo nayī||

6. Sragdharā

dīnānāthā[turāṇām]<20> dvija-vara-samiter yy(ā)cakānā(rṁ) yat(i)nām
(nān)ā-deśāgatānām paṭu-vaṭu-naṭa-sad-gā(ya)[kānām ka]<21>vīnām
bandhūnām andhakānām abhilaṣita-phala-śrāṇanād rakṣaṇād yo
māteva triṁśa[d abdān bhuva]<22>m abhunag asau ○ cāru-cālukya-bhīmaḥ||

7. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

tat-putraḥ sva-bhujāsi-khaṇḍi(ta-r)[ipu-kṣmābhṛ]<23>d balād vāsavī○(rṁ)
jitvāġs?<ś>ām viraje pratiṣṭhita-<ja>ya-stambha<h> paġt?<t>ġi(ddh)?<(ṣṭh)>[o]{h}
ra(ṇe)|
(svarṇnā)(rū)[ḍha]<24>-tulo <'>tra ġb?<bh>āḍha○m atulo dhātrī-tal(e kṣatr)i(yair)
mmitrābhġā?<aḥ> pari<ra>kṣat[i] (s)ma vija[yā]<25>(dit)ya<h> samārdham
dharā(M)||

8. Vasantatilakā

(ta)syātmaja(h) praṇata-vairi-śiro-vilagna-
-ratna-dvirepha-pari(cuṁ)[bi]<26>[ta]-pāda-padmaḥ|
meruṁ hasaṁs tulita-hāṭaka-rāśi-bhāsā
varṣ(ā)ṇi sapta s{s}ama(pā)[d bhuva]m a<27>[mma](rājah)||

9. Anuṣṭubh

tat-sutaṁ vijayādityaṁ
bālam uccāṭya l*ṛ*i?<i>layā|
tālādhipatir (ākra)mya
mā<Page 3r><28>(sam eka)m apād bhuvam|

10. Anuṣṭubh

taṁ jivā yudhi cālukya-
-bhīma-bhūmipates sutaḥ|
(vi)kramāditya<29>-(bhūpo) <'>pān
māsān ekādaśa kṣitim||

11. Anuṣṭubh

tatas tālāpa-rājasya
sūnus sūnṛta-(vāk p)r(abhuḥ)|
yuddha<30>malla-dharādhiśas
sapta varṣāṇy apād bhuvam||

12. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

san(n)addhaṁ yudhi yuddhamallam av*ṛ*e?<a>ner nni(r)ddhāṭya dhāṭyāha<31>r*ṛ*ā?<a>t
kṛtvā bha(g)na○-rathān api parā*n*!<n>śiṣṭāṁś ca śiṣṭetarāN|
śrīmat-kollabigaṇḍa-nāma-vija<32>yādityātma○jas sādaram
bhīmo bhīma-parākramas samabhunag dhātṛīm samā d(v)āda<33>śa||

13. Vasantatilakā

tasyāmma○rāja Iti sūnur athāpi garbbhe
yaḥ kaṇṭhikā-racita-kaṇṭha-(yu)(jā?)<34>tta-vr*ṛ*!<tt>yā
baddhvā samasta-janapārc(c)ita-rājya-paṭṭam
bhūdeva-deva-hitam eva tatāna śāsva(T||)

14. Vasantatilakā

<35> (s)adh*ṛ*ō?<ā>raṇādhika-virodhi-gaj*ṛ*a?<ā>vasādāt
madhye-raṇam tribhuvanāṁkuśa-nāma yasya|
(A)[-v]<36>(tām) suciram (ā)pa gaja[sya]<<pri>>yatvam
simhasya śaurya-vijayāc ca kṛtārttha-bhāvaM||

15. Vasantatilakā

[---]<Page 3v><37>[---] (t)(a?) [-v]-janmā
yaḥ (pa)m̐caviṁśati-sa[mā]s samarakṣad u[r]vv[īm]||

dv(ai?)(māt)u(r)(o?)[~~]<38> [-~](d-a?)(rāti-va)rgga<h>
śrī-rāja-bhīma-tanayo nayanābhirāmaḥ||

<<śrī-rājanā(rā)ya(ṇa?)>>[ca. 2+]

16. Vasantatilakā

<39> [dānā]r<nn><nn>avas samadhar<i?<i>kṛta-kar<nn><nn>a-dānaḥ
kṣoṇīśa-mauli-maṇi-ramjita-pāda-piṭhaḥ|
vi(dyā-ni)[dhir]bbu<40>(dha)-nidhiḥ pradha○na-pradhānas
t[r]is{s}ras samās samabhunak sakalām dharitrīm||

17. Āryāgīti

dānār<nn><nn>a<41>va-bhūmipa○ter anu daiva-kṛtena saptavimśaty-abdān|
Āsīd arājikeyaṁ ba(hu)<42>la-niśevāndhra○-<<bhūmir atrā>><tyandhā||?>
<Atrā?>vasare|||

18. Gīti

Āryyā-devyās tasya ca dāna-<na>rendrasya śakti<43>varmmeti|
śakti-traya-saṁyuktas tana{na}yo naya-vinaya-śauryya-sampannaḥ||

19. Vallarī

yasyendu-dhava<44>bhāvāt kīrttir brahmāṇḍa-maṇ<th?<d>apasya sudheva|
tan-madhy[e]<<a>>-dīpa<yl<i>va yat-tejaḥ-prasaro vibhāsate śāsva<M?<T>|

20. Vallarī

<45> (A)ri-karaṭi-ghaṭ(i)-kumbha-sthala-dalana-sthagita-mauktikāvalir ājau|
puṣpāvalir iva rājati kha<!<d>ga-la<Page 4r><46>tāyā<h> sphuṭaṁ yadīyāyāḥ||

21. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

bālye kīrttir alā(bh)i caulika-raṇe yena vraṇodbhāsinā
yenātyuddha<47>ta-badyemā<dī?<dhi>pa-mahārāj<a?<ā>day<ā?<o> vidr(u)tāḥ|
(ya)s tīkṣṇān urasā parikṣata-carō hatvā ripu-pre<48>ṣitāN
loke <'>d[e]<<a>>rśayad ātma-sāram asamaṁ śrī-śaktiva<r>mmādhipaḥ||

22. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

svarṇ rūpaṁ parih[(u)]<<r>>tya d<ye?<ai>tya-nikarā<49>n matsyādy-alikātmatām
prāpya prāg jītavān kileti hasatā nārāyaṇaṁ cetasā||
Īśas saṁyati rāvaṇa<50>-pratidinidhiś cā○līū!<u>kya-nārāyaṇen-
ā<s?<p>āsta-dviṣatāpi yena nidhanaṁ śrī-coḍa-bhīmā<51>dhipaḥ||

23. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

mā○dyad-dāruṇa-vāraṇebha-makaraṁ vīrāvalī-nakrakaṁ
 kilālāmbu-vilola<52>m aśva-lahari-mālā-sahasrākulaṁ|
 nirmmathyotkalikādhināth_i?<a>-rathin_i?<i>-vārddhirṁ sva-bāhā-balā_iM?<T>
 ta<53>t(r)atyām śr_i?<i>yam ādadāti yudhi yaś cālukya-nārāyaṇaḥ||
 sa sarvvalokā_it?<ś>raya-śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahā<54>rāj_ia?<ā>dhirāja-parameśvara-
 parama-bhaṭṭ_ia?<ā>raka-parama-brahmaṇya-parama-māhe<śva>raḥ vaṇanāṇḍu-
 viṣaya-ni<55>vāsino rāṣṭrak_iu?<ū>ṭa-pramukhā(N) kuṭ_i!<u>m̐binas sarvvān
 samāh_ia?<ū>ya mantri-purohita-senāpati-yu<Page 4v><56>(varāja-dauvārikādhyakṣam
 i)_i(th)?<t>(tham ājñāpayati)<.> (yathā||)

24. Āryāgīti(?)

(brahmānva)ye (va)r(iyāN bhā)radvā(ja-rṣi)<57>(r apara) _i(yi)!<I>va dha(rmm)_i(e)?<i>(ṣ?)_i(t?)?<th>(a?)[h?
 [---](nvaya-varddhayitā puṇy?) [o] [---](sa?)ka(la-śā)stro j_ia?<ā>taḥ||

25. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

Āsī<58>(t tas)ya sutas sat(ām kṛ?) [---](vennamayyāhvayaḥ|?)
 (sādhus sā)(dhujaṇīna?)-(karmma-nirato ya)<59>(ś co)danā-co(ditaḥ||)○
 [---](ti-śāl?)_i?<i>nān nayavatā(m?) [-](pū?)(rvva)m ā(śr)_i(i)?<ā>vaṇa-
 -pratya<60>śrāvaṇa-(pu?)○(ṣṭa?) [---](mayyo?) (mahā-yajñiyaḥ|)

26. Gīti(?)

(Atha ve)nnamayya-nāmna<61>s tasya [-](sā?) ○ [ca. 8×]
 [ca. 2×](vir vvirājadeva?)[(Itya?)]<<(na?) I>>ty ajani dvija-kulo<62>t(t)amas
 (sū)(nuḥ|?)

27. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

(de)vā(n) ta(r)ppa(y)(itā pi?)t_ir!_i<ṛ>(mś) ca v(i)_i(th)?<dh>(iva)[d yo?] (havya-
 kavyā)(d?)i(bhir?)
 (yyaḥ p)r_i_iā?<a>kṣālana-vāriṇāti(th)i<63>-(padām?) pra(kṣāli)tā(m)gho-malaḥ
 (ya)ś (ś)a(śv)ad budha-bandhu-dīna-vita(te)(r ṇṇe?)tā hitārthta-prado
 yas sāhāyya<64>(m u?)p(e)t_ie?<a>vān nija-pateḥ kāryyasya kha_i!<d>gasya ca|

28. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

(bhāra)dvā[[dvā]]<<ja>>-muner mmuni-stu<ta>-mateḥ pr(ā)g nāma-mātr(e)ṇa hi
 svarṁ<65>(go)tra(m) parivarttamā(na)m asamo (n)i(stā?)r(yy)a vist_iā?<ā>r(i)-dhīḥ|
 (tasmād a)bhy_iā?<a>dhiko <'>bhava_in?<d>guṇa-<ni>dhi(r) yyo va<m>śa-ka

<Page 3v>

Apparatus

Plates

<4> [calukyā]<5>[nām kulam] ◇ [ca]<5>[li](kyā)nām kulam KR • Nothing to the left of the hole can now be made out in the original, and I doubt both that KR was able to obtain a clear reading and that so much text could have fitted in the line before the hole. There is also no reason to restore the name as Calikya.

<8> ko{r}kkiliḥ ◇ kōkkiliḥ KR. — <8> vi(ṣ)ṇ(u)var(ddhana)[s tam] ◇ viṣṇuvarddha(na)[m] KR • Probably a typo/oversight in KR.

<10> -(v)igaṇaḥ[(y)]<[ṇ]>?<[n]>ayā ◇ -vigaṇa(na)yā KR • The received reading clearly has two cerebral ṇa-s, but the second of these, where dental na is expected, is a result of correction, probably from ya, the initial part of which has been redrawn as ṇa, while the final part was either never engraved or has been fully incorporated into the following ya.

<11> -ramaḥn?<[ṇ]>i- ◇ -ramaṇī- KR. — <11> -dhīro <'>(ṣṭa)- • The reading dhīro is clear. Parallel attestations of this stanza read -dhīraṣṭa- in the Tāṇḍikoṇḍa grant of Amma II, and -dhīrāṣṭa- in the Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava and the Guṇḍipoduṇḍu grant.

<12> naren(draḥ||) • The final visarga and punctuation mark may well be a correction from an initially inscribed ṇa. — <12> (anū)[na-dā]<13>na- ◇ anū<13>na- KR.

<13> -ḥc[ā]<[i]>?<[vṛ]>ṣṭ<y>ā ◇ vḥi?<[ṛ]>ṣṭ(im) KR • The plate is quite clear here, but the engraving is difficult to make sense of. The second character certainly looks like c, not v, and it has vowel markers both for ā and i. I assume that the former has been corrected to the latter, but the inverse is also possible. My emendation is tentative; compare the differently corrupt vrissāM in the Guṇḍipoduṇḍu grant — <13> dīnā○nḥd?<[dh]>a- ◇ dīnāṁdha- KR. — <13> -(ga)ṇikārtḥt?<[th]>i-sā(r)tḥt?<[th]>a-sasya(M) ◇ -gaṇikār(tthi)-sārtha-sasyaḥa?<[ā]>ṁ| KR • KR's emendation to sasyām does not seem necessary to me. — <13> (a)[vāpaya?]<14>n<n> ◇ avāpa(ya)<14>n KR • Though KR prints only ya as unclear, most of this stretch is now illegible. The parallel in the Guṇḍipoduṇḍu grant is differently corrupt. KR may have had access to a better version of this stanza, but none are known to me, and he refers only to “other well-known copper plate grants” of the Eastern Cālukyas. At any rate, his restoration (reading?) is plausible.

<14> aḥddh!<[dh]>ya○(rddham) ◇ atyarddham KR.

<15> -la○<[sa]>(d-) ◇ la(sa)d- KR.

<16> kan<n>arā<m>ka(m) ◇ ka(nnarā)ṁkaM KR. — <16> -ja(na)padād

<d>durgg_ṛā?<a>mān ◇ *janapadād (durggamān)* KR • The parallels in the Nāgiyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II and the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant read *durggaman* and *durggamam* respectively, so the former may have been intended here. The meaning is not affected, so I do not emend. — <16> [dāvaṁ] ◇ [*dhāvan*] KR • The parallel in the Nāgiyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II and the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant both clearly read *dāvaṁ*, though it was misread as *dhāvaṁ* by the former's editor. — <16> [ya]<17>_ṛt?<h> ◇ [*ya*]_ṛt KR • The parallel in the Nāgiyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II and the clearly reads *yaḥ*, which I find better in context. The form *yaḥ* in the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant corroborates my emendation.

<17> vi(jayāditya)-[bhūpati]<18>[r] ◇ *vijayā(ditya)-[ś caturbhi]*<18>(r) KR • The parallels in the Nāgiyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II, the Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava and the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant all read *vijayāditya-bhūpatir* here. KR's discussion explicitly mentions four brothers, and he may have been familiar with another attestation of this stanza with that reading that I am not aware of. I prefer to restore on the basis of the parallels known to me.

<18> (sa)mās <s>ā(rdham) ◇ *samās (s)ārddham* KR.

<19> -kaṇṭhikā-d_ṛa?<ā>ma ◇ -(*kaṇṭhikod*)(*dāma*- KR • The received reading is quite legible as it is, and parallels in the Nāgiyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II and the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant clearly read *kaṇṭhikā-dāma*.

<21> [bhuva]<22>m ◇ [*sama*]_ṛm KR • Restoring *bhuvam* is supported by the Nāgiyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II, the Masulipatam plates of Amma II, the Single Bhimavaram plate of a late Eastern Cālukya king, and the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant. I am not aware of any parallel of this stanza with *samam*.

<22> -[ripu-kṣmābhṛ]<23>d ◇ [----]<23>d KR • The lost text is attested in the Pulivaṛṛu (spurious?) grant of Amma I the Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava, the Single Bhimavaram plate of a late Eastern Cālukya king and the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant.

<23> pa_ṛt?<t>_ṛi_ṛ(ddh)?<(ṣṭh)>[o]{h} ◇ *p<r>a-ṛt?<s>iddho{h}* KR • I emend on the basis of the Pulivaṛṛu (spurious?) grant of Amma I, the Single Bhimavaram plate of a late Eastern Cālukya king and the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant. A differently corrupt variant is found in the Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava.

<24> (kṣatriyair) mmitrābh_ṛā?<aḥ> ◇ *kṣatriye mitrābhā<h>* KR.

<25> samārddham ◇ *samārddhām* KR. — <25> -pari(cuṁ)[bi]<26>[ta]- • Both the end of line 25 and the beginning of line 26 have enough space for the lost character *ta*. I assume with KR that it was at the beginning of line 26, where there is a crack in the plate, and the following *pā* is quite narrow. It is also possible that the plate was

already defective here and *ta* was at the end of the previous line, or that one or even two erroneous characters were inscribed there.

<30> °āha<31>r;ā?<a>t ◇ °āha<31>rat KR.

<31> bha(g)na○-rathān ◇ *bh(in)na-(ra)thān* KR • The text is metrically deficient by two syllables. The intended text may for instance have been *bhagna-manorathān*, but *bhagna-rathān* is in itself plausible and metrically correct where it is, so the missing syllables may need to be supplied after it (e.g. *bhagna-rathān nṛpān/arīn*). The loosely parallel stanza XII of the Guṇḍipoduṟu grant reads *Anyān apy ahitān samitsu sabalān nighnann*. — <31> -kollabigaṇḍa- ◇ *-kollabhigaṇḍa-* KR.

<33> garbbhe ◇ *garbhe* KR. — <33> -kaṇṭha-(yu)(jā?)<34>tta-vṛ;t!<tt>yā ◇ *-kaṇṭha-yuj ā<34>tta-vṛ;t!<tt>y;a?<ā>* KR • KR's *a* at the end of this locus is probably a typo. In other respects, his reading is the most plausible that I can arrive at, although I cannot make sense of it as received. The last consonant in line 33 could conceivably be *ṣ*, *p* or *b* and its vowel could be just about anything, but none of these yield a more interpretable text. As a desperate conjecture, I assume that the composer had intended *kaṇṭha-yuj ātma-vṛttyā*. See also the note to the translation.

<34> -janapārc(c)ita- ◇ *-janapārthika-* KR.

<35> (s)ādh;ō?<ā>raṇādhika- ◇ *(Ā)dhōraṇādhika-* KR. — <35> -gaj;ā?<ā>vasādāt ◇ *-gajāvasādāt<n>* KR. — <35> (A)[-v]<36>(tām) suciram ◇ *(Ā)[-v]<36>tāsu cīram* KR • The last extant character in line 35 is in my opinion more likely to be *A*, but I cannot rule out KR's *Ā* with absolute confidence. The lacuna may perhaps be restored as *anvarthatām*, but options abound, and I am unable to make sense of the latter half of the stanza. See also the note to the translation.

<36> gaja[sya]<<pri>>yatvaṁ ◇ *gaja-pr;i?<i>yatvaṁ* KR • Part of the originally inscribed subscript *y* was converted to a subscript *r*, and the end of *y* was incorporated into the following *ya*. I am, however, uncertain whether the post-correction text really reflects the composer's intention. Perhaps *gajāpriyatvam* or some third alternative was intended. — <36> [---]<Page 3v> <37> [---] (t)(a?) [-v]-janmā ◇ *[---]<Page 3v><37>[---]-janmā* KR • In addition to heavy damage, scribal omission may well be present here. The broken-off end of line 36 could hardly have accommodated more than three characters, and the corroded beginning of line 37 is likely to have had 3, at most 4 before the passably preserved *ta*. The vestiges after *ta* suggest *simi* or *siri*, but both are metrically incorrect and uninterpretable. Given that Amma II was the younger son of Bhīma II, I wonder if this word may have been *nimna-*. See also the note to the translation.

<37> u[r]v[īn] ◇ *urvvā?<ī>m* KR. — <37> dv(ai?)(māt)u(r)(o?) ◇ *dvāu?<ai>(māt)ura* KR. — <37> [~]<38> [~](d-a?)(rāti-) ◇ [~]<38> [~](d-a)rāti- KR • Here too I believe the characters were distributed differently across the line break from KR's edition. I accept his reading for the beginning of line 38, but am far from confident in it. The beginning of the lacuna may perhaps be restored as *mma-nṛpateḥ*, but I cannot suggest an appropriate continuation for this. Compare *dvaimituro mma-nṛpater ddānna-nṛpo rāja-bhīma-nṛpa-tanayaḥ* in the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya and *amma-nṛpater dvaimaturah* in the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant.

<38> -vargga<h> ◇ *-vargga* KR. — <38> <<śrī-rājanā(rā)ya(ṇa?)>>[ca. 2+] • I accept KR's reading of the epithet, but the last character is not recognisable. This segment, with the possible exception of the initial śrī, is engraved over partially deleted earlier text that I cannot restore. The character beneath *ja* was a conjunct with a superscript *repha*, possibly *rgga*. This was followed by *ma* (largely overlapping the PC *nā*), a conjunct involving a subscript *s*, another *ma* (mostly in the space between PC *rā* and *ya*), and something with the vowel *i* at the end. One or two characters are probably lost at the end, so the text may have been *śrī-rājanārāyaṇākhyah*, *śrī-rājanārāyaṇo yah* or *śrī-rājanārāyaṇa Iti*.

<40> pradhana- ◇ *praḍdh?<th>ana* KR • I do not find *prathana* better suited to the context and prefer to retain the received reading with a better sound effect. Compare *pradhana-pradhāna-puruṣān* (in a different context) in the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant. — <40> t[r]is{s}ras ◇ *t{r}isras* KR • The superfluous *r* has been hammered out in the original; the body of this character may also have been corrected.

<42> -<<bhūmir atrā>><tyandhā||?> <Atrā?>vasare|| ◇ *-bhūmir a<ndhaM|| A>trāvasare* KR • The restoration proposed by KR is both metrically and syntactically inappropriate. My own restoration is offered as a possible one. I assume that the omission was the result of eyeskip at a repetition of *trā*, and that the stanza was an *āryāgīti*. Both assumptions may be wrong (the metre may have been a *vallarī* like stanzas 19 and 20, with two fewer morae in the second hemistich), and some other words to a similar effect may have stood here. The situation is complicated by the presence of scribal correction, but none of the pre-correction text can be made out except for what looks like a subscript *ḍ* below the space between PC *mi* and *ra*; and a possible subscript *r* or the curved lower part of a different subscript consonant slightly to the right of PC *trā*.

<44> -maṇḍth?<ḍ>apasya ◇ *-maṇḍc?<ḍ>apasya* KR. — <44> -madhy[e]<<a>>- ◇ *-madhye* KR. — <44> śāsvaM?<T> ◇ *śāsvaT* KR.

<45> -sthagita- • This word does not seem to fit the context. I wonder if *skhalita* had been meant instead. Emending to *āsthagita* (or even *otsthagita*) would presuppose a

simpler scribal error, but neither of these forms seem to be attested anywhere. See also the translation. — <45> khaḥ!<d>ga- ◇ *khadga*- KR.

<46> tāyā<ḥ> ◇ *tāyā* KR • It would perhaps be better to supply an *anusvāra* here and to likewise emend the *visarga* at the end of the stanza to an *anusvāra*. — <46> sphuṭaṁ • KR’s editor (Sircar?) proposes emending this to *sphuṭataraṁ* for the sake of the metre. That would result in an *āryāgīti* stanza, but there is now plenty of evidence that the rare *vallārī* metre was used by the Cālukya court poets, including the next stanza of the present inscription.

<47> -badyemā<ḍi>?<dhi>pa- KR • I provisionally endorse KR’s emendation but since *adhipa* is rather redundant next to *mahārāja*, I wonder if *Ādipa* (or something similar) could instead be the name of another vanquished enemy. The closely parallel stanza 21 of the Guṇḍipoduṟu grant says, unmetrically: *yenājāv aḥitena badde-mahārājādāyo nirjitaḥ*, where the name is probably to be emended to *Baddema*. — <47> -mahārāj<ḍa>?<ā>day<ḍa>?<o> ◇ -*mahārājādāyo* KR. — <47> urasā parikṣata- • KR remarks in a footnote that “The idea of this quarter of the stanza is not quite clear.” With the parallel in the Guṇḍipoduṟu grant, it is now certain that the passage speaks about assassins. Given that information, I wonder if *aparikṣita-caraḥ* (plural nominative masculine) had been intended here. However, that would leave me unable to fit *urasā* into the sentence, so I retain the received reading and interpret *parikṣata-caraḥ* as a singular nominative masculine. See also the translation.

<48> <’>d[e]<a>rśayad ◇ *darśayad* KR • Scribal correction may be more extensive here. The characters *loke da* are compressed and have more background noise than the surrounding surface of the plate, but no other remnants of deleted characters can be made out. — <48> asamaṁ ◇ *asamaḥ* KR. — <48> -śaktiva<r>mmādhipaḥ ◇ -*śaktivarmmādhipaḥ* KR. — <48> parih[(u)]<<r>>tya d<ye>?<ai>tya- ◇ *parihṛtya daitya*- KR • Scribal correction may have been more extensive, possibly affecting each of the characters *hṛtya daitya*.

<50> cā<ḷi>ū<u>kya- ◇ *cālukya*- KR.

<52> *ādhināth<ḍi>?<a> ◇ **ādhināṭṭh*?<th>a KR. — <52> -bāhā- ◇ -*bāhū*- KR. — <52> -balā<ḍi>M?<T> ◇ -*balāT* KR.

<53> -sarvvalokā<ḍi>?<ś>raya- ◇ *sarvvalokā(śra)ya* KR • The characters *lokā* are probably a correction from something else, and there also may be a corrected character beneath *tra*, but there is no sign of *tra* having been corrected to *śra*.

<54> -bhaṭṭ<ḍa>?<ā>raka- ◇ -*bhaṭṭāraka*- KR.

<56> *(varāja-dauvārikādhyakṣam i)<ḍi>(th)?<t>(tham ājñāpayati)<.> (yathā||) ◇ [*ca*.

7×]rikāddhyakṣā[...] KR • The outer face of the last extant plate is badly corroded; see also the commentary. This passage, although barely legible, can be safely restored on the basis of the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya. — <56> (brahmānva)ye (va)r(iyāN bhā)radvā(ja-rṣi)° ◇ [...]py a. ye varīyāḥ (bhāra)dvājābdhi° KR.

<57> (r apara) j(yi)!<I>va dha(rmm)ḷ(e?)?<i>(ṣ?)ḷ(t?)?<th>(a?)[h?] ◇ °r ap(ā)ra[...] KR • The reading up to dharmm is quite secure, but I have doubts about reading dharmmeṣṭa and emending to dharmmiṣṭha. Also, the first noted ancestor does not appear to be named. — <57> [--](nvaya-varddhayitā puṇy?)[o] [----](sa?)ka(la-śā)stro jḷa?<ā>taḥ|| ◇ [...]kala-śāstro jātaḥ KR.

<58> °(t tas)ya sutas sat(ām kṛ?)[----](vennamayyāhvayaḥ|?) ◇ t tasya sutas satyakā(ma vā) [ca. 3×] cāryyā(hvayaḥ|) sa(tya) [ca. 6×] karmma-nirato yo KR • The second instance of satya in KR's reading is probably what I read as suta. I see nothing discernible where he reads cāryyāhvayaḥ|. — <58> (sādhus sā)(dhujanīna?)-(karmma-nirato ya)<59>(ś co)danā-co(ditaḥ||) ◇ sa(tya) [ca. 6×] karmma-nirato yo<59>(r)tth(air dāna)-coditaḥ|| KR.

<59> [----](ti-śāl?)ḷi?<i>nān nayavatā(m?) [-](pū?)(rvva)m ā(śr)ḷ(i)?<ā>vaṇa- ◇ [ca. 9×] litan nayavatām sārddham āśravaṇa KR.

<60> -pratyā<60>śrāvaṇa-(pu?)○(ṣṭa?) [----](mayyo?) (mahā-yajñiyaḥ|) ◇ - pratyā<60>śrava(ṇa)yāṣṭa [ca. 8×] mahāyajñīyaḥ| KR.

<61> tasya [-](sā?) ○ [ca. 8×] ◇ tasya sū [...] KR. — <61> [ca. 2×](vir vvirā-jadeva?)[(Itya?)][<<(na?) i>>ty ajani dvija-kulo<62>t(t)amas (sū)(nuḥ|?) ◇ [...]m-ādityo jani dvija-kulo<62>t(ta)mah|| jāta KR • The reading shown as uncertain are extremely tentative and alternative possibilities abound, but I have found none that are more coherent. It seems quite certain that the characters Itya were first engraved, then deleted and re-engraved one position further to the right. The scope of the correction may have extended further to the left, but due to the amount of damage there, this cannot be ascertained. The character engraved over the PC I appears to be na with quite a bit of empty space to its left. The preceding character is very probably va, but the one before it may well be ḍ, l or p, and the vowel e is very uncertain, although a long vowel is likely here on account of the metre. If the name is indeed Virājadevana, then the preceding text may for instance have been sukavir or, reading dvi instead of rvvi, nayavid.

<62> (de)vā(n) ta(r)ppa(y)(itā pi?)tḷi!<f>(mś) ca v(i)ḷ(th)?<dh>(iva)[d yo?] (havya-kavyā)(d?)i(bhir?) ◇ [ca. 4×] ma [ca. 5×] (ta)t<vaś ca va [ca. 4×] vyākara(ṇa) KR. — <62> (yyaḥ p)rḷā?<a>kṣālana-vāriṇāti(th)i<63>-(padām?) pra(kṣāli)tā(m)gho-malaḥ ◇ [ca. 2×] prakṣālana-vāriṇātiśi<63>[ca. 2×] prakṣāli(ta)-pā(pa)-malaḥ KR.

⟨63⟩ -vita(te)(r ṇṇe?)tā ◇ -(vitate)r ṇṇaṭi?⟨tyā⟩ KR • The character read as *r ṇṇe* is slightly awkward and the strokes comprising its top part are unclear, but there is little doubt that the scribe had meant it to be *r ṇṇe*. The straightforward emendation would be *r nne*, but I am not happy with *netā* in the context and propose that the composer's intention was probably -vitater nnātho. — ⟨63⟩ sāhāyya⟨64⟩(m u?)p(e)tṭe?⟨a⟩vān nija- ◇ sāhāyyā⟨64⟩pate [1×] n nija- KR.

⟨64⟩ khaṭṭi!⟨d⟩gasya ◇ khaḍḍgasya KR. — ⟨64⟩ (bhāra)dvā[[dvā]]⟨⟨ja⟩⟩- • The scope of correction is probably larger. I believe that *bhā*, *ra* or (most likely) *ja* had been omitted at first, then *bhāradvāja* was re-inscribed in the space formerly occupied by three characters, the last of which was *dvā*. — ⟨64⟩ pr(ā)g nāma-mātr(e)ṇa ◇ [1×] ma māṭṭiṭi?⟨ṭ⟩ṇāṇ KR. — ⟨64⟩ svaṇ⟨65⟩(go)tra(m) parivarttamā(na)m asamo (n)i(stā?)r(yy)a vistṭiṭi?⟨ā⟩r(i)-dhīḥ ◇ sva⟨65⟩-gotra-parivarttamāna-ma(mano) [3×] yudhi sthira-dhīḥ KR.

⟨65⟩ ⟨'⟩bhavaṭṭi?⟨d⟩ guṇa-⟨ni⟩dhi(r) yyo va⟨m⟩śa-ka ◇ bhavan guṇa-vīryya-vasa(ka) KR.

Translation

Plates

⟨1–9⟩ 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 Mahāseṇa, 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 Jayasimha (I), for thirty-three. His younger brother Indrarāja's (Indra Bhaṭṭāraka's) son Viṣṇuvardhana (II), for nine. His son Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five. His son Jayasimha (II), for thirteen. His younger brother, Kokkili, for six months. After dethroning him, his eldest brother Viṣṇuvardhana (III), for thirty-seven. His son Vijayāditya (I) Bhaṭṭāraka, for eighteen. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (IV), for thirty-six.

1.

His son, brilliant as the sun, constructed—according to the count of his battles—a

staggering one hundred and eight temples of the blue-necked (Śiva), abodes of virtuous men complete with villages and parks and replete with graceful (dancing?) ladies. Steadfast as a hero, he ruled (*bhuj-*) the earth for forty years and eight as king (*narendra*), renowned among the populace by the name Vijayāditya (II, Narendramṛgarāja).

2.

Always causing the crops consisting of flocks of the destitute, the blind, Brahmins, courtesans and supplicants to attain complete satisfaction by a shower of outstanding gifts, his son Kali Viṣṇuvardhana (V) is said to have protected (*pā-*) the earth for a year and a half.¹

⟨14⟩ His dear son—

3.

The fearless-hearted lord who with his own flashing sword gleefully caused the uppermost member (head) of King (*rājan*) Maṅgi to topple from his body to the field of battle as lightning ⟨causes⟩ the summit ⟨to topple⟩ from a towering mountain to the earth; who ⟨by⟩ intrepidly driving the one named the Kannara ⟨along⟩ with Śaṁkila from the spacious inhabited land into the badlands (*durgama*) ⟨and⟩ pressing them swiftly into a forest fire (*dāva*), protected the one named Baddega.

4.

That majestic King Vijayāditya (III, Guṇaga) enjoyed (*bhuj-*) the earth for forty and four years together with his four brothers.²

5.

His brother Prince (*bhūpati*) Vikramāditya, the good general of the army whose neck was garlanded with the flashing locket (of the heir-apparent), had a judicious son:

6.

He, the dear Cālukya-Bhīma—who ⟨was⟩ like a mother to the destitute, the helpless and the sick, to the congregation of excellent Brahmins, to supplicants, to ascetics, as well as to clever Brahmin pupils (*vaṭu*), actors, good singers and poets arriving from various lands, because he presented them with the objects of their desires and protected them—ruled (*bhuj-*) the earth for thirty years.

¹See the apparatus to line 13 for the textual problem in this stanza.

²KR in his commentary interprets the text to mean that Vijayāditya III's reign lasted 44 and a half years, rather than 44 as usually recorded. I agree with his editor (Sircar) that *sārdham* simply means "together with," not "and a half."

7.

His son—who with the sword <held in> his arm crushed enemy rulers; who, having forcibly conquered the eastern (*vāsavi*) region, established a victory pillar in Viraja; the craftiest one in battle who ascended a balance scale with gold; who is surely incomparable to <any other> *kṣatriyas* on the surface of this earth—protected (*rakṣ-*) the earth for half a year as Vijayāditya (IV, Kollabigaṇḍa), brilliant as the sun (*mitra*).³

8.

His son—the lotus of whose feet was kissed all over by bees that were the jewels dangling from the heads of prostrate enemies, and who mocked (Mount) Meru with the brilliance of a heap of gold that was on a par (with Meru)⁴—protected (*pā-*) the earth for seven years as Ammarāja (I).

9.

After assaulting and effortlessly dethroning his son the child Vijayāditya (V), Lord (*adhipati*) Tālā protected (*pā-*) the earth for one month.

10.

After defeating him in battle, King (*bhūmipati*) Cālukya-Bhīma's son, King (*bhūpa*) Vikramāditya (II), protected the earth for eleven months.

11.

Then, King (*rājan*) Tālāpa's son King (*dharādhiśa*) Yuddhamalla, a lord of kindly speech, protected the land for seven years.

12.

The son of the majestic Vijayāditya (IV) named Kollabigaṇḍa, Bhīma (II) of terrific (*bhīma*) prowess, ruled (*bhuj-*) the earth, (viewed) with respect, for twelve years. By a raid dislodging Yuddhamalla, who was girt for battle, he removed him from the land; and he also shattered the hopes (or chariots)? of [...] enemies, both civilised and uncivilised.⁵

13.

³See the apparatus to line 23 for textual problems with this stanza. Vijayāditya IV's ascension of a balance scale is also mentioned in close proximity to his erection of a victory pillar in Viraja in stanza 32 of the Diggubārṇu grant of Bhīma II. According to KR's discussion, Vijayāditya "conquered king Vāsava", but as his editor (Sircar?) bluntly points out, the text mentions no such king; *vāsavi* qualifies *āśā*, meaning the eastern direction.

⁴Or perhaps: with the brilliance of the heap of gold that had been weighed (in the balance against him).

⁵A word has been omitted in the second quarter of this stanza; see the apparatus to line 31.

His son known as Ammarāja (II), who already in the womb was possessed of a neck decorated with the locket (of the heir-apparent), donned *ḥ*at his own initiative? the turban of kingship honoured by all rulers, and always fostered the cause of the gods and gods-on-earth (Brahmins).⁶

14.

Because of <his> above-average (skill at the) suppression of enemy elephants in the midst of battle, his name Tribhuvanāṅkuśa (the elephant-goad of the three worlds) became permanently *ḥ*appropriate, even while his fondness for elephants gained successful expression in his heroic victories over lions.⁷

15.

<Amma II, who was> born [...], protected (*rakṣ-*) the earth for twenty-five years. <His brother> born of a different mother [...] groups of enemies: (Dānārṇava,) the handsome son of His Majesty King Bhīma (II).⁸

<38> [Called] His Majesty Rājanārāyaṇa,

16.

Dānārṇava, who completely surpassed the generosity of Karṇa and whose footstool was coloured by the gems in the diadems of kings—a treasury of knowledge and a treasury to learned men, distinguished in the fray—ruled (*bhuj-*) the entire earth for three years.

17.

After King (*bhūmipati*) Dānārṇava, due to an act of fate this land of Āndhra was bereft of a king for twenty-seven years, completely dark like a moonless night.

<42> On this occasion,

⁶The reading and interpretation of part of this stanza is problematic; see also the apparatus to line 33. KR interpreted the text to mean that Amma II was “born with an ornament-like tissue around his neck”, but I agree with his editor (Sircar?), whose footnote says, “In fact ... Amma II was declared heir-apparent even when he was in the womb of his mother”. I translate the text as emended by me, and believe that the composer intended a contrast between the *yuvārāja*’s locket, which was bestowed on Amma when he had no say in the matter, and the royal turban, which he took as an act of will.

⁷I translate with the lost word restored as suggested in the apparatus to line 36. Even so, the syntax of the second half is ambiguous and does not reveal whose fondness for elephants and whose heroic victory is meant, nor how a lion enters the picture. Lions are conventionally the arch-enemies of elephants, so my attempt at translation is not impossible, but it is grammatically quite awkward, especially because “lion” and “victory” are clearly in the singular.

⁸Several parts of this stanza are lost or illegible. The second hemistich seems to be about Dānārṇava, and the first about Amma II.

18.

The son of Queen Āryā and that King Dāna, called Śaktivarman and equipped with the triad of powers (*śakti*), endowed with political sense (*naya*), discipline (*vinaya*) and valour—

19.

who is as bright as the moon, so that his fame is like lime whitewash {nectar} for the palace that is the universe, and the effusion of his glory {light} shines permanently like a lamp in the middle of that (palace)—

20.

the concealed pearls of the forehead globes of whose enemies' elephants shine open to view when he splits the surface (of those globes), strung like a string of flowers on the liana that is his sword—⁹

21.

who, aglow with wounds, attained fame (even) in childhood (*bālya*) in the battle with the Colas;¹⁰ who routed the overly conceited King (*mahārāja*) Badyema and others; who demonstrated his own fortitude, unrivalled in the world, by killing the assassins sent by his enemies (even) while he was wounded in the chest¹¹—the King (*adhipa*) His Majesty Śaktivarman.

22.

Mentally laughing at (the divine) Nārāyaṇa, (thinking,) “he is said to have defeated the hosts of demons (*daitya*) in olden days by abandoning his own form and taking recourse to faked identities like the Fish,” this Cālukya-Nārāyaṇa (Śaktivarman), in

⁹My translation involves stretching the boundaries of syntax and compound structure to the extreme in order to accommodate the unexpected word *sthaḡita* in the original which, if deliberate, was probably meant to countered by *sphuṭam*. If *sthaḡita* is a mistake for a word meaning something like “revealed,” then a much easier translation would be: “the string of pearls revealed by whose splitting of the surface of the forehead globes of his enemies' elephants shine clearly like a string of flowers on the liana that is his sword—”. For a similar image, compare verse 15 of the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya.

¹⁰According to KR, the same battle is referred to as *draṃiḷāhava* in the Pabhuparṇu grant of Śaktivarman. Apparently (Krishna Rao 1965, p. 191), this grant has only been published in the *Āndhra Sāhitya Parishad Patrikā*, and neither the original nor any good facsimiles remain available. However, the Guṇḍipoduṛu grant of Śaktivarman has now been edited and refers, probably, to the same episode as *drāviḍa-saṅggare*, so understanding *caulika* to refer to some Coḷa rulers is probably warranted even though Śaktivarman eventually married a Coḷa princess and reclaimed the throne of Veṅḡi with his father-in-law's support. KR's interpretation that “a battle for the Coḷas/Tamils” is meant is not impossible, but rather forced. KR further notes that *bālya* probably indicates an age up to 16 years, as defined in Dharmaśāstras.

¹¹See the apparatus to line 47 for a slight uncertainty in this passage.

addition to having cast down his (other) enemies, (put) to death in battle His Majesty the masterful King (*adhipa*) Coḍa-Bhīma, who was a likeness of Rāvaṇa.¹²

23.

Churning with the power of his own arms the ocean of the army (*rathinī*) of the lord of Utkalikā—<this ocean> in which the sea monsters (*makara*) are fearsome, inexorable,¹³ raging elephants, in which the crocodiles (*nakra*) are processions of heroes, which swells with water that is blood and tumbles with thousands of strings of waves which are horses—this Cālukya-Nārāyaṇa seizes in battle the Royal Fortune (*śrī*) belonging to that <lord of Utkalikā> (as the divine Nārāyaṇa churned the ocean and seized the goddess Śrī who had belonged to that ocean).

<53–56> That shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), His Majesty Viṣṇuvardhana, the supremely pious Supreme Lord (*parameśvara*), the Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*), the Supreme Sovereign (*parama-bhaṭṭāraka*) and supreme devotee of Maheśvara, convokes all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Varāṇāṇḍu district (*viṣaya*), and, witnessed by the minister (*mantrin*), the chaplain (*purohita*), the general (*senāpati*), the crown prince (*yuvarāja*) and the gate guard (*dauvārika*), commands them as follows. To wit:

24.

In a lineage of Brahmins, there was born the excellent and most righteous [...], like a new sage Bhāradvāja, the enricher of his lineage, holy (*punya*), [...] <familiar with> all the treatises.

¹²Given the first hemistich, one would expect the stanza to say that Cālukya-Nārāyaṇa laughs at the divine Nārāyaṇa because he does not need a false guise to defeat his enemies. This is indeed how RK summarises the stanza, but I see no way to finding that meaning in the text. The second hemistich is an awkward jumble of words. Most jarringly, it lacks a verbal form to express the action. Moreover, it uses surprisingly flattering terminology (*īśa* and *śrī*) for the enemy Coḍa-Bhīma, and while *api* ought to imply a contradiction (“even though he had first cast down his enemies”), I see no such thing, nor any need for a reference to enemies in general here. Conversely, there is nothing in the second hemistich about Cālukya-Nārāyaṇa doing so in his own form, nor is there a counterpart here to *prāk*, “in olden days.” The only point where the second hemistich matches the first is that this human Nārāyaṇa defeats an enemy likened to Rāvaṇa, who was defeated by the divine Nārāyaṇa in the form of Rāma. The text on the plate is quite clearly legible and includes only one evident scribal mistake (*āśāsta*), where the composer’s original intent is quite straightforward (*āpāsta*). I wonder if perhaps the fourth quarter belongs originally to a different stanza. Two stanzas may have been either cobbled together badly by a clumsy composer, or a quarter of the first and three quarters of the second may have been omitted by an inattentive scribe.

¹³I am somewhat baffled by the juxtaposition of *vāraṇa* and *ibha*, both normally meaning “elephant.” It may be that two different kinds of elephants were meant by the composer, but neither of these words has the connotation of a particular sort of elephant. I therefore prefer to take *vāraṇa* in the less common sense of “invincible.”

25.

He had a son ¿named Vennamayya?, [...] of the truthful, honourable and engaged in acts ¿befitting honourable men?, driven by (Vedic) injunction, [...] of those rich in [...] and possessed of diplomacy (*naya*), with [...] boosted by the ritual calls (*āśravaṇa*) and the ritual responses (*pratyāśravaṇa*) [...] a great practitioner of sacrifices.

26.

Then that one named Vennamayya [...] had a son born, [...] ¿named Virājadevana?, the most excellent of his priestly family.

27.

He duly gratifies the gods as well as the ancestors (*pitṛ*) by sacrificial offerings (*havya*) and oblations (*kavya*) and suchlike. His stains of sin have been washed off by the water of the ablutions <offered> to the feet of his guests. He is eternally a ¿leader?¹⁴ granting the beneficial objects of their desire to the flock of the learned, his relatives and the destitute. He has come to the aid of his own lord's <administrative> affairs (*kārya*) as well as his sword.

28.

This peerless repository of virtues, with extensive acumen, has surpassed even that sage Bhāradvāja whose intellect is praised by savants, ¿as that <sage> rescued his lineage (*gotra*), which was deteriorating, merely by <granting it> his name, while he did so by? [...] ¹⁵

Commentary

3.

KR, in my opinion, misunderstands this stanza in his discussion, stating first that Vijayāditya III chased Kannara and Śaṅkila into the impregnable country, but then adding in a note that this “impregnable country was evidently the kingdom of Baddega”. He may have done so on the assumption that his restoration *durggamān* (with sandhi for *durggamāt*) was a singular ablative qualifying *janapadāt*, but the much better preserved

¹⁴Or perhaps “patron”? See the apparatus to line 63.

¹⁵The end of this stanza is lost, and the reading of the extant part is not entirely certain. The gist of the verse probably ran along lines similar to what is translated here. The name Bhāradvāja may refer to the patriarch Bharadvāja himself (with the first syllable lengthened for the sake of the metre), or it may indicate a famous personage descended from him, possibly Droṇa, the son of Bharadvāja, who in spite of being a Brahmin was famed for his skill with weapons.

parallel version clearly reads *durggaman* (with sandhi for *durggamam*), which I find to be better in context, establishing a contrast between *janapada* and *durggama*.¹⁶ KR's editor (probably Sircar) also thinks that the badlands are not identical to Baddega's homeland. KR's interpretation also states that Guṇaga Vijayāditya "protected Baddega from fear". However, it can only be Vijayāditya himself who is described here as fearless.

Sandhi-obscured caesura in v12 (śārdūlavikrīḍita) c. The break between pādas c and d is obscured by sandhi in v22 (also śārdūlavikrīḍita).

The outer side of the last extant plate is heavily corroded and in many places illegible or barely legible. With the photos of the original, I have been able to provide a reading for most of it. Text shown on this plate as unclear may be almost clear to almost completely indistinct so long as it is confidently readable in the context, but minor details such as scribal mistakes may in fact be different than shown here. Text shown as unclear with low certainty is poorly legible to all but lost and tentatively reconstructed from the vestiges. Text shown as supplied includes no interpretable vestiges and is tentatively reconstructed from context. My numbering of stanzas, which I believe to be correct, differs slightly from the numbering in KR's edition as well as from that in an earlier version of this digital edition created without access to the original.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1917–18, p. 13, appendix A/1917–18, № 15 with some further details at ARIE 1917–18, pp. 132–133, § 5. Edited from inked impressions by B. V. Krishna Rao(1965), with facsimiles but no translation.¹⁷ The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Krishna Rao's edition with his facsimiles (offset printed in small size) and with photographs taken by myself in February 2023 at the Andhra Sahitya Parishad Museum, Kakinada. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[KR] Krishna Rao, Bhavaraju Venkata. 1965. "Andhra Sahitya Parishad plates of Saktivarman." *Epigraphia Indica* 36, pp. 191–198.

¹⁶The Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava reportedly also read *durggamān*. If this can be confirmed from a facsimile, then the same reading may also be acceptable here, but it should still be construed as a plural accusative (*durggamān* scil. *deśān*), not a singular ablative.

¹⁷This article was published posthumously. EI received its manuscript in 1956. The editor of EI (Sircar, according to the title page) thoroughly revised the text before publication.

Secondary

ARIE 1917–18. G.O. No. 1172, 6th September 1918. *Epigraphy. Recording, with remarks, the progress report of the Assistant Archaeological Superintendent for epigraphy, Southern Circle, for the year 1917-1918*. Edited by H. Krishna Sastri. No place, 1918.

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