

Koṇḍaṇagūru grant of Indra Bhaṭṭāraka

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00053

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00053.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 M looks rather like a check mark, at head height. Final T looks like a slightly reduced ta, possibly with a different stroke in place of its headmark (l18, l34), or clearly without a headmark in line 34. Final N is a slightly simplified na without a headmark (l26). Rare final ḷ in l28-29 (3 times) and l37. All instances of the latter are unclear; those in l28-29 seem like regular ḷa with a curved horizontal stroke attached to the head, while that in l37 appears to be a reduced ḷa with a curved vertical stroke in place of a headmark.

Original punctuation marks, if present in the inscription, may be plain vertical bars and perhaps a median dot. See the apparatus to lines 14, 19, 28 and 33 for potential punctuation marks.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is normally on top of the character to which it belongs, but occasionally apparently atop the next character ((l19 muṇḍjuṇūru, possibly l37 °āśaṁ for °āśā).

Edition

Seal

<1> śrī-tyāgadhenu

Plates

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <01> svasti

<1> śr(i)matām sakala-bhuvana-sa(rn)stūyamāna-mā(na)vya-sa(go)<2>tr_ia?<ā>nām
hārīti-putrānām svāmi-mahāsena-p_ia?<ā>dānu(dhyā)<3>tānām kauś_i?<i>kī-vara-
prasāda-labdha-rājy_ia?<ā>n(ām) bhagava(n-nārā)ya_n?<n>a-pra<4>sāda-samāsādita-
varāha-lāñchane(kṣa)ṇa-(kṣa)ṇa-va(śik)_i(ri)!<ṛ>tā(śe)ṣa<Page 2r><5>mahī(bhṛt)ām
(Aśva)m(e)dh(āvabhṛtha-snāna-pavi)t(rik)_i(ri)!<ṛ>ta-m(ānasa)-(śarīrā?)<6>(ṇā)M
s(v)a-yaśo-(v)iṣay(ik)_i(ri)!<ṛ>(ta)-tr(ailokyā)nā(M) ca(!)ukyānā(M) ku<7>lam
ala(rnk)_i(ri)!<ṛ>tya ni(ja)-ja(n)man_i(ah)?<ā>virājamān_iāh?<asya>śrī-kī<r>ttivarmma-
mahā<8>(rā)jasya naptā śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārāja_ih?<sya>raṇa-mukha-
gata-ripu<Page 2v><9>-vijaya-samupalabdha-śrī-vadhū-nivāsāyamāna-vipula-
vak_i!<ah>-sthala<10>sya putraḥ śakti-traya-samadhigat_ia?<o> mahā-khyāti-
vibhūti(h) tri<11>vargga-sevā-nipuṇaḥ purāṇa-puruṣa Iva bahu-loka-stu<12>taḥ
purārātir iva bhūta-gaṇa-priyaḥ dviṭīya Iva makaradhvajah<Page 3r><13>pañ-
cama Iva lokapālāḥ _ipridhagra?<prthāgra>-suta Iva satya-sandhaḥ śar_iā?<a>(t)-
k(ā)la (I)va<14> kṛta-bandhu-jīvotsava(h) pūrvvācal[o]<<e>>ndra Iva mitro-
dayānukūla<15>-mahim_iā!<ah> mahīpati-makuṭa-taṭa-ghaṭita-mahā-ratna-marīci-
ma<16>ñjarī-rañjita-caraṇāravinda-yuga_i!<l>aḥ śrīndrava<r>mma-mahārājaḥ
tyā<17>ga-dhen_iyā?<v-a>para-nāma-dheyah Udaka-pūrv(v)akarṇ sarvva-karā!a-
parihāropetaM<Page 3v><18> (b)rahmad_ia?<e>y(i)k(r)tya koṇḍaṇagūru-nāma
grāma{grāma}M prādāt

tasya grāmasya<19> (d)ig-(v)ibhāgā(h)<.> Uttarataḥ muṃjuṇūru nāma grāma<h><.>
pūrvvataḥ pagu(nū)ru nāma grā<20>maḥ<.> dakṣiṇa-vibhāg_ia?<ā>vasthitaḥ
ceṇupūru nāma grāma<h><.> pa(ś)c(i)mataḥ Irb(u)<21>(l)i nāma gr_ia?<ā>maḥ<.>
Eteṣāṃ grāmāṇāṃ maddhye{m} niv_ia?<ā>sī-kṛtaḥ<.> vājasaneya-ca<22>(ra)ṇasya
du<r>ggaśa<r>mmanāḥ brahma-vihita-karmma-niratasya Irṛaḥ(ūr)-boya
nāma<Page 4r><23> (brāhmaṇa?)sya pautrāya Abhijana-v_iī?<i>dyā-v_iri!<ṛ>tta-
vataḥ bhāradvā(ja)-sa(go)tra<24>sya viṣṇuśarmmanāḥ putrāya vedavid-
vipra-saṃstūyamāna-caritā(ya)<25> ceṇḍīśarmmaṇe mātā-pitror ātmanaś ca
puṇy_io?<ā>vāptaye

Iti (ca)<26> bhāvino rāja<r>ṣiN yathopacāra-purassaraM sammānayaṭi

Āryy(ā)<27>hū-va(m)śa-gagana-tilaka-bhūta-(r/k)ṇ(ḍi)varmmaṇo mahārājasyāgra-
sut<ja-!<Page 4v><28>ndrava(r)mma{(ṇa?)}-(n)āma-dheya-vi<ṇj?<jñ>āpanayā<.> ta-
syā<ṇjā?<jñā>ptir <o?<e>vaM Ālapāka-(boḷ)<29> [2×](ppi-boḷ) somayājula-veḷlekki-
boḷ mārāṭa-boḷ

Api ca mohā(l lobhā)<30>d vā yaḥ kaścīd vighna-karttā{ra} sa pañca-mahāpātaka-
yukto bhaviṣyati<.> Iti ca<31> veda-vyā<sa>sya śloka<a?<ā>ś cātra

1. Anuṣṭubh

nighnato □ bha<r>t<ri!<r>-go-vipra-
-bāla-yoṣit-(t)a<32>pasvinaḥ
yā gatis sā bhava<t?<d>vṛttiM
harata<ḥ> śāsanāṅkitāM

2. Anuṣṭubh

ṣaṣṭim{ma} varṣa-sa<Page 5r><33>h<ā?<a>srāṇi
svargge tiṣṭhati bhūmi-da(ḥ)
Ākṣeptā cānumant<a?<ā> ca
tāny eva na<34>[(ra)]○rake vaseT

3. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhir vva<su>dhā dattā
bahubhiś cā(nu)pālītā
yasya ya<35>sya yad(ā bh)ūmi<s>
tasya tasya tadā phalaM

Iti

kanakarāma-li(kh)i<36>te śā<ś?<s>ane catu<ḥ>ṣaṣ<ṭh?<t>y-<ā?<a><m>ś<a?<ā>ḥ<.>
Eteṣā<m> nāmānām Ekaikā<m>śaḥ □

<37> [ca. 2×](pājñā?) <kum!<?<ā>ekāmśa(m?) (c/v)(o?)ḍa-boḷ t<ri!<r>t<i?<i>yā<śam?<mśa><ḥ>

<Page 5v>

Apparatus

Plates

<3> -(nārā)ya<n?<n>a- ◇ -(nārā)yaṇa- EH. — <3> mahī(bhṛt)ām ◇ mahībhṛtām EH •

Hultzsich's edition prints literally “*mahībhṛitām*[=*]”, which I interpret to mean that he reads a final *M* here and normalises to *m* (in an *akṣara* with the following *a*). In the facsimile the text seems to have an *anusvāra*.

<5> -(śarīrā?)° EH • I accept Hultzsich's reading, shown as unclear in his edition, but cannot confirm it from the facsimile, in which nothing can be made out here. It seems possible that four rather than three characters were engraved here.

<7> -ja(n)man_i(aḥ)?<ā> virājamān_iāḥ?<asya> ◇ -janman_iaḥ?<ā> virājamān_iāḥ?<aḥ> EH • Hultzsich offers both of his emendations tentatively. I agree with the first (though it is also possible that the composer's intent had been *alanīkṛta-nija-janmanah*), but disagree with the second, which I prefer to emend so that it agrees with *kīrttivarmma-mahārājasya*.

<8> -gata- ◇ -_ig?<ś>ata- EH • I consider Hultzsich's emendation unnecessary. — <8> -samadhigat_ia?<o> ◇ -*samadhigata*- EH • I prefer to see the end of a compound here, since being equipped with the three *śaktis* is listed as a separate item in numerous grants of the dynasty.

<14> -jīvotsava(h) EH • I accept Hultzsich's reading (which he prints as clear), but the last character looks in the estampage rather like a vertical bar.

<19> -(v)ibhāgā(h)<.> ◇ -*vibhāgā*<h>| EH • Hultzsich may be correct in reading the sign as a punctuation mark, but it looks more like a *visarga* to me; compare the note on line 14 above. — <19> munjuṇūru- ◇ *mujumṇūru*- EH • The *anusvāra* is on top of *ju*, but I assume it is to be read after *mu*.

<20> Irb(u)<21>(l)i- ◇ *Irbba*<21>(l)i- EH • In the estampage, the last character in line 20 is almost certainly *rbu*, not *rbba*. The village Irbuli is mentioned in line 11 of the Kopparam plates of Pulakeśin II as being in proximity to the village Koṇḍacerupūr, which I believe is identical to the Cerupūru of the present grant.

<22> Irṛaḷ(ūr)- ◇ *Irṛalū(r)*- EH • The *l* in EH's edition is probably a typo, since the consonant is clear in the estampage. The subscript of that consonant may perhaps be a second consonant, but it is most likely the vocalisation *ū* as read by Hultzsich.

<23> (brāhmaṇa?)sya • Here too I accept EH's reading, but cannot confirm it from the estampage. There may have been only two characters engraved here. — <23> -v_iī?<i>dyā- ◇ *vidyā*- EH.

<25> Iti (ca) • Hultzsich construes these words with the preceding sentence, but to me the lack of sandhi before them, as well as the context, suggest that they go with the following one. See my translation and commentary for details.

<26> Āryy(ā)<27>hū- • Could āryyāhva have been intended here? The vowel at the end of line 23 may also be o instead of ā.

<27> -(r/k)ṇ(ḍi)varmmaṇo ◇ -ko(ṇḍi)varmmaṇā EH • I think the ṇ at the end of this word has a quite clear second vowel stroke attached at the bottom left. See my translation and commentary about how my interpretation differs from that of Hultzsich here. The first character of the name looks like ro in the estampage; if it was intended for ko, then it has no headmark. The second character may have been corrected from something else. Its consonants are probably intended to be ṇḍ, but ḍ is attached to the right of ṇ rather than to the bottom (as e.g. in l25, ceṇḍiśarmmaṇe). The vowel marker includes a second curved stroke to the left of a recognisable i. — <27> āgra-sutja- I<Page 4v><28>ndrava(r)mma{(ṇa?)}-nāma-dheya- ◇ āgra-suta I<Page 4v><28>ndravar-mma{(ṇa)-ṇa?<ā>madheyḍa?<o> EH • I feel quite sure that all of this sequence describes the petitioner, so the words are technically in compound (in fact simply being used without case endings). See my translation and commentary about how my interpretation differs from that of Hultzsich here. Hultzsich's nama may be a typo in the edition, since the ā is the clearest part of the character nā; his emendation concerns the locus as a whole, not this particular character. In the facsimile, I see nothing of Hultzsich's ṇa. The damaged space is slightly wider than expected for ṇa, but I assume that Hultzsich read this character correctly. If so, this genitive ending, though syntactically incorrect here, is nonetheless in my opinion an indication that I am correct to interpret all of this stretch as a description of the petitioner.

<28> -viḍṇj?<jṇ>āpanayā<.> tasyāḍṇjā?<jṇa>ptir ḍo?<e>vaM ◇ -viḍṇj?<jṇ>āpanayā tasyāḍṇjā?<jṇa>ptir?<h>.<.> ḍo?<E>vaM EH • See my translation and commentary about how my interpretation differs from that of Hultzsich here. There is in fact a dot at median height after this word, which may be a punctuation mark or the remnant of one.

<30> bhaviṣyati<.> Iti (ca) ◇ bhaviṣyatḍi I?<ī>ti (ca)<.> EH • Hultzsich construes Iti ca with the preceding sentence, but to me the lack of sandhi before these words, as well as the context, suggest that they go with the following one. See the translation for my interpretation.

<31> nighnato □ • After this word, there is a thick, roughly horizontal line at about median height, occupying about one character width. This may be a pre-existing defect in the copper surface that the engraver skipped, or it may be an aborted character.

<33> bhūmi-da(h) ◇ bhūmi-da<h> EH • If Hultzsich is correct in reading a punctuation mark here, then this may be the only punctuation mark in the charter. It thus seems more likely to me that we have a visarga here, similar to the apparent vertical bar read by Hultzsich as a visarga in line 14. — <33> na<34>[(ra)]○rake • In line 34 above the

hole (slightly to the left of its centreline) there is a mark that resembles a capital T. It does not appear to be a numeral for foliation, and thus I take it to be part of an aborted *ra* that the scribe commenced here, then decided not to squeeze it in above the binding hole and re-engraved to the right of the hole. — <33> cā(nu)pālitā • The intended *nu* looks very much like *ka*.

<36> nāmānām • Hultzsich tentatively suggests emending this word to *brāhmaṇānām*.

<37> Ekaikā<ṛn>śaḥ • It is also possible that *Ekaikaśaḥ* was intended here. — <37> □
 • This symbol may have been intended for the very end of the text, but it is clearly at the end of line 37. — <37> [ca. 2×](pājñā?) ◇ [ca. 2×](pālvā) EH • The lacuna at the beginning may be only one character in extent; if it is two characters, then the first is rather narrow. The second (or only) illegible character seems to have a roundish body. The first tentatively read character seems to be *pā*, but may perhaps be *dā* instead. The second looks to me like *jñā* with the vowel *ā* attached twice, once to the middle prong and curling over the top as occasionally done with *j*, and a second time in the standard way, attached to the top right. It is also possible that Hultzsich is correct in interpreting the curled upper part (which I see as the first *ā*) as *l*, but in that case the subscript component seems to me to be too large and complex for *v*, looking more like a consonant+*r* combination. — <37> (c/v)(o?)ḍa- ◇ coḍa- EH • The vowel marker on the first character looks like that for *ā*, but is connected to the body with a double-humped line resembling the single-stroke cursive form of *o*. The humps are, however, to the right of and in line with the head of the character instead of being above it. Given that this inscription does not use the cursive *o*, I am not sure what vowel was intended here. — <37> -boḷ • As Hultzsich also observes, there is a dot (or short dash) at median height after *bo*. This is probably irrelevant to the text even if it is not a product of later damage. — <37> tṛil<ṛ>tṛi?<ī>yā° ◇ tṛil<ṛ>tīyā° EH.

Translation

Plates

<1–18> Greetings. The grandson of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Kīrtivarman, who by <the mere fact of> his birth shone <like an ornament> adorning the lineage of the majestic Caḷukyas—who are of the Mānavya *gotra* which is praised by the entire world, who are sons of Hārīti, who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by Lord Mahāseṇa, who attained kingship by the grace of Kauśikī's boon, to whom all kings instantaneously submit at the <mere> sight of the Boar emblem they have acquired by the grace of the divine Nārāyaṇa, whose ʒminds and? bodies have been hallowed

through washing in the purificatory ablutions (*avabhṛtha*) of the Aśvamedha sacrifice, and who have subjected the triple world to themselves by their inherent glory—; the son of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (I), the wide face of whose chest became the dwelling-place of Lady Majesty acquired by defeating enemies who had positioned themselves at the battlefield: His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Indravarman (Indra Bhaṭṭāraka)—whose other name is Milkcow of Liberality (*tyāga-dhenu*), who is endowed with the three powers (*śakti-traya*), whose fame and might are great, who is adept in serving the three goals (*trivarga*),¹ who is praised by many people as the Primeval Man (*purāṇa-puruṣa*, i.e. probably Viṣṇu) {is praised by many worlds}, who is the beloved of hosts of creatures as the Enemy of Pura (Śiva) {is the beloved of troops of ghosts (*bhūta*)}, who is like a second Crocodile-Bannered (Kāma), like a fifth Guardian of the World (*lokapāla*), who is true to his word like the firstborn son of Pṛthā (Yudhiṣṭhira), who creates a feast for his kinsmen and for living beings (in general) like the autumn season {which creates a feast of *bandhujīva* flowers}, whose power is inclined toward the elevation of his friends, like the Lordly Mountain of the East {whose bulk is inclined toward the rising of the sun}, whose pair of lotus feet are tinted by clusters of rays from great gems fitted to the surfaces of the crowns of kings—(this King Indravarman) has donated the village named Koṇḍaṇagūru, converted into a Brahmanic gift (*brahma-deya*) and with a remission of all taxes, <the donation being> sanctified by (a libation of) water.

<18–25> The demarcations of directions for that village <are as follows>. To the north, the village named Muṇjuṇūru. To the east, the village named Pagunūru. The village named Ceṇupūru is established as the southern demarcation. To the west, the village named Irbuli. <The donee?> has been allocated a residence amidst these villages. <The donation has been made> to the grandson of the Brāhmin Durgaśarman (also) named Irīṇlūr-boya, who belonged to the Vājasaneyā *carāṇa* and was dedicated to the rituals (*karma*) ordained for Brahmins; the son of Viṣṇuśarman of the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, who possessed a high birth, knowledge and (virtuous) conduct; (namely,) to Ceṇḍīśarman, whose demeanour is praised by Brahmins knowledgeable in the Vedas. <The donation has been made> in order to acquire merit for <my (Indravarman's)> mother and father as well as for myself (Indravarman).

<25–26> He (Indravarman) further respects (i.e. respectfully informs) future kingly sages (*rājarṣi*) with all due courtesy as follows:²

¹I assume that *trivarga* refers here to the three *puruṣārthas*: *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma*. Compare verse 14 of the Vemalūrpāḍu plates of Amma II. However, some other group of three may have been meant, e.g. the three higher orders of society.

²I construe *iti* at the beginning of this passage to refer to the following text. See also the apparatus to line 25.

⟨26–29⟩ ⟨The donation has been made⟩ at the petition of the firstborn son, named Indravarman, of King (*mahārāja*) Koṇḍivarman³, who was an ornament of the sky⁴ of the Āryāhū? lineage.⁵ The executor (*ājñapti*) of that (decree) is thus Ālapāka-boḷ, [...]ppi-boḷ, Somayājula-veḷḷekki-boḷ (and) Māraṭa-boḷ.⁶

⟨29–31⟩ Moreover, whosoever would pose an obstacle (to the donee’s rights) out of a lack of discernment (*moha*) or out of greed shall be conjoined with the five great sins. In addition, there are also the following verses of Veda-vyāsa on this matter.

1.

It is the fate of a killer of his lord, a cow, a Brahmin, a woman or an ascetic that meets one who takes away revenues (*vṛtti*) allotted (*aṅkita*) by ⟨royal⟩ charter (*śāsana*).

2.

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

3.

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.

⟨35–36⟩ With regard to this decree written (*likhita*) by Kanakarāma, there are sixty-four shares. One share each for these ĵnames?.⁷

⟨35–37⟩ [...] ... one share. Coḍa-boḷ, one third share.⁸

³Or Roṇḍivarman.

⁴Although *tilaka*, “ornament” and *gagana*, “sky” are not normally associated, I believe the composer’s intent was to say that this ruler was a moon (“sky-ornament”) to the sky that was his dynasty.

⁵Or possibly the lineage named Ārya.

⁶The word *boḷ* probably means either a village officer or the landlord of a village. It is thus likely that four persons are listed here not by name but by their titles (except probably for Somayājula, who seems to have both a name and a title); but since *ājñapti* appears in the singular, it is also possible that a single unnamed person was *boḷ* of four villages. See the commentary for my interpretation and how it differs from that of Hultzsich.

⁷This passage is again obscure. Hultzsich tentatively emends the text to mean “One share each for these Brahmins” and believes that the Brahmins referred to may include the four *boḷ*s mentioned in lines 28–29 above, in addition to the principal donee Ceṇḍiśarman. He further assumes that the pronoun *eteṣām*, “these”, implies that the Brahmins in question would have been assembled in the king’s presence when he made the grant. I have no opinion pro or contra, except that the required emendation is a major one (not the rectification of a scribal error), and that is the assumption that the donees were assembled is correct, this gathering would probably have taken place at the village in question and not in the king’s presence. I wonder if the donees were in fact listed on an additional plate that is now lost.

⁸See the commentary.

Commentary

The opening text *svasti* level with (or slightly above) line 2 of the body text, placed on the left (beginning around 1 o' clock of the binding hole), so that the body text of line 2 is indented by about 3 character widths.

On most pages, lines next to the binding hole are indented to avoid the hole, but occasionally (where the hole is indicated in my edition), a character is inserted into the narrow space before the hole.

I feel quite sure that *nāma grāmagrāmaM* in line 18 is dittography, where the scribe engraved *grāma*, then skipped believing he was still at *nāma* and re-engraved *grāma*. Hultzsch 1925–1926, p. 4, n. 11 believes otherwise and thinks *grāma-grāma* is deliberately used, meaning perhaps a large village or a chief village. He points out a parallel in line 18 of the Peṇukapaṇu grant of Jayasinha I (where, however, the original editor of that grant, Fleet, deems the repetition to be dittography).

By my interpretation of the rather elliptical and vague passage in lines 26–29, the Eastern Cālukya king Indravarman is hereby issuing a grant at the request of (or endorsing a grant made by) a petty ruler likewise named Indravarman, the son of Koṇḍivarman/Roṇḍivarman. The four *boḷs* listed here were probably persons of note in the territory concerned, which was ruled by the petty Indravarman as a vassal of the Cālukya Indravarman, and were therefore (*evam* in the text) given the task of conveying the grant to the village and publicising it. It is also conceivable that they were, in the first place, the messengers sent by the vassal Indravarman to the suzerain Indravarman's court to ask for this grant to be made or endorsed. Hultzsch, however, interprets the passage differently. He believes that the subordinate who petitioned for the grant was Koṇḍivarman, and the Indravarman mentioned in this passage was the son of the Cālukya Indravarman, who was appointed as the executor of the grant at the request of Koṇḍivarman. As for the four *boḷs*, according to Hultzsch they were probably witnesses to the grant, which he sees as being implied by the word *evam*, “thus”, in the text. I find his interpretation unconvincing for the following reasons. 1) it requires two emendations (*nāma-dheya* to *nāma-dheyo* and *°ājñaptir* to *°ājñaptiḥ*) , whereas my proposal only assumes a lack of sandhi at a point where the writer may well have preferred hiatus for the sake of clarity. 2) even with Hultzsch's emendations, the resulting syntax is extremely awkward and staggered, with the possessive phrase *koṇḍivarmmaṇo ... vijñāpanayā* split into two widely separated parts, containing another possessive phrase in the intervening text, whereas the text as I read it involves only the minimal awkwardness of a long and not-quite-regular compound. 3) I perceive my own scenario as quite coherent, while I do not see such coherence in Hultzsch's

scenario. Why would the vassal have requested that the suzerain's son be appointed as executor? Why is the text not clearer if the vassal actually made two requests, one for the grant to be made, and another for the prince to be appointed as executor? Why would witnesses need to be involved at all, and—since I am not aware of witnesses being named in any Eastern Cālukya grant—why is their function and the reason for their inclusion not clearly stated? 4) I believe that the reason why Hultzsich did not choose to interpret the text along lines similar to my thinking was the fact that by my interpretation, both the vassal and the suzerain bear the style *mahārāja*, whereas by his understanding, only the suzerain gets this style. Since *mahārāja* is often used as a title of subordinate rulers, I see no difficulty in understanding this to refer to the vassal Koṇḍivarman here; and conversely, Eastern Cālukya grants frequently use *mahārāja* (as well as even more unassuming styles) for their kings without any implication of inferior status.

The meaning and purpose of the last line is obscure. It may have been added subsequently, since it comes after the closing sign at the end of line 36 and it seems to be in a different hand. If I am correct in reading the word *ājñā* in line 37, then it may be that the executors were also granted shares in the donated land, and if so, Coḍa-boḷ may have been another agent instrumental to the implementation of the grant.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1921–22, p. 9, appendix A/1921–22, N° 2 with some further details at ARIE 1921–22, pp. 96–97, § 4. Edited from inked impressions by E. Hultzsich (1925–1926), with facsimiles⁹ and an abstract of the contents. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Hultzsich's edition with his facsimiles. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[EH] Hultzsich, Eugen Julius Theodor. 1925–1926. “Kondanaguru grant of Indravarman.” EI 18, pp. 1–5.

Secondary

ARIE 1921–22. *Annual report on Indian epigraphy for the year 1921–1922*. Edited by G. Venkoba Rao. Madras: Government Press, 1923.

⁹A photograph of the seal is included in the plate showing the seal of the Niḍuparu grant of Jayasīrṇha I, between pages 56 and 57.

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