

M̐lopar̐ru grant attributed to Maṅgi Yuvarāja

Dániel Balogh

Alternative title: Ipuru (Īpūru, Īpūr) plates of Maṅgi yuva-vallabha-mahārāja

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00054

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00054.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 T in l1 seems to be a slightly reduced ta with a headmark much like the regular one; it may also be an erroneous ta instead of T.

Original punctuation marks

Other palaeographic observations. The consonants ka and ra occur in both short and long forms. Anusvāra is usually above the character to which it belongs, but often to the right of that consonant and occasionally atop the next character (e.g. l8 maṅgi; l9 kuṭimbinas; l11 vedāṅga; l22, m̐jalir). Dependent i and ī are rarely distinguished and are read as expected where there is no clear indication of either. See also the commentary.

Edition

Seal

<1> śrī-sarvvasiddhi

Plates

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <1> svasti<.> śrīm<ā>?<a>d-bhagava(T)-sv<ā>?<a>mi-mahāsenā-
pādānudhy(ā)t<ā>?<a>nā<m> m<ā>?<a>tr-gaṇa-paripālītānām m<ā>?<a><2>navya-
sagotr(ā)nā(m) hārit(i)-pu(trā)nām (k)auśikī-vara-prasā(da-labdha)-(r)ājy(ā)nām
(A)ś(vamedha-yā)jinā(m) a<3>?<mvro>?<mbho>dhi-paryyanta-(p)ra(th)ita-
(ya)śa(sām) [ca]l(u)k)yānām (kula-ja)la(dhi)-sa(mud)it(e)[nd]o(r) nna(ya-vinaya-
vikra)m(o)p<ā>?<a><4>(r)jita○-bhūri-kī(r)tt<ā>?<eh> kī(r)tti(va)[rm](ma)ṇa<h>
sūn(o)r a(neka-sa)ma[saṁ]<<ra>>-sa(m)ghaṭ<ṭ>opalabdha-(jaya-śrī)-lat<ā>?<a><5>-
pra<ś>?<s>ūta-ya<śaḥ>-prasūty-āmōda-gandhādhivāsita-sa(kala)-diṇ-maṇḍalasya
śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārā<6>jasya priya-tanayaḥ tr(ailo)kya-vikramod<d>yotita-
sakala-(lo)kāśr<ā>?<a>ya<h>bhu(ja?)bhu(ja)}-(bala)-bh<ā>?<a><7>ya-namit<ā>?<a>śeṣa-
ripu-nṛpati-makuṭa-taṭa-ghaṭita-maṇi-kiraṇa-rā>ga-ra(m)j(i)ta-caraṇa-yuga<Page
2r><8>?<i>!<l>aḥ parama-bh<ā>?<a>gavata-śrī-(ma)mgi-yuva-vallabha-mahārājaḥ
ca(vu?)lallya-viṣaye rāṣṭra(kū)ṭa<9>-pramukhān kuṭ<i>!<u>(m)bi)nas sarvv(ā)n
itth<ā>?<a>m <ā>?<a>(jñāpa)yati

viditam astu (vo) <'>s(mā)bhiḥ vanapaṛru-v<ā>?<a>stavy(ā)<10>ya va<c>(ch)!<ts>a-
gotrāya <rinya>(ke)si(ne)!<hiranya>keśine> Agniśarmmaṇ<e>?<aḥ> pauṭrāya
(guṇava?)<to>?<ā>(śa)rmma(ṇaḥ)p<u><11>tr<ā>?<a>(ya) ○ maṇḍaśarmma(ṇe veda)-
vedāṅga-p<ā>?<a>rag<ā>?<a>ya ṣaṭ-kar(mm)a-n(iratāya) <ā>(Astiśahasana?)<12><ma>(mñcūd-
hūkaṁ?)<?> ma(mgi)-yuvarājaḥ sv(ā)mi-bhaktāḥ maṇḍaśarmmaṇe (Udaka-pūrvva)s
sarvva-kara-par(i)h(ā)ra(M)<13> Utt<ā>?<a>rāyaṇa-nimitta<h>?<m> m(l)opaṛru-nāmā
grāmo (da)ttāḥ

tasy(ā)vadhayaḥ<.> _ pūrvva(taḥ) (ve?)l(l?)<a>varru<.><14> dakṣiṇataḥ pulgoṭlapab-
ulūru<.> paścimataḥ A(g)ūnakṣayyaṁ<.> Utt<ā>?<a>rataḥ k(l?)<o>cce doḍu<Page
2v> <15> (ca?)<.>(Ete)śām madhya-varṭt<i>h!<i><.> (Asyopari na ke)nacid bādha
k<ā>?<a>raṇīy<ā>?<a><.> yaḥ k<ā>?<a>r(o)t(i) sa(h) pañca<16>-mahāpātaka-sa(m)yukto
bhavati<.> vyā(senā)py ukt<ā>?<a>M

1. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhir vvasudhā dattā

bahubhiś cānu<17>pālitṛa?<ā>
yasya (ya)sya yadā bhūmṛa?<i>s
tasya tasya tadā phala(m)

2. Anuṣṭubh

sva-(da)ttā<m> para-dattā<m> vā
y(o)<18>hare○ta <va>sundhṛa?<ā>rṛa?<ā>(m)
śaṣṭh?<t>i-varṣa-sahasr(āṇi)
viṣṭhāyā(m) jāyate kṛmi(h)

3. Anuṣṭubh

gavāṁ koṭi-pra<19>dānena
Aśva[(śe)]<<(me)>>dha-śatena (ca)
(ta)ṭākānā(m) sahasreṇa
bhūmi-ha(rt)tā na śuṛd?<dh>yati

4. Anuṣṭubh

na vi<20>śa<m> viṣam ity ṛa?<ā>hu<r>
brahma-sva(m) viṣam u(c)ya<te>
(viṣa)m (e)kākina<m> hanti
(b)ra(hma)-sva<m> putra-pautra<21>ka(m)

5. Vasantatilakā

mad-varṣa-jāḥ para-mahīpati-(v)amśa-jā(ś) ca
(pāpā)d apeta-manaso bhuvi bhṛa?<ā>vi-bhū<Page 3r><22>pā<h>
ye p(ā)la(ya)nti mama dharmmam ima(m) samastam
t(eṣāṁ ma)y(ā) viracito <'>mjalir eṣa<23> mū<r>dhni

6. Indravajrā

yān(iha da)ttā(n)i (p)urṛa?<ā> narendra
dānṛa?<ā>(ni) (dha)rmm(ā)rttha-yaśas-karāṇi
nirmmṛa?<ā>(l)yṛā?<a>-vā<24>nti-pra○timṛa?<ā>ni tāni
k(o) nṛa?<ā>ma sṛa?<ā>dhuḥ punar ādadita{h}

7. Śālinī

sarvv(ā)n etṛa?<ā>n bhāvinaḥ pā(r)tthivendrṛa?<ā><N>
<25> bhūyo bhūyo yṛa?<ā>ca(te) r(āma)devaḥ
s(ā)m(ā)nyo <'>ya(m) dharmma-(se)tu<r> nṛpṛa?<ā>ṇām
kāle kāle pālāniyo<26> bhavadbhiḥ

8. Indravajrā

Ājñaptir as(min gha)narāśir ī(śaḥ)

(śrī)-bh_ia?<ā>nuśa(k)ti<r> hitavān praj_ia?<ā>n_ia?<ā><m>

śā_iś?<s>an_iā?<a>sya li(□?)

<Page 3v>

Apparatus

Plates

<1> -bhagava(T)- ◇ *bhāgavata* RM.

<2> hārit(ī)- ◇ *h_ia?<ā>ritī*- RM. — <2> a<3> *i(mvro)?<mbho>dhi*- ◇ *a<3>mbhodhi*- RM.

<3> sa(mud)it(e)[nd]o(r) nna(ya-vinaya)- ◇ *-samudita [ca. 6×]* RM • Compare the Nutula-paru grant and London plates of Maṅgi Yuvarāja, both of which use the same wording, though for Jayasimha rather than Kīrtivarman.

<4> -(sa)ma[sam]<<ra>>- ◇ *-samara*- RM • According to RM's note, *ra* "looks like *ru*. However, the *ū* sign is curved upwards." In fact, it looks like *sarṁ* was first engraved, then corrected to *ra*. In addition to this character, there may be something added below the line at this point, just to the right of the descender of *ra*. The strokes are quite conspicuous in the estampage, but not visible at all in the photos. No insertion seems to be required either here or in the next line at this point. I cannot read the inserted text, if that is what it is. Its first character may be a small *ṇa*, and this may be followed by one to three further small characters of whose shape nothing can be discerned. —

<4> sa(m)ghaṭ<ṭ>opalabdha- • The engraved text may in fact be *saṁghāṭopalabdha*. — <4> -(jaya-śrī)-lat_i?<ā><5>-pra_iś?<s>ūta-ya<śaḥ>-prasūty-āmoda- ◇ *(jayaśīlat)_i?<ā><5>-pra_iś?<s>ūtāya [praroḥa]-prasūty-āmoda*- RM • The characters *taya* are at the lower edge of the binding hole, and are therefore reduced in size and slightly distorted in shape. I cannot fully reconstruct RM's reading and emendation. At the end of line 4, he apparently reads *jayaśīlati* and emends the final vowel to *ā*. A footnote by his editor completes this emendation to *jayāśī-latā*. In line 5 it is also clear that RM emends *śū* to *sū*, but I fail to understand what he intends with the word *praroḥa*, shown in his edition in round parentheses. He probably means this to replace the preceding word he reads as *praśūtāya*, but if so, then I do not see why he first emends that to *prasūtāya*. No matter what RM intended, we have a close parallel in lines 10-11 of the Koṇeki grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II, which describe Jayasimha I as °*āneka-samara-saṁghaṭṭa-labdha-vijaya-śīlatā-prasūta-yaśaḥ-prasūtāmoda-gandhādhivāsita-sakala-dig-maṇḍalasya* (where

-*prasūtāmoda*- is probably erroneous for -*prasūty-āmoda*-). The phrase *jaya-śrī-latā* in place of *jaya-śīlatā* is unexpected, but the subscript *r* is unmistakeable in the photo even in its worn state. It is possible that all of *praśūtaya* at the beginning of line 5 was intended to be cancelled, in which case we are left with a more elegant compound involving *jaya-śrī-latā*; but the text is interpretable with the above minor emendations even if all characters are retained.

<6> -(lo)kāśr;*ā?*<*a*>yah ◇ -*lokāśraya*- RM • I am certain that the compound ending here is not subordinate to the one beginning after this point. — <6> -bhu(ja?){bhu(ja?)}- • I follow RM in dismissing the second *bhuja* as superfluous dittography. There is a slight possibility that the first *bhuja* is in fact a different word beginning with *bhu*, and thus the second is not redundant. It is also possible that the second *bhuja* is not simply a product of dittography, but an erroneously engraved word influenced by the first *bhuja*. The Koṇeki grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II has *sakala-lokāśraya-bhuja-yugaḷa-bala-namitāśeṣa*- (describing Jayasimha), and the composer's intent may have been -*bhuja-yuga*- here.

<8> -bh;*a?*<*ā*>gavata- ◇ -*bh;*a?*<*ā*>gavataḥ* RM. — <8> śrī-(ma)ṅgi- • I endorse RM's reading, which he prints as clear. In fact, the first character differs conspicuously from instances of *ma* in the same line: it has an exaggerated headmark and its right is attached too low. Given its closeness to the next character, it may be a correction from *va*. — <8> ca(vu?)lpallya- ◇ *ca(nu)lpallyā-viṣaye* RM • The ARIE report says the granted village is in *canū(rpa)lli viṣaya*, having probably read the locative ending *pallyām*. On the testimony of the Pulgoṭlapaṃbuluru grant of Vijayāditya III, I prefer to read the partly effaced second character as *vu*. I believe there is neither an *anusvāra* nor an *ā* marker here; the dot at the top right of *llyā* is simply a serif-like feature of the engraving, like the dot at the top right of the subscript *p*, or that at the top left of *ṣa*, both of which clearly lack a function.

<9> itth;*ā?*<*a*>m ;*a?*<*ā*>(jñāpa)yati ◇ *ittham ājñāpayati* RM.

<10> va;*c(ch)!*<*ts*>a- • The lower part of *ccha* is lost to the edge of the binding hole. It may also have been *c*. — <10> (guṇava?)[to?] (Āḍ?)i(śa)rmma(ṇaḥ) ◇ ;*śu?*<*su*>*śarmmaṇe/vveṃgiśarmma(ṇaḥ)* RM • Although RM prints most of this text as clearly legible, neither the estampage nor the photo confirms his reading. Though the syntax of the sentence is garbled, I expect only one name here (see the note to the translation). My own reading is largely conjectural, based on very faint and ambiguous vestiges. What I read as *va* looks in fact more like *vā* or *ma*. In the name, my tentatively read *Ā* (apparently ignored or read as a punctuation mark by RM) could, on its own, be *dra* or *vra*, and my tentative *ḍi* (RM's *gi*, which I find impossible) may also be *di* or *dhi*.

<11> ;(*Astīśahasana?*)?<12> ;*ma(rñcūdadhūkam?)?* ◇ *Astivīhasana*<12>-*maṇḍūrē* RM •

I am unable to propose a meaningful reading here, and show what I deem to be the most likely reading on the basis of the vestiges. This is unlikely to be exactly what was inscribed on the plates, and an examination of the original may reveal some further clues. I cannot agree with RM's reading *maṇḍūrūre* even though his editor in a footnote suggests that this is a toponym identifiable as the village Maṇḍūru near the modern village Moparṛu, which he believes was "the camping place" (presumably of Maṅgi Yuvarāja). I note that, on Google Maps at least, that village's name is Manduru with a dental *d*. In line 11, what I and RM read as *A* is identifiable only by a large and curling tail; the body is fully effaced. In principle, almost any consonant with a subscript *r* is also conceivable. The second character is most likely to be *sti*, but a different subscript consonant is possible. Reading *smāi* (for *Asmai*) is not entirely out of the question, although the vowel is unlikely to be anything other than *i*. The third character is almost certainly *śa*, discernible both in the estampage and the photo. What RM reads as an *i* marker is the subscript *m* of *śarmmaṇaḥ* in the previous line. After this, *ha* and *sa* are reasonably clear. The former could perhaps also be *la*; the latter is badly worn, but not too ambiguous. At the end of the line, *na* might also be *va*. In line 12, the second character, which I read as *ñcū*, is definitely not *ṇḍa*: compare the very different *ṇḍa* further on in this line, and the very similar *ñca* in line 15. It is preceded by a conspicuous dot that may be an *anusvāra* or an irrelevant pit in the metal. The following character is somewhat distorted to fit in below the binding hole, and its upper part may be lost to wear at the edge of the hole. Assuming that it is fully preserved, its most likely reading is *dhū*, but *lū* is also possible. Compare *dha* in line 13 which, though slightly damaged, looks very similar. If the upper right part is lost to wear, then *thū* and *rū* are also conceivable. The upper part of the line's fourth character is definitely lost to the widening of the hole, but it seems to have had a crossbar, so *ka* is a more likely reading than *ra*. It is followed by another possible *anusvāra* that may also be meaningless damage, but since the next character is inscribed at some distance, an *anusvāra* is more likely.

<12> -bhaktāḥ ◇ -*bhakt(āya?)* RM • The plate is worn here, but the reading is unambiguous. — <12> -par(i)h(ā)ra(M) ◇ -*parihāraṁ* RM.

<13> -nimittaḥ ◇ -*nimittam* RM. — <13> m(l)opaṛṛu ◇ *mḷompaṛṛu* RM • The ARIE report reads the name as *mṛōpaṛṛu*. I see no *anusvāra* here. The subscript part of the first character is more likely to be *l* than *r*. — <13> -n(ā)mā ◇ -*nāma* RM. — <13> (ve?)l(l?)(a)vaṛṛu ◇ *l(l)avaṛṛu* RM • Although this is in all probability the modern village Yellavaruru identified in an editorial footnote in RM's edition, RM's reading cannot be right. The first character is probably *ve*. The subscript part of the second looks like *l*,

but could be *r* or *th*. A clumsily reduced *l* cannot be excluded, but it is definitely not the usual cursive simplification of subscript *l*.

<14> pulgoṭlapabulūru ◇ *pulgoṭlipa(ru)[2×]* RM • These characters are quite effaced in the estampage, but all are reasonably clear in the photo. The name is attested in the as yet unedited Pulgoṭlapambuluru grant of Vijayāditya III. — <14> A(g)ūnakṣayya ◇ *Agūnakṣayya* RM. — <14> Utt*ṛ*ā?<ā>rataḥ ◇ *Uttarataḥ* RM. — <14> k(l?)(o)cce doḍu <Page 2v> <15> (ca?)<.>(Ete)ṣām madhya- ◇ *k(r?)(o)cce (d)o(p?)u* <Page 2v> <15> [3×]mmadhya- RM • If RM's reading at the end of 2r is interpretable, then it may be correct. Both the estampage and the photo are quite clear, but many of the characters can be ambiguous. The first may perhaps also be *kṣo*. The first character on 2v seems to belong to this phrase, but it may be *va* rather than *ca*. The Sanskrit words from the second character onward are reasonably clear in the photo.

<15> k*ṛ*ā?<ā>rot(i) ◇ *karot*ṛ*a?<i>* RM.

<17> *pālīt*ṛ*a?<ā> ◇ **pālītā* RM. — <17> bhūm*ṛ*a?<i>s ◇ *bhūmis* RM.

<18> <va>sundh*ṛ*a?<ā>r*ṛ*a?<ā>(r) ◇ <va>sundharā<M> RM. — <18> ṣaṣ*ṛ*th?<t>i- ◇ *ṣaṣṭir* RM. — <18> koṭi-pra<19>dānena ◇ *koṭi<19>-pradānena* RM.

<19> Aśva[(śe)]<<(me)>>dha- ◇ *Aśvamedha-* RM • In this place, *śe* or *ge* was first inscribed, then the right-hand side of the consonant was incorporated into an *m*, but the left and top parts were left in place.

<20> *ṛ*a?<ā>hu<r> ◇ *āhuḥ* RM. — <20> hanti ◇ *haṇi<n>ti* RM.

<21> bh*ṛ*a?<ā>vi- ◇ *bhāvi-* RM.

<22> p(ā)la(ya)nti ◇ *pālayanti* RM. — <22> ima(r) ◇ *imāṁ* RM.

<23> mū<r>dhni ◇ *mūrdhni* RM. — <23> narendra ◇ *narendr*ṛ*a?<aiḥ>* RM • Since the text is meaningful as received, I prefer not to emend to the standard version of this stanza. — <23> dān*ṛ*a?<ā>(ni) ◇ *dānāni* RM. — <23> (dha)rmm(ā)rttha- ◇ *dharmārttha-* RM. — <23> nirmm*ṛ*a?<ā>(l)y*ṛ*ā?<ā>-vā<24>nti- ◇ *nirmāly*ṛ*a?<ā>-ṛm?<v>ā<24>nt*ṛ*i?<ā>-* RM.

<24> -pra○tim*ṛ*a?<ā>ni ◇ *-pratimāni* RM. — <24> n*ṛ*a?<ā>ma ◇ *nāma* RM. — <24> s*ṛ*a?<ā>dhuḥ ◇ *sādhuḥ* RM. — <24> sarvv(ā)n et*ṛ*a?<ā>n ◇ *sarvān etān* RM. — <24> bhāvinah pā(r)tthivendr*ṛ*a?<ā><N> ◇ *bhāv-nah (pā)ratthivendrā<N>* RM • Seems to be a typo in RM.

<25> y*ṛ*a?<ā>ca(te) ◇ *yācate* RM. — <25> r(āma)devaḥ • Since the reading is clear, intelligible and metrically correct, I do not emend. However, this stanza normally has

Rāmabhadra here. — <25> dharmma- ◇ *dharmā-* RM. — <25> -(se)tu<r> ◇ *-setur* RM.
— <25> nṛp_ṛa?<ā>nām ◇ *nṛpānām* RM.

<26> as(min gha)(gha)narāśir ◇ *asmin dhana-rāśir* RM • The problematic is quite worn and faint, but is quite certainly *ngḥa*, especially from the photo. Since RM does not mention Dhanarāśi in his discussion, this is probably not a typo in his edition. — <26> -bh_ṛa?<ā>nu° ◇ *-bhānu°* RM. — <26> praj_ṛa?<ā>n_ṛa?<ā><r̥n> ◇ *prajānām* RM. — <26> śā_ṛś?<s>an_ṛā?<a>sya li(□?) ◇ *śā_ṛś?<s>anasya li* RM • The last symbol on the page may be a circle with a concentric dot instad of a spiral.

Translation

Plates

<1–9> Greetings. From the ocean that is the lineage of the Caḷukyas—who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by the Divine Lord Mahāśena, who are protected by the band of Mothers, who are of the Mānavya gotra, who are sons of Hāritī, who attained kingship by the grace of Kauśikī’s boon, who perform the Aśvamedha sacrifice, and whose fame has spread as far as the oceans—had arisen a moon <who was> Kīrtivarman, who earned his great reputation by his political acumen (*naya*), discipline (*vinaya*) and valour. His son <was> His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana, who perfumed the complete circle of the quarters with pleasant fragrance from the efflorescence, which is glory, sprouting from the liana that is the victory goddess attained in the clash of many a battle. His son, His Majesty the supremely pious Junior Vallabha King (*yuva-vallabha-mahārāja*) Maṅgi, a shelter to the complete world (*sakala-lokāśraya*) illuminated by his valour <unique> in the three worlds, whose pair of feet are tinted by the hues of the rays from the gems fitted to the surfaces of the crowns of all the enemy kings bowed down by fear of the power of his arms, commands all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—in Cavuḷpallya district (*viṣaya*) as follows.

<9–13> Let it be known to you <that> on the occasion of the winter solstice we have given the village named ṛMḷopaṛṛu? with exemption from all taxes, <the donation being> sanctified by (a libation of) water, to Maṇḍaśarman, who is thoroughly versed in the Vedas and Vedāṅgas and devoted to the six duties, ṛand who is the grandson of Agniśarman, a *hiranyakeśin* of the Vatsa gotra residing in Vanapaṛṛu and the son of ṛthe

talented Āḍiśarman?¹—to <this> Maṇḍaśarman ḥwho is? ... (*astiśahasana mamñcūd-hūkam*)² devoted to ḥhis? lord Maṅgi Yuvarāja.

<13–16> Its boundaries <are as follows>. To the east, Vellavarū. To the south, Pulgoḥlapabulūru. To the west, ḥAgūnakṣayyaṁ?³ To the north, ḥKlocce and Ḑoḍu?. <The donated land is> situated in between these. Let no-one pose an obstacle (to the enjoyment of rights) over it. He who does so shall be conjoined with the five great sins. Vyāsa too has said:

1.

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.

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.

A seizer of (granted) land cannot be purified <even> by donating ten million cows, nor by <performing> a hundred Aśvamedhas, <nor by constructing> a thousand tanks.

4.

It is not <actual> poison that is <properly> called poison: it is the property of a Brahmin that is said to be poison. Poison kills just the one man, while <seizing> the property of a Brahmin <destroys> his progeny.

5.

Hereby I offer my respectful obeisance (*añjali*) to <all> future kings on earth, born in

¹Although the case endings in the text indicate otherwise, I am quite certain on the basis of the structure of the sentence that the donee is Maṇḍaśarman, son of Āḍiśarman and grandson of Agniśarman. According to RM's commentary, there are three donees: Agniśarman, Suśarman (read by RM where I show a lacuna) and Maṇḍaśarman. This matches the syntax implied by the endings. However, by this reading, only Agniśarman would have a residence, *gotra* and school; moreover, the next person (the ostensible Suśarman) would be the grandson of Agniśarman with no other family ties specified, while Maṇḍaśarman would (as in my interpretation) be the son of Āḍiśarman (whose name RM reads as Veriṅgiśarman), again with no other family ties specified. It is much more logical in my opinion to assume a single Brahmanical lineage of three generations, with residence, *gotra* and school recorded only for the grandfather, as commonly done in related grants.

²I cannot interpret this phrase; see the apparatus to line 11.

³Could *akṣayya* mean a previously granted Brahmanical holding (*akṣaya-nīvi*)?

my lineage and in different royal lineages, who with minds averted from sin observe this provision (*dharma*) of mine in its integrity.

6.

The donations given by kings in olden days to generate merit (*dharma*), wealth (*artha*) and fame are <now> comparable to discarded garlands or vomit. What decent man would ever partake of them again?

7.

Over and over again, Rāmadeva⁴ begs all these future rulers: “Each in your own time, you shall respect this bulwark of legality that is universally applicable to kings!”

8.

The executor (*ājñapti*) in this <matter> is the lord (*īśa*) Ghanarāśi.⁵ His Honour Bhānuśakti, beneficent to subjects

<26> <is?> the ;writer? of this decree⁶

Commentary

The text ends abruptly with the last line on 3r. I agree with RM that only a very small amount of text seems to be missing here, most probably identifying the writer of the text. RM believes a date was also lost here, but I do not find this likely on the basis of parallel grants. It is not clear whether the last bit of text in line 26 is prose or a garbled continuation of the *indravajrā* hemistich identifying the executor; nor is it clear whether Ghanarāśi and Bhānuśakti are two separate persons or only one. The intended text may for instance have been something like *tac-chāsanasyāśya ca lekha-karttā*. The photographs published by the National Museum include a picture of 3v, which bears no trace of writing there whatsoever. Perhaps the text was intended to be complete as it is. The last character, *li*, may have been intended as an abbreviation for *likhita*, and the symbol after it might be an abbreviation marker. Assuming that the second hemistich intended by the composer was shortened meaningfully by the scribe to fit the text on the plate, it seems most likely that Ghanarāśi was the executor and Bhānuśakti was the writer.

⁴The name in this stanza is normally Rāmabhadra.

⁵Or, given the ending of his name *rāśi*, perhaps *īśa* should be understood to mean that Ghanarāśi is Śiva, i.e. a fully initiated Śaiva.

⁶The text ends abruptly here. See the commentary.

The issuer of these plates was identified in the ARIE report as Jayasimha I on the grounds that the seal bears the legend *sarvasiddhi* and only Kirtivarman and Viṣṇuvardhana (I) are mentioned as ancestors in the genealogy. RM, however, asserts that *maṅgi-yuva-vallabha-mahārāja* is clearly the donor. While neither instance of the name *maṅgi* is entirely clear, the reading is indeed quite secure. RM adds that, since Maṅgi Yuvarāja's seals have the legend *vijayasiddhi*, the seal may not be the original seal of this grant. He further supposes that reference to the closer ancestry of Maṅgi Yuvarāja was apparently "left out by oversight", which I find preposterous. His editor in EI (probably K. G. Krishnan) adds in a footnote that there may have been "a mix up of two different plates at a distant time", which is even more preposterous. Moreover, RM notes that the donor's epithet is *sakala-lokāśraya* in line 6, but says only that this "means the same" as Maṅgi Yuvarāja's regular epithet *sarvalokāśraya*. However, the two epithets are evidently not interchangeable. It is now known that Jayasimha II also used *sarvasiddhi* on his seals, but no other ruler of the dynasty did. The question of the issuer needs further study.

Some details to consider are the following.

- 1, The phraseology of the grant has much in common with known grants of Maṅgi Yuvarāja. However, it has just as much in common with grants of Jayasimha I and Viṣṇuvardhana II, most especially with the Koṇeki grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that all grants of Maṅgi known to me commence with a more mature version of the stock text *śrīmatām sakala-*.
- 2, The genealogy begins with Kirtivarman, whereas grants of Maṅgi known to me begin either with Jayasimha I or with Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana. Genealogies beginning with Kirtivarman are found in practically all grants of Jayasimha I, the single known grant of Indra Bhaṭṭāraka, and one grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II (of the seven that I know).
- 3, The exhortatory verses are uncommon. The first five are identical (down to their details and their sequence) to those in the Pulgoṭṭapambuluru grant of Vijayāditya III and the Uṇuvuṭūru grant of Vijayāditya III, and each of the five (or a variant thereof) also occurs, not necessarily in the same order, in the Cimbūluru plates of Vijayāditya III (with the lines in a different sequence). Variants of stanza 4 occur sporadically in grants of Viṣṇuvardhana II and Vijayāditya I, but the first closely related variant is in a grant of Kali Viṣṇuvardhana, and its only exact parallels are in the above grants of Vijayāditya III. Stanza 6 is common in the grants of the Bādāmi Cālukyas, but in the Veṅgī corpus it is only paralleled in the Peddāpurappāḍu plates (set 2) of Viṣṇuvardhana II and the Bezvāḍa plates

of Bhīma I. Variants of stanza VII occur sporadically in the corpus, but variants where the speaker is named Rāmadeva rather than Rāmabhadra only occur in grants of Vijayāditya III.

- 4, I have not verified this, but the elaborate headmarks of this inscription (usually long horizontal lines with the ends curved up) seem late to me. It may be that a later scribe was attempting to imitate an earlier style of writing, but 9th-century production without any attempt at a different writing style seems most likely. A more detailed study of the palaeography is warranted.

All in all, it seems likely that the plates were inscribed at a time several generations after Maṅgi Yuvarāja. Given the elegant execution of the writing and the plates' overall similarity to those of Vijayāditya III, it is in my opinion likely that the present grant was legitimately produced in Vijayāditya III's chancellery, and is probably a reissue of a damaged earlier grant.⁷ Given the presumably original seal and the archaic preamble, the original on which the text is based probably hailed from the time of Jayasīnha I, whose genealogy is correctly presented and who is also known to have used the epithets *sakala-lokāśraya* and *trailokya-vikrama*, applied to the issuer in the present text. The name of Maṅgi Yuvarāja may have been inserted into the new text at the insistence of the owner of the earlier grant, but this insertion has rendered the genealogy inaccurate, and the repeated mention of Maṅgi in lines 11-12 is unintelligible. The exhortatory stanzas would have been added according to the custom of the day (there may have been none or much fewer in the original), and the mutilated colophon may be the best copy of a damaged original that the latter-day scribes could manage.

Another fanciful way to explain the inconsistencies would be to assume that the original grant on which this text is based was issued by Jayasīnha I's younger brother who subsequently reigned as Indra Bhaṭṭāraka. Although there is no evidence for this, his birth name may have been Maṅgi and he may have been his elder brother's *yuvarāja*. If so, then *yuvarāja* may have stuck to him as a permanent epithet, explaining to some degree why his grandson bore the name Maṅgi Yuvarāja even as a crowned king.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1919–20, p. 12, appendix A/1919–20, N° 9 with discussion at ARIE 1919–20, p. 99. Edited from inked estampages by S. S. Ramachandra Murthy ([1986] 1973–1974), with facsimiles,⁸ without translation. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Ramachandra Murthy's edition with his facsimiles and with

⁷Vijayāditya III also donated the adjacent village in his Pulgoṭṭalapambuluru grant.

⁸No image of the seal has been published.

photographs published by the National Museum.⁹ Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[RM] Ramachandra Murthy, S. S. [1986] 1973–1974. “Ipuru plates of Mangi-yuvavallabha-maharaja.” EI 40, pp. 235–238.

Secondary

ARIE 1919–20. G.O. No. 985, 31st August 1920. *Epigraphy. Annual report recording, with remarks, the progress report for the year 1919–1920 of the Assistant Archaeological Superintendent for --, Southern Circle. Recorded with remarks.* Edited by G. Venkoba Rao. No place, 1920.

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

⁹http://museumsofindia.gov.in/repository/record/nat_del-56-151-1-8727; http://museumsofindia.gov.in/repository/record/nat_del-56-151-2-8728; http://museumsofindia.gov.in/repository/record/nat_del-56-151-3-8729; accessed 31 March 2021.