

Cāmar̥ru plates of Jayasim̥ha I

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00055

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00055.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-10-16 17:02 (a1bf930), last modified 2026-10-14 16:50 (215de12)

Palaeographic description

Halantas: small, tick-mark shaped characters that I interpret as final M are used (l3, l19) apparently as "wildcard" final consonants. The definite final M in l20 phalaM is just a curved stroke like an opening parenthesis, while the definite final T in l22 [va]seT is a full-sized and only slightly simplified ta without a headmark.

Other palaeographic observations. The text is on the whole very clumsily written, with many characters awkwardly executed. In addition to many inconsistently misshapen characters, there are some systematically unusual forms such as the Central Indian-style la (e.g. l10, vallabha) and especially the cursive lo (l10, l29); and multiple instances of a glyph that must have been meant for ddhya, but looks clearly like ndhya (unambiguous instances in l1, l5 and l9); the initial A with a highly simplified body that on the whole looks like gra (and was misread as such three times in line 18 by its previous editor). However, "proper" initial Ā occurs in line 21, and "proper" A in line 28.

Edition

Seal

<1> śrī-sarvvasiddhi

Plates

<Page 1r>

<1> svasti śrīmat-piṣṭapurā<T><.> svām<ī?><i>-m<ā?><a>hāsena-pādānu(d)dhyātānā<m><2>
○h<a?><ā>rīti-putrānā<m> mānavya-sagotrānā<m> kura<3>mara○-sv<a?><ā>mi-
vara-la<ph>(dha)-r<a?><ā>jyānā<m> śrīmaM-c(a)kī!nā<m> Aśvame<4>dha-
yājina<vā?><m a>nvaya-mahodadh<o?><eh> Amṛta jyi!<I>va bhūta-trānā<Page
1v><5>ya sambhūta<h>kī(r)t(t)iva(r)mmā<.>tasya putras t<i?><a>t-pādānu(d)dhyāta<h>
śakti-traya-sa<6>mpādi○ta-mahā-dhanaugha-vi<c?><bh>avo jagati sa<th><t>-
kī(r)ty-abhilak<s?><ś>ito nānā<7>-yuddha○-vijay<i?><i> pīri!<ṛ><d?><th>i<ś?><v>īpati-
makuta-maṇi-<ma>yūkha-dhauta-pā<8>dāravin<t?><d>a-*j?><y>ugala<h> śrīmā<na?><N>
makaradhvajo viṣṇur ivāparo viṣṇu<9>vardhana-m<ā?><a>hār<a?><ā>j<(e)?><aḥ><.> ta-
sya putras tat-p<a?><ā>dānu(d)dhyāto <maho(śva)?><Page 2r><10><losaddhipayyatha-
ma(d)dhya?> śiṅgha jyi!<I>va vikr<a?><ā>nta<h> śrī-ja<y>siṅgha-valla<11>bha-
mahār<a?><ā>j<ā><o> mātā-pitr-*punya-vividuyel<punyaābhivṛddhaye>* Intra<pu>>ra-
v<a?><ā>stavyā<12>ya bhū○tisv<a?><ā>mi-catu(r)v(v)eda-p<o?><au>trāya <(pa)dagā(d)dhyāyino?
bodasvā<13>mi-pu○trāya k<o?><au>t-sa-sagotr<a?><ā>ya dvivedāya svāmiśarmmaṇ(e?)
kṛ<14>ṣṇa-biṇṇāyā Uttara-taṭe nātāvāḍi-viṣaye viḷetti nāma<Page 2v><15>grā<ma>m
āgrahārī-kṛtya sarvva-bādha-parih<a?><ā>reṇa Uda(ka)-pūrvveṇa<16>pratta<M>○
viditam astu sarvva-viṣaya-vāsi(nā?)<m> As(m)ad-bhr̥tyānāñ ca<.><17>
sa○rvva(th?)<a?><ā>s<th><m>a<d>-dharmm<ā?><o> rakṣaṇ<i?><i>ya<h><.> sarvva-
dharmma-śāstra-vid <o?><ā>jñ<(ā)?><a>pt<a?><i><h><18>Atra śrī-Ammā<.> Api
cokta<M>*

1. Anuṣṭubh

<p?><ś>a<p?><ś>ti-var<p?><ś>a-saha<p?><s>rāṇi
svargge modati bhūmi<19>-da<h>
<A?><Ā>kṣ(e)ptā cānumantā ca
<tāva>n<n?><t>i narake vase<(M)?><T>

2. Anuṣṭubh

<l?>ahubhi<r> vvasudhā da<Page 3r><20>ttā

bahu(bh)is cānupālīt(ā)
[(sya)]<<ya>>sya yasya yadā bhūmi<ḥ>
tasya tasya tadā phala(M)

3. Anuṣṭubh

<21> ṣaṣṭi?<i>○-vaṛiṣa?<rṣa>-sahasrāṇi
sva<r>gge modati bhūmi-daḥ
Ākṣeptā cā<22>numant(ā) ○ ca
tṛa?<ā>vanṛn?<t>i narake <va>seT

4. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhiṣvvi?<r vva>sudhā dattā
bahubhiś cānupālī<23>tā
ya○sya yasya yadā bhṛu?<ū>mis
tasya tasya tadā phala<M>

5. Anuṣṭubh

(sva-dat)ṛa?<ā><m> para-datt(ā)<m><24>vā
yat(n)ād rakṣa yudhiṣṭhira
mahī(m) mahīmatā<m> śrṛa?<e>ṣṭha
dṛa?<ā>nāT śrṛa?<e>yṛā?<o> <'>nup(ā)lana<M>

6. Indravajrā

d(ā)nā<25>ni daṛn?<t>āni purā narendrai<Page 3v><26>{ndrepuna}<<r>>
<<ddā>><nā>ni dharmmāṭṭhi?<rttha>-yaśas-kṛā?<a>rāṇi
nirmmāi(la)!<lyā>-(v)ānta-pratimāni tā<27>ni
ko nā○ma sādhu<ḥ> punar ādadātiḥ?<|>

7. Indravajrā

dhaṛmmi?<rmā>śraya<ḥ> kalpa-taru(h) prajānā<m>
śrṛi?<i>-vṛi?<i><28>ya○mā sādhu-ja{va}nāvagam(y)a<ḥ>
ṛa?<ā>jñaptir asmin kaḍu-rāja kāti
<29>nityā ○ samulla(m?)ghita-loka-netraḥ

Apparatus

Plates

<2> kura<3>mara○-svṛa?<ā>mi- ◇ ku{ra}<3>māra-svāmi-vara- K&PS • While emen-

dation to *kumāra-svāmi* is attractive, that name is not attested in any cognate grant, and the acquisition of a kingdom is never connected to Kumāra, while *kaśīkī-vara-prasāda-labdhā-rājyānām* is quite ubiquitous. Sanction by Kumāra may of course be connected to the likewise ubiquitous phrase *svāmi-mahāsena-pādānuddhyātānām*. I wonder if *kurumara-svāmi* is rather a local deity, perhaps connected to the locality *kurumarathyā* mentioned in the Sātārā plates of Viṣṇuvardhana I. For the acquisition of a kingdom through what may be a local deity, compare *svāmi-bhaṭṭāraka-pāda-padma-prasādāvāptarājyānām* in the Guḍivāḍa plates (set 1) of Jayasimha I.

<3> *śrīmaM-c(al)kī!nā<in>* ◇ *śrī-ḷ(vīravakḥkhaṇ)?<vīra-lakṣṇa>* K&PS • KPS's reading is not satisfactory, and their emendation makes no sense in the context even assuming that their intent was *vīra-lakṣṇa*. What they read as *vī* is clearly *ma*. The tick-mark shaped glyph they read as *ra* is in my opinion a (rather late-seeming) final *M*, presumably intended for *T*. Their *va* is *ca*, possibly corrected to or from *cā*. The next character might conceivably be *khka* (though not *khkha*), but I think it was in fact meant to be *lkī*, although the execution of the *l* component is very poor. Compare the attested forms *caḷikyānām* and *calikyānām*.

<4> *-yājīnāḷvā?<m a>nvaya-mahodadhḷo?<eh>* ◇ *-yḷa?<ā>jīnā ḷcātraya?<kṣatriya>-mahodadhḷo?<ā>* K&PS • The intent may also have been *-yājīnām anvaye mahodadhau*, but a compound seems more likely in such an expression.

<5> *sambhūta<h>kī(r)t(t)iva(r)mmā<.>tasya putras* ◇ *sambhūta-kīrttivarmmḷā?<a>ṇasya pḷu?<au>tras* K&PS.

<6> *-mahā-dhanaugha-viḷc?<bh>avo* ◇ *mahā-dāhaḷno?<nā>ya-deva vo-* K&PS.

<7> *-<ma>yūkha-dhauta-* ◇ *-<ma>yūkhḷe?<a>-ḷcota?<c-ot>-* K&PS. — <7> *viṣṇḷo?<u>r ivāparo* ◇ *viṣṇor ivāparḷo?<a>-* K&PS.

<9> *ḷmahō(śva)?<Page 2r><10>ḷlosaddhipayyatha-ma(d)dhya?* ◇ *mahḷo?<e>śva<Page 2r><10>ḷ!<r>a-siddhi-paryya<nta>-dha<r>bhvavya* K&PS • In spite of the ungainly execution of most characters, this nonsensical string is quite clearly legible. At the end of line 9, *śva* may have been meant for, corrected to, or corrected from *jva*. In line 10, *lo* might on its own be interpreted as *pha*, but the glyph is exactly identical to the cursive *lo* in line 29; it cannot be *la* as read by KPS (nor can the next character be *si*). *ddhi* may be *dvi*. *yya* might perhaps be *yu* and seems to have been corrected, probably from *ya* or *yā*, when the next line had already been engraved, as its subscript component stays to the right of the intervening *jā* there. *tha* may perhaps be *rtha*; out of context, it could also be interpreted as a clumsy *la*. The ligature I read as *ddhya* could be taken for *ndhya* or *bhvya* (which is probably what KPS had read and misprinted *bhvavya*), but is the same glyph as that in several instances of the word *pādānuddhyāta* (ll 1, 5, 9; see also the

palaeographic description). All in all, I am unable to offer a plausible correction. The composer's intent may have involved *mahojvalodadhi-paryyanta*, but the word expected after this would be *yaśāḥ* or *kīrttiḥ*, while *madhya* is the only directly intelligible word recognisable in the received reading.

<11> -mahār_ṛa?<ā>jā!<o> ◇ -mahār_ṛa?<ā>j_ṛe?<a><sya> K&PS. — <11> -j_ṛpuṇya-vividuye!<puṇyābhivṛddhaye> ◇ -puṇyā_ṛv?<bh>ivṛddhaye K&PS • The *du* engraved instead of *ddha* is in all probability a scribal mistake, but the rest of the strangeness here may reflect vernacularised usage. — <11> Intra<<pu>>ra- ◇ guntapura K&PS • *pu* is probably a correction from *ra*. KPS's Guntapura is impossible; the principal stroke of the first character does resemble *ga*, but definitely not *gu*, and with the two dashes below it, it can only have been meant for initial *I*. Thus, KPS's identification with modern Guntur must also be dismissed. The intended name may, however, be Indrapura.

<12> -p_ṛo?<au>trāya ◇ -hotrāya K&PS. — <12> _ṛ(pa)dagā(d)dhyāyino? ◇ _ṛgo?<kā>nvāyine K&PS • I am unable to interpret the beginning of this string or to explain why KPS do not read the first two characters. The *akṣara* I read as *pa* begins with a loop rather than a headmark and thus bears some resemblance to the Central Indian *la* used in this inscription, but it lacks the extended tail which I believe would be required in absence of a superscript vowel marker. There is an oblique stroke attached to the bottom right of this glyph, which is much too small to be a subscript *r* and the wrong shape to be an *u* marker, so I assume that it is an irrelevant slip of the chisel. The character I read as *ddhyā* is the same as that in several instances of *anuddhyāta* (see also the palaeographic description), so the latter part of the segment is secure. Throughout the corpus, when the term *adhyāyin* occurs in the description of a Brahmin, the expression is *veda-dvayādhyāyin* or an equivalent, but this cannot have been meant here. Could the intent have been *pada-Adhyāyino* or *prthag-adhyāyino*? Or could *padagādhyāyino* be correct and mean a religious student who is a footsoldier? — <12> bodasvā<13>mi- ◇ po_ṛasvā<13>mi- K&PS.

<14> -biṇṇāyā ◇ -be{r}ṇṇāyā(m) K&PS • The *i* is unequivocal and may be a rendering of a short *e* sound. — <14> viḷetti ◇ viḷeṣṭi K&PS • The name of the village was correctly read for ARIE. KPS's incorrect reading is repeated in their discussion, so it is not a typo in the edition.

<15> grā<ma>m āgrahārī-kṛtya ◇ grāmāgrahārī kṛtvā K&PS.

<16> pratta<M> ◇ pr_ṛe?<o>kta<M>|| K&PS. — <16> -vās_ṛi?<i>(nām?) ◇ -vā_ṛi?<si>_ṛnā?<ne> K&PS • KPR's text is *vāsī(si)ṇ(ne)* with a macron over the opening parenthesis of *(ne)*. I assume that their reading is *ṇā*.

<17> sa○rvva(th?)*ḷa?<ā>sḷth?<m>a<d>-dharmmḷā?<o>* ◇ *sarvvḷi?<a>-ḷda?<vidha>*
sva-dharmmmā K&PS. — <17> sva-dharmmḷā?<o> rakṣaṇḷi?<ī>ya<ḥ> ◇ *sva-dharmmā*
rakṣaṇ{ṇ}ḷi?<ī>ya K&PS • I emend tentatively, not being fully satisfied with my re-
 construction of the sentence. — <17> -vid *ḷo?<ā>jñḷ(ā)?<a>ptḷa?<i><ḥ>*<18>Atra
 ◇ *-vidḷo?<ā>jñḷe?<ā>pta<18>gratpa* K&PS • KPS emend in the body of their edition to
 -vidājñāpta (which is not intelligible to me), and then apparently re-emend to in a
 footnote attached to “gratpa” in the next line, which says, “The word is unnecessary.
 Read as ājñaptirasya.” The reading of Atra is unambiguous.

<18> śrī-Ammā<.> Api ◇ *śrī-ḷgrammāgrasi?<dharmmarakṣitā>* K&PS.

<19> <tāva>nḷn?<t>i narake ◇ *[tāny eva] nḷi?<a>rake* K&PS • For the justification of my
 restoration, compare the less corrupt iteration of the same locus in line 22. — <19>
vaseḷ(M)?<T> ◇ *va[sed iti]* K&PS.

<21> ṣaṣṭḷi?<i> • What I (and KPS) read as *i* is represented by a dot in the circle of *i*.
 The intent may instead be *ṣaṣṭim*.

<22> tḷa?<ā>vanḷn?<t>i ◇ *tāny eva* K&PS. — <22> <va>seT ◇ *vased ḷa?<i><ti>* K&PS.

<23> (sva-dat)*ḷa?<ā>* • The dharacters *datta* may be a correction over something else.
 — <23> dḷa?<ā>nāT śrḷa?<e>yḷā?<o> ◇ *dānaḷś?<c> chreyo* K&PS.

<25> daḷn?<t>āni purā narendrai<Page 3v><26>{ndrepuṇa}<<r ddā>><nā>ni ◇
daḷnt?<tv>eva narendra<Page 3v><26>{nadre}puṇaḷr?<n>ā K&PS • The superfluous *ndre*
 in line 26 is obviously a repetition of *ndrai* in the previous line and one or the other
 was meant to be ignored. I have no explanation for the superfluous *puṇa*. I am quite
 certain that *rddāni* is a corruption of *rddānāni*, which produces a correct continuation
 of the stanza except for the fact that *dānāni* is repeated (as if *yāniha* had been inscribed
 instead of in the first quarter *dānāni*). In this segment, *pu* may be a correction, and
rddā has definitely been re-engraved, but apparently over another (slightly larger and
 clearer) rendition of the same character.

<27> śrḷi?<ī>-vḷi?<ī><28>ya○mā sādhu-ja{va}nāvagam(y)a<ḥ> ◇ *śrīma<28>yarḷ-*
āsādhu ja vanāvagamya K&PS • The executor’s name looks rather like Dhīyamā here, but
 compare stanza 1 of the Niḍupaṛu grant of Jayasiṁha I, where the name of (probably)
 the same person is Vīyamā (or possibly Cīyamā). The *i* of this name must be long for
 the metre to be correct. After *nāvaga*, this line dips to avoid the descender of *mmi* in
 the previous line, and there are several dots that seem to form a semicircle around
 that descender, as if to demarcate the space where the next line can be engraved. The
 character read as *mya* has a misshapen subscript component that looks rather like *ṭ*,
 but the intent is quite certain.

⟨28⟩ ॐa?⟨Ā⟩jñaptir asmin kaḍu-rāja kāti ◇ Ājñaptir asya ॐkuṭku?⟨kaṭaka⟩-rāja kaṇḍi
K&PS • The term *kaḍu-rāja* is clear, although I know of no other attestations. However, compare *kaḍa-ereya* in the Jaḷayūru grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III and *kaḍeya-rāja* in the Bezvāḍa plates and Moga grant of Bhīma I, noting also that in the Bezvāḍa plates, *kaḍeya* is used in place of two syllables of an *anusṭubh* stanza. The reading of *kāti* is also clear and unambiguous, but I cannot interpret this string in any other way than as another name of this person.

⟨29⟩ nītyā ○ samulla(rn?)ghita-loka-netraḥ ◇ ॐnītya?⟨tavya⟩ samullayati lokanetraḥ
K&PS • KPS believe that the engraver of the grant was named Lokanetra. They may have understood their “*samullayati*” (probably a misprint of *samullayita*) to stand for *samullikhita* or a similar word. Although I am not certain of the correct interpretation (see my translation), the reading as established by me is certain. What I read as an *anusvāra* in *samullaṁghita* is rather a horizontal stroke attached to the left top of *gh*, and given the almost complete absence of *anusvāras* in the inscription, this may be just a slip of the chisel; nonetheless, an *anusvāra* is then to be supplied.

Translation

Plates

⟨1–16⟩ Greetings from majestic Piṣṭapura. From the great ocean that is the lineage of the majestic ॐCaḷkis?, who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by the Lord Mahāsena, who are the sons of Hārītī, who are of the Mānavya *gotra*, who have attained kingship through the boon of Lord ॐKuramara?,¹ who perform the Aśvamedha sacrifice, there arose Kīrtivarman, like nectar (*amṛta*) {arising from the great ocean} for the salvation of living beings. His son, deliberately appointed (as successor) by him, was King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana, the majestic Crocodile-bannered (love god) (*makaradhvaḥja*), <resembling> another Viṣṇu, whose opulence was a great mass of wealth achieved by means of his three powers (*śakti-traya*), who was recognised in the world for by just reputation, victorious in diverse battles, whose two lotus feet were washed by rays from the gemstones on the crowns of kings. His son, deliberately appointed (as successor) by him, His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Jayasirṁha Vallabha, ...² who is courageous like a lion (*siṁha*), in order to increase his mother’s and father’s merit, has granted the village named Viḷetti, <located> in Nātavāḍi district (*viṣaya*) on the northern bank of the (river) Kṛṣṇa-biṇṇā, converted into a rent-free holding (*agrahāra*) by a remission

¹ See the apparatus to line 2.

² I am unable to interpret the text here. It may meant to say something about Jayasirṁha’s fame extending to the oceans. See the apparatus to line 9.

of all burdens, to the grandson of the *caturvedin* Bhūtisvāmin, the son of Bodasvāmin who was a student of the *padaga*,³ <namely> to the *dvivedin* Svāmiśarman of the Kautsa *gotra*, a resident of Intrapura, <the donation being> sanctified by (a libation of) water.

<16–18> Let <this> be known to all residents of the district and to our (Jayasirīha's) retainers (*bhṛtya*). Our ruling (*dharma*) is to be preserved by all means. The executor in this <matter>, conversant with all legal treatises (*dharma-śāstra*), is His Highness Ammā. Moreover, it is said:

1.

A donor of land rejoices in heaven for sixty millennia, <while> a seizer <of granted land> and a condoner <of such seizure> shall reside in hell for as many.

2.

Many <kings> have granted land, and many have preserved <former grants>. Whosoever at any time owns the land, the fruit/reward <accrued of granting it> belongs to him at that time.

3.

⁴A donor of land rejoices in heaven for sixty millennia, <while> a seizer <of granted land> and a condoner <of such seizure> shall reside in hell for as many.

4.

Many <kings> have granted land, and many have preserved <former grants>. Whosoever at any time owns the land, the fruit/reward <accrued of granting it> belongs to him at that time.

5.

O Yudhiṣṭhira, diligently preserve land that has been donated, whether by yourself or another. O best of land-possessors, preserving <a grant> is superior to making a grant.

6.

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

7.

³I cannot interpret this word. See the apparatus to line 12 for the associated problems.

⁴Stanzas III and IV are repetitions of stanzas I and II, for no clear reason.

The executor (*ājñapti*) in <the matter of> this <provision> is His Highness Vīyamā, the Castellan (*kaḍu-rāja*) Kāti,⁵ a foundation of proper order (*dharma*), a wishing-tree for subjects, approachable by virtuous men, who ḷhas risen above the common purview? through his political skill (*nīti*).

Commentary

Very unusually, both sides of each plate are inscribed. Katti and Padmanabha Sastry (1995, p. 100) incorrectly report that the verso of the third plate is not inscribed; their edition shows the last four lines of the text as being on 3 recto.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1990–91, p. 23, appendix A/1990–91, N° 8 with some further details at ARIE 1990–91, pp. 3–4. Edited from inked impressions by Madhav N. Katti and C. A. Padmanabha Sastry (1995), without facsimiles and without translation. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on photographs taken by myself in 2023 at the ASI Museum, Amaravati, collated with the above edition.⁶ Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[K&PS] Katti, Madhav N. & C. A. Padmanabha Sastry. 1995. “An Eastern Chālukya copper plate charter from Chāmaṛṛu.” JESI 21, pp. 100–103.

Secondary

ARIE 1990–91. *Annual report on Indian epigraphy for 1990–91*. Edited by Madhav N. Katti. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 2006.

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

⁵I am not sure if Kāti is another name of the executor or a description that I fail to understand.

⁶Katti and Padmanabha Sastry’s edition contains an inordinate number of typographic (or other) mistakes. Divergence from my readings is only shown in the apparatus where it is meaningful and potentially significant.